

# M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange

**TR010030**

## **9.37 Statement of Common Ground with Surrey County 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 ]

---

#### 9.37 STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND WITH SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL


---

<b>Regulation Number:</b>	Rule 8 (1) (e)
<b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference</b>	TR010030
<b>Application Document Reference</b>	TR010030/APP/9.37
<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
Rev 0	28 January 2020	Deadline 3

**STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND**

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

Signed.....  


**Jonathan Wade**

**Project Manager**

**on behalf of Highways England**

**Date: 01 May 2020**

Signed.....  


**Caroline Smith**

**Planning Group Manager**

**on behalf of Surrey County 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>16</b>

## Tables

No table of figures entries found.

# 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 Surrey County Council (SCC) as at 1 May 2020 and supersedes that submitted at Deadline 5 [REP5-009]. 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 has been prepared by (1) Highways England as the Applicant and (2) Surrey County Council.

## 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. A small number of matters continue to be the subject of discussion between the parties. These are identified within the SoCG as 'Under discussion as at Deadline 8'. An update as regards the position on these matters will be provided to the Examining Authority prior to the close of the DCO examination.
- 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 Surrey County 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 Surrey County Council.

## 2. Record of Engagement

2.1.1 A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between Highways England and Surrey County 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 Local Authority (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 Guildford Borough Council (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

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
		<p>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 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</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
		<p>Road, which has been discussed and agreed by SCC, FFS and Highways England. 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 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 wish to hold a meeting with SCC to present a draft paper which concerns 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>



Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
		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.
24.07.2019	Meeting	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>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> </ul> <p>Common Land, history and way forward.</p>
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> </ul> <p>Arranging further meetings with each LA to review draft SoCGs.</p>
19.07.2019	Briefing Pack for Wider SCC Councillors & Woking Councillors	Scheme & DCO Update for those who could not attend the Councillor Presentation session on 23.07.2019
23.07.2019	Presentation and Q&A	Scheme & DCO Update with Q&A session.
03.12.2019	Meeting	<p>Sent apologies and received the minutes. 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> </ul> <p>SoCG approach and programme</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
<b>Technical Meetings</b>		
28.06.2018	Meeting	Local Road Interaction & Modelling.
01.11.2018	Workshop	Seven Hills Road Workshop.
01.11.2018	Meeting	Land Acquisition.
01.11.2018	Meeting	Traffic Modelling.
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.
20.03.2019	Meeting	Drainage consent.
09.05.2019	Workshop	Traffic Management Plan.
08.07.2019	Workshop	SPA & Replacement Land Management 1.
19.08.2019	Workshop	SPA & Replacement Land Management & review of issue logs 2.
15.10.2019	Meeting	Land Acquisition
10.10.2019	Meeting	Cultural Heritage Impacts
29.10.2019	Meeting	SCC SoCG (Meeting 1) Devised a way forward on content and layout. It was agreed that SCC would send their key issues to HE, and the SoCG would use the same headings as used in the Rule 6 Letter.
29.10.2019	Workshop	SPA & Replacement Land Management & review of issue logs 3. Mostly a discussion regarding legal agreements between HE and SCC, and cost and responsibilities of future ecological maintenance.
11.12.2019	Workshop	Traffic Management Plan & Traffic Modelling
17.01.2020	Meeting	SCC SoCG (Meeting 2) Discussed the draft propositions, confirmed areas of agreement, disagreement and under discussion, progress of the side agreement
23.01.2020	Meeting	Painshill Park Access A meeting between Surrey Fire and Rescue Service, Painshill Park and Highways England to discuss access issues.
24.01.2020	Meeting	SCC SoCG (Meeting 3) Discussed the draft propositions, confirmed areas of agreement, disagreement and under discussion.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
10.02.2020	Meeting	SCC SoCG (Meeting 4) Discussed traffic modelling, road safety, visibility splays, highways and environment side agreements and dDCO.
14.02.2020		SCC SoCG (Meeting 5)  Discussed issues relating to Ripley and outstanding traffic matters yet to be agreed.
17.02.2020	Meeting	SCC SoCG (Meeting 6)  Discussed the environmental side agreement and outstanding environmental related matters yet to be agreed.
18.02.2020	Meeting	Collaborative traffic management approaches
24.02.2020	Meeting	SCC SoCG (Meeting 7)  Discussed SoCG to be submitted at Deadline 5, side agreements and outstanding matters.
09.03.2020	Meeting	Environment Side Agreement  Meeting to discuss amended version of environment side agreement, including with Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT)
12.03.2020	Meeting	Drainage Strategy  Meeting to discuss drainage strategy for preliminary scheme design.
19.03.2020	Skype Meeting	SCC SoCG Update meeting.
20.03.2020	Skype Meeting	Meeting between SCC and Highways England to discuss SE Permit Scheme.
15.04.2020	On-line Meeting	Collaborative meeting re. the Examining Authority's Written Questions
16.04.2020	Skype Meeting	Environment Side Agreement Meeting
24.04.2020	Skype Meeting	SCC SoCG meeting
28.04.2020	Skype Meeting	Side Agreement finalisation meeting
29.04.2020	Skype Meeting	SCC SoCG finalisation meeting for Deadline 8
<b>Shared Documentation (not including Consultation materials, listed above)</b>		
09.10.2017	Email	Informal information on the SOCC approach.
25.01.2018	Email	Letter informing of the inclusion of J10-16 smart motorways programme.
02.02.2018	Email	Statement of Community Consultation.
04.10.2018	Email & Post	Highways England response to the public consultation on the M25 junction 10 /A3 Wisley interchange scheme dated 23 March 2018.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
25.10.2018	Email	Results from the surveys of HGV layby usage, this is part of the scheme design.
12.10.2018	Email	Highways England response to SCC/GBC/EBC statutory consultation submissions.
25.10.2018	Email	An advance draft of the Highways England traffic forecasting report. Feedback was provided during the meeting. Further feedback was provided at the technical meeting on 2/11/18. In which further questions were asked by SCC.
25.10.2018	Email	An advance draft of the Highways England Operational Report was shared. Feedback was provided during the meeting. Further feedback was provided at the technical meeting on 2/11/18. In which further questions were asked by SCC.
31.10.2019	Email	A document showing links and nodes (peak flows), including vehicle and PCU flows with all scenarios shown was shared. Feedback was provided during the meeting. Further feedback was provided at the technical meeting on 2/11/18. In which further questions were asked by SCC.
12.11.2018	Email	The notification of development safeguarding letter and PDF was shared. Drawings are to include the land acquisition requirements of the scheme and the area to be safeguarded ahead of development. Feedback was not required. Planning authorities are required to include the detail in planning searches.
15.11.2018	Email	Red line boundary comparison drawings of design fix 3 vs design fix 2. This was for information only.
16.11.2018	Email	Strategic transport model package.
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.
20.12.2018	Email	A draft DCO Statutory Document was issued for SCC review and comments.
20.12.2018	Email	Response to SCC modelling questions.
25.01.2019	Email	Scheme papers for the 4 NMU routes near J10.
05.02.2019	Email	A1 scheme plans.
15.02.2019	Email	SCC cut of BoR, SoR and acquisition/temporary possession schedules
15.02.2019	Email	Full suite of land and works plans.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
21.02.2019	Email	Speed limit, rights of way and scheme layout plans.
11.03.2019	Email	Road Safety Audit and designer's response.
26.03.2019	Email	Drainage DIS Appendix.pdf and Drainage Strategy Report.pdf and the M25 J10 - Drainage Design.pdf
26.03.2019	Email	Flood Risk Assessment.pdf.
26.03.2019	Email	Green Bridge Feasibility Report 1.pdf, Green Bridge Feasibility Report 2.pdf, Green Bridge Feasibility Report 3.pdf, Green Bridge Feasibility Report 4.pdf, and M25 J10 Green Bridge Feasibility Study.pdf.
26.03.2019	Email	Speed Limits and Traffic Regulations Plan-Wisley Lane.pdf.
27.03.2019	Email	GIS files in relation to traffic modelling.
12.03.2019	Email	Road Safety Audit.
01.04.2019	Email	Draft of Structures Schedule
03.04.2019	Email	General Arrangement Drawings.
16.04.2019	Email	Draft DF3.0 Transport Assessment.
08.05.2019	Email	Draft DCO Schedule 3.
16.05.2018	Email	Traffic Management Plan workshop presentation (alongside minutes).
17.05.2019	Email	Draft of Issues Log.
24.05.2019	Email	Draft DCO Schedules and suite of work plans (Work Plans, Streets, Rights of ways, Access plans, Traffic speeds, Traffic regulations plans, Scheme layout plans and Temporary works plans.
28.05.2019	Email	Response letter to SCC's comments on the Road Safety Audit.
05.06.2019	Email	Draft Transport Assessment with Highways England letter responding to SCC's comments on a previous draft of the Transport Assessment.
13.06.2019	Email	Land Plans and response to SCC's comments on the draft DCO Schedules sent previously.
23.07.2019	Email	A briefing (based on the councillor presentations 23 July 2019) on the scheme update, to be shared amongst Woking and Surrey Councillors who could not attend the presentations.
30.07.2019	Email	A selection of DCO hard copy drawings. Drawings only, and not the entire documents of

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
		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 Examining Authority (ExA)
10.12.2019	Email	Draft Statement of Common Ground (First Draft)
17.12.2019	Email	RHS Wisley Data
19.12.2019	Email	Documentation submitted to ExA for Deadline 2
08.01.2020	Email	Consultation Land Plans
10.01.2020	Email	Traffic technical note of A245 Eastbound Changes
14.01.2020	Email	Draft Highways Agreement
17.01.2020	Email	Draft plan showing intended maintenance responsibilities
22.01.2020	Email	Draft Statement of Common Ground (Second Draft)
29.01.2020	Email	Documentation submitted to ExA for Deadline 3
04.02.2020	Email	Statement of Common Ground Outstanding Matters
06.02.2020	Email	Local Model Validation Report
07.02.2020	Email	Draft Environmental Agreement
12.02.2020	Email	Documentation submitted to ExA for Deadline 4
13.02.2020	Email	Link/reference to DMRB
20.02.2020	Email	Outstanding information requirements/actions
20.02.2020	Email	Outline for Archaeological Management and Mitigation Strategy (AMMS)
21.02.2020	Email	Updated draft highways agreement
21.02.2020	Email	Updated draft environment agreement
24.02.2020	Email	Plan of Maintenance Access
27.02.2020	Email	Updated draft SoCG

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
27.02.2020	Email	Response to queries re 2022 DM traffic flows - Ripley
16.03.2020	Email	Response to queries re. land acquisition matters
16.03.2020	Email	Old Lane/Elm Lane forward visibility – options for DCO application amendment
18.03.2020	Email	Wisley Lane Diversion – confirmation that forward visibility can be achieved.
27.03.2020	Email	Old Lane/Elm Lane junction – 70m forward visibility and extent of vegetation clearance required
08.04.2020	Email	Ockham South-Facing Slips modelling and ExA Q3
09.04.2020	Email	Updated draft SoCG
09.04.2020	Email	Interim Road Safety Audit Report
09.04.2020	Email	Old Lane/Elm Lane forward visibility responses to SCC queries
23.04.2020	Email	Painshill forward visibility
23.04.2020	Email	Road Safety Audit information
30.04.2020	Email	LinSig traffic modelling results for A245

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) Surrey County 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**

Examination Reference	Document Title
APP-002	Highways England 1.2 Introduction to the Application and Scheme Description
APP-012	Highways England 2.8 Scheme Layout Plans (Sheets 1-10 of 31)
APP-014	Highways England 2.9 Engineering Drawings and Sections
APP-015	Highways England 2.10 Temporary Works Plans
APP-043	Highways England 5.3 Habitats Regulations Assessment Stage 3-5
APP-049	Highways England 6.3 Environmental Statement (Chapters 1-4)
APP-050	Highways England 6.3 Environmental Statement Chapter 5: Air Quality
APP-136	Highways England 7.4 Transport Assessment Report
AS-002	Highways England Additional Submission – Applicant’s response to s51 advice – 2.2 Land Plans (Revision 1)
RR-004	Surrey County Council Relevant Representations
REP1-009	Highways England Deadline 1 Submission – 9.12 Applicant’s Comments on Relevant Representations
REP1-010	Highways England Deadline 1 Submission – 9.13 Traffic Forecasting Report
REP1-020	Surrey County Council Deadline 1 Submission – Written Representation
REP2-002	Highways England Deadline 2 Submission – 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order (Revision 1)
REP2-005	Highways England Deadline 2 Submission – 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (Revision 1)



Examination Reference	Document Title
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
REP2-023	Highways England Deadline 2 Submission- 9.28 Revised draft Development Consent Order Deadline 2 (Tracked Changes)
REP2-045	Surrey County 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)
REP3-012	Highways England Deadline 3 Submission – 9.37 Statement of Common Ground with Surrey County Council (Rev 0)
REP3-036	Surrey County Council Deadline 3 Submission – Annex A – Key points from Surrey County Council’s oral statements made at the Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2)
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
REP3-063	Painshill Park Trust Ltd Deadline 3 Submission – Response from Central Command, Community Safety and Risk Reduction, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service
REP4-006	Highways England Deadline 4 Submission – 9.52 – Applicant’s comments on Surrey County Council’s Deadline 3 submission

Examination Reference	Document Title
REP4-040	Highways England Deadline 4 Submission – 10.6 Consultation Report Addendum – Changes to application
REP4-041	Highways England Deadline 4 Submission – 10.7 Transport Assessment Addendum – Changes to application
REP4-048	Surrey County Council Deadline 4 Submission – Responses to Highways England’s comments on the Joint Council’s Local Impact Report
REP4a-004	Highways England Deadline 4a Submission – 10.1 Report on Proposed Scheme Changes Rev 1
REP5-002	Highways England Deadline 5 Submission -3.1(2) – Revised draft Development Consent Order (Clean Version)
REP5-007	Highways England Deadline 5 Submission – 9.35 (1) – Statement of Common Ground with Elmbridge Borough Council
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
REP5-016	Highways England Deadline 5 Submission – 9.60 – Response to Surrey County Council’s Deadline 4 submission
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
REP5-028	Surrey County Council Deadline 5 Submission – Cover letter in response to Examining Authority’s Second Written Questions
REP5-029	Surrey County Council Deadline 5 Submission – Annex A – Response to ExA’s Written Questions (EXQ2)

Examination Reference	Document Title
REP5-030	Surrey County Council Deadline 5 Submission – Annex B – Collisions resulting in injury recorded by the police Ripley 2015-2019
REP5-031	Surrey County Council Deadline 5 Submission- Annex C – Response to Additional Consultation Feb 2020
REP6-003	Highways England Deadline 6 Submission – 3.1 Revised draft Development Consent Order (Clean) (Revision 3)
REP6-008	Highways England Deadline 6 Submission – 9.28 Revised draft Development Consent Order (Tracked) Revision 2
REP6-013	Highways England Deadline 6 Submission – 9.78 Comments on Interested Party Responses to ExQ2
REP6-019	Surrey County Council Deadline 6 Submission – Comments on any further information requested by the ExA received by D5 and D5a
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
REP7-016	Highways England Deadline 7 Submission – Volume 10.12 – Report on Proposed Scheme Changes 7-9
REP7-024	Surrey County Council Deadline 7 Submission – Comments on Examining Authority’s draft DCO schedule of changes
REP7-025	Surrey County Council Deadline 7 Submission – Response to Examining Authority’s Third Written Questions (Annex A)

**Table 3.2 Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) Between Highways England and Surrey County Council (SCC) Table of Issues/Matters to be Agreed -Final Version dated 1 May 2020**

