

M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange TR010030

5.1 Consultation Report: Annex H - Section 42 and Section 44 Regards tables

Section 37(3) and Regulation 5(2)(q) Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009



Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (as amended)**

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

5.1 CONSULTATION REPORT:

ANNEX H – S42 AND S44 REGARDS TABLES

| | |
|---|---|
| Regulation Number: | Section 37(3)(c) Regulation 5(2)(q) |
| Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference | TR010030 |
| Application Document Reference | TR010030/APP/5.1 |
| Author: | M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange Project Team, Highways England |

| Version | Date | Status of Version |
|----------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|
| Rev 0 | June 2019 | Development Consent Order application |

Table of contents

| | Pages |
|--|--------------|
| Annex H. S42 and S44 Regards Tables | 4 |
| H.1 S42 and S44 regards tables – Statutory consultation, February – April 2018 | 4 |
| H.2 S42 and S44 regards table – Targeted consultation (November-December 2018) | 102 |
| H.3 S42 and S44 regards tables – Additional targeted consultation (April 2019) | 114 |

Annex H. S42 and S44 Regards Tables

H.1 S42 and S44 regards tables – Statutory consultation, February – April 2018

Note: These regards tables include response to the statutory consultation as well as the additional period provided to newly identified land interests following the refresh of the Book of Reference.

Table H.1.1 Scheme principles and operations

Table H.1.2 Scheme design

Table H.1.3 Environmental Impacts

Table H.1.4 Stakeholder specific issues

Table H.1.5 Traffic and economic modelling

Table H.1.6 Planning

Table H.1.7 Safety

Table H.1.8 Construction

Table H.1.1 Scheme principles and operations

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| ECR-S-1 | Accept that the BOAT provides the community with the least worst option for alternative access, however would insist existing excess is returned to nature. | The existing surface will remain in place to serve the existing bridleway that runs along the route. There will be no public vehicular access possible along this route. Maintenance vehicles will be permitted to access the attenuation ponds and other equipment. | No |
| ECR-S-2 | Support BOAT option even if Old Lane is closed up as part of the Airfield development. | Noted. | No |
| ECR-S-3 | Suggest all of Elm Lane be included within the scheme red line boundary for any additional mitigation works required. | Works are not required along the existing Elm Lane. Highways England only include land in the red line boundary that is required for the construction, operation and maintenance of the scheme. | No |
| EBC-S-1 | Confirmation about whether a free-flow left turn slip is included from A245 east-A3 North. | A free-flow left turn lane from the A245 eastbound to the A3 northbound is included in the scheme design. | Yes |
| EBC-S-2 | Scheme appears to move congestion from the SRN to LRN. Is this the case? | <p>This scheme will result in less traffic on the local road network during the AM peak. However, traffic through Ripley is forecast to increase as a result of background growth and this scheme adds a further 4% more traffic through Newark Lane junction in the AM peak in 2037.</p> <p>Our traffic forecasting has modelled the impacts on local villages, and in particular the impacts on Ripley. This scheme will result in less traffic on the local road network during the AM peak. Traffic through Ripley is forecast to increase as a result of background growth however, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley, and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction will change by -2% in the 2037 AM peak and +2% in the 2037 PM peak. Highways England will be working hard to minimise disruption during the construction of the scheme and will work to ensure that the same number of lanes will be open during construction. However, it is likely there will be narrower lanes and speed restrictions during the construction of the scheme. The development of this scheme will improve congestion at the junction in the longer term.</p> | No |
| FFS-S-1 | Have raised the concern that the jet lane at A3/A245 | A pedestrian crossing has been added to all south facing slip roads on the | Yes |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|---|---|------------------------|
| | will further segregate Cobham communities without appropriate mitigation. | Painshill Junction, allowing pedestrians to cross safely at grade. | |
| FFS-S-2 | Would like to discuss the future of Byfleet Road in more detail with all concerned parties. | Not relevant to the scheme - the middle extent of Byfleet Road is outside the red line boundary. | No |
| FFS-S-3 | The school has indicated that they may have an interest in the purchase of any land in the vicinity of the school that may be available post construction. | Not relevant to the scheme. | No |
| FFS-S-4 | The School requests a better understanding of the likely phasing and timescales of the proposed works as it will have significant effect on the daily arrangements / schedules of the school. | Highways England will make contact with all affected parties in the vicinity of the scheme to discuss its construction methodology during the next stage of the project. | No |
| GBC-S-1 | Burnt Common North facing slip roads need to be included in this scheme. | Slips at Burnt Common are not within the scope of this scheme. | No |
| GBC-S-2 | HE should consider the RHS proposals for Wisley Lane access. | These have been considered but have been rejected on safety grounds. Highways England Chief Engineer has reviewed the design options fully and concluded that the safest access is via the bridge. | No |
| GBC-S-3 | Concern that HGV parking should be included in the scheme. | A survey of the existing HGV lay-by provision between M25 junction 10 and Guildford concluded that there is sufficient capacity for the displaced vehicles from near the junction to park and rest safely. | No |
| GBC-S-4 | Suggest ensuring that Elm Corner can be incorporated into Airfield Development in future. | An appropriate alternative access for the residents on Elm Corner has been developed as part of this scheme. The residents do not wish to be connected into any future development at Wisley Airfield, and it is not necessary for the delivery of this scheme. | No |
| GBC-S-5 | Guildford BC requests that their future input into the scheme be funded. | Highways England is in advanced discussions with GBