

From: [REDACTED]
To: [M25 Junction 10](#)
Subject: M25 Junction 10 / A3 Wisley Interchange Project – TR010030
Date: 02 June 2020 23:43:14

Dear Sirs,

Re; Written representations in lieu of Open Floor Hearing 2

From my observations attending the hearings of this examination and written queries and responses, I perceive how much the applicant is willing to work together with interested parties to accommodate their needs.

I am therefore hopeful that the applicant will be equally considerate and accommodating when it comes to mitigating for the impact of the scheme on wildlife and the environment.

There is a kind of collective selfishness that can pervade projects like this. Human interests are top of the list, while nature and wildlife are treated as dispensable. It is cheap and easy to destroy wildlife and nature as they don't have a voice.

I just hope that this project will be different and that the applicant and the examiners will place due regard on the needs of wildlife. In this respect I am very excited about the 50m wide heathland bridge that will be built.

But there need to be green elements added to all the NMU's that will be constructed.

I would like to emphasize the need for improved mitigation for toads and Great Crested Newts in the Boldermere area, as I have done previously.

Amphibian underpasses need to be addressed:

- 1) Two toad tunnels in Old Lane are not enough as the crossing covers a wider area. There should be a minimum of three, ideally more.
- 2) The impact of the new Elm Lane on toads and Great Crested Newts must not be underestimated and the plan to avoid mitigation for this is a contravention of planning guidance rules.
- 3) There is still no certainty as to what will happen with the existing A3 underpass, and if there will be an alternative provided.
- 4) If the Wisley bypass is to go ahead as currently planned (I hope it won't be) this would need amphibian underpasses as well.

Again I ask for the Wisley bypass scheme to be revised. The RHS appear to have acted according to the St Florian Principle. The need for improvement is in a great degree due to the needs of the RHS to accommodate current and future numbers of visitors. Taking some land along the gardens for the scheme would have therefore been fair and reasonable. It would have had the lowest impact on travel times, environment, wildlife and habitat fragmentation. The RHS should have accepted this rather than using the leverage of public media to push for a scheme that causes much more damage to wildlife. It is very disappointing to see a conservation organisation act in this manner. I strongly oppose any further slip roads being built - the proposed damage to wildlife is enough and to spare already.

With respect to change 7 - I was not aware of the opportunity to submit

representations. But I would like to take the occasion of the Open Floor Hearing to make comments.

During the hearings and site inspections I attended I took note of the discussion surrounding the safeguarding of the girl scouts.

I appreciate that this is important but I am disappointed with the solution that has been chosen. This solution causes further destruction of ancient woodland - a habitat that is extremely rare and that can never be restored once lost - when simple management of site security could be easily implemented and achieve the same result.

I was a keen girl scout and always loved nature. My younger self would have been appalled at this kind of decision to trade destruction of special habitat against implementing security procedures.

Many thanks for your consideration.

Kind regards,

Regena Coult