3.1.2 Table 3.2 has been agreed with SCC 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 Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
<b>1.0 DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER (dDCO)</b>				
<b>1.1 dDCO articles &amp; associated schedules</b>				
1.1.1	REP2-047 (paras DCO3, DCO6 and DCO7)	<b>Article 2 of the dDCO.</b> The definitions and interpretation provided within article 2 of the dDCO are appropriate for the Scheme.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
1.1.2	RR-004 (para 2.5.1)	<b>Article 3 of the dDCO.</b> The disapplication of s.23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 and any byelaws made under s66 of the Lane Drainage Act 1991 is appropriate.	<b>Agreed.</b> SCC's agreement to the disapplication of s.23 is subject to the wording of the protective provisions contained in Part 4 of Schedule 9 of the dDCO being agreed. (see 1.3.1 below). A revised and agreed set of protective provisions in Part 4, Schedule 9 of the dDCO is being submitted to the Examining Authority (ExA) by Highways England at Deadline 8. See also issue 1.3.1 below.	
1.1.3	N/A	<b>Article 6 of the dDCO.</b> The provisions of article 6 which relate to the maintenance of drainage works are appropriate.	<b>Agreed.</b>  SCC's agreement is subject to Highways England and SCC entering into a separate legally binding side agreement on highway matters as set out at item 1.5.1 of this SoCG below.	
1.1.4	REP2-047 (para DCO4)	<b>Article 9 of the dDCO.</b> The provisions of article 9 which relate to consent to transfer benefit of order are appropriate.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
1.1.5	REP1-020 (paras 5.1.4.2 and 10.1) and REP2-047 (paras 7.11.4 and 7.11.5 and DCO5)  REP7-025 (see SCC's response to Ex Q 3.1.3)	<b>Article 11 of the dDCO.</b> The provisions of article 11 (as amended in the dDCO at Deadline 8) as regards streets and the application of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are appropriate and address SCC's concerns regarding the application of its Permit Scheme (The Traffic Management (Surrey County Council) Permit Scheme Order 2015 (as varied) and made under Part 3 of the Traffic Management Act 2004).	<b>Agreed.</b>	Highways England will engage with SCC as regards the timetabling of the works and to agree arrangements for the submission and approval of relevant permit applications.
1.1.6	RR-004 (Paras:1.3 2.3.3.3 2.3.4.2 2.5.3 – 2.5.4 2.6.1 - 2.6.6)	<b>Article 12 of the dDCO.</b> The provisions of article 12 are appropriate for providing for the future maintenance of streets forming part of the local highway network.	<b>Under discussion as at Deadline 8.</b>  SCC's agreement to article 12 would be contingent upon the conclusion of a legally binding side agreement on highway matters between Highways England and SCC as referred to at item 1.5.1 of this SoCG below and would also be	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
	2.8.2 3.1.1 - 3.1.4 4.1.1.2 5.1.1.1–5.1.1.2 5.1.1.6 5.1.2.1 -5.1.2.7 5.1.3.1–5.1.3.4 7.4, 7.7 and REP2-047 (paras 7.2.2.2 7.11.1 to 7.11.7 and SCC2 and DCO6)		subject to agreement on commuted maintenance sums as set out at issue 1.5.3 of this SoCG below.	
1.1.7	RR-004 (para 2.3.8.2)	<b>Article 12 of the dDCO and Work No. 18(a).</b> As Highways England maintains the existing signals at the Painshill junction, Highways England will accept responsibility for the future maintenance of the new signalised crossing on the A3 southbound on-slip at the A3/A245 Painshill junction (work no. 18(a)). This will be confirmed in a side agreement between Highways England and SCC.	<b>Agreed.</b>  SCC's agreement is subject to confirmation of this being included with the side agreement.  Highways England has confirmed that it will accept responsibility for the maintenance of the new signalised crossing proposed at the Painshill junction, as well as continuing to maintain the existing Painshill junction traffic signals. This was confirmed in REP2-014 (see comment on REP1-020-51 on page 41) and provision has been made within the terms of the highway side agreement prepared by Highways England	Highways England and SCC will seek to adopt a Collaborative Traffic Management approach during the construction and operational phases of the Scheme.
1.1.8	RR-004 (para 2.3.3.3) and REP2-047 para 7.2.2.2	<b>Article 12 of the dDCO and Work No. 31.</b> Under article 12, SCC will retain responsibility for the future maintenance of the improved A3 Ockham Park junction, and the B2215 and B2039 where they tie into the improved junction, including all associated new signals and signage, drainage and landscaping.	<b>Not agreed.</b>  SCC consider that the new traffic signals at the Ockham Park junction, should be maintained at the expense of Highways England, reflecting the approach currently adopted for the signals at the A3/A245 Painshill junction and other M25 junctions such as Junction 8.  Highways England considers that as this junction currently forms part of the local road network, its future maintenance should remain the responsibility of SCC as local highway authority in its entirety. SCC currently maintains the junction and associated lighting. Highways England considers that there is no reasonable justification as to why Highways England should be responsible for the future operation and maintenance of the new traffic signals. The purpose of the traffic signals is primarily to regulate the flow of traffic joining the Ockham Park junction from the local road network with only one arm of approaching traffic originating from the strategic road network.  See also Highways England's response on this matter in REP2-014 (comments on item REP1-020-49 on page 41).	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			Highways England observes that in all other respects, there is no dispute between SCC and Highways England as regards responsibility for the maintenance of the Ockham Park junction and the B2215 and B2039.	
1.1.9	RR-004 (paras 2.3.4.2, 5.1.1.4, 5.1.1.5, 2.6.1)	<b>Article 12 of the dDCO and Work No. 33.</b> Under article 12, SCC will become responsible for the future maintenance of the Wisley Lane Diversion (Work No. 33) including its tie-in with the existing Wisley Lane carriageway, together with associated earthworks, the Stratford Brook underbridge, the highway surface on the Wisley Lane overbridge structure and all associated drainage, landscaping and fencing.	<p><b>Under discussion as at Deadline 8</b></p> <p>SCC consider that this work should be subject to the payment of a commuted maintenance sum for the works and wishes also to exclude the highway surface on the Wisley Lane Overbridge, which SCC considers should be maintained by Highways England as part of the overall structure. SCC has requested further clarification as regards the future maintenance of the Stratford Brook underbridge and culvert.</p> <p>Highways England considers it appropriate that SCC should become the highway authority for the Wisley Lane Diversion upon its completion because this road would become part of the local rather than the strategic road network. Highways England considers that the drafting of article 12(4) [REP5-002] as regards the maintenance of any new overbridge and its associated highway surface is appropriate and is consistent with the approach adopted in other made DCOs for Highways England schemes. It would be illogical for the highway surface on the bridge to be maintained separately from the road surface either side of the bridge. See Highways England's response on this issue in REP2-14 (comment on REP1-020-50 on page 41). Highways England has amended the wording in article 12(1) of the dDCO to clarify that maintenance responsibilities would include any structures or culverts laid under the highway [REP5-006].</p> <p>See item 1.5.3 of this SoCG below for Highways England's position as regards the payment of commuted maintenance sums.</p>	
1.1.10	RR-004 (paras 3.1.2 and 5.1.1.2)  REP2-047 para 4.9.2	<b>Article 12 of the dDCO and Work No. 35.</b> Under article 12, SCC will become responsible for the future maintenance of the proposed new bridleway between Wisley Lane and Seven Hills Road (Work No. 35), including the highway surface on the replacement Cockcrow Bridleway Overbridge (excluding the green verge), the highway surface on the new Sandpit Hill Bridleway Overbridge and the highway surface on the new Redhill Bridleway 12 Overbridge.	<p><b>Not agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC considers that this work should be maintained by Highways England as it considers it a replacement facility for the closure of the existing cycle path/footpath that runs alongside the A3 and which is currently maintained by Highways England. In SCC's view, the rights of way network have never, and should not in the future, include strategic routes such as Trunk Roads and their associated infrastructure. SCC consider that the infrastructure necessary to carry non-motorised users along the A3 corridor should be defined as being part of the A3 Trunk Road network, not part of SCC's public rights of way network. SCC considers that there is no justification to pass the future permanent maintenance of this element of the HE network onto the local highway authority.</p> <p>Highways England considers that responsibility for the maintenance of this route, as with other public rights of way should fall with the relevant local highway authority. The approach provided for in the dDCO is consistent with other made DCOs in this regard. See Highways England's earlier responses on this matter in REP2-014 (comment on REP1-020-48 on page 40) and in REP3-047 (comment on NMU1 on page 23).</p>	
1.1.11	RR-004 (para 7.7) and REP1-	<b>Article 12 of the dDCO and Work No. 35(b).</b> As a 'non-standard' highway feature, it is appropriate that Highways England should be responsible for the maintenance and long-term management of the green verge proposed	<b>Agreed.</b>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
	047 para 4.4.12	on the replacement Cockcrow Overbridge, should designated funds be secured for this element of the works.	<p>Subject to confirmation of this in the side agreement, SCC agree that HE should be responsible for the maintenance and long-term management of the green verge.</p> <p>Highways England has confirmed that it will accept responsibility for the future maintenance of the green verge in REP2-014 (see its comment on REP1-020-57 on page 42) and in REP3-007 (see comment on para. 4.4.12 of the LIR on page 6). Highways England has included a clause within the side agreement to confirm that it will be responsible for the maintenance of the green verge and associated planting.</p> <p>See issue 1.5.1 of this SoCG below as regards the status of the side agreement.</p>	
1.1.12	RR-004 (para 3.1.5)	<b>Article 13 and Parts 3,4 and 8 of Schedule 3 of the dDCO.</b> The classification of highways/roads (as shown on the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (APP-008) and as described in Schedule 3 (Parts 3 and 4) of the dDCO) is appropriate.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
1.1.13	RR-004 (paras 2.3.7.1 4.1.1.1 4.1.1.2)  REP1-020 (paras: 2.3.7.1 and 4.1.1.1)	<b>Article 13(2) and Part 5 of Schedule 3 of the dDCO.</b> The speed limits as shown on the Speed Limits and Traffic Regulations Plans and set out in Part 5 of Schedule 3 of the dDCO are appropriate.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC agreement is subject to the speed limit at Elm Lane being reduced from 40 mph to 20 mph and provision being made within a side agreement regarding replacement of relevant speed limit signs.</p> <p>The dDCO makes provision for the replacement of the relevant speed limit signs within the description of the authorised works in Schedule 1. Highways England has submitted a change to the DCO application at Deadline 4, to make provision for the speed limit on Elm Lane to be reduced to 20mph. The Examining Authority has accepted this change for examination (see its procedural decision dated 27 February 2020).</p> <p>See also issue 11.8.1 below.</p>	
1.1.14	RR-004 (paras 4.1.1.2 4.1.3.1)	<b>Article 13 and Parts 6 and 7 of Schedule 3 of the dDCO.</b> The provisions of article 13 as regards traffic regulation matters are appropriate.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
1.1.15	REP2-047 (DCO1 and DCO8)	<b>Article 14 of the dDCO.</b> The provisions of article 14 as regards the temporary stopping up and restriction of use of streets are appropriate.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
1.1.16	N/A	<b>Article 15 of the dDCO.</b> The provisions of article 15 as regards the permanent stopping up and restriction of use of streets and private means of access are appropriate.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
1.1.17	REP2-047 (DCO9)	<b>Article 16 of the dDCO.</b> The provisions of article 16 as regards access to works are appropriate.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC's agreement is subject to Highways England and SCC entering into a separate legally binding side agreement on highway matters as referred to at item 1.5.1 of this SoCG below. The agreement is to make provision for Highways England to consult with SCC on the formation of any new access not otherwise identified in any of the certified DCO plans.</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			See issue 1.5.1 of this SoCG below as to the position reached on the side agreement.	
1.1.18	REP2-047 (DCO10)	<b>Article 18 of the dDCO.</b> The provisions of article 18 as regards traffic regulations are appropriate.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
1.1.19	REP2-047 (DCO12)	<b>Article 21 of the dDCO.</b> The provisions of article 21 as regards authority to survey and investigate the land are appropriate.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC's agreement to article 21 is subject to provision being made in a separate side agreement, requiring the Undertaker to restore any land owned by SCC used for survey or investigation purposes to the condition and level it was in on the date on which the survey or investigation began or other such condition as may be agreed with the owner of the land.</p> <p>SCC has also questioned the applicability of s.13 of the 1965 Act.</p> <p>Highways England has made provision in a separate legally binding side agreement to address SCC's concern about the restoration of its land used temporarily (see 1.5.1 and 1.5.2 of this SoCG below). As to SCC's point about the applicability of s.13, Highways England confirms that article 21(7) was included in the dDCO in error and has now been deleted from the dDCO [REP5-006].</p>	
1.1.20	N/A	<b>Article 26 of the dDCO.</b> The provisions of article 26 as regards the extinguishment of public rights of way are appropriate.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
1.1.21	RR-004 para 10.9 And REP2-047 DCO14	<b>Article 32 of the dDCO.</b> The use of temporary possession powers for carrying out the Scheme as identified in Schedule 7 of the dDCO is appropriate as regards land owned by SCC and that the article in combination with Requirement 17 of the dDCO provides sufficient assurance as regards the restoration of any SCC land used temporarily.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC is satisfied that its concerns regarding the formation of a new means of access to any of SCC's land being used temporarily can be satisfactorily addressed in a separate side agreement, as per issue 1.1.17 above.</p> <p>See also item 1.5.1 of this SoCG below.</p>	
1.1.22	REP2-047 (DCO15)	<b>Article 33 of the dDCO.</b> The provisions of article 33 as regards the temporary use of land for maintaining the authorised development are appropriate.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC is satisfied that its concerns about the formation of a new means of access to any of SCC's land to be used temporarily can be satisfactorily addressed in a separate side agreement, as per issue 1.1.17.</p> <p>See also item 1.5.1 of this SoCG below.</p>	
1.1.23	RR-004 para: 7.3	<b>Article 38 of the dDCO.</b> The provisions of article 38 as regards the compulsory acquisition of special category land or rights over special category land owned by SCC are appropriate and that the dDCO makes suitable provision for replacement land.  (see also items 9.2.1 and 9.2.2 below).	<b>Agreed.</b>	
1.1.24	REP2-047 (DCO17) and REP1-019 item 7	<b>Article 49 of the dDCO.</b> The provisions in article 49 as regards arbitration are appropriate.  (Note this article number was formerly article 48 up until the Deadline 8 version of the dDCO).	<p><b>Not agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC considers that there is a lack of clarity in this article, particularly as regards which party is responsible for meeting the costs of the arbitration process— see REP1-019. SCC also queries the responsibility for the payment of the arbitrator's fee upon their appointment as the article does not provide clarity as to the responsibility for payment of this fee.</p>	



SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>Highways England has responded to SCC's point about the award of costs in REP2-014 (see comment made on issue REP1-019-4 on page 52). Highways England considers that it would not be appropriate for the article to make specific provisions as to the award of costs as that is a matter that would need to be settled as part of any arbitration. Article 49 is well precedented. Highways England notes that the ExA has not suggested any amendment to this particular aspect of the drafting of article 49. Highways England has proposed a number of other amendments to article 49 to provide greater clarity which were intended to address SCC's earlier concerns. [REP2-023].</p> <p>See also Highways England's response to the Examining Authority's schedule of changes to the dDCO [REP7-012].</p>	
1.1.25	N/A	<b>Schedule 4 of the dDCO.</b> The provisions in Schedule 4 as regards the permanent stopping up of highways and private means of access and the provision of new highways and private means of access are appropriate.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
1.1.26		<b>Schedule 9 of the dDCO.</b> See 1.3.1 and 1.3.2 below.		
<b>1.2 DCO Requirements</b>				
1.2.1	N/A	<b>Schedule 2 Requirements.</b> The requirements as set out in Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the dDCO are appropriate.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>Agreed by SCC subject to the qualification at item 1.2 6 of this SoCG below. See also SCC's and Highways England's responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP7-025] and [REP7-004] respectively and to SCC's and Highways England's comments on the Examining Authority's schedule of changes to the draft DCO [REP7-024] and [REP7-012]. Of particular note, Highways England considers that the 5 year period in relation to the replacement of tree and shrub planting in requirement 6(5) to be sufficient to ensure that the proposed soft landscaping becomes established, whereas SCC whilst observing that the 5 year period is commonly used, considers that an increase to 10 years (as suggested by the Examining Authority) will ensure better landscape establishment.</p> <p>In commenting on the Examining Authority's schedule of changes to the draft DCO, SCC also requests that SCC is added as consultee for requirement 11 [REP7-024]. Highways England does not consider this to be strictly necessary as SCC is neither the relevant land owner nor the local planning authority for the proposed Buxton Wood Environmental Mitigation Area. However, this is not a matter of dispute between the parties.</p>	
1.2.2	REP2-047 (DCO1)	<b>Schedule 2 Requirements.</b> The procedures for discharging requirements and SCC's role as a requirement consultee as set out in Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the dDCO are appropriate.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC has asked that it be notified of any decisions made by the Secretary of State as regards applications made under the DCO requirements.</p> <p>The wording in the dDCO as regards the register of requirements is consistent with other made DCOs and is in Highways England's view well precedented and appropriate. Nonetheless, Highways England undertakes to notify SCC of any decisions made by the Secretary of State in relation to applications submitted under the DCO requirements and has included provision for this in a separate</p>	Under the terms of a highway side agreement, Highways England or its Undertaker will notify SCC of any decisions made by the Secretary of State as regards the DCO requirements.

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			legally binding side agreement that is being negotiated between Highways England and SCC.	
1.2.3	N/A	<b>Schedule 2 Requirement 3</b> – extending the working hours to allow construction works to be carried out between the hours of 07:00 and 19:00 on Saturdays is appropriate and will help facilitate timely completion of the Scheme.	<b>Agreed.</b>  SCC supports the principle of reducing the overall time period for construction of the project. (See also issue 11.4.1 below).	
1.2.4	REP2-047 (DCO18)	<b>Schedule 2 Requirement 3</b> – the wording as regards the preparation and approval of a Handover Environmental Management Plan is appropriate.	<b>Agreed.</b>  See also Highways England's response to Ex Q 3.15.7, Ex Q 3.15.8 and Ex Q 3.15.9 in REP7-004 as regards the wording of Requirement 3.	
1.2.5	REP2-047 (DCO19)	<b>Schedule 2 Requirement 23</b> – the wording as regards anticipatory steps towards compliance with any requirement is appropriate.	<b>Agreed</b>	
1.2.6	N/A REP5-029 (response to Ex Q 2.15.5)	<b>Schedule 2 – Interpretation</b> – the definitions provided in Schedule 2(1) are appropriate for the Scheme.	<b>Agreed.</b>  Agreed by SCC with one exception relating to the definition of commence. SCC considers that site clearance and the erection of temporary means of enclosure should be included within the definition of commence. See SCC's submissions on this point in responding to ExQ 2.15.5 [REP5-029]. SCC supports the Examining Authority's (ExA) proposed changes to the definition of commence including the removal of the words 'site clearance' from the exclusions as set out in the ExA's schedule of changes to the dDCO published on 9 April 2020.  Highways England has amended the dDCO at Deadline 6 [REP6-008] to remove site clearance (and the receipt and erection of construction plant and equipment) from the exceptions to the definition of commence. SCC's concern on this exclusion has therefore been addressed.  As to temporary means of enclosure, Highways England does not agree with SCC or with the ExA's suggestion to remove this from the list of exclusions. Highways England considers that the definition (in its revised DCO as at Deadline 6 [REP6-008]) strikes an appropriate balance between the need for certainty together with a proportionate degree of flexibility to ensure the efficient implementation of a nationally significant infrastructure project. The erection of temporary means of enclosure has very recent precedent in The A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross Development Consent Order 2020 and is considered appropriate. Accordingly, in Highways England's view the definition in the dDCO (as revised) is reflective of precedent as regards highways DCOs. Highways England's position on this point is further confirmed in its response to ExQ3.15.6 [REP7-004] and in its response to the ExA's schedule of changes to the dDCO [REP7-012].	
<b>1.3 Protective Provisions</b>				
1.3.1	RR-004 (paras: 2.5.1	Schedule 9. The provisions as set out in Part 4 of Schedule 9 of the dDCO are appropriate as regards the protection of ordinary watercourses.	<b>Agreed.</b>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
	2.5.2 2.5.3 2.5.4 2.5.5 8.1) and REP2-047 (paras 4.5.1 to 4.5.5 and DCO6 and DCO21)  REP6-019		SCC agrees the protective provisions in Part 4 of Schedule 9 of the dDCO as worded in the version of the dDCO being submitted by Highways England at Deadline 8.	
1.3.2	RR-004 paras: 2.8.2 10.4 and REP2-047 (DCO6 and DCO20)	It is not appropriate for the dDCO to contain protective provisions for the benefit of SCC as local highway authority.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC emphasises that its agreement is subject to conclusion of a side agreement between Highways England and SCC to provide for the protection of SCC highway assets.</p> <p>See issue 1.5.1 below for the position as regards the side agreement between Highways England and SCC.</p>	
<b>1.4 Other DCO matters</b>				
1.4.1	RR-004 paras: 2.5.4 2.6.1 REP4-048 (P22.LRN5)  See also SCC's response to ExQ3.1.2 [REP7-025]	The DCO makes appropriate provision for maintenance access to the works that are intended to become the responsibility of SCC in the future.	<p><b>Under discussion as at Deadline 8.</b></p> <p>SCC is concerned that adequate provision for maintenance access should be secured through the DCO, including for ponds and structures and ideally not over third-party land. SCC has requested drawings and explanatory text setting out how the assets Highways England is proposing to transfer to SCC are to be accessed for maintenance. SCC has requested that the title of land required for access should be passed to SCC.</p> <p>Highways England has responded to SCC's concerns on this point in REP2-014 (see comment on REP1-020-54 on page 42) and in REP3-007 (see comment on LRN5 on page 22). In summary, Highways England has confirmed that the DCO boundary has been defined to include all land necessary to construct, operate, maintain and manage the Scheme, including suitable provision for maintenance access.</p> <p>Highways England has provided SCC with a plan identifying the different elements of the Scheme that it would expect SCC to maintain under the DCO, together with a maintenance access route plan. Discussions are continuing with SCC on these matters and Highways England is endeavouring to provide more detailed information as to the maintenance access for specific elements of the works expected to become the responsibility of SCC in the future under the DCO.</p> <p>See also issues 1.5.1 and 1.5.3 of this SoCG below.</p>	Highways England is endeavouring to resolve this matter with SCC and will provide an update on the position reached before the close of the DCO examination.

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
<b>1.5 Side agreements and commuted sums</b>				
1.5.1	REP1-020 paragraphs 5.1.4.1 and 5.1.4.2	SCC and Highways England to agree the terms of a legally binding side agreement as regards highway matters.	<p><b>Under discussion as at Deadline 8.</b></p> <p>A draft side agreement has been prepared by Highways England on highway matters. Progress has been made with agreement reached on some terms. SCC and Highways England are continuing to negotiate on the remaining outstanding matters and are endeavouring to conclude the agreement prior to the close of the DCO examination.</p> <p>The draft side agreement covers a range of matters, including the mechanism for SCC's involvement in detailed designs, road safety audits, collaboration on arrangements for the management of construction works, the operation and maintenance of traffic signals, the inspection and testing of materials, defects, completion certification, handover and maintenance and commuted sums.</p> <p>As noted under issue 1.4.1 of this SoCG above, Highways England is also preparing a full and detailed schedule of the works that are expected to become the responsibility of SCC in the future under the DCO.</p> <p>See also Highways England's response to Ex Q 2.12.33 [REP5-014].</p>	Highways England is working with SCC, with a view to the side agreement being completed prior to the close of the examination. Highways England will provide an update on the position before the close of the DCO examination.
1.5.2	REP1-020 paragraphs 5.1.4.1 and 5.1.4.2  REP2-047 SCC3 and B1	SCC and Highways England to agree the terms of a legally binding side agreement as regards the arrangements for the management and monitoring of environmental mitigation and compensation measures on land within SCC's countryside estate.	<p><b>Under discussion as at Deadline 8.</b></p> <p>Highways England has prepared a draft side agreement relating to the management of the proposed environmental mitigation, compensation and reinstatement measures on SCC's land. Some terms have been agreed and Highways England is continuing discussions with SCC and Surrey Wildlife Trust to agree outstanding matters and final details..</p> <p>In summary, the draft agreement envisages an initial period during which Highways England's principal contractor would carry out and then maintain the relevant environmental works for a period of up to five years (depending upon the relevant work), following which the long-term management would be effectively contracted out to Surrey Wildlife Trust (the leaseholder of SCC's land) to carry out on Highways England's behalf. This long-term management period will last for up to a further twenty years (depending on the specific environmental mitigation/compensation involved and the measures required). This will be in line with the SPA Management and Monitoring Plan [AS-015] and the Landscape and Ecology Management and Monitoring Plan [REP4-032].</p> <p>The Scheme is not dependent upon this agreement being executed as the DCO will provide for the relevant powers for Highways England to carry out all necessary management and monitoring activities itself. However, it is recognised by both parties that there will be benefit in integrating the Scheme management plans within the wider management arrangements for SCC's estate at the Ockham and Wisley Commons. The agreement will also provide further assurance on the delivery of the relevant measures.</p>	Highways England is continuing to engage in discussions with SCC and Surrey Wildlife Trust on the provisions of this side agreement. However, the grant of development consent ought not be contingent upon agreement being reached as suitable provision for the management of the proposed environmental mitigation, compensation and reinstatement measures is already provided for in the dDCO. Highways England will provide an update on the position as regards this agreement prior to the close of the DCO examination.

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
1.5.3	RR-004 para s 2.8.2, 5.1.1.6 and 5.1.2.1 to 5.1.2.7	SCC has requested commuted sums to cover the maintenance burden that would fall on SCC for additional infrastructure that Highways England is proposing to pass to SCC.	<p><b>Under discussion as at Deadline 8.</b></p> <p>SCC is concerned about the financial burden it will incur as a result of the additional obligations that will be imposed by the DCO for the maintenance of new and altered highways. SCC's position on commuted maintenance sums is set out within the Local Impact Report [REP2-047], para 7.11. SCC has asked Highways England to provide a schedule of assets that it is asking SCC to adopt and maintain. This will allow SCC to understand the financial implications of this and where it has concerns over the financial burden it will impose on SCC, in particular on certain assets. At this point in time, SCC has concerns about the following major assets that will result in a financial pressure and hence requires commuted maintenance sums (this list is not exhaustive and is dependent upon the assets schedule):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work No. 31 – new traffic signals at the Ockham Park junction;</li> <li>• Work No. 33 – the Wisley Lane Diversion; and</li> <li>• Work No. 35 – a new bridleway between Wisley Lane and Seven Hills Road.</li> </ul> <p>SCC emphasises that its requests relate to the additional infrastructure that SCC is being asked to maintain without the associated funds. The County Council's position on commuted sums is set out within the Local Impact Report [REP2-047], para 7.11.</p> <p>As set out in REP2-014 (comment on REP1-020-60 on page 43) Highways England does not consider it appropriate for the DCO to make provision for the payment of commuted maintenance sums for local highway works or for new public rights of way as other mechanisms exist for SCC to secure the necessary funding for this additional responsibility from central Government. Moreover, it does not follow that because Highways England is making improvements to the local highway network that Highways England should bear the future maintenance burden.</p> <p>However, as set out in Highways England's response to Ex Q 2.13.33, Highways England and SCC are continuing to discuss issues around the future maintenance of certain highway works, including matters related to commuted sums. A compromise position is being discussed for the Scheme based upon the protective provisions in the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Scheme draft DCO (Part 4 of Schedule 8), whereby Highways England is required to pay commuted sums to the local highway authority for the future maintenance of defined "Non-standard Highway Assets" not previously forming part of the local highway network. Highways England is continuing to prepare a detailed schedule of assets to share with SCC.</p> <p>Highways England will provide an update on this issue prior to the close of the examination, it being one of the matters under discussion in relation to the prospective side agreement mentioned at item 1.5.1 of this SoCG above.</p> <p>See also Highways England's response to Ex Q 2.13.31 and 2.13.33 [REP5-014].</p>	Highways England is continuing to engage in discussions with SCC as regards the future maintenance of certain highway works affecting the local highway network. Highways England will provide an update on the position as regards these discussions prior to the close of the DCO examination.

