

M25 JUNCTION 10/A3 WISLEY INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENT SCHEME
DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER
REPRESENTATION BY RHS

RESPONSE TO REP8-040 (SOUTH FACING SLIPS REPORT) AND ASSOCIATED INFORMATION
CONTAINED IN REP10-003 (APPLICANT'S COMMENTS TO DEADLINE 9 SUBMISSIONS)

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This representation has been prepared by Mr Hibbert of TTHC on behalf of RHS and responds to the reported results of the South Facing Slips (SFS) modelling undertaken by the Applicant as set out in **REP8-040** and **REP10-003**.
- 1.2 The SFS are one of the component parts of the RHS Alternative, the other being the retention of a connection between Wisley Lane and the A3 Northbound in the form of an improved slip road arrangement. The modelling set out in REP8-040 excludes the Wisley Lane slip connection to the A3.
- 1.3 At paragraph 1.1.3 of REP8-040, it is noted that the report excludes any consideration of the environmental impact of the SFS tests.
- 1.4 Section 3 of REP8-040 provides a summary of the traffic modelling undertaken by the Applicant. Although the output from this work is reported, the junction assessments are not provided and so this response does not provide a review or commentary on such work.

2.0 Reported Results

- 2.1 Table 4.1 presents the forecast usage of the slips in 2022 and 2037. Paragraph 4.1.2 seeks to downplay the importance of the SFS by reference to forecast flows in 2022 which notes that 95% of this traffic is generated by RHS Wisley and that the volume of traffic using the south-facing slips is small. The model zone within which RHS Wisley is contained in fact relates not

just to the Garden but also Wisley village. In 2022, the daily traffic using the SFS would be 1,182 to 1,345 vehicles.

- 2.2 By 2037, the Applicant’s forecast use of the slips increases to 2,875 to 3,546 vehicles per day. Paragraph 4.1.3 notes that by 2037, the majority of traffic using the SFS would be Wisley Airfield related (approximately 70%). This is an important point because the benefits of providing a route for Wisley Airfield Development-related traffic which avoids having to route via Ripley and Send hasn’t previously been accounted for.
- 2.3 The routing of Wisley Airfield traffic for the A3 northbound movement is confirmed in paragraph 4.1.4.
- 2.4 For Wisley Airfield traffic travelling in the opposite direction, paragraph 4.1.5 confirms that the southbound SFS would be used in preference to Old Lane. This point will be returned to later.
- 2.5 With respect to Local Road Network (LRN) traffic, paragraphs 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 (and Tables 4.2 and 4.3) refer to the following reductions in traffic on the B2215 through Ripley and on Old Lane but notes increases in flow on Ockham Road North and Newark Lane, with ‘moderate increases’ on Ockham Lane (less than 60 vehicles per day).
- 2.6 As shown below, the largest changes in flow as a consequence of the SFS would actually be reductions; on the B2215 (between Ripley and Send) and on Old Lane (between the A3 and Hatch Lane).

SFS Forecast changes in 2-way AADT Flows compared to the DCO	2022	2037
B2215 (between Ripley & Send)	-1,402	-2,496
Old Lane (between A3 and Hatch Lane)	-593	-2,670
Ockham Road North (between A3 and Guileshill Lane)	+742	+1,118
Newark Lane	+409	+1,165
Ockham Lane	+56	+52

- 2.7 Paragraphs 4.2.4 and 4.2.5 conclude that:
- Compared to the DCO Scheme, there will be less traffic on the LRN as a result of the SFS

- Flows through Ripley (with SFS) would be broadly unchanged compared to the DoMin

2.8 In order to quantify the overall effects of the SFS on the LRN, following the submission of REP8-040, RHS sought some additional information from the Applicant (see **REP9-012** and response **REP10-003 (Section 3)** and **REP10-023**).

2.9 Based on the Applicant's modelling, when compared to the DCO Scheme, **the SFS would reduce the annual travel on the LRN by 1,049,000 vehicle kilometres**. When the same comparison is undertaken **including the effects on the Strategic Road Network (SRN), the reduction in annual travel would be 1,740,000 vehicle kilometres**.

2.10 It should be remembered that these savings relate only to the SFS component of the RHS Alternative, with no allowance for the additional savings which would result from the retention of a Wisley Lane connection to the A3 northbound.

2.11 Also, as noted in paragraph 1.3 above, there has been no assessment of these savings in terms of environmental implications. The same applies in respect of accident savings resulting from reduced travel on the network and through junctions.

3.0 Surrey County Council Comments

3.1 In response to REP8-040, SCC have issued comments on the modelling of the SFS (**REP10-012 – Section 13**).

3.2 The suggestion that the RHS 'concept' design would be subject to a detailed design process is not disputed. It is normal practice for such detail to follow preliminary designs.

3.3 With respect to the model results, although not quantified, SCC refers to the reductions on the B2215 whilst also noting the increases on some roads. The decreases and increases are set out in paragraph 2.6 above, which show the greatest change in flows being reductions on the B2215 (between Ripley and Send) and Old Lane. Despite both of these locations being identified by SCC as concerns in respect of DCO impacts (for example see 2.8.11 and 2.9.1 of the Applicant/SCC SoCG – **REP8-030**) no mention is made of the benefits which would arise as a consequence of SFS within the context of the economic-related comments suggested by

the Applicant (without supporting technical evidence) and repeated by SCC. Mr Bunney does, however, provide analysis of the economic benefits which would result from the SFS and the rate of return on investment of the SFS.

3.4 It should also be remembered that, as a consequence of DCO impacts, SCC is seeking a mitigation package for Ripley (**see response to Q3.13.3 – REP7-025**) which could be avoided or scaled down with the inclusion of SFS. Through the prevention of the DCO impacts (by way of SFS slips), the costs of the cure (mitigation within Ripley) would be off-set.

3.5 Whilst the savings in overall travel on the LRN and SRN were the subject of specific exchanges between RHS and the Applicant (as referred to in paragraph 2.8 above), rather than with SCC, there are significant benefits arising both locally and strategically as set out in paragraph 2.9 above.