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
<b>2.0 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT, INCLUDING TRAFFIC MODELLING AND ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES</b>				
<b>2.1 Need for the Scheme</b>				
2.1.1	RR-004 (para 1.2)	There is a compelling case for the Scheme to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) address the current congestion and safety issues at the M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange and on the relevant parts of the A3,</li> <li>(b) address congestion at the Painshill junction; and</li> <li>(c) provide sufficient capacity for the traffic likely to be generated by planned growth in this part of Surrey, together with general background traffic growth.</li> </ul>	<b>Agreed.</b>  SCC wishes to ensure that the development does not however result in unacceptable impacts on the residents, businesses or the environment.	
<b>2.2 Scheme Objectives</b>				
2.2.1	RR-004 (para 2.1.1)	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 situated.	<b>Agreed.</b>  SCC was involved in the setting of the Scheme objectives at the pre-application stage, including the objective to minimise impacts on the surrounding local road network.	
<b>2.3 Alternatives</b>				
2.3.1	N/A	All other strategic scheme options considered (and described in chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement (APP-049) would result in a greater loss of land from the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and the Ockham and Wisley Commons Site of Special Scientific Interest and/or land which is special category land.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>2.4 Relevant highway design standards</b>				
2.4.1	REP1-004 and REP2-020 paras: 2.3.3.2, 2.3.8.1, 2.3.8.3 2.3.8.6, 2.5.5, 3.1.3, 3.2.1 (v), 4.1.2.2  REP2-047 paras 3.4, 4.5.5, 7.2.2.1, 7.2.6, 7.2.7.2, 7.2.7.4, 7.6.9, 7.7.1, 7.7.2, 7.7.3 and 7.7.4.  REP3-036 paras 1.2 and 1.5(c)  REP5-028	The local road network and public rights of way elements of the Scheme have been appropriately designed to the relevant standards (The Department for Transport's Manual for Streets Two, Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and SCC's Standard Details).	<b>Under discussion as at Deadline 8.</b>  During the course of the examination, SCC has raised a number of concerns about the level of detail in the DCO application documents to provide it with sufficient assurance as regards the acceptability of the Scheme designs. These concerns specifically relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the level of detail provided in the stage 1 road safety audits, which SCC considers to be insufficient to provide the necessary assurance on the safety and suitability of certain matters; and</li> <li>• whether the Scheme designs provide sufficient forward visibility at certain critical locations.</li> </ul> Highways England and SCC have engaged in constructive discussions to resolve as many issues as possible during the examination. SCC has reviewed the additional information submitted by Highways England as regards forward visibility [REP4-006] and the DCO change No. 8 (see issue 11.8.1 of this SoCG below). SCC is satisfied that its concerns regarding visibility have been addressed at the Old Lane/Elm Lane junction and for the Wisley Lane Diversion but seeks reassurance from Highways England that other issues are capable of being addressed at the detailed design stage and within the DCO boundary so as not to constrain decision making on any issues that could be subsequently raised.	Highways England will use reasonable endeavours to agree the following with SCC at the detailed design stage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The extent of high friction surfacing to be provided on Old Lane at its junction with Elm Lane;</li> <li>• Details of hazard signage to be provided at the junction between Old Lane and Elm Lane;</li> <li>• Details of any trees to be retained within the area proposed for vegetation clearance adjacent to the Old Lane/Elm Lane junction;</li> <li>• A plan for the management of land within the relevant visibility splay required at the junction between Old Lane and Elm Lane;</li> <li>• The detail and siting of any gate to be provided at the maintenance access for the proposed new drainage attenuation pond to the north of the A245 Byfleet Road eastbound carriageway, including the design of the bell mouth and turning head for the pond access;</li> </ul>

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
	See also responses to ExQ2.13.30 in REP5-029 and to ExQ3.13.5 in REP7-025		<p>SCC confirms that matters relating to forward visibility at the Painshill junction – from the A3 northbound off-slip to the A245 westbound carriageway have yet to be fully resolved as a departure from standards may be required. SCC also has concerns about the number of SCC trees likely to be affected at this location. SCC questioned whether the issue had any potential implications for the DCO boundary when commenting on this matter in response to Ex Q 2.13.30 in REP5-029. SCC is working with Highways England to agree possible measures to address its concerns with a view to reaching agreement through the DCO examination process. More generally, SCC has also requested confirmation that the DCO makes suitable provision for any land required to provide the necessary visibility where it affects SCC’s network to be within SCC’s control to prevent any potential restrictions to sight lines by third party landowners.</p> <p>Highways England recognises the positive dialogue with SCC to resolve outstanding matters. As to SCC’s specific concern about forward visibility at Painshill, Highways England has shared further detailed information with SCC and is endeavouring to agree a suitable package of measures with SCC to address its concerns before the close of the DCO examination. Highways England is also working to provide SCC with the assurances it seeks as regards land ownership and forward visibility. Highways England has previously given assurances that adequate forward visibility can be achieved for the maintenance access to the drainage attenuation pond alongside the A245 Byfleet Road and had understood this to be been accepted by SCC. This was recorded at issue 2.4.1 of the SoCG between Highways England and SCC submitted at Deadline 5 [REP5-009].</p> <p>Highways England notes that SCC has not raised any concerns with the design details shown on the other drawings submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-006] and these have therefore been taken to have been agreed.</p> <p>As to SCC’s points on the level of detail in the Road Safety Audits (RSAs), Highways England’s response is provided at item 2.16.1 of this SoCG below. In summary, the RSAs have been carried out in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and a more detailed audit will be carried out at the detailed design stage. Highways England has however included provision within the highway side agreement referred to at issue 1.5.1 of this SoCG above, for the involvement of SCC in RSA process to ensure that their issues are satisfactorily addressed at that stage.</p> <p>See also issues 3.4.3 and 11.8.1 of this SoCG below.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the optimum position for siting the bus stop on the A3 southbound on-slip at the Painshill junction and;</li> <li>The detail of measures to encourage lower speeds on entry to the bend on the Wisley Lane Diversion, with appropriate forward visibility to suit (including the design of landscape planting at this location).</li> </ul> <p>Highways England will use reasonable endeavours to agree with Surrey County Council, the measures that must be implemented to mitigate for any exceptions relating to forward visibility between the A3 northbound off-slip and the A245 Byfleet Road (westbound) and will provide for matters of forward visibility at this location to be assessed as part of any relevant road safety audit.</p>
2.4.2	See Examining Authority’s Action Points for ISH2 REP3-036 para. 1.1	The design of the proposed substitute private means of access to serve New Farm, the Gas Valve Compound, the Heyswood Camp Site and Court Close Farm is appropriately designed for its intended purpose.	<p><b>SCC has no further comments on this matter.</b></p> <p>SCC provided advice at deadline 3 (in response to ISH2 action point 3) that in its view a 3m width would be sufficient for the substitute access route serving only Court Close Farm lest it be routed along the eastern and northern boundaries of Heyswood (see REP3-036). SCC considers that the proposed substitute private means of access to serve the Gas Valve Compound and Heyswood from the A3 southbound Painshill on-slip is fit for purpose as currently designed. SCC encourages Highways England to work with the Heyswood Camp Site to agree a suitable design for this element to include how their internal access road is</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>upgraded from their eastern boundary to their existing car park area and whether their current access road coming in from the west is broken up and landscaped.</p> <p>Highways England submitted at Deadline 7 a request to change the DCO application to make provision for an alternative option for the alignment of the private access road at Heyswood [REP7-013]. This was accepted by the Examining Authority (see procedural decision dated 24 April 2020). The alternative access road option has been designed in accordance with SCC standards and is 3m in width, with passing places. It will be for the Secretary of State to determine which route alignment should be consented as part of the DCO.</p> <p>See also issue 11.7.1 of this SoCG below.</p>	
2.4.3	RR-004 para 2.5.3	In relation to structures there are a number of areas where approval of the Highway Authority will be required, including approval of the design (loading, dimensions etc of the structure)	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>The side agreement prepared by Highways England and under discussion with SCC makes provision for SCC's involvement in the detailed design of new or altered structures.</p> <p>See issue 1.5.1 of this SoCG above.</p>	
<b>2.5 Traffic Modelling and Transport Assessment Approach</b>				
2.5.1	<p>RR-004 Paras: 2.2.1 2.3.2.3 2.3.2.5 2.3.6.2</p> <p>REP2-047 paras 7.1 to 7.1.1, 7.1.2</p> <p>REP3-036 para1.5 See also SCC's response to ExA Q 2.13.34 in REP5-029.</p> <p>REP7-025 (response to ExA Q 313.3)</p>	<p>The methodology and scope of the traffic modelling carried out for the Scheme is robust and appropriate as regards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• baseline modelling;</li> <li>• demand forecasting</li> <li>• future year modelling.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC's agreement is subject to a suitable mitigation scheme being secured for Ripley High Street, as set out in SCC's response to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions (Q.3.13.3) [REP7-025]. SCC also maintains that the Scheme should have modelled the Burntcommon slips.</p> <p>Highways England confirms that its traffic modelling for the Scheme has been developed, calibrated and validated in compliance with best practice and Department for Transport (WebTAG) requirements. Highways England welcomes SCC's agreement that the calibration and validation of the model is satisfactory (see SCC's response to ExQ2.12.29 [REP5-029]. Highways England strongly defends the robustness of its traffic modelling, which has been carried out in a manner consistent with other Highways England schemes.</p> <p>Highways England has set out its reasons for not including the Burntcommon slips within its modelling for 2037 (see REP2-014 -comment on REP1-020-21 on page 34 and REP3-007 (comment on LRN1 on page 20). As set out in paragraph 4.7.9 of SCC's Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) [REP3-038] and other extracts from the SHAR in REP3-039, the Burntcommon slips would have the effect of significantly reducing traffic through Ripley. By omitting the slips from the modelling, it is likely that Highways England's assessment over-states rather than under-estimates the likely implications for traffic flows through Ripley.</p>	



SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
2.5.2	REP5-029 see response to Ex Q 2.13.29 (a)	The 2015 base flows used in the traffic modelling and reported in the Transport Assessment Report (APP-136) are robust and appropriate and are derived from reliable sources.	<b>Agreed</b>  SCC considers the calibration and validation of the model to be satisfactory for the purposes of the NSIP Scheme.	
2.5.3	N/A	The list of proposed developments contained in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 and shown on Figure 3.7 of the Transport Assessment Report (APP-136) correctly reflect the scale, type and location of planned growth within the modelled network area and are suitable for use in the traffic modelling/transport assessment.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
2.5.4	N/A	The level of detail contained in the Transport Assessment Report (APP-136) and in the Transport Assessment Supplementary Information Report (REP2-011) are appropriate and reflect the principles contained in Surrey County Council's Transport Planning Good Practice Guide 2017.	<b>Agreed.</b> However, SCC does not agree on Highways England's position as regards mitigation arising from this assessment. See section 2.8 below.	
<b>2.6 Ockham Park junction – Design and assessment</b>				
2.6.1	RR-004 paras: 2.3.3.1 2.3.2.5	The traffic modelling shows that the Ockham Park junction, when fully signalised as part of the Scheme, will provide sufficient capacity to accommodate predicted traffic flows in both the 2022 opening and the 2037 design year do-something scenarios, including accommodating the traffic likely to be generated by the development of the Wisley Airfield site or any other development, without the need for south-facing slips.	<b>Agreed.</b>  SCC acknowledges that the junction will remain within its operational capacity but notes that the Transport Assessment Report for the Scheme (APP-136) predicts that some minor delays are likely to occur in the evening peak. SCC expects to be involved at the detailed design stage to agree signal timings/phasing.  Highways England refers to its submission in REP2-014 (see comment on REP1-020-20 on page 33) which concludes that 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.	
2.6.2	RR-004 para 2.3.2.5	There is no planning policy requirement for south-facing slips to be provided at the Ockham Park junction to accommodate the traffic likely to be generated by development at the former Wisley Airfield site or any other planned development.	<b>Agreed.</b> However, SCC considers that Highways England should model south-facing slips at the Ockham Park junction (both with and without north-facing slips at Burnt Common) to establish whether they would help alleviate traffic impacts on Ripley.  See also Highways England and SCC's responses to Ex Q 3.13.2 on the modelling of south-facing slip roads at the Ockham Park junction [REP7-004] and [REP7-025].	
2.6.3	RR-004 para 2.2.5	The Scheme does not preclude the provision of south-facing slips at the Ockham Park junction at a later date.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>2.7 Closure of the A3/Wisley Lane junction – design and assessment</b>				
2.7.1	RR-004 para 2.2.5(c)	It would be unacceptable for the Scheme to retain a direct connection between the A3 and Wisley Lane on grounds of safety and design standards.	<b>SCC has no further comment to make, as this matter is determined by the standards in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.</b>  Highways England considers that a left turn would present an unacceptable safety risk that would contravene the relevant standards in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges [REP5-022]. It would also increase habitat loss from the	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. (See Highways England's response on this matter in REP2-014 – comment on REP1-020-10 on page 27). See also Highways England's response to Ex Q 2.13.14, Q2.13.14, Q2.13.15, 2.13.18 and 2.13.20 [REP5-014].	
2.7.2	REP2-047 para 4.9.12	The Scheme will provide a safer access arrangement for traffic using the A3/Wisley Lane junction.	<b>Agreed.</b>  SCC's agreement is subject to a stage 2 Road Safety Audit.	
2.7.3	RR-004 paras 2.3.2.22.3.2.4	An effective signage strategy can be implemented that would reduce the proportion of Wisley Lane traffic likely to route through Ripley as a result of the closure of the A3/Wisley Lane junction.	<b>Partially agreed.</b>  SCC considers that signage in isolation would not be sufficient to prevent most Wisley Lane traffic from using the B2215 through Ripley, given the complexity of the necessary movements involved. However, SCC does acknowledge that a signage scheme in combination with appropriate traffic management measures would have a more significant effect on reducing the traffic through Ripley  Highways England emphasises that the route via Ripley would be just one minute quicker than following the signposted route. This is not a significant difference in the context of a key visitor destination. Whilst the traffic modelling has been carried out on a 'worst-case' assumption that all the RHS traffic travelling to and from the A3 south would route via Ripley, it is highly likely that some traffic will follow the signposted route. Given the small difference in journey times between the two alternative routes, an effective signage strategy has the potential to encourage more traffic to follow the signposted route, particularly traffic travelling towards RHS Wisley from the south. See Highways England's response on this point in REP3-007 (see comment on paragraph 4.9.12 on page 9).  See also issue 2.8.7A of this SoCG below.	
<b>2.8 Traffic modelling and effects on Ripley</b>				
2.8.1	REP2-047 section 7  REP7-025 (see SCC's response to Ex Q 3.13.3)	The modelled do-minimum traffic flows through Ripley for the 2022 am peak, 2022 pm peak and 2022 inter-peak periods as set out in the Transport Assessment Report [APP-136] and the Transport Assessment Supplementary Information Report REP2-011] are robust and provide a sound basis for assessing the effects of the Scheme as regards Ripley.	<b>Agreed.</b>  As set out in its response to Ex Q 3.13.3 [REP7-025] SCC accepts the 2022 do-minimum traffic flow data on the basis that a suitable mitigation scheme is secured for Ripley High Street.  Highways England emphasises that the robustness of its 2022 do-minimum modelled traffic flows is not dependent upon any agreement on the need for mitigation. The need for mitigation is an entirely separate matter which should be determined by reference to the do-something (and not the do-minimum) traffic flows and only in relation to changes in flows that are specifically attributable to the Scheme having regard to the capacity of the network to accommodate those predicted increases and any associated and consequential environmental impacts.  See also section 2.5.1 of this SoCG above.	
2.8.1A	REP7-025 (see SCC's	The modelled do-something traffic flows through Ripley for the 2022 am peak, 2022 pm peak and 2022 inter-peak periods as set out in the Transport Assessment Report [APP-136] and the Transport Assessment	<b>Agreed.</b>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
	response to Ex Q 3.13.3)	Supplementary Information Report REP2-011] are robust and provide a sound basis for determining the effects of the Scheme as regards Ripley.	<p>SCC accepts the 2022 do-something traffic flow data but only on the basis that a suitable mitigation scheme is secured for Ripley High Street. See SCC's response to Ex Q 3.13.3 [REP7-025].</p> <p>Highways England considers that the robustness of its 2022 do-something modelled traffic flow data is a matter that can be agreed separately from the interpretation of that data and the question of mitigation. Highways England notes that in responding to Ex Q 3.13.3, SCC highlights that its 'main concern is in the interpretation of the results'. The need for mitigation is a judgement that should be made having regard to the capacity of the road network to accommodate any predicted increases in traffic flows and the likely effects on the operational performance of the local road network directly attributable to the Scheme and/or whether the increases in traffic due to the Scheme would give rise to significant environmental effects on nearby receptors. Highways England's position is that the small increase in traffic predicted on the B2215 through Ripley on account of the Scheme would not materially affect the operational performance of the local road network or give rise to any significant environmental effects on receptors along that route on account of the change in traffic flows attributable to the Scheme. Highways England does not therefore agree that mitigation is necessary on account of the Scheme.</p> <p>See issues 2.8.3, 2.8.5, 2.8.7 and 2.8.7A of this SoCG below for a further explanation of Highways England's position.</p>	
2.8.1B	REP7-025 (see SCC's response to Ex Q 3.13.3)	The modelled do-minimum traffic flows through Ripley for the 2037 am peak, 2037 pm peak and 2037 inter-peak periods as set out in the Transport Assessment Report [APP-136] and the Transport Assessment Supplementary Information Report REP2-011] are robust and provide a sound basis for assessing the effects of the Scheme as regards Ripley.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>As set out in its response to Ex Q 3.13.3 [REP7-025] SCC accepts the 2037 do-minimum traffic flow data on the basis that a suitable mitigation scheme is secured for Ripley High Street.</p> <p>Highways England emphasises that the robustness of its 2037 do-minimum modelled traffic flows is not dependent upon any agreement on the need for mitigation. Highways England considers that the need for mitigation is an entirely separate matter which should be determined by reference to the do-something (and not the do-minimum) traffic flows and only in relation to changes in flows that are specifically attributable to the Scheme having regard to the capacity of the network to accommodate those predicted increases and any associated and consequential environmental impacts.</p> <p>See also section 2.5.1 of this SoCG above.</p>	
2.8.1C	REP7-025 (see SCC's response to Ex Q 3.13.3)	The modelled do-something traffic flows through Ripley for the 2037 am peak, 2037 pm peak and 2037 inter-peak periods as set out in the Transport Assessment Report [APP-136] and the Transport Assessment Supplementary Information Report REP2-011] are robust and provide a sound basis for determining the effects of the Scheme as regards Ripley.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC accepts the 2037 do-something traffic flow data but only on the basis that a suitable mitigation scheme is secured for Ripley High Street. See SCC's response to Ex Q 3.13.3 [REP7-025].</p> <p>Highways England considers that the robustness of its 2037 do-something modelled traffic flow data is a matter that can be agreed separately from the interpretation of that data and the question of mitigation. Highways England</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>notes that in responding to Ex Q 3.13.3, SCC highlights that its 'main concern is in the interpretation of the results'. The need for mitigation is a judgement that should be made having regard to the capacity of the road network to accommodate any predicted increases in traffic flows and the likely effects on the operational performance of the local road network directly attributable to the Scheme and/or whether the increases in traffic due to the Scheme would give rise to significant environmental effects on nearby receptors. Highways England's position is that the small increase in traffic predicted on the B2215 through Ripley on account of the Scheme would not materially affect the operational performance of the local road network or give rise to any significant environmental effects on receptors along that route on account of the change in traffic flows attributable to the Scheme. Highways England does not therefore agree that mitigation is necessary on account of the Scheme.</p> <p>See issues 2.8.3, 2.8.5, 2.8.7 and 2.8.7A of this SoCG below for a further explanation of Highways England's position.</p>	
2.8.2	<p>REP2-047 paras 7.2.1.4 and 7.2.1.8 to 7.2.1.9</p> <p>REP3-036 para 1.4</p> <p>See also SCC's response to ExQ 2.13.4 in REP5-029</p>	<p>The north-facing slips at the A3 Burntcommon junction, which are to be secured as mitigation specifically for the development of the Wisley Airfield site, could have the effect of reducing traffic flows through Ripley in comparison with those assessed which means the modelling and assessment have appropriately considered a reasonable worst case in this regard.</p>	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC comments that the Burnt Common Slips, together with traffic management measures on the B2215, would help to mitigate the impact of Local Plan growth and strategic highway improvements on the village of Ripley.</p> <p>Highways England notes SCC's comment above. SCC has accepted the 2022 and 2037 traffic data (see SCC's response to ExQ 3.13.3 [REP7-025]. From this data it is evident that most of the predicted traffic growth in Ripley will be due to background growth and growth proposed in the Guildford Borough Local Plan and not as a result of the Scheme. See Highways England's comment on this at 2.13.3 in REP6-013. The Scheme will increase traffic flows through Ripley by approximately 5% (AADT) (see Table 4.1 of the Transport Assessment Supplementary Information Report [REP2-011] and by less than 2% in the busier morning peak hour see Table 7.9 of [APP-136].</p> <p>Highways England refers to Policy A35 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan which requires the delivery of the Burnt Common slips specifically as mitigation for the development of the former Wisley Airfield site.</p> <p>See also issue 2.8.4 below.</p>	
2.8.3	<p>RR-004 paras 2.2.2 2.2.3 2.3.2.1 2.3.2.2 2.3.2.3 2.3.2.4 2.3.2.5 2.6.6</p>	<p>The Scheme will have a limited effect on overall traffic flows and the operation of the local road network at Ripley, including due to the routing of traffic through Ripley on account of the closure of the A3/Wisley Lane junction.</p>	<p><b>Not agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC has expressed strong concerns as regards the effects of the Scheme on the local road network at Ripley, including the potential impact of RHS Wisley Garden trips routing through Ripley village in the PM peak. The full detail of comments made is available within the LIR, para 7.2 [REP2-047].</p> <p>Highways England notes that as set out in the Transport Assessment Report (APP-136), in the am peak time, the Scheme is predicted to increase overall traffic flows through the High Street/Newark Lane/Rose Lane junction by no more than 2% (in both 2022 and 2037 do-something scenarios). In the pm peak, when flows are lower than those in the morning, the Scheme is predicted to increase overall traffic flows at this junction by 7% in 2022 and by 2% in 2037.</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
	<p>and REP2-047 paras 7.1 to 7.2.1.20 and para 4.9.12</p> <p>REP7-025 responses on Ex Q 3.13.3 and ExQ 3.13.4,</p>		<p>Highways England considers that the effects on the operational performance of the junction will be limited.</p> <p>As set out in REP1-010, in terms of average daily traffic flows (AADT) the Scheme is not expected to increase overall traffic flows at the High Street/Newark Lane/Rose Lane junction by more than 4%, both in the 2022 and 2037 do-something scenarios and by more than 5% on the section of the B2215 between Newark Lane and the Ockham Park junction.</p> <p>The predicted increase in traffic through Ripley during the inter-peak period on account of the Scheme is expected to be higher (approximately 11-12%) but the network is less busy during this time and no loss of operational performance is expected.</p>	
2.8.4	<p>REP2-047 paras 7.2.1.10 and 7.2.1.11</p>	<p>Highways England has assessed a reasonable likely worst case as regards the effects of RHS Wisley traffic on Ripley, by assessing traffic flows consistent with an event day and by assuming that all affected traffic will route through Ripley rather than follow the signposted u-turn via M25 junction 10.</p>	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>From the work that SCC has undertaken, this statement can be agreed by SCC.</p> <p>Highways England is confident that it has modelled a reasonably likely worst case as regards the effects of RHS/Wisley Lane traffic on Ripley. 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). This is a point that has been agreed by RHS Wisley (see REP5-050).</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. Again, this is a point that has been agreed by RHS Wisley (see Rep5-005). It also means that Highways England has modelled an increase in traffic which is greater than that referred to as a likely worst case in the Joint Councils Local Impact Report (LIR) (see Table 1 on page 30 of the LIR [REP2-047]. 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 in the modelling for the 2022 and 2037 do-something scenarios.</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			See also Highways England's response to Ex Q 2.13.8 and 2.13.22 in REP5-014.	
2.8.5	RR-004 para 2.3.2.5  REP2-047 REP4-048  REP7-025 see responses to ExQ 3.13.3 and 3.13.4	The Scheme is not expected to give rise to a severance effect at Ripley.	<p><b>Not agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC has requested (see paragraph 2.3.2.5 of RR-004) that a comprehensive package of mitigation measures be provided in Ripley as part of the DCO. SCC has confirmed that the requested elements are mitigation against severance due to unbalanced flows on particular arms in additional directions. SCC consider that this severance is predominantly an inter-peak issue for Ripley justifying the mitigation measures set out above. In REP4-048 SCC states that the 30% threshold is 'too blunt a measure to determine whether mitigation is required' and considers that the potential for severance is dependent upon the circumstances of where the increase is occurring.</p> <p>SCC has advised that the speed reduction measures requested are also intended to slow traffic speeds through the village of Ripley to encourage more RHS Ripley and general Wisley Lane traffic to use Highway England's signed 'u' turn route through the M25 J10 roundabout.</p> <p>Highways England does not consider that the Scheme would cause severance. Do-something traffic flows on the B2215 Ripley High Street (between the Newark Lane junction and the Ockham Park junction) would not increase by more than 12% in any hour in both the 2022 and 2037 do-something scenarios, which is well below the 30% threshold even for a minor severance effect as identified in Institute of Environmental Assessment's Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic. SCC has not put forward any compelling evidence as to why an increase in AADT or peak time flows of up to approximately 5% would give rise to a severance effect or to clarify what circumstances apply in this case if the 30% threshold is considered by SCC to be 'too blunt'</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 inter-peak periods (approximately 12%) as the overall volume of traffic passing through Ripley between peak periods will be considerably less (approximately 28% less than the morning peak (2022), the potential for a traffic-related severance effect will be lower.</p>	
2.8.6	RR-004 paras: 2.3.2.5(3) 2.4.3	The operation of the Scheme is not expected to lead to a significant increase HGV traffic flows through Ripley.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
2.8.7	RR-004 paras: 2.2.5 2.3.2.3 2.3.2.5  REP2-047 (paras 4.11.1 and 7.2.1.20)	There is no need for any mitigation measures to be provided at Ripley on account of the Scheme.	<p><b>Not agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC considers that the Scheme should provide a comprehensive package of mitigation measures at Ripley (costing £2.4m) as detailed in paragraph 2.3.2.5 of SCC's relevant representation RR-004.</p> <p>Highways England does not accept that there is a need for the Scheme to provide mitigation at Ripley. See Highways England's responses on this point in</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
	<p>REP3-036 para 1.5(a)</p> <p>REP4-048</p> <p>See also SCC's responses to ExQ 2.3.6 and 2.13.5 in REP5-029</p> <p>REP7-025 – responses to ExQ 3.13.3 and 3.13.4</p>		<p>REP2-014 (comments on REP1-020-11 on page 28) and in REP3-007 (comments on paragraph 7.2.1.20 on page 15, noting a correction to omit reference to a meeting held on 11 December 2019 for which minutes had not been agreed).</p> <p>Highways England considers that SCC has not provided sufficient evidence to justify its request for the Scheme to provide a £2.4M package of mitigation measures at Ripley or that the measures it has requested will provide any meaningful benefit or reduction in impact. Initially, SCC stated that the mitigation is required 'against severance rather than for the additional traffic as a result of the Scheme' (see paragraph 2.3.2.5 of RR-004). SCC then stated in the LIR that the severance is predominantly an issue for the inter-peak period and that mitigation is required primarily to address the increase in traffic between the completion of the Scheme and the completion of the Burntcommon slips, as well as to address noise, air quality and other (unspecified) environmental effects (see paragraphs 7.2.1.4 to 7.2.1.20 and paragraph 4.2.4 of REP2-047). By deadline 5, SCC's position had changed, stating that Highways England should provide mitigation in Ripley to address the impact of the increase in RHS Wisley traffic or to deter RHS traffic from diverting through the village as well as to address the increased risk of accidents, with no mention being made of the severance point. (See SCC's response to Ex Q2.13.5 and 2.13.21 in REP5-029). SCC also refers to environmental and social impact being more applicable than link capacity in determining the impact on place making and severance in Ripley and that traffic management and signage would be the best solution for the mitigation of the Scheme's effects on Ripley High Street (see SCC's response to Ex Q2.13.29(c) and 2.13.34 in REP5-029).</p> <p>Highways England considers that SCC's case on mitigation has been inconsistent and inadequately justified. The increase in traffic flows directly attributable to the Scheme would be small, even allowing for assessing a reasonably worst case as regards RHS Wisley/Wisley Lane traffic routing through Ripley. The largest increase (of 12%) would occur during the inter-peak period when traffic flows are up to 28% lower than morning peak flows and can therefore be more readily accommodated. The increase in traffic has been assessed as having a minimal effect on the operational performance of the local road network. Potential severance considerations would also be of less significance during the inter-peak period as overall traffic flows would be lower. The modelling shows that do-something traffic levels through Ripley during the inter-peak period would remain lower than traffic flows during both the morning and evening peak periods without the Scheme in both the 2022 and 2037 modelled scenarios. SCC has not raised any severance concerns associated with these do-minimum peak time traffic flows.</p> <p>As to SCC's point about an increased risk of accidents associated with increased traffic, Highways England is not aware of any evidence which supports SCC's view that the Scheme would result in an increase in accidents in Ripley. (See Highways England's comments on ExQ 2.13.21 on page 12 of REP6-013).</p> <p>As to SCC's concern about the impact of further traffic growth through Ripley associated with the development of the former Wisley Airfield site, then Highways England considers that it will be for Guildford Borough Council (GBC) and SCC to agree an appropriate trigger point for the completion of the Burntcommon slips with the promoter of that development once a planning application comes forward. It is not for Highways England to address the effects of development generated traffic through Ripley or indeed to address the effects</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>of growth in traffic levels through Ripley in the do-minimum scenarios without the Scheme. The Burntcommon slips have been included within the RIS2 scheme development programme, which is a factor that GBC and SCC can now take into account in any development viability negotiations with the developer.</p> <p>As to SCC's point about environmental and social reasons being more applicable than highway capacity in determining the need for mitigation, then Highways England considers that SCC position is unjustified. No significant environmental effects, including noise and air quality effects have been assessed in the Environmental Statement for any receptors along the B2215 at Ripley. Neither has SCC put forward any evidence to demonstrate any environmental or social harm arising in Ripley from the small increase in traffic directly attributable to the Scheme. 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. Highways England also notes that neither the capacity of rural roads nor a change in character due to increased traffic levels were held to be insurmountable obstacles to the development of the Wisley Airfield site (see paragraph 20.67 of the Inspector's Report on the WPIL appeal).</p> <p>Turning to the list of measures specifically requested by SCC (see paragraph 2.3.2.5 (3) of REP1-020 and paragraph 7.2.1.20 (3) of the LIR [REP2-047]), no evidence has been put forward by SCC to demonstrate how road resurfacing/carriageway reconstruction, new cycling facilities or the upgrading of bus stops would have any meaningful benefit in reducing the impact of increased traffic, reducing severance or mitigating any effects of increased traffic on local amenity in Ripley. Highways England does not agree that these measures are necessary or that they are directly relevant to the Scheme. Nor does the list in REP1-020 appear to support SCC's most recently held view that the best solution for mitigation would involve a combination of traffic management measures in Ripley together with signage on the A3. The measures requested in REP1-020 include features unrelated to traffic management.</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 on a without prejudice basis suggested 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 for mitigation measures within the DCO. See issue 2.8.7A below.</p>	
2.8.7A	<p>REP2-047 para 7.2.1.20 and</p> <p>REP7-025 response to Ex Q 3.13.4</p>	<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 SCC's concerns as regards the need for mitigation measures in Ripley.</p>	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC's position is that it considers that the ExA should impose upon the applicant a requirement to construct a scheme to mitigate against the impacts of the additional traffic caused by the Scheme on the B2215 Ripley High Street. (See SCC's response to ExQ3.13.4 [REP7-025]). SCC explains that in its opinion the purpose of such a mitigation scheme would be primarily to dissuade RHS Wisley traffic from using the B2215 through Ripley and to ameliorate the effects of that traffic on the sense of place in Ripley. SCC considers that the wording of the requirement put forward by Highways England [REP7-004] could be further strengthened by requiring the Scheme to make provision for new non-motorised user facilities in Ripley in addition to the traffic management measures suggested.</p>	



SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>Highways England considers that the wording put forward in its response to Ex Q 3.13.4 [REP7-004] would satisfy the primary purpose identified by SCC as being to dissuade RHS traffic from using the B2215 through Ripley. The wording put forward for the requirement would also provide a mechanism for securing the necessary funding and implementation of the measures.</p> <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. Should the Examining Authority and Secretary of State determine otherwise and consider a requirement (along the lines worded in REP7-004) to be justified, then the imposition of such a requirement would be taken to satisfy the relevant tests set out at paragraph 4.9 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN).</p> <p>Following further discussion with SCC, Highways England wishes to suggest some amendment to the wording of the requirement offered in its response to ExQ 3.13.4 [REP7-004]. These amendments would 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 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, which have been discussed with SCC, 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 an <del>that</del> approximately 1km stretch of the B2215 that lies between the existing village entrance signs.</b></li> <li>(b) <b>Contain a cost estimate for the design and construction of the proposed works and specify arrangements by which either</b></li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>(i) <i>The undertaker will provide funds to the local highway authority to cover the approved cost (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) of the local highway authority designing and constructing the approved works; or</i></p> <p>(ii) <i>The undertaker will undertake the design and construction of the approved works at its own expense up to the value of the approved cost pursuant to an appropriate agreement with the local highway authority</i></p> <p>Highways England's view is that if such a requirement to deal with traffic flows on the B2215 is appropriate at all then the scope of the requirement put forward by Highways England [REP7-004] as amended above is appropriate. As set out at issue 2.8.7 of this SoCG above, Highways England does not consider that the measures requested by SCC and set out in paragraph 7.2.1.20 (3) of the Local Impact Report (page 33) [REP2-047] (as referred to in SCC's response to the question) are appropriate or proportionate given the modest increase in traffic flows attributable to the Scheme and would involve excessive cost at £2.4m.</p>	
2.8.8	RR-004 para 2.3.2.5 and REP2-047 (para 6.13).	The Guildford Local Plan Policy A35 provides for the highway improvement measures that are necessary in Ripley and its surrounds to address the increase in future traffic flows in the do-minimum scenarios, including measures required for accommodating planned growth and traffic likely to be generated by the development of the Wisley Airfield site.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>2.8A – Matters Raised in the Examining Authority's further Written Questions (ExQ2) published on 18 February 2020</b>				
2.8.9	ExQ2.13.29(c)	All the links approaching the junction of the B2215 Ripley High Street and Newark Lane and Rose Lane are currently operating within capacity (based on 2015 base flows).	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>Whilst SCC considers that the links along the B2215 between the A3 and A247 are currently operating within theoretical capacity. SCC considers that this is not the only criteria that should be applied to the B2215 especially where it passes through Ripley. SCC considers that the current traffic flows have a significant impact on the sense of place and severance that occurs within Ripley High Street and the environmental and social impact is more applicable than applying theoretical capacity of a link. SCC considers that the B2215's junction with Newark Lane currently operates at capacity particularly during peak periods. SCC refers to significant queuing and delays currently occurring on Newark Lane and along the B2215 in the AM and PM peaks.</p> <p>Highways England's position is that the capacity of the links along the B2215 Portsmouth Road is determined by the capacities of the junctions along it, specifically the junctions with the A247 Send roundabout, the off-set crossroads with Newark Lane/Rose Lane and the approach to the Ockham roundabout. Highways England considers that an approach to a junction is approaching its practical operational capacity when demand exceeds 85% of available capacity and is likely to be exceeding its practical capacity when demand exceeds 90% of available capacity.</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>Highways England does not agree with SCC's view that the B2215 High Street/Rose Lane/Newark Lane junction is operating at capacity, including during peak periods. Highways England's modelling and assessment work demonstrates otherwise: the modelling data presented in APP-136 Table 7.9 shows that further forecast traffic growth can be accommodated over time. Highways England considers that the queuing on Newark Lane to which SCC refers is primarily due to congestion on the A3 causing traffic to back up from the Ockham Park junction and in to Ripley. Whilst this backing up of traffic affects the performance of the junction, the queuing is not due to insufficient capacity at the junction itself. The delivery of the Scheme will significantly reduce congestion on the A3, which will help smooth the flow of traffic on approaching links.</p> <p>Highways England's local junction traffic modelling for the 2015 Base scenario demonstrates that the junction of the B2215 with Newark Lane and Rose Lanes currently operates within practical capacity during all peak periods with a maximum demand to capacity ratio of 77% between 07:00 and 08:00 for the left turn out of Newark Lane. Queues for the right turns into either Newark Lane or Rose Lane from Ripley High Street do not exceed two vehicles and do not therefore obstruct straight ahead traffic flow along the High Street.</p> <p>Highways England submitted further information as regards the operational capacity of the network in Ripley in the 2015 base year at Deadline 5 [REP5-027].</p> <p>Highways England notes that SCC refers to current traffic flows through Ripley having a significant impact on its sense of place, severance and environmental and social impact. Whilst addressing SCC's concerns about existing conditions in Ripley cannot be a matter for the Scheme, Highways England observes that most of the increase in traffic through Ripley in the future will be attributable to a general increase in background traffic and to development that is planned in the area and not on account of the Scheme. This growth will occur regardless of whether the Scheme comes forward. If environmental impact, severance and sense of place is to be more applicable than the capacity of the local road network, then the Scheme is equally acceptable under those terms as the assessment of the Scheme has not identified any significant environmental effects or traffic related severance effects in Ripley.</p>	
2.8.10	ExQ2.13.29(c)	The link comprising the B2215 Portsmouth Road (northbound) approaching the Ockham Park junction is currently operating within capacity (based on 2015 base flows).	<p><b>Agreed</b></p> <p>SCC's position on this matter is as per that set out in 2.8.9 above.</p> <p>Highways England's local junction traffic modelling for the 2015 Base scenario demonstrates that the B2215 Portsmouth Road at its approach to the Ockham Park junction is currently operating within capacity, with a maximum demand to capacity ratio of 69% (in the busier morning peak hour).</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>Highways England submitted additional information as regards operational capacity of the network in Ripley in the 2015 base year (refer to REP5-027).</p>	
2.8.11	ExQ2.13.29(d)	<p>The Scheme will not cause any of the links or junctions at Ripley to exceed their operational capacity in any of the future modelled do-something scenarios.</p>	<p><b>Not agreed.</b></p> <p>For SCC's position on this matter see SCC's response to ExQ 3.13.3 [REP7-025] which states that, 'With the data currently available SCC are not able to confirm whether the links are able to accommodate the predicted level of traffic flows'.</p> <p>SCC considers that the B2215 High Street, Rose Lane/Newark Lane operates at capacity in 2020. SCC refers to Highways England's do-something modelling for 2022 predicting that traffic flows will increase through this junction by 25% during the AM peak and 39% during the PM peak compared with 2015 levels (Table 7-9 of the Transport Assessment Report [APP-136]. SCC comments that with the Scheme in place, in 2037, traffic flows are predicted to increase by 58% in the AM peak and 80% in the PM peak compared with 2015. SCC does not accept Highways England's view that the junction will continue to operate within reserve capacity in the future given the proposed increases in traffic flows (Table 7-10 of APP-136). SCC considers that this junction operates at capacity in 2020. SCC considers the capacity exceedance is likely to be caused by traffic growth and/or the increased traffic from the proposed scheme, for example all the Wisley Lane traffic from the A3 south diverting through Ripley on the B2215.</p> <p>Highways England does not agree with SCC's view that the B2215 High Street/Rose Lane/Newark Lane is operating at capacity in 2020 for the reasons set out at issue 2.8.9 above or that the Scheme will cause the B2215 High Street junction to exceed its operational capacity in 2020 ahead of its opening year</p> <p>Highways England recognises that significant growth in traffic is likely to occur in Ripley between the 2015 base and 2022. However, most of the predicted increases in traffic will occur regardless of whether the Scheme comes forward or not. Traffic flows through Ripley are likely to increase by approximately 20% between the 2015 base case and the 2022 do-minimum case (without the Scheme), a point which is not disputed by SCC above. However, the main conclusion for the examination is that the increase in traffic attributable to the Scheme, will be small (not exceeding 5% AADT or up to 3% in the busier morning peak) and will have a minimal effect on the operation of the local road network. Highways England's traffic modelling is predicated on a worst-case approach regarding the routing of Wisley Lane traffic. The volume of Wisley Lane traffic is likely to be significantly less on a typical weekday compared with that assessed which is predicated on a busy event day.</p> <p>Highways England refers to the results of its operational assessments reported in the Transport Assessment Report (TA) [APP-136]. The capacity of the links along the B2215 at Ripley is largely determined by the capacities of the junctions along it, specifically the Ockham Park junction and the staggered crossroads</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>with Newark Lane and Rose Lane. These are addressed in turn.</p> <p><b><u>B2215 approaching the Ockham Park Junction</u></b></p> <p>As can be seen from Tables G-54 to G-60 of Appendix G of the TA, the B2215 Portsmouth Road as it approaches the Ockham Park junction will generally remain within operational capacity during peak periods, with and without the Scheme in both the 2022 and 2037 do-something scenarios. The overall demand to capacity ratios for the B2115 at this point (expressed in terms of degree of saturation in Appendix G) will be mostly less than 80%. SCC has not challenged these assessments.</p> <p><b><u>B2115 Ripley High Street/Newark Lane/Rose Lane junction</u></b></p> <p>The assessment of the operational performance of the staggered junction between the B2215 Ripley High Street, Newark Lane and Rose Lane is set out in Section 7.5 and Tables H-69 and H-70 in Appendix H of the TA. With the Scheme, as is shown in Table 7-10 of the TA on page 87, the junction is predicted to operate within practical capacity in both the 2022 and 2037 do-something scenarios, with a maximum ratio of flow to capacity (RFC) of 0.88 in any modelled peak period, which is on the Rose Lane approach during the PM peak period. Queues for the right turns into either Newark Lane or Rose Lane from Ripley High Street do not exceed one vehicle and do not therefore obstruct straight ahead traffic flow along the High Street. No evidence has been put forward to dispute these assessments.</p> <p>It can however be seen from Table 7-10 of the TA, that the Newark Lane approach to the junction is expected to operate above its practical capacity in the 2022 am peak do-minimum scenario (with an RFC of 0.95). This is because the model predicts an increase in traffic routing through Ripley from the Woking direction via Newark Lane between the 2015 base case and the 2022 do-minimum which has the effect of reducing the gaps in the traffic flow along Ripley High Street, thereby reducing the capacity of the exit from Newark Lane. This is likely to be attributable to conditions elsewhere on the road network, including in the M25 junction 11 area. Queues for the right turns into either Newark Lane or Rose Lane from Ripley High Street do not exceed one vehicle and do not therefore obstruct straight ahead traffic flow along the High Street.</p> <p>Tables H-69 and H-70 in Appendix H of the TA demonstrate that the most constrained link at this junction is the left-turn out of Newark Lane into Ripley High Street in any modelled year or period.</p> <p>These assessment results make no allowance for any reduction in traffic flows that may be realised by the implementation of the Burnt Common slips and are predicated on a busy event day for RHS Wisley traffic.</p>	
<b>2.9 Old Lane – design and assessment</b>				
2.9.1	RR-004 paras: 2.3.5.2 2.3.5.3	There is no planning policy commitment which specifically requires the closure of any part of Old Lane to southbound traffic and on this basis, there is insufficient certainty to assume this within the traffic modelling for the Scheme.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>However, SCC is concerned about any increase in vehicular traffic south of the airfield as it considers that Old Lane will need to become an important non-motorised user route between the Wisley Airfield development and Effingham</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
	REP2-047 paras 6.12-6.15		<p>Junction station.</p> <p>SCC wish to record that the scheme considered at appeal as regards proposed development on the former Wisley Airfield site (planning application 15/P/00012) included a proposal to close Old Lane between the Ockham Bites and the Pond car parks for southbound traffic. This means that whilst traffic could egress the former airfield site both left to the A3 and right to Martyr's Green, ingress off Old Lane would only be via the Black Swan / Mucky Duck crossroads: there would be no access into the site from Old Lane (including from the A3). Paragraph 20.64 of the Inspector's Report on the appeal for the former Wisley Airfield development records that both Surrey County Council and Highways England were satisfied with this proposal.</p> <p>Highways England considers that as that closure was brought forward specifically in relation to a planning application/appeal rather than being a matter stipulated within the policy itself, its merits and modelling thereof should be a matter for consideration in the light of any further planning application for the development of the Wisley Airfield site. Such a closure could have wider implications for other parts of the local road network which would not relate directly to the purpose or effects of the Scheme and Highways England understands that some members of the local community expressed concerns about its implications.</p>	
2.9.2	RR-004 paras: 2.2.4 2.3.5.1  REP2-047 paras 7.2.1.16 to 7.2.1.19  See also SCC's responses to ExQ 2.13.2 and 2.13.11.	The improvement of the A3/Old Lane junction to be carried out as part of the Scheme will allow more traffic from the Wisley Airfield development to access the A3 at this point thereby reducing the amount of development traffic that would otherwise have to route through Ripley were the Scheme not to be built.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>It is agreed that the proposed improvement of the A3/Old Lane junction would maximise the amount of WPIL development traffic that would use this junction compared with the existing layout of the junction. However, SCC notes that an improvement to the A3/Old Lane junction was previously agreed by Highways England as part of the WPIL planning application which provided for a similar level of WPIL development traffic to be able to use the junction.</p> <p>Highways England considers that the acceptability of WPIL development generated traffic to be a matter for Guildford Borough Council and SCC to determine once a planning application comes forward for the development of the former Wisley Airfield Site. It is not Highways England's intention to seek to maximise the amount of WPIL traffic using the Old Lane junction, but it is agreed that the Scheme will allow more WPIL traffic to use this junction compared with the do-minimum scenario. Highways England has not carried out an assessment as to whether the Scheme provides the same level of capacity at the junction as was proposed by WPIL originally. Whilst the WPIL application may have improved acceleration and deceleration arrangements at this junction, much of the improved capacity in the Scheme actually derives from the provision of a two-lane on-slip to the A3 from M25 junction 10 (as is shown on Sheet 4 of the Scheme Layout Plans [APP-012] which may not have been included in the WPIL proposal.</p> <p>See also Highways England's comments on Ex Q 2.13.2 (submitted at Deadline 5) [REP5-014].</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
2.9.3	RR-004 paras: 2.2.4 2.3.5.1  REP1-020 (para 2.3.5.1)	The improved A3/Old Lane junction will provide sufficient capacity to accommodate the predicted traffic flows without loss of operational performance.	<b>Agreed.</b>	5
2.9.4	RR-004 paras: 2.3.5.2 2.3.5.3  REP2-047 paras 7.2.1.14 (2 <sup>nd</sup> para of this no.) and 7.2.4.3 and 7.2.4.4  REP3-036 para 1.3	The increase in traffic on Old Lane to the east of its junction with Ockham Lane that is predicted to result in the 2037 do-something scenario is likely to be attributable to traffic from Effingham reassigning to avoid congestion elsewhere on the local road network and accessing the A3 at the improved A3/Old Lane junction instead.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>2.10 Ockham Lane at Bridge End and Martyr's Green – assessment of effects</b>				
2.10.1	RR-004 paras: 2.3.6.1 2.3.6.2  REP2-047 para 7.2.5.1	The resulting traffic flows on Ockham Lane will potentially be less than those predicted in the model were the Wisley Airfield development to incorporate a design which encourages non-airfield traffic to route directly through the development site.	<b>Agreed.</b>  However, SCC has expressed concern about the Scheme significantly increasing traffic on Ockham Lane and considers that the traffic model should have assumed that a through vehicular link would be provided as part of the Wisley Airfield development.  Highways England considers that until design details for this link are known (once a planning application is submitted) it is not possible to model this with sufficient confidence. The traffic impacts of the Scheme are therefore likely to be overstated in this regard, which Highways England considers is a more robust and appropriate approach in the circumstances. In any event, whilst the percentage increases in flows are large, in absolute terms the numbers are modest and will not give rise to any significant noise effects on nearby receptors. The increase in flows will be below the threshold necessary for an air quality assessment.  (See Highways England's response on this matter in REP2-014 (see comment on REP1-020-14 on page31) and in REP3-007 (see comment on paragraph 7.2.5 on page 17).	
2.10.2	RR-004 para 2.2.4 REP2-047 para 7.2.5	The predicted increase in traffic flows on Ockham Lane north of the junction with Old Lane in the do-something scenarios is likely to be attributable to traffic from Cobham rerouting to avoid congestion at the A245/A307 junction and join the A3 at the improved Old Lane junction instead of at Painshill.	<b>Agreed.</b>  However, SCC has expressed concern about the projected increase in trips on Ockham Lane.	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>Highways England is of the view that the additional numbers are relatively low, (approximately one additional vehicle per minute), which is unlikely to affect the performance of the local road network. No significant noise effects on receptors along this route are predicted as a result of the Scheme and the predicted increase in traffic flows falls below the threshold for carrying out an air quality assessment.</p> <p>Highways England has responded to SCC's point about increased traffic on Ockham Lane in REP2-014 (see comment on REP1-020-14 on page 31) and in REP3-007 (see comment on para 7.2.5 on page 17). In summary, whilst the modelling shows a proportionately high increase in traffic on Ockham Lane, particularly in 2037 when the former Wisley Airfield site has been developed, numerically the actual number of additional trips will be small and can be accommodated without detriment to the operation of the local road network.</p>	
2.10.3	RR-004 para 2.2.4	The predicted increase in traffic using Ockham Lane to the south of the junction with Old Lane in the 2022 do-something scenario is small and is not significant.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
2.10.4	RR-004 paras 2.3.6.1 and 2.3.6.2 and REP2-047 para 7.2.5	The Guildford Local Plan proposes mitigation to Ockham Lane as part of Policy A35: Former Wisley airfield, Ockham through the provision of Requirement (2) "A through vehicular link is required between the A3 Ockham interchange and Old Lane". Once the provision of the link is obtained, traffic management would be required on Ockham Lane to downgrade its current level of usage and encourage traffic to use the through vehicular link through the Wisley Airfield site.	<p><b>Agreed (as a matter of fact).</b></p> <p>However, SCC is concerned that the Guildford Local Plan Policy A35 Requirement (2) (the through vehicular link) has not been modelled in the assessment even though the site allocation has been assessed in terms of the increased development traffic flows. SCC emphasises that modelling Requirement (2), which Highways England was aware of at the time of developing the transport evidence base for the DCO, would likely significantly reduce the amount of traffic using Ockham Lane, Old Lane and indeed the Old Lane junction with A3 which experiences a significant increase in traffic flows. However, SCC considers that this could also have implications for Ripley High Street as more traffic could continue to use this route in the Do-Something scenario. (as discussed at DCO ISH).</p> <p>Highways England comments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The through vehicular link would be likely to reduce the amount of traffic on Ockham Lane, which means that its assessment represents a reasonable worst case in this regard; and</li> <li>The through vehicular link will be unlikely to reduce the amount of Wisley Airfield traffic accessing the A3 via Old Lane and Highways England's as the model shows this to be the shortest/quickest route for traffic.</li> </ul>	
<b>2.11 Elm Lane design</b>				
2.11.1	RR-004 para 2.3.7.2	The character and width of Elm Lane and the environment through which it passes make it unsuitable for use as 'through route' for traffic.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>2.12 Painshill – design and assessment</b>				
2.12.1	RR-004 para 2.3.8.5 and REP2-047 para 4.9.7	The design of the A245 Byfleet Road/Seven Hills Road junction satisfactorily incorporates the amendments discussed between Highways England and SCC during the November 2018 targeted non-statutory consultation.	<p><b>Not agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC considers that the design should be further modified to incorporate several additional changes as set out in paragraph 2.3.8.5 of SCC's relevant</p>	



SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>representation. See also SCC's comments below on issues 2.12.4, 3.3.1 and 3.4.2 of this SoCG.</p> <p>Highways England has responded to SCC's points in REP2-014 (see comments on REP1-020-19 on page 33). In summary, the improvements to the junction had already been designed to take into account comments provided by SCC and Highways England does not agree that the additional changes suggested are necessary.</p> <p>See also issues 11.3.1 and 11.3.2 below which relate to Change No. 3 and the removal of widening of the A245 Byfleet Road eastbound carriageway from the Scheme.</p>	
2.12.2	RR-004 para 2.3.8.5 and REP1-020 para 2.3.8.7	The stopping up of Old Byfleet Road has no direct relationship with the banning of right turning and straight on movements from Seven Hills Road (north).	<b>Agreed.</b>	
2.12.3	RR-004 para 2.3.8.5  REP1-020 para 2.3.8.6	Traffic modelling for the Seven Hills Road junction shows that the Scheme will provide sufficient capacity to accommodate forecast traffic growth.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
2.12.4	RR-004 para 2.3.8.5  REP4-047 para 7.2.7.3 (6)  See also responses to ExQ2.13.32	The condition of the highway surface on that part of Seven Hills Road (south) between the entrance to the Hilton Hotel and the A245 Byfleet Road remains adequate for its current and future level of traffic usage.	<p><b>Not agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC considers that Seven Hills Road (south) will require resurfacing along its whole length. As this road is currently closed, will be reopened and SCC do not know the future use of San Domenico at this stage. Cyclists will also use this section. As part of discussions on this SoCG, SCC has also commented that as the road will be used for construction traffic a condition survey will be required. It has also commented that the road will be improved either side of this section requiring new joints.</p> <p>Highways England has confirmed that the section of Seven Hills Road (south) that is currently closed will be resurfaced under the Scheme (see REP2-014 (see comments on REP1-012-2 on page 6 and comments on REP1-020-19 on page 33). This is shown on sheet 7 of the Scheme Layout Plans [APP-012]. The only section of Seven Hills Road (south) that will not be resurfaced is that section of existing highway between the Hilton Hotel entrance and the A245 as the surface of this section is already suitable. Highways England is therefore not aware of any specific reason as to why this matter cannot be agreed with SCC.</p> <p>See also Highways England's response to ExQ 2.13.32 [REP5-014].</p>	
<b>2.13 Other traffic/transport issues</b>				
2.13.1	N/A	The additional capacity that the Scheme will deliver at the M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange will reduce the volume of traffic on local roads overall as set out in the Transport Assessment [APP-136] paras 7.2.7, 7.4.12 and 7.4.14 and Figures 7.3 and 7.4.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC accepts that the overall volume of traffic on local roads will reduce. However, SCC notes that the Scheme also creates substantial increases in</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>traffic flows on sensitive local roads, examples being the B2215 Ripley High Street, Old Lane, Ockham Lane (North), and Guilshall Lane and other roads that will affect local communities adjacent to the A3.</p> <p>Highways England refers to its response on this matter in REP1-009 (see comment on RR-038 on page 86) which explains that the Scheme will reduce overall traffic flows on local roads by up to 741,000 vehicle kilometres on an average day across the modelled local road network. Highways England acknowledges that inevitably there will be increases in traffic flows on some local roads. Most importantly, the assessments conclude that these increases can be accommodated without material loss of operational performance of the local road network. Overall there will be a reduction in total vehicle kilometres travelled on local roads as a result of the Scheme. With reduced congestion at the M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange as a result of the Scheme, the modelling shows that traffic will reassign to the strategic road network when quicker and/or more direct than continuing on the local network.</p>	
<b>2.14 Private access arrangements</b>				
2.14.1	<p>RR-004 para: 2.3.8.4 and REP2-047 paras 4.9.10 - 4.9.11 and 7.2.1.2.</p> <p>See also SCC's responses to ExQ 2.12.1 and other responses to ExQ 2.12.3</p>	<p>There is no legal requirement from a fire safety perspective to provide/maintain a second point of access to Painshill Park in the vicinity of the Gothic Tower.</p>	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>Highways England has given careful consideration to this matter, however its position remains that it would be unsafe to allow continued access to Painshill Park directly from the A3, both for the people using the access and for people travelling on the A3 itself. The use of the existing access in emergencies for gaining access to the Gothic Tower is also constrained by the fact that high level firefighting equipment is unable to gain access to the Tower from this direction due to topographical conditions.</p> <p>The Park has an alternative access direct from the A245, which is closer to the Cobham Fire Station than the access which is being closed. The Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) has confirmed [REP3-063] that from a fire safety perspective, there is not a requirement to provide or maintain a 2<sup>nd</sup> access to Painshill Park for fire service vehicles. Although it is acknowledged that attendance times would be longer than at present, this has to be balanced against the low risk to life from fire and the fact that the SFRS has previously confirmed that it would not be prepared to use the existing access direct from the A3 as it is unsafe (see REP1-009 – comment on RR-021 on page 53). In view of these considerations, the compulsory acquisition of land from other third parties to provide a second access to Painshill Park cannot be justified.</p>	
<b>2.15 Lorry lay-bys</b>				
2.15.1	<p>RR-004 paras: 2.4.1 2.4.2 2.4.3</p> <p>REP2-047 paras 7.3.1 and 7.3.3</p>	<p>It would be inappropriate for the Scheme to retain the lorry layby on the A3 on the grounds of highway safety and design standards.</p>	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
2.15.2	RR-004 paras: 2.4.1 2.4.2 2.4.3  REP2-047 paras 7.3.1 and 7.3.3	There is sufficient layby capacity on the A3 to the south of Ockham to accommodate any displaced demand for lorry drivers on the A3. For lorry drivers travelling on the M25, the nearest alternative lorry parking facilities are at Cobham services approximately 2 miles to the east of M25 junction 10. There are no locations in the vicinity of the M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange that would be suitable for the provision of replacement HGV parking as part of the Scheme.	<b>Agreed.</b>  Whilst SCC is concerned about the loss of lorry parking, it acknowledges that given the sensitive nature of the environment surrounding the M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange there are no suitable locations where replacement spaces could be provided as part of the Scheme. SCC looks to Highways England to address the need for HGV parking/spaces as part of its wider remit in managing the Strategic Road Network.	
<b>2.16 Road safety</b>				
2.16.1	RR-004 paras: 2.3.3.2 2.3.8.1 2.3.8.3 2.5.5 3.1.3 4.1.2.1 4.1.2.2 4.1.2.3	The Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) which has been carried out provides an appropriate level of assurance commensurate with the preliminary design status of the Scheme.	<b>Not agreed.</b>  SCC does not consider that the Road Safety Audit (RSA) provides a sufficient level of assurance commensurate with the Scheme's preliminary design status. It makes reference to need for the applicant to have requested an amendment to the DCO boundary at Old Lane at Deadline 7 [REP7-10] and to concerns about sub-standard forward visibility at the Painshill junction. SCC remains concerned that there are potential RSA issues not yet identified for the 10 Local Road Network (LRN) locations stated in the Joint Councils' Local Impact Report (LIR). SCC states that its concern has always been that a comprehensive Stage 1 RSA covering the LRN is needed at an early stage whilst there is the opportunity to incorporate any adjustments to the design rather than undertake assessments at a later stage when land/opportunities and decision options are more limited as the extent of land available has been fixed.  Highways England has responded to SCC's concerns about road safety audits in REP2-015 (see comments on RR004-15 on page 32, on REP1-020-36 and REP1-020-37 on page 38). In summary, a stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) has been carried out on the preliminary design in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. A copy of which is presented in Appendix I of the Transport Assessment Report [APP-136] and a further interim RSA has been shared with SCC as it has requested. The scope of the Stage 1 RSA was in accordance with the relevant guidance in GG119 (formerly HD19/15). In chapter 1 of GG119, it is made clear that the purpose of an RSA is to identify aspects of engineering interventions that could give rise to road safety problems and to suggest modifications that could improve road safety. It states that 'it is important to note that the road safety audit is not intended to be a technical check of compliance with design requirements'. A number of SCC's criticisms of the RSA relate to technical matters which are outside its scope or relate to matters that are not normally addressed until the detailed design stage. Their omission from the RSA does not therefore diminish the robustness of the RSA that has been carried out. Highways England has confirmed to SCC that its stage 1 RSA has assessed the ten locations referred to in the LIR [REP2-047].  The stage 2 RSA for the detailed design will be carried out in more detail and Highways England has made provision within a separate legally binding side agreement for SCC's involvement in the brief for the stage 2 RSA process so that the level of detail can be agreed (see issue 1.5.1 above). This approach is	Highways England will consult SCC on arrangements for carrying out a more detailed RSA at stage 2 of the project. The side agreement which is being negotiated between Highways England and SCC will provide for SCC's involvement in the RSA process.

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>consistent with other Highways England NSIP schemes. Further reassurance is provided in the drafting of the DCO articles, which require that any highway (other than a trunk road or special road) must be constructed/completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the local highway authority. Highways England is willing to enter into a legally binding side agreement with SCC providing that final certificates would be contingent upon a stage 4 safety audit having been undertaken to the Council's reasonable satisfaction and any associated additional measures carried out.</p> <p>See issue 1.5.1 of this SoCG above as regards the position on the side agreement.</p>	
2.16.2	<p>RR-004 paras: 2.3.4.1 4.1.1.3</p> <p>REP2-047 para 7.2.3</p> <p>REP3-036 para 1.5 (b)</p>	It is appropriate for details of design features to discourage speeding on the Wisley Lane diversion to be agreed at the detailed design stage under requirement 5 of the dDCO.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC's agreement is subject to there being enough space within the DCO boundary for any detailed design measures to reduce the risk of speeding, such as gateway features.</p> <p>The extent of land to be acquired for the purposes of constructing the Wisley Lane Diversion is shown on sheets 1 and 2 of the Land Plans [AS-002]. Any features required will need to be provided within the land to be acquired permanently. Highways England is confident that there will be enough space to incorporate these features at the detailed design stage</p>	
2.16.3	RR-004 para: 3.1.7	It is appropriate for details of vehicle restraint systems to be agreed at the detailed design stage under requirement 5 of the dDCO.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC accepts that this matter can be agreed at the detailed design stage providing that the necessary measures can be provided within the DCO boundary.</p>	
2.16.4	RR-004 para: 4.1.2.4	The proposals for anti-dazzle fencing, as shown on the Scheme Layout Plans (APP-012) adequately address potential hazards associated with glare from headlights.	<p><b>Agreed</b></p> <p>SCC has asked if consideration has been given to an effective method of screening headlights between the new service roads and the A3. The antidazzle fencing is shown on the Scheme Layout Plans.</p>	
<b>2.17 Road signage</b>				
2.17.1	<p>RR-004 paras: 2.7.1 2.7.2 2.7.3</p> <p>REP2-047 paras 7.5.1, 7.5.2, 7.5.3 and 7.5.4.</p>	Replacement variable message signs (VMS) on the A245 near Painshill could be secured through designated funds and need not be provided as part of the Scheme.	<p><b>Not Agreed.</b></p> <p>Discussions have taken place about SCC submitting a bid under the Users and Communities Designated Funds during the 2020/2021 financial year.</p> <p>Highways England considers that the provision of signage on the local road network is a matter for SCC as local highway authority and that the signage requested is not essential for the purposes of the Scheme. Nonetheless Highways England will support SCC in resubmitting a bid for funds for replacement signage in RIS2 – April 2020. (See Highways England's previous responses on this matter in REP2-14 – comment on REP1-020-25 on page 35 and in REP3-007 – see comment on 7.5.4 on page 17).</p>	Highways England will support SCC in resubmitting a bid for funds in RIS2 – commencing 2020/2021 financial year.
2.17.2	RR-004 paras: 2.7.2 2.7.3	Additional variable message signs on the local road network are not directly necessary for the purposes of the Scheme.	<p><b>Not agreed.</b></p>	Highways England will support SCC in resubmitting a bid for funding in RIS2 – commencing 2020/2021 financial year.

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
	REP2-047 paras 7.5.1, 7.5.2, 7.5.3 and 7.5.4.		<p>SCC considers that the Scheme should make provision for new VMS on the local road network including on the approaches to the Ockham Park junction. SCC considers that these will be essential in relation to Emergency Diversion Routes.</p> <p>Highways England considers that the provision of additional VMS signage on the local road network should be a matter for the local highway authority and that such signage is not required for the purposes of the Scheme. Nonetheless Highways England will continue to support SCC should it decide to resubmit a bid for funds for this signage in RIS2 – in the 2020/2021 financial year. (See Highways England’s previous responses on this matter in REP2-14 – comment on REP1-020-25 on page 35 and in REP3-007 – see comment on 7.5.4 on page 17).</p>	
2.17.3	RR-004 para 2.3.8.5	There is unlikely to be any operational benefit in linking the signals at the A3 Painshill junction with the signals at the A245 Byfleet Road/Seven Hills Road junction.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC accepts Highways England’s response given in REP2-014 (see comments made on REP1-020-19 on page 33) that the given the distance between the two sets of signals, the linking of the signals would offer no operational benefit.</p> <p>SCC requests that Highways England adopt a Collaborative Traffic Management approach with the County Council.</p>	Highways England will continue to engage in discussions with SCC on a collaborative approach to traffic management.
<b>2.18 Traffic management and construction phase traffic impacts</b>				
2.18.1	RR-004 paras: 10.1 10.2  REP2-047 para 7.9.2	The Scheme and associated DCO application documents make appropriate provision for maintaining traffic flows on the strategic road network to reduce potential effects on the local road network during construction. Detailed measures for the management of traffic during the works can be appropriately addressed under requirement 4 of the dDCO.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC agrees this matter subject to the approval of an appropriate traffic management plan under requirement 4 of the dDCO and subject to the undertaker obtaining all necessary approvals under SCC’s Permit Scheme.</p> <p>Highways England comments that SCC is a consultee under requirement 4 of the dDCO and that it has made a commitment to agree the TMP with SCC in the REAC (see item PC1.7 on page 31 of REP2-005). The DCO application documents make clear that any closures required on the M25 or A3 would be limited to overnight or at weekends and that narrow running lanes and reduced speed limits would be used to maintain traffic flows. The Temporary Works Plans [APP-015] also show that temporary slip roads are to be provided at M25 junction 10 specifically to maintain the flow of traffic during the junction works. (See APP-002 paragraphs 25.2.8 and 25.3.3, APP-049 paragraphs 2.7.15 and 2.7.16, APP-015 Temporary Works Plans, REP2-011 paragraph 11.1.2).</p>	Under item PC1.7 of the REAC, Highways England will work with SCC to agree details of traffic management measures, including any temporary diversions required during the construction phase of the project. These details will be submitted for approval by the Secretary of State in accordance with requirement 4 of the dDCO.

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>Highways England has given very careful consideration to the issue of maintaining traffic flows during the works and the provision of temporary slip roads at M25 junction 10 represents a very substantial commitment. An assessment of the potential impacts on traffic during the construction of the works has been carried out (see REP2-011), which concluded that significant rerouting of traffic to the local road network would be unlikely. Highways England considers that its approach is reasonable and appropriate for this stage of the project and that suitable safeguards remain through Requirement 4 for the details of diversion routes to be agreed. This approach is entirely consistent with other made DCOs.</p> <p>Following further discussions with SCC during the DCO examination, Highways England has agreed to make provision for the SCC's Permit Scheme within the DCO. Highways England is submitting a revised dDCO at Deadline 8 which will make provision for this.</p>	
2.18.2	RR-004 para: 3.2.1	It is appropriate that measures to maintain bus services/bus stop access during construction are agreed under Requirement 4 of the dDCO.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC considers that provision should however be made for a shuttle bus replacement service between Ripley and Wisley Lane.</p> <p>Highways England considers that SCC's request for the Scheme to fund a replacement shuttle bus service between Ripley and Wisley Lane to be disproportionate having regard to the small number of people using the existing bus stops at present. Highways England considers that the detailed arrangements for maintaining bus services during the works is a matter that should be addressed at the requirements stage and approved under DCO requirement 4. (See also Highways England's response on this matter in REP2-014, comment on REEP1-020-35 on page 38). Reference should also be made to the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) [REP2-005] which contains several commitments about the Undertaker having to agree arrangements with SCC as to the maintenance of bus services during the construction works.</p>	Highways England will seek to agree with SCC the arrangements for maintaining bus services during construction works.
2.18.3	RR-004 paras: 10.3 10.5 10.6	The REAC (APP-135) contains sufficient assurance that roads and other public rights of way (including Wisley Lane) will be kept open for traffic during the works, except for any overnight closures that may be reasonably required during works to tie-in the new and existing carriageways, demolish or install structures etc.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC emphasises the importance of maintaining a continuous direct access from the A3 to Wisley Lane during the works and that the works should be programmed to avoid temporary closures of PROW routes that would compromise accessibility for NMUs.</p> <p>Highways England has responded to this point in REP2-014 (see comments on REP1-020-76 on page 48). In summary Highways England has confirmed that access to Wisley Lane will be maintained during the works, except during carriageway tie-in works when an overnight closure will be required. The Register of Environmental Commitments and Actions (REAC) [REP2-005] also makes several commitments as regards maintaining accessibility for non-motorised users (see pages 15-16 and pages 29 -31 and pages 49-50).</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
2.18.4	RR-004 para: 10.7	The construction traffic routes, as shown on the Temporary Works Plans (APP-015) are appropriate for the Scheme.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC's agreement is subject to the approval of a traffic management plan (TMP) under requirement 4 of the dDCO and to the undertaker involving Surrey Police in early discussions as to the content of the TMP.</p> <p>See also issue 2.18.7 of this SoCG below.</p>	Highways England will engage with Surrey Police in developing its detailed traffic management proposals to be approved under requirement 4 of the dDCO.
2.18.5	RR-004 para: 10.7	The assumption in the Transport Assessment Report (APP-136) that construction workforce traffic would be split evenly across the four approaches to M25 junction 10, is reasonable and appropriate.	<p><b>Not agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC considers that a greater proportion of the workforce would originate from the north.</p> <p>Highways England has responded to this point in REP2-014 (see comments made on REP1-020-80 on page 49). In summary, Highways England based its assessment on the advice of a specialist construction adviser and considers the assumption that construction workforce traffic will be evenly split to be reasonable. Highways England notes that the assessment is based on the busiest period of construction activity and for the rest of the construction period, the volumes of construction traffic will be significantly less than those assessed.</p>	
2.18.6	RR-004 paras: 10.1 10.7  REP2-047 paras 4.8.3- 4.8.6	The construction phase of the Scheme will not give rise to significant adverse effects on the local road network, as reported in the Transport Assessment Report (APP-136) and in the Transport Assessment Supplementary Information Report (REP2-011).	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC agrees subject to the following comments.</p> <p>SCC agrees with the approach taken in section 9.16 of the Transport Assessment Supplementary Information Report [REP2-011] as regards the potential impact of the volume of construction traffic (HGVs and workforce vehicle movements). SCC also acknowledges that a workshop to discuss the preparation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan and Traffic Management Plan during which, inter alia, vehicle routes, times of operation and monitoring will be discussed and agreed.</p> <p>However, SCC is concerned about the approach taken towards assessing the potential effect of other highway users diverting if there are delays on the M25 and/or A3 associated with the operation of traffic management measures. SCC is unclear how the modelling has been undertaken, although it is noted that the strategic model has been used and speed limits on specific links adjusted to reflect traffic management (section 11.4.1). SCC also questions whether the traffic management on the A3 will be confined to between the points stated (Painshill to Ockham) and assumes that narrow lanes will also need to be imposed. Consequently, SCC is asking whether the Paramics model should be used to consider the additional delay on the mainline A3 and at M25 junction 10 and inserted into the strategic model. SCC agrees that the impact will not require an adjustment to the DCO, but the resulting outputs might help to inform measures identified in the CEMP and TMP, such as signing and re-phasing of signals at key junctions (e.g. the A246 Effingham junction).</p>	Highways England will continue to engage in discussions with SCC with a view to agreeing what further analysis would help support the development of the Construction Environmental Management Plan and the Traffic Management Plan to be prepared under requirements 3 and 4 of the dDCO. This may involve further traffic modelling techniques to address trip re-timing and displacement issues that could arise during the construction phase of the Scheme.

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>Highways England welcomes SCC's agreement to the approach taken for assessing the potential impact of the volume of construction traffic (HGVs and workforce vehicle movements) as reported in the Transport Assessment Supplementary Information Report [REP2-011].</p> <p>The approach to traffic modelling to evaluate the potential effects of temporary traffic management arrangements during construction of the DCO Scheme is fully explained in Section 11 of the Transport Assessment Supplementary Information Report [REP2-011]. The traffic modelling is based on the currently anticipated temporary traffic management arrangements for both the A3 and M25 that would be in place concurrently during the majority of the construction phase of the project. These temporary traffic management arrangements are assumed to consist of narrow traffic lanes in combination with a reduced speed limit of 50mph that will enable the current number of traffic lanes to be maintained on the SRN, other than at weekends and overnight for specific construction activities. The impact of these temporary traffic management arrangements has been assessed using the strategic traffic model. The extent of the temporary traffic management arrangements along both the A3 and M25 is also based on that currently anticipated.</p> <p>The strategic traffic model is the correct model to use to assess the potential for traffic to divert from the SRN on to the LRN as a result of the proposed temporary traffic management arrangements, since it is a traffic reassignment model. It adequately replicates the impact on traffic speeds, and thus journey times on the SRN, of narrow running lanes in combination with a reduced speed limit. Consequently, no meaningful benefit would currently be achieved by using the Paramics model to assess the impact of the temporary traffic management arrangements, since it would be unlikely to alter the assumptions regarding traffic speeds through the temporary traffic management arrangements from those used in the strategic model. Highways England agrees that it may, however, be appropriate for the Contractor to undertake more detailed modelling of local junctions to inform the CEMP and TMP once the detailed traffic management arrangements have been prepared.</p> <p>The traffic modelling of the proposed temporary traffic management arrangements has indicated that they will result in minimal diversion of traffic from the SRN on to the LRN, as reported in Section 11 of the Transport Supplementary Information Report [REP2-011].</p>	
2.18.7	RR-004 para: 10.8	It is appropriate that the proposed construction compound on the site of the former San Domenico Hotel is accessed from the A3, provided that suitable traffic management measures are implemented to enable this to be achieved without compromising the safety of construction workers or the travelling public.	<p><b>SCC has no further comments on this matter.</b></p> <p>SCC considers that the matter of construction site access arrangements from the strategic road network is not a relevant matter for the local highway authority to comment on. SCC consider that Surrey Police will need to be involved in discussions on detailed traffic management measures to be approved under DCO requirement 4.</p>	Highways England will liaise with Surrey Police in developing its proposals for traffic management plans to be approved under requirement 4 of the dDCO.
<b>2.19 Public transport</b>				
2.19.1	RR-004 paras: 3.2.1(i) 3.2.1 (ii)	The Scheme makes appropriate provision for the replacement of affected bus stops.	<p><b>Not agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC considers that the Scheme should provide for upgraded facilities, including the installation of 'real-time' information and upgraded bus stops at the Ockham Park junction.</p>	



SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
	REP2-047 (paras 4.11.1 and 7.6.1 to 7.6.9)		Highways England considers that the Scheme should provide replacement bus stops to a comparable standard as existing. As real-time information is not currently provided at the existing bus stops and given this information is readily available via mobile applications, Highways England considers that these upgrades are not directly necessary for the Scheme or as mitigation for its effects. (See Highways England's response on this matter in REP2-014 – comment on REP1-020-31 on page 37).	
2.19.2	RR-004 paras: 3.2.1(ii) 3.2.1 (iii) REP2-047 (paras 7.6.1 to 7.6.9) REP3-036 para 1.6	Retaining the two existing bus stops on the A3 near Wisley Lane would be unsafe and a position at the entrance to RHS Wisley Garden offers the best possible option for their relocation.	<b>Agreed.</b> See 2.19.3 below.	
2.19.3	RR-004 para: 3.2.1 REP2-047 (paras 7.6.1 to 7.6.9) REP4-048 See also SCC's response to ExQ 2.13.35 in REP5-029	The Scheme will require buses to divert off the A3 to pick up and set down passengers at Wisley Lane, which will add up to approximately three minutes to journeys for the 715 bus service, as set out in the Transport Assessment Supplementary Information Report [REP2-011].	<b>Not agreed.</b>  SCC wishes to highlight that the three minutes quoted is an academic modelled figure and does not reflect the true impact on bus journey times as aspects such as set down and accessing the turning area cannot be fully factored in. In any event, Stagecoach, the County's bus operator, strongly disagrees that even a three-minute delay can be absorbed within the timetabling for the 715 route. Stagecoach advise that additional journey time and potential loss of patronage elsewhere on the route due to unattractive journey times (i.e. passengers on the bus that have no need to visit RHS Wisley) will make this proposal financially unsustainable.  SCC advises that Stagecoach estimate that this could cost an additional £30,000 to £40,000 per annum in lost revenue. As such SCC believes that this impact can be mitigated through Highways England providing funding to incentivise the bus diversion either through the 715 service or via a new/diverted community bus service. This has previously been set out in paragraph 3.2.1 of its written representation [RR-004] and in paragraph 7.6 of the Local Impact Report [REP2-047].  Highways England has carried out an assessment of the Scheme's impact on the 715 bus service the results of which are set out on page 31 of the Transport Assessment Supplementary Information Report (TASIR) [REP2-011] noting that the northbound and southbound times in the 2037 columns of Table 5.1 are presented the wrong way round, i.e. southbound should be northbound and visa-versa. The additional three minutes referred to in column 3 of this SoCG and in REP2-007 relates to the additional time a bus will take to exit the Ockham Park junction, travel along the Wisley Lane diversion, turn around at the entrance to RHS Wisley Garden and return to the Ockham Park junction and re-join its current route. This represents the full extent of the diversion for the 715 service, which at present routes through Ripley to join or leave the A3 at the Ockham	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>Park junction. It includes a reasonable allowance for the set down and picking up of passengers.</p> <p>During peak times, when the benefits of the Scheme in terms of improved journey times through M25 junction 10 will be most notable, the additional journey time is likely to generally reduce by between 30 seconds and 2 minutes, depending on direction and peak period, when compared with journey times for the service in the do-minimum scenario. Bus journey times are forecast to be significantly reduced northbound during the morning peak period in 2037 with the Scheme (by up to 21 minutes) compared to the do-minimum scenario due to the reduction in traffic congestion and delay on the A3 northbound during the morning period delivered by the Scheme.</p> <p>Highways England does not agree that these increases in journey times would give rise to a significant adverse impact on the operation of the bus service and has responded to this effect in REP2-014 (see comment on issue REP1-020-33 on page 37). The maximum increase in journey times by approximately 3 minutes each way (during the inter-peak period) due to the additional distance arising from the diversion, will need to be balanced against the potential benefits of increased patronage due to the bus stop being more conveniently sited for RHS Wisley Garden and the benefits that the Scheme will deliver in improving journey times through the M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange during peak periods.</p> <p>SCC's representation [RR-004] (see paragraph 3.2.1 (iii)) makes the point that there may need to be an incentive provided to make the diversion attractive to bus operators – in the order of £30,000 to £50,000 per annum for two years. However, that point was made without the benefit of seeing Highways England's assessment in REP2-011. Since then it is apparent from SCC's response to ExQ2.13.35 [REP5-029] that no diversion of the 715 service would be supported, largely based on the assumption that the diversion would add 5 minutes to the bus journey times, which is two-thirds longer than the maximum increase in journey times that has been assessed. SCC now requests funding for a bespoke bus to serve RHS Wisley. No further reference has been made to retaining a stopping point for the 715 service at this location, presumably indicating that most passengers currently using the existing bus stops at Wisley Lane are likely to be RHS Wisley visitors. Neither has any evidence been provided by SCC to justify the sums it is requesting or how they have been calculated.</p> <p>Highways England considers that the funding of a bus service specifically for RHS Wisley Gardens is a matter for the RHS to address itself as part of its commitment to sustainable travel for its growing number of garden visitors. This is not a matter for Highways England or necessary for the purposes of the Scheme. The Scheme provides for the construction of a new bus stop at the entrance to RHS Wisley which is consistent with SCC's views on the need for a bus to serve the Gardens. Moreover, given that SCC has previously described itself as the 'de facto' operator of the 715 bus service [REP3-036] then SCC is clearly in a position to make decisions on the operation of that service. Highways England cannot compel SCC or Stagecoach to continue stopping the</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			715 service at Wisley Lane, however it has made provision for a replacement bus stop in the Scheme to facilitate services to continue.	
2.19.4	RR-004 para: 3.2.1(iii) REP2-047 (paras 7.6.1 to 7.6.9) REP3-036 para 1.6  See also SCC's response to ExQ 2.13.35 in REP5-029	The relocation of the Wisley Lane bus stops to the entrance to RHS Wisley Gardens offers a more convenient solution for passengers/RHS visitors than an alternative solution involving the provision of a new footpath link from the bus stop at Ockham Park, which would need to be routed through RHS Wisley Garden land.	<p><b>Agreed, as a matter of fact.</b></p> <p>However, SCC wishes to draw attention to issue 2.19.3 of this SoCG above. Given that there is no certainty that buses will utilise the RHS Wisley Garden stop, SCC's view is that the nearest bus stops to RHS Wisley Gardens will be at the Ockham Park junction which is a considerable walk distance from the gardens. For pedestrians to use the new Wisley Lane Diversion will involve an obvious and lengthy diversion/walk distance. As such SCC would wish to ensure that the shortest possible pedestrian route to the destination is achieved and asks Highways England to investigate and confirm the options to achieve this in lieu of funding be provided as set out in 2.19.3 of this SoCG above. SCC acknowledges that this is an issue that will likely require RHS Wisley involvement given that an alternative access route could involve their land, for example Highways England could provide a footway to the RHS Gardens boundary adjacent to Mill Lane but would then either provide an additional footway alongside the A3 or a footpath with the RHS Wisley Gardens land ownership. SCC's view on this could be resolved should the funding be provided as set out at issue 2.19.3 of this SoCG above.</p> <p>Highways England notes that the suitability of the replacement bus stop location has been agreed with SCC (see item 2.19.2 of this SoCG above). SCC has also confirmed in REP3-036 that it has 'no issue with the principle of the proposed bus turn around at RHS Wisley'. If SCC considers there to be a need for a bus passenger transport service to access RHS Wisley (as it states in response to ExQ2.13.35 [REP5-029]), then there cannot be any objection to the Scheme making provision for this, as it does. In which case, it logically follows that there cannot be a need for the Scheme to also provide an additional footpath link in the way requested by SCC.</p> <p>The Scheme makes provision for a new bus stop at the entrance to RHS Wisley which will facilitate convenient access for visitors, supporting SCC's view that a bus service will be needed. It also makes provision for an improved footway and/ or footway/ cycletrack between the bus stops at the Ockham Park junction and Mill Lane (the southern boundary of RHS Wisley) and for a new bridleway along the entire length of the Wisley Lane diversion between the Ockham Park junction and the entrance to RHS Wisley. SCC's request for the Scheme to make provision for a further footpath link between Ockham Park and the entrance to RHS Wisley cannot be justified if provision is already made in the Scheme for these new connections. A shorter and more direct route would necessitate taking further land from RHS Wisley with no clear benefit and the relevant land is beyond the DCO boundary for the Scheme. From a visitor perspective, allowing services to call at the bus stop being provided by the Scheme at the entrance to RHS Wisley will provide the most convenient solution for passengers and RHS visitors. As SCC is the operator of the 715 service 'de facto' SCC is in a position to determine which services do or do not stop at the newly provided bus stop location and the improvement of bus access to RHS Wisley Gardens specifically is a matter for RHS Wisley itself.</p>	
2.19.5	RR-004 para:3.2.1(v)	The proposed location for the re-siting of the existing bus stop on the A3 southbound on-slip at the Painshill junction is appropriate.	<b>Agreed.</b>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
	REP2-047 (paras 7.6.1 to 7.6.9)		<p>SCC's agreement is subject to a satisfactory stage 2 road safety audit being provided at the detailed design stage of the Scheme, given SCC's concerns about the proposed bus stop location requiring passengers to wait on a narrow splitter island, which would be an inhospitable environment and could block sight lines.</p> <p>Highways England considers that the proposed location is suitable. Whilst it is on a splitter island, the volume of traffic using the private access road to Heyswood would be very small and would not represent a significant hazard for waiting passengers. Relocating the bus stop further north could however create greater conflict between stopping buses, traffic diverging to the Heyswood private access and traffic accelerating on the off-side to join the A3 southbound carriageway. The proposal for the re-siting of the bus stop was within the scope of the Road Safety Audit for the Scheme (provided in Appendix I of the Transport Assessment Report [APP-136] and no particular concerns or issues were identified.</p>	
<b>3.0 EFFECTS ON THE PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY NETWORK AND ON CYCLISTS, PEDESTRIANS AND HORSE RIDERS</b>				
<b>3.1 Proposals for non-motorised user (NMU) routes</b>				
3.1.1	RR-004 para: 3.1.3 and REP2-047 paras 4.9.3 and 7.10.3	The proposed NMU routes to be provided as part of Work No. 31 (improvement of the Ockham Park junction) are appropriate and matters relating to their surface treatment should be agreed at the detailed design stage.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC's agreement is subject to a satisfactory stage 2 road safety audit for the NMU proposals at the Ockham Park junction.</p> <p>Highways England is in discussions with SCC regarding the terms of a separate legally binding side agreement on a range of highway matters, including arrangements for the involvement of SCC in the detailed design and road safety audit processes. See issue 1.5.1 of this SoCG above.</p> <p>A copy of the stage 1 RSA has been shared with SCC for information. No issues or concerns were identified in relation to the NMU proposals at the Ockham Park junction.</p>	Highways England will consult with SCC at the detailed design stage on the surface treatment for the NMU routes proposed at the Ockham Park junction. Highways England is negotiating a legally binding highway side agreement to provide for SCC's involvement in the detailed design process.
3.1.2	RR-004 para: 3.1.6 and REP2-047 para 4.9.3	The width and surface treatment proposed for Work No. 33 (a new bridleway along the Wisley Lane Diversion) are appropriate for its intended purpose and usage.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>Details of the proposed new bridleway along the Wisley Lane diversion are shown on Cross-Section 01 in DCO application document APP-014, which shows a cross-section for the Wisley Diversion and to paragraph 17.2.3 of Highways England's application document, 'Introduction to the Application and Scheme Description [APP-002], which describes the proposal for the Wisley Lane Diversion. In summary, the Scheme makes provision for a 5.5m wide NMU route alongside the carriageway, comprising a 3m wide tarmac surface with adjacent soft verge, with a maximum gradient of 5%.</p>	
3.1.3	N/A	The proposed upgrading of existing permissive routes to public footpaths or bridleways will not necessitate any works along their route.	<b>Matter under discussion as at Deadline 8.</b>	Highways England will provide SCC with a schedule detailing the suitability of each proposed upgrade, to provide reassurance on

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>SCC requires details of proposed design and surfacing to assess suitability of the existing routes for their intended classification as no works are proposed.</p> <p>Highways England is continuing to engage in discussions with SCC on this matter. The permissive routes are already used by horse-riders and are therefore suitable without any further work to enable their status to be upgraded to bridleways, as is proposed in the dDCO. Highways England is preparing a full schedule of upgrades and will use its best endeavours to resolve matters with SCC prior to the close of the DCO examination.</p>	<p>this point. The position as regards agreement on the matter will be confirmed to the Examining Authority prior to the close of the DCO examination.</p>
<b>3.2 Alignment of Work No. 35 – proposed new bridleway between Wisley Lane and Seven Hills Road (south)</b>				
3.2.1	RR-004 paras: 5.1.1.3 6.2 REP4-048	The alignment of Work No. 35, by following existing tracks or the route required for a gas main diversion, will help reduce the extent of habitat loss from the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and reduce the need for more engineered retaining solutions.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>However, SCC is concerned that the alignment of Work No. 35 will create enclaves of land between the A3 and the NMU route. SCC comment that appropriate compensation should be provided for this orphaned land.</p> <p>Highways England has responded to this point in REP2-014 (see comments made on REP1-020-30 on page 36 and on REP1-020-61 on page 43) and in REP3-007 (see comment on Issue LI1 on page 27). In summary, the highway boundary for the A3 (the would be aligned on the A3 side and would exclude the NMU route and parcels of land between the A3 and the NMU, unless specifically shown as required for drainage attenuation ponds and other features associated with the A3. This is shown on the Scheme Layout Plans [APP-012] by the proposed highway fence line/environmental barrier line as appropriate and is represented by the extent of land shaded pink on the Land Plans [AS-002] (the land to be permanently acquired by Highways England).</p>	
<b>3.3 NMU provision on Seven Hills Road (south)</b>				
3.3.1	RR-004 para: 2.3.8.5	There is insufficient space within the existing highway boundary to accommodate a separate cycle facility along that part of Seven Hills Road (south) between the Hilton Hotel entrance and the A245 Byfleet Road.	<p><b>Not agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC has requested that provision be made for a continuous traffic free route for cyclists, including provision for a cycle facility along the eastern side of Seven Hills Road (south). SCC considers that this is by far the most likely way to facilitate a modal shift. SCC considers that there is enough space to accommodate a cycle facility along this section of Seven Hills Road (south) within the existing highway boundary. SCC has suggested that use could be made of the existing footway to create a shared use path, for both pedestrians and cyclists. Alternatively, SCC suggest that Dutch style on-carriageway cycle lanes with no centre line should be considered at the detailed design stage, given that traffic levels are expected to be very low.</p> <p>SCC has also requested that a Road Safety Audit be provided to show how cyclists will get safely from the end of the NMU route to the signals.</p> <p>Highways England does not consider there to be sufficient space within the highway boundary to create a shared use path of suitable width/standard. Given the low volumes of traffic using Seven Hills Road (south), a point which SCC acknowledges, it considers that people will be able to cycle safely between the end of the proposed new bridleway and the commencement of the proposed new footway/cycletrack alongside the A245 Byfleet Road. Nonetheless and</p>	<p>Highways England/the Undertaker will, as suggested by SCC, give further consideration as to whether it will be possible to incorporate cycling provision for this section of Seven Hills Road (south) at the detailed design stage of the project.</p>

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			without prejudice, Highways England is willing to consider this matter further at the detailed design stage, as suggested by SCC.  No issues or concerns were identified in the Road Safety Audit for this part of the Scheme. A copy of that audit has been provided to SCC for information.	
<b>3.4 NMU provision on A245 Byfleet Road</b>				
3.4.1	N/A	The alignment and classification for the new cycle track/footway proposed alongside the A245 Byfleet Road westbound carriageway is appropriate.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
3.4.2	RR-004 para: 2.3.8.5  REP2-047 para 4.9.7	A new signal-controlled pedestrian crossing over the A245 Byfleet Road at the Seven Hills Road junction can be secured through designated funds and is not required for the purposes of the Scheme.	<b>Not agreed.</b>  SCC acknowledge the opportunity to bid for designated funds, however it considers that as Highways England is carrying out works at this junction, it should incorporate the crossing within the Scheme, having regard to the fact that there is no guarantee that funding will be forthcoming. SCC has also noted through discussions on this SoCG that it considers that the Scheme is creating demand through the new NMU route from the Seven Hills Road, across the Painshill junction to Cobham.  Highways England has responded to this point in REP2-014 (see comment on REP1-020-19 on page 33). Most of the future traffic growth on the A245 Byfleet Road will not be attributable to the Scheme and the provision of an additional crossing as mitigation for the Scheme cannot therefore be justified. In addition, a survey carried out in May 2017 recorded just two pedestrians crossing the A245 at the Seven Hills Road junction between the hours of 06:00 and 19:00, which indicates that there is no compelling evidence for extending the DCO boundary further west to accommodate it in the way suggested by SCC. Nonetheless, Highways England will continue to support SCC should it decide to bid to secure funding for this under RIS2 – in the 2020/2021 financial year.	Highways England will support SCC in resubmitting a bid for designated funds for this crossing in RIS2 – April 2020.
3.4.3	RR-004 para: 2.5.5(iv)	The Scheme makes suitable provision to replace an existing footway alongside the A245 Byfleet Road eastbound carriageway.	<b>Agreed.</b>  However, SCC is seeking confirmation that there is enough space to enable a maintenance vehicle accessing the pond to be able to manoeuvre safely. Highways England confirms that the issue of vehicle access to the pond is addressed at issue 2.4.1 of this SoCG above.	Highways England will make provision in the detailed design for the Scheme for maintenance vehicles to be able to safely enter and exit the drainage pond site. The design and location of the security gate, turning head and bell-mouth will be agreed with SCC.
<b>3.5 Effects on NMUs during the construction phase of the Scheme</b>				
3.5.1	RR-004 paras: 10.5 10.6	The measures described in section 2.7 (paragraphs 2.7.15 – 2.7.25) of the Environmental Statement (APP-049) will provide for NMU access to the Ockham and Wisley Commons and along public rights of way as far as reasonably practicable during construction of the Scheme.	<b>Agreed.</b>  SCC has emphasised that safe access to the Wisley and Ockham Commons will need to be provided both during and after construction.	
<b>4.0 ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL IMPACTS</b>				
<b>4.1 Economy and facilitating planned growth</b>				
4.1.1	N/A	The Scheme objectives give appropriate weight to supporting the projected population and economic growth.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>4.2 Social, Health and well-being</b>				
4.2.1	N/A	The upgrading of NMU routes around the M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley	<b>Agreed.</b>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
		interchange will improve recreational opportunities, reduce severance and bring health and well-being benefits.		
<b>5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT INCLUDING ISSUES RELATING TO CUMULATIVE EFFECTS</b>				
<b>5.1 Methodology</b>				
5.1.1	N/A	The methodology for the environmental assessment is robust, as regards the topics of particular relevance to SCC's functions (biodiversity, road drainage and the water environment, cultural heritage and materials and waste).	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>5.2 Baseline</b>				
5.2.1	N/A	The baseline information presented in the Environmental Statement as regards the topics of particular interest to SCC's functions (biodiversity, road drainage and the water environment, cultural heritage and materials and waste) is appropriate.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>5.3 Assessment of effects</b>				
5.3.1	RR-004 para: 7.2	The significance of the effects identified in the Environmental Statement appropriately reflects the likely magnitude of impact and sensitivity of the resources affected, as regards the topics of particular interest to SCC's functions (biodiversity, road drainage and the water environment, cultural heritage and materials and waste).	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>5.4 Cumulative effects</b>				
5.4.1	N/A	The Environmental Statement (APP-048-APP-131), the Habitats Regulations Assessment (APP-039-APP-044), the Water Framework Directive Assessment (APP-045), the Flood Risk Assessment (APP-046) appropriately assess the effects of the Scheme in combination with other developments likely to take place in the study area and makes suitable provision to mitigate the Scheme's likely significant effects.	<b>SCC has no comments to make on this matter.</b>	
<b>5.5 Adequacy of mitigation and compensation</b>				
5.5.1	RR-004 paras: 7.2, 7.3, 8.2, 10.9, REP6-019	The package of environmental mitigation and compensation measures for the Scheme have been the subject of extensive discussions between Highways England and several parties including SCC and appropriately address the Scheme's likely significant effects.	<b>Agreed.</b>  In REP6-019, SCC states that it considers that the proposed compensation areas are all needed to adequately compensate for the impact on habitats caused by the Scheme. It confirms that the proposed compensation scheme has been carefully put together in consultation with SCC, SWT and NE and includes habitats that have the greatest potential to achieve compensation for the habitat loss but are also in locations which will achieve habitat continuity. It states that SCC considers that any reduction in these areas could not only compromise the Scheme's ability to adequately compensate for the impacts but also reduce any contribution to biodiversity net gain.	Highways England is in discussions with SCC on the terms of a separate and legally binding side agreement concerning arrangements for the future maintenance, management and monitoring of the environmental mitigation and compensation areas. See 1.5.2 of this SoCG above.
5.5.2	RR-004 paras: 7.2, 7.3, 7.4	The proposed environmental measures to be carried out on the proposed SPA compensation land together with the SPA enhancement works on SCC's estate will provide suitable and adequate mitigation and/or compensation for the Scheme's effects on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.	<b>Agreed.</b>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
	REP2-047 (para 4.4.10)			
5.5.3	REP1-020 para: 2.3.5.1  REP3-036 para 2.3	The Scheme makes suitable and adequate provision to mitigate the environmental effects associated with increased traffic on Old Lane.	<b>Agreed.</b> SCC agree subject to Highways England incorporating proposals for mitigating the County registered toad crossing, as identified by SCC in its written representation (REP1-020 paragraph 2.3.5.1).  See issues 11.2.1 and 11.2.2 of this SoCG below as regards respective positions on change No.2.	
<b>5.6 Management and Monitoring of mitigation/compensation measures</b>				
5.6.1	RR-004 paras: 7.1 7.3 and REP2-047 para 4.4.8 REP3-036 para 2.2  See also SCC's response to ExQ 2.4.3 which is being submitted by SCC at Deadline 5.	The measures set out in the SPA Management and Monitoring Plan and the Landscape and Ecology Management and Monitoring Plan reflect those discussed with SCC at the pre-application stage and provide a suitable framework for the future maintenance, management and monitoring of the environmental mitigation and compensation measures as they relate to SCC's land interests and as regards the nature of future monitoring activities and durations.	<b>Agreed-</b>  SCC has raised some additional points as regards the management plans and is looking for further clarification to be provided in relation to: badger sett monitoring, ancient woodland soil translocation monitoring and botanical monitoring.  Highways England notes that these matters will be addressed at the discharging requirements stage when detailed management proposals for the various elements of environmental mitigation measures must be agreed. SCC has been added as a requirement consultee for requirements 8, 9 and 10 to provide further assurance. However, with regard to ancient woodland soil translocation, Highways England considers the 25-year monitoring period to be enough time in which to determine whether plant species have appropriately established.	Highways England will address SCC's comments about monitoring for the badger sett, ancient woodland soil translocation and botanical monitoring when submitting the SPA Management and Monitoring Plan and the Landscape and Ecology Management and Monitoring Plan for approval under the DCO requirements.
<b>6.0 NOISE, AIR QUALITY AND DISTURBANCE</b>				
<b>6.1 Noise and vibration</b>				
6.1.1	RR-004 para: 7.3	The conclusion that the felling of trees proposed within the SPA enhancement works to be undertaken as part of the Scheme will not give rise to significant noise impacts is robust.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>6.2 Emissions/air quality</b>				
6.2.1	RR-004 para: 2.3.5.1  See also REP5-029 ExQ 2.3.6	The conclusions in the Environmental Statement that the operation of the Scheme is not expected to have a significant adverse air quality effect on designated ecological sites at the Ockham and Wisley Commons are robust.	<b>SCC has no comments to make on this matter.</b> SCC consider that this is a matter for Elmbridge Borough and Guildford Borough to address, as air quality is a district/borough function.	



SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
<b>7.0 CONSTRUCTION ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (CEMP)</b>				
<b>7.1 Scope of CEMP</b>				
7.1.1	RR-004 paras: 1.6 (6) 7.1 REP2-047 para 4.4.9	The commitments made in the oCEMP (AS-016) and REAC (APP-135) as regards the preparation of a full CEMP and its constituent environmental control plans, method statements and risk assessments etc., together with the requirement 3 of the dDCO will ensure that appropriate environmental safeguards and controls are put in place prior to the commencement of the construction works.	<b>Agreed.</b> SCC considers that commitments made to date give sufficient safeguards as long as all protective measures are taken forward as a thread from the original surveys, recommended measures then included in the CEMP.	
<b>8.0 ANY OTHER POTENTIAL EFFECTS INCLUDING ON HERITAGE ASSETS, BIODIVERSITY, LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT, FLOOD RISK AND CONTAMINATION</b>				
<b>8.1 Heritage assets and historic environment/cultural heritage</b>				
8.1.1	RR-004 paras: 7.8 and 7.9  REP2-047 para 4.7  See also SCC's responses to ExQ 2.7.7 in REP5-029	Requirement 14 of the dDCO provides a suitable mechanism for a written scheme of archaeological investigation to be agreed and implemented as part of the Scheme.	<b>Agreed.</b> However, SCC comments that it has not yet seen the detail of a written scheme for the investigation and mitigation of areas of archaeological interest and has asked to be consulted and input to the brief for the Written Scheme.  Highways England considers that adequate provision is made to address this matter in requirement 14 of the DCO and that the principle of leaving such matters to the discharging of requirements is well precedented in other made DCOs. Highways England has shared with SCC an outline scope for the overarching Written Scheme for the investigation and mitigation of areas of archaeological interest which will need to be submitted under requirement 14, to enable SCC to contribute to the brief for this work. In REP5-029 (see SCC's response to ExQ 2.7.7 on page 7), SCC confirmed that the brief provided by Highways England covered the areas that SCC expected to see at this stage of the project.  See also issue 11.1.1 below.	Highways England has shared with SCC for comment an outline scope for the brief for the overarching Written Scheme of Investigation and Mitigation of Areas of Archaeological Interest. In preparing its submission to discharge requirement 14, Highways England will have full regard to any feedback that SCC may wish to provide, noting the comments made by SCC in REP5-029.
<b>8.2 Biodiversity/ecology/natural environment</b>				
8.2.1	RR-004 paras: 7.5 7.6 7.7  REP1-020 (para 7.6)  REP2-047 para 4.4.12	The position and width of the green verge on the replacement Cockcrow overbridge is appropriate for the purpose of addressing the historic severance of ecological habitats caused by construction of the A3.	<b>Agreed.</b> SCC's agreement is subject to a 25m wide green verge being incorporated within the Scheme design.  Highways England has amended its DCO application to include a 25m wide green verge (see change No. 1 submitted at Deadline 4. This change was accepted for examination by procedural decision published on 24 April 2020. However, as the green verge is not required as mitigation for the Scheme, its delivery is contingent upon securing the necessary designated funds. As is made clear in Requirement 9(3) of the dDCO, (the Secretary of State may authorise the undertaker to construct the replacement Cockcrow overbridge without a green verge element, in the unlikely event that such designated funding is not forthcoming.  See also issue 11.1.1 of this SoCG below, which relates to Change No. 1.	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
<b>8.3 Landscape, arboriculture and visual impact (including lighting)</b>				
8.3.1	RR-004 para: 7.3 REP2-047 para 4.6	The existing woodland surrounding much of the scheme and which will be retained provides good levels of tree screening. It will be supplemented by new planting and environmental barriers to minimise the visual impact of the scheme. The location of the scheme in the SPA/SSSI limits the scope for screening by earth bunding.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>8.4 Road Drainage Flood Risk</b>				
8.4.1	RR-004 paras: 2.5.2 8.2 REP2-047 paras 4.5.1 to 4.5.5	The proposed new drainage measures incorporated within the preliminary design for the Scheme will provide sufficient attenuation to address existing flooding on the relevant parts of the local road network and sufficient attenuation for increased surface water run-off from new, widened or improved carriageways to be provided as part of the Scheme.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC state that they would need to approve/agree the design criteria for drainage provision in terms of asset design and attenuation principles on the local roads. Any assets for adoption within SCC Highway network, for SCC adoption or on SCC owned land would need to meet operational and maintenance criteria. In addition, SCC would also need to agree the design of any assets (or those in 3<sup>rd</sup> party control) with runoff discharge to local watercourses, ditches or ponds (with regard pollution control/rates of discharge etc) to ensure that WFD responsibilities are met and flood risk is not increased.</p> <p>Highways England is engaging in discussions with SCC regarding the terms of a separate legally binding side agreement that will provide for SCC's involvement in the detailed design process of features that are intended to become the responsibility of SCC, including drainage.</p> <p>See issue 1.5.1 of this SoCG above.</p>	
<b>8.5 Contamination</b>				
8.5.1	RR-004 para: 9.2	The risk of contamination being encountered during construction of the Scheme is low and appropriate safeguards are provided in the DCO through requirements 3 and 13 and the commitments in the REAC and oCEMP to deal with any uncertainty and the steps to be taken should the need arise.	<b>SCC has no comments to make on this matter.</b>	
<b>8.6 Materials, Minerals and Waste/Impact on SCC as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority</b>				
8.6.1	RR-004 para: 9.1 REP2-047 paras 4.8.1, 4.8.3 and 4.8.4	The assumptions and assessment as regards materials and waste as set out in chapter 12 – Materials and Waste (APP-057) are appropriate and robust.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC has raised queries about the likely demand for materials for the Scheme and the availability of material sources. SCC as Minerals Planning Authority is required to plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates (under the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 207). SCC is concerned that the Scheme has the potential to increase aggregate sales in Surrey by a large amount and this has implications for the amount of aggregates that SCC needs to plan for. SCC comments that the assessment contained in the Environmental Assessment was at a regional level, however SCC is concerned that Surrey will be disproportionately affected as host authority, given prohibitive transportation costs for aggregates.</p> <p>SCC has also commented through discussions on this SoCG that if a greater impact is to be experienced in Surrey, a more detailed assessment should have followed to determine impacts, including transport impacts and how much primary/secondary material will be required and the sustainability of this material.</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>SCC considers that the Scheme should comply with Policy MC4 of the Surrey Minerals Plan and states that efficient use of mineral resources, includes the use of lower grade material if feasible.</p> <p>Highways England has responded to SCC's comments in application documents REP2-014 (see comments on REP1-020-72 on page 47) and REP3-007 (see comment on para 4.8.4 on page 8). In addition, the study area and baseline for the materials assessment was originally proposed at a national level in the EIA Scoping Report [APP-132] and SCC responded during consultation on 11 January 2018 stating that the 'County Council concurs with the proposed extent of the study area for materials and waste, subject to there being no substantial alterations to the proposed scheme' and that the 'County Council is broadly content with the approach that has been outlined with reference to the assessment of the scheme's effects on demand for material resources and on the management of waste arisings.'</p> <p>In summary, the assessment set out in the Environmental Statement - Chapter 12: Materials and waste [APP-057] is based on the best available data available at the time of the assessment. It is assumed that construction materials including aggregate will be sourced from both within Surrey and from the wider region, and therefore a regional materials baseline is appropriate and robust. The conclusion in the Environmental Statement was that the Scheme would not have a significant impact on the materials baseline.</p> <p>The transport assessment contained in the Transport Assessment Report [APP-136] identified the use of the railhead at Woking to import construction materials, allowing bulk materials such as aggregate to be imported from the wider region and transported locally using heavy goods vehicles. The sources of aggregates will be determined by the Principal Contractor involved in construction of the Scheme, the required specification of product and the market conditions at the time of construction. On this basis, the assumptions and assessment as regards materials as set out in Chapter 12: Materials and waste [APP-057] are appropriate and robust.</p> <p>The sustainability of the Scheme has been assessed in Environmental Statement Chapter 15: Climate [APP-060]. This assessment considers the transport and consumption of materials required for construction. Highways England will aim to use recycled and secondary aggregates in place of primary aggregates, where these are available locally and meet the requirements of the design and are geotechnically and chemically suitable. Reference to Policy MC4 of the Surrey Minerals Plan regarding the efficient use of mineral resources is noted and the Scheme will comply with this, wherever it is practicable to do so. The type of aggregate used will be dependent upon its availability at the time of construction and the specification required by the Standards for Highways, including the Manual of Contract Documents for Highway Works and other applicable specifications.</p>	
8.6.2	RR-004 paras: 9.1	The Scheme will not give rise to any significant adverse implications for the January 2019 Draft Surrey Waste Local Plan, as the total waste arising	<b>Agreed.</b>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
	9.2 9.3	from the Scheme is likely to equate with 1% of the total waste arisings in Surrey.		
8.6.3	RR-004 para: 9.2	The DCO appropriately provides for the management of topsoil to be approved under DCO requirement 3.	<b>Agreed</b> , subject to consultation on the Soil Handling and Management Plan	Requirement 3 of the dDCO provides for the Undertaker to submit for approval a management plan/method statement for the management of materials and topsoil, prior to the commencement of the authorised development.
<b>9.0 COMPUSLORY ACQUISITION</b>				
<b>9.1 Need to acquire or use SCC land</b>				
9.1.1	RR-004 paras: 6.1 6.2 6.3 2.3.8.5  REP4-048	The SCC land that is intended to be subject to compulsory acquisition of title, rights or subject to temporary possession is no more than reasonably required for the purposes of constructing, operating and maintaining the Scheme or providing for the long-term mitigation/compensation of its environmental effects.	<b>Agreed.</b>  SCC's agreement is subject to provision being made within the highway side agreement for SCC's involvement in the detailed design of structures.  SCC has raised points on maintenance access routes for the Scheme – see issue 1.4.1 of this SoCG above.	
<b>9.2 Implications for common land/countryside estate due to permanent acquisition and temporary possession</b>				
9.2.1	RR-004 para: 7.3  REP6-019  See also SCC's response to ExQ3.9.2 in REP7-025.	The extent and location of proposed replacement land is suitable and appropriate and will be no less advantageous to the public.	<b>Agreed.</b>  In REP6-019, SCC confirms that it would not wish to see any reduction in the extent and nature of the replacement land. SCC also confirms that it agrees with the target ratios used (see SCC's response to ExQ 3.9.2) [REP7-025].	
9.2.2	RR-004 para:6.3 and REP1-020 paras 6.4 and 6.5  See also SCC's response to ExQ2.16.4 in REP5-029.  See also SCC's response to	The Scheme makes appropriate allowance for the replacement of any land affected by the Scheme and which is intended to become common land in the future (under any existing/extant agreement), regardless of whether the relevant formal registration processes have been concluded or not.	<b>Agreed.</b>  Highways England and SCC are working to achieve the relevant transfers and registration processes. In responding to Ex Q 2.16.4 [REP5-029] SCC has indicated that this work could be completed within 9-12 months.  Highways England emphasises that it is not necessary for these outstanding registration matters to be resolved within the examination period (see Highways England's response to Ex Q 2.16.4) [REP5-014]. This is because the Applicant has treated the affected exchange land as if it were special category land, which it currently is in any event by virtue of being open to public recreation. Moreover, the Applicant has not sought compulsory acquisition powers over the areas of registered common land which fall within the mainline M25 carriageway. Accordingly, in respect of that land the Secretary of State is not asked to consider whether to authorise the compulsory acquisition of common land.	Highways England has provided funding to SCC to enable the necessary transfers and registration processes to be concluded. Negotiations are continuing to resolve historic anomalies and resolution of these matters is not necessary for the Secretary of State to make a DCO for the Scheme.

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
	ExQ3.9.1 and ExQ3.16.6 in REP7-025		<p>Nonetheless, Highways England and SCC agree that resolution of these matters is desirable for reasons for administrative practicality and are endeavouring to bring matters to a conclusion as soon as possible.</p> <p>Further reference should be made to Highways England and SCC's responses to Ex Q 3.16.6 [rREP7-004 and REP7-025].</p>	
<b>9.3 Implications for other SCC assets</b>				
9.3.1	<p>REP1-020 paras: 6.6 and 6.7 and REP2-047 para 8.3</p> <p>REP7-025 (See SCC's response to Ex Q3.16.1)</p>	<p>Works to reconfigure the car parking at the Ockham Bites café are not directly necessary for the purposes of the Scheme and can be secured either through an appropriate compensation settlement with SCC as landowner or under the terms of a separate side agreement covering an agreed specification for accommodation works to be carried out by the Undertaker on SCC's behalf (subject to planning permission and other consents).</p>	<p><b>Not agreed.</b></p> <p>The Scheme will result in the loss of approximately one third of the capacity at the Ockham Bites car park. SCC considers that the scheme should fund and incorporate suitable accommodation works to remodel the car park to create replacement parking. SCC has submitted to Highways England an outline scope of works it considers necessary and considers that the matter should be addressed through a separate side agreement rather than through a compensation settlement. SCC is keen to conclude a side agreement on this issue during the DCO examination.</p> <p>SCC considers that the proposed access track will also create a visual and physical barrier from the car park to the common. SCC also asks that the height of the embankment for work No.35 be lowered to reduce its severance effects or realigned to the rear of the Ockham Bites Cafe.</p> <p>Highways England has been engaging in discussions with SCC on this matter. Whilst the compensation settlement for the Scheme would enable SCC to secure the reconfiguration works directly, Highways England acknowledges SCC's preference for it to enter into a separate side agreement providing for the undertaker to carry out an agreed set of accommodation works on its behalf. This would be subject to the necessary planning permissions and other relevant consents and licences being obtained outside of the DCO. However, there is limited value in seeking to specify the nature of the accommodate works at this stage because any solution will need to be determined in the light of detailed designs. Highways England has therefore included heads of terms within the highway side agreement between it and SCC which provide for the parties to use their reasonable endeavours to agree a solution and a mechanism for securing the works at the detailed design stage. In view of this commitment, it is Highways England's opinion that the determination of the DCO application need not be contingent upon a detailed agreement being executed prior to the close of the DCO examination.</p> <p>Highways England has responded to SCC's points about the impact of the proposed new bridleway embankment and alignment. See its comments in REP2-014 (comments on REP1-020-86 and REP1-020-87 on page 51) and its comments in REP3-007 (comments on para 8.3 on page 19). In summary, it would not be possible at this stage to confirm whether the design of the embankments can be modified to reduce their impact, given that the height is largely determined by the need for the bridleway to connect with the deck height of the replacement Cockcrow Overbridge. It is recognised that the proposed embankment will obstruct some views into the common from parts of the Common, however this needs to be balanced with its beneficial effect on helping</p>	<p>Highways England will continue to use reasonable endeavours to agree a scheme of accommodation works for the Ockham Bites car park with SCC. The implementation of such a scheme will be contingent upon securing planning permission and other consents as necessary. Where agreement cannot be reached, the impact on SCC's holdings will be addressed as part of the financial compensation settlement.</p>

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			screen views to the car park from the Common. Nonetheless, Highways England will continue to involve SCC in the detailing of these works, with a view to seeking any opportunities to further address the concerns raised.	
9.3.2	REP1-020 para 6.6.	It is appropriate that the replacement Cockcrow overbridge be designed so as to permit its use by vehicles used in connection with the management of the Ockham and Wisley Commons and to comply with relevant design standards as regards the maximum suitable gradient for NMUs.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
9.3.3	REP1-020 para 6.8	The areas of additional land that would be required as regards changes no.2 and no.5 (described in REP4a-004) are unlikely to materially change the Scheme's effects on SCC's estate.	<b>Agreed.</b>  See also issues 11.2.1, 11.2.2 and 11.5.1 of this SoCG below.	
<b>10.0 OTHER MATTERS</b>				
<b>10.1 Landscaping proposals</b>				
10.1.1	N/A	The proposed level of landscape planting is appropriate to adequately mitigate the effects of the scheme, as it affects SCC's managed estate.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>10.2 Lighting design</b>				
10.2.1	N/A	The lighting proposals for the Scheme as regards the local road network are appropriate.	<b>Agreed.</b>  SCC's agreement is subject to the Scheme providing for sufficient land within the DCO boundary for lighting purposes and subject to provision being made within a separate highway side agreement for the undertaker to consult and obtain any necessary design approvals from SCC's appointed street lighting PFI contractor.	
<b>10.3 Community involvement</b>				
10.3.1	2.8.1	The Scheme makes appropriate provision for a community liaison strategy to be implemented during the construction works.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>10.4 Effects on non-motorised users</b>				
10.4.1	REP2-047 (para 4.9.1)	Conditions for non-motorised users will improve with the scheme.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>10.5 Planning performance agreement (PPA)</b>				
10.5.1	RR-004 paras:  5.1.3.1 5.1.3.2 5.1.3.3 5.1.3.4  REP2-047 (para 1.4)	Highways England and SCC are in discussions on the terms of a planning performance agreement to address issues raised in paragraph 1.4 of the Local Impact Report and in RR-004.	<b>Not agreed.</b>  SCC asks that Highways England provides funding (under a PPA) to cover its costs for staff time in providing technical input to date and the Joint Councils have expressed disappointment in the Local Impact Report [REP2-047] that no agreement has been reached on this matter. SCC reiterates that provision should be made for a PPA to cover SCC's involvement, including for the next stage of the project  Highways England confirms that it has not been able to secure a PPA with SCC at this stage.	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
<b>11.0 DCO APPLICATION CHANGES</b>				
<b>11.1 Change No. 1 – Extension of the proposed green element on Cockcrow Bridge</b>				
11.1.1	<p>REP5-031 paras 1.1 – 1.7</p> <p>REP7-025 – see responses to Ex Q 3.1.4 and 3.8.4.</p>	<p>The ecological benefits of widening the proposed green verge on the replacement Cockcrow Overbridge from 10m to 25m in terms of improving connectivity between severed ecological habitats will outweigh any small disbenefits in terms of increased permanent footprint, changes in visual appearance of the bridge structure in terms of its width and extent of earthworks and materials and construction impact.</p>	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC has expressed support for the proposal to widen the green verge to 25m on the grounds that it will provide a better conduit for wildlife across the A3. SCC notes that the widened approach ramps will change the impact of the Scheme on SCC's land holdings, including increasing the area of permanent title acquisition. As such SCC would require suitable financial compensation for the acquisition of SCC affected land. SCC also notes in its response to ExQ 3.1.4 [REP7-025] that the widened approach ramps will slightly increase the risk of encountering buried archaeology and will increase the impact on the Ockham Bites site.</p> <p>Highways England requested a change to the DCO application to provide for the widening of the green verge specifically in response to representations made about the submitted scheme, including by SCC (see paragraphs 7.5 and 7.6 of REP1-020]. The Examining Authority published its procedural decision on 24 April 2020 confirming acceptance of this change for examination.</p> <p>See also issues 8.1.1 and 9.3.1 to 9.3.3 above, as regards SCC's points made in REP5-031 regarding archaeology and the impact of the Scheme on the Ockham Bites café site and car park.</p>	
11.1.2	<p>RR-004 (para 7.8)</p> <p>REP5-031 para 1.2</p>	<p>Details of measures to reduce the risk of surface material being washed on to the A3 below, to protect any species crossing the bridge and to reduce the impact from lighting and headlights below are matters that can be addressed at the detailed design stage and agreed under requirement 9 of the dDCO.</p>	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>However, SCC notes that it has concerns about the implications for highway safety if material is washed from the bridge onto the A3 beneath. SCC has also commented that the bridge will need to have suitably high parapets/fencing to protect any species crossing the bridge and to reduce the impact from lighting and headlights on traffic below.</p> <p>Highways England has confirmed that the detailed design of the green bridge will include measures to prevent material being washed on to the A3 and to protect species using the bridge. (See Highways England's comments on REP1-020-68 on page 46 of [REP2-014]. Parapets will also be designed to reduce lighting impacts from the small number of vehicles likely to be using the bridge as a substitute means of access. These matters will be addressed under requirement 9 of the dDCO.</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
<b>11.2 Change No. 2 – Two Toad Underpasses at Old Lane</b>				
11.2.1	<p>REP5-031 para 21.</p> <p>REP7-025 (see response to Ex Q 3.1.3)</p>	<p>The provision of two toad underpasses at Old Lane will adequately mitigate the Scheme's effects on toad mortality due to increased traffic on Old Lane.</p>	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC supports the change to the dDCO to include two toad tunnels at Old Lane. SCC also notes that useful discussions have taken place on site with Highways England, SCC and the Surrey Amphibian and Reptile Group, which have suggested that the tunnel locations and fencing could be better positioned and that an additional tunnel would improve the effectiveness of the mitigation. See issue 11.2.1 of this SoCG below.</p> <p>Highways England's Report on the Proposed Scheme Changes [REP4a-004] states that the provision of two toad underpass crossing points will allow the safe dispersal to and from the two toad breeding ponds on either side of Old Lane. Paragraph 4.2.8 of REP4a-004 states the measures proposed will result in a positive effect, both mitigating for the increase in mortality as a result of the operation of the Scheme and reducing the number of mortalities along this section of Old Lane compared with current levels. Highways England acknowledges that further discussions have taken place as to whether the proposed tunnels are sited in the most optimal locations. However, Highways England emphasises that the measures proposed in change 2 (as described in REP4a-004) will adequately mitigate the effects of the Scheme on toad mortality without the necessity of making any further changes.</p> <p>The Examining Authority confirmed its acceptance of this change for examination by procedural decision published on 27 February 2020.</p> <p>See also issue 11.6.1 of this SoCG below and Highways England's response to Ex Q 3.16.2 in REP7-004 as regards the maintenance of the toad crossings.</p>	
11.2.2	<p>REP5-031 para 2.1</p> <p>REP7-025 (see response to Ex Q 3.1.3)</p>	<p>Provision can be made in a separate side agreement between Highways England and SCC to secure an additional or alternative toad underpass location should this be agreed by the relevant parties, however such agreement would not be required in order to mitigate the effects of the Scheme.</p>	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC notes that further discussions have taken place between Highways England and the Surrey Amphibian and Reptile Group, which have indicated that the crossings could be better positioned and that a third tunnel crossing would improve the effectiveness of the mitigation.</p> <p>Highways England has continued to engage on this matter and good progress has been made with SCC in determining the optimum positions for the two crossings, together with provision for a third crossing being added. As SCC is both the highway authority and owner of the adjoining land, the parties are agreed that these measures can be secured under the terms of a separate side agreement. Once the toad underpasses have been constructed, the land and the underpasses will be returned to SCC subject to agreement regarding detailed maintenance provisions.</p> <p>See also Highways England's response to Ex Q 3.16.2 [REP7-004].</p>	<p>Highways England and SCC (in its capacity as highway authority and land owner) will enter into an agreement for Highways England to deliver an alternative solution, if this is supported by all the relevant parties, including the Surrey Amphibian and Reptile Group</p>



SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
<b>11.3 Change No. 3 – Removal of part of the proposed improvements to the A245 eastbound between the Seven Hills Road and Painshill junctions</b>				
11.3.1	<p>REP5-031 paras 3.5, 3.7 and 3.8.</p> <p>REP7-025 (see response to Ex Q 3.1.3)</p>	<p>Significant improvements to journey times and reductions in delays at the Painshill and Seven Hills junctions (compared with the do-minimum scenario) can be achieved without the need to widen the A245 Byfleet Road eastbound carriageway or provide a dedicated link between the A245 eastbound and the A3 northbound carriageways.</p>	<p><b>Under discussion as at Deadline 8.</b></p> <p>SCC is concerned that any reduction in capacity on the eastbound approach to the Painshill junction will have impacts on congestion experienced by traffic travelling from the Brooklands areas. SCC has stated in paragraph 3.8 of REP5-031 that the level of detail provided about Change No. 3 was insufficient for SCC to fully comment. SCC has reiterated this view in responding to Ex Q 3.1.3 [REP7-025].</p> <p>Highways England’s Transport Assessment Addendum Report [REP4-041] confirms that Change No. 3 would have a minimal effect on traffic flows and on the operational performance of the two junctions compared with the dDCO scheme as submitted and that the significant capacity improvements would be preserved by the amended scheme.</p> <p>Highways England has provided SCC with technical information about the change by email. Highways England has also shared its Linsig modelling results, which are being submitted along with its comments on SCC’s responses to the Examining Authority’s Third Written Questions at Deadline 8 (Highways England document 9.108).</p> <p>The Examining Authority confirmed its acceptance of Change No. 3 for examination by procedural decision published on 27 February 2020.</p>	<p>Highways England is currently sharing traffic information with SCC and discussions are continuing around the detail.</p>

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
11.3.2	<p>REP5-031 paras 3.3-3.8</p> <p>REP7-025 see response to Ex Q 3.1.3</p>	<p>The amended design for the A245/Seven Hills Road junction accords with relevant standards as regards merge tapers, including those in DMRB CD 123.</p>	<p><b>Under discussion as at Deadline 8.</b></p> <p>SCC is concerned about the proposed downstream merge arrangement for eastbound traffic travelling from Byfleet towards the Painshill junction (see paragraph 3.4 of REP5-031). SCC's preference is for the nearside lane to be for left-turning traffic only [REP7-025]. SCC requires further detail on the traffic modelling/queue data and interaction with the road safety audit.</p> <p>Highways England emphasises that the amendments have been designed in accordance with current standards and incorporate a 100m merge taper to the east of the A245/Seven Hills Road junction. This is explained in the Transport Assessment Addendum Report [REP4-041] (paragraph 4.1.1) and Consultation Report Addendum [REP4-040] (pages 12-13). In both the original Scheme and in the amended Scheme, the nearside lane provides for left turning and straight-ahead traffic movements. In the amended Scheme, the nearside lane merges with the adjacent lane downstream of the junction.</p> <p>Whilst relatively little traffic goes straight ahead from the A245 eastbound nearside lane, if this lane were to be limited to left-turning traffic only, it is likely that the forecast capacity of the junction would be exceeded. Nonetheless, Highways England is content to modify the design of the Seven Hills junction to address SCC's concerns should SCC be prepared to accept the resulting reduction in operational performance (on this part of the local highway network). Highways England confirms that such design modifications could be delivered within the current DCO boundary and within the relevant limits of deviation and agrees to discuss this further with SCC at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>See also issues 2.4.1 and 3.4.3 above, as regards the concerns expressed by SCC in paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2 of REP5-031 in relation to safety and security of the proposed access to the new drainage attenuation pond.</p>	<p>Highways England will consult SCC at the detailed design stage to agree details of the lane markings etc for the nearside lane on the A245 Byfleet Road eastbound approach to the Seven Hills Road junction.</p>

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
<b>11.4 Change No. 4 – Amendments to Saturday construction working hours</b>				
11.4.1	REP5-031 paras 4.1 – 4.3 REP7-025 (see SCC's response to Ex Q 3.1.3)	The extension of construction working hours on Saturdays will allow for more efficient programming of the works without giving rise to any noticeable changes in the Scheme's likely environmental effects.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC confirmed in REP5-031 that it supports the principle of reducing the overall time period for construction of the Scheme, but asks that Highways England considers the potential impact on local residents and businesses and how such impacts would be mitigated. SCC's agreement/support is also contingent upon the works being co-ordinated under the South East Permit Scheme/Surrey Permit Scheme.</p> <p>In its Report on the Proposed Scheme Changes [REP4a-004], Highways England confirms that the extended working hours have been assessed and would not give rise to any new or different significant environmental effects compared with those assessed for the submitted Scheme. No further mitigation is therefore required as a result of this change. Highways England has agreed to incorporate provision within article 11 of the dDCO for the application of SCC's Permit Scheme (see issues 1.1.5 and 1.1.16 of this SoCG above. This will be included within the revised dDCO being submitted at Deadline 8.</p> <p>The Examining Authority confirmed its acceptance of change No. 4 for examination by procedural decision published on 27 February 2020.</p> <p>See also issue 1.2.3 above.</p>	
<b>11.5 Change No. 5- Adjustments to the Order limits to accommodate the diversion of a gas main</b>				
11.5.1	REP5-031 paras 6.1 and 6.2  REP7-025 (see SCC's response to Ex Q 3.1.3)	There are no matters of contention between SCC and Highways England as regards the change to the Order limits to accommodate the diversion of a gas main to the west of M25 junction 10 (change 5).	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC has no comment to make on this change, beyond the point made in response to Ex Q 3.1.3 that SCC will require suitable financial compensation for the impact upon SCC affected land. In paragraph 6.2 of REP5-031, SCC comments that this additional work should be covered by a method statement covering both the working and reinstatement of the land. This is to address potential biodiversity impacts.</p> <p>Highways England notes that requirements 3 and 17 of the dDCO provide for the approval of method statements for construction works and for the reinstatement of the land.</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
<b>11.6 Change No. 6 –Amendment to the speed limit at Elm Lane</b>				
11.6.1.	<p>REP5-031 paras 5.1 – 5.3 and para 2.2</p> <p>REP7-025 (see SCC's response to Ex Q 3.1.3).</p>	<p>The reduction in the speed limit at Elm Lane from 40mph to 20 mph would help mitigate the Scheme's effect on toad mortality associated with the increase in traffic using Elm Lane.</p>	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>In REP5-031, SCC seeks clarification as to how the design of the Scheme will help secure this reduced speed in order to reduce the impact on amphibians crossing Elm Lane.</p> <p>Highways England clarifies that the improved section of Elm Lane between Elm Corner and Old Lane (Work No. 50) will be a single-track road, 3m wide, with passing places, as a result the traffic speed is not anticipated to exceed the posted speed limit of 20mph.</p> <p>See also issue 2.4.1 above, as regards SCC's comments in paragraph 2.2 of REP5-031 about the forward visibility at the Elm Lane/Old Lane junction.</p>	
<b>11.7 Change No. 7 – Optional alternative route alignment for the Private Means of Access at Heyswood</b>				
11.7.1		<p>The width/design of the alternative option for the private means of access at Heyswood, as proposed in Change 7 is adequate for the purposes of a private means of access and anticipated user requirements.</p>	<p><b>SCC has no further comment on this matter.</b></p> <p>Highways England submitted a request to change the DCO application at Deadline 7 to provide for an alternative route alignment for the private access road at Heyswood [REP7-013]. The proposed alternative access has been designed as a 3m wide route, with five passing points. The private access road would consist of a paved carriageway with kerbs and drainage. It will be for the Secretary of State to determine which alignment for the private access road at Heyswood should be consented.</p> <p>The Examining Authority confirmed its acceptance of this change for examination by procedural decision published on 24 April 2020.</p> <p>See also issue 2.4.2 of this SoCG above.</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council and reasons for any difference in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
<b>11.8 Change No. 8 – Amendment to the DCO boundary at Old Lane</b>				
11.8.1	REP3-036 paras 1.2 and 1.5(c)	The provision of a 70m forward visibility standard at the Old Lane/Elm Lane junction is appropriate for the Scheme and represents a suitable balance between limiting the amount of vegetation clearance required beyond the current highway boundary, the need for the provision of suitable road markings, signage and high friction surfacing and the need to discourage higher vehicle speeds along Old Lane.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>SCC raised concerns about the standard of forward visibility provided by the Scheme for the Old Lane/Elm Lane junction [REP3-036]. Following ISH2, SCC has worked with Highways England to agree a solution to enable an acceptable forward level of visibility to be agreed. This solution involves the clearance of an area of vegetation on the northside of the junction, to enable a 70m sight stopping distance to be achieved, together with the provision of suitable hazard signage and high friction surfacing at the junction and additional widening within the DCO boundary of a 20m section of Elm Lane where it joins Old Lane.</p> <p>Highways England submitted a request to change the DCO application at Deadline 7 to provide for improved forward visibility at the Old Lane/Elm Lane junction in line with the solution agreed with SCC [REP7-013]. This was accepted by the Examining Authority in its procedural decision dated 24 April 2020. The clearance of the additional area of vegetation will not give rise to a materially new or different significant environmental effect and as Old Lane does not currently meet the appropriate forward visibility standards set out in TD9/93 (see SCC's response to Ex Q2.13.6 in REP5-029) this change would provide a benefit compared to the without Scheme situation. Once the vegetation has been cleared by Highways England under temporary possession powers, SCC will become responsible for maintaining the necessary forward visibility at this junction under section 154 of the Highways Act 1980.</p> <p>See also issue 2.4.1 of this SoCG above.</p>	<p>Highways England will widen the first 20m of Elm Lane from its junction with Old Lane, to 5.5m and will provide passing places every 100m along Elm Lane (within the DCO boundary), to address SCC's concerns raised in its response to Ex Q 2.13.30 in REP5-029.</p> <p>The details of trees/vegetation to be cleared, the extent of high friction road surfacing and details of hazard signage will be agreed with SCC at the detailed design stage.</p>
<b>11.9 Change No. 9 – Wisley Airfield Construction Compound</b>				
11.9.1	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 southernmost part of the proposed topsoil and materials storage area off Elm Lane will have a negligible effect on the conclusions of the Environmental Statement.	<p><b>SCC has no comment on this change.</b></p> <p>SCC considers that this issue is a matter for Guildford Borough Council to confirm in its capacity as local planning authority.</p> <p>Highways England submitted a request to change the DCO application at Deadline 7 [REP7-013]. This change was accepted by the Examining Authority by procedural decision dated 24 April 2020. The change was required to provide for the grading and mixing of materials required during construction. The sensitive nature of the environment surrounding the rest of the M25 junction 10 works and the presence of a large concrete hardstanding at this location meant that this site would be the most suitable for the purpose. A 3m high earth bund would be provided on the northern most boundary of the compound to provide noise attenuation/mitigation for the residents of Elm Corner whose properties are situated approximately 200m to the north. Highways England has carried out an assessment of the change [REP7-016] which concludes that the change would have a negligible environmental effect compared with the effects of the Scheme already assessed in the Environmental Statement.</p>	

© 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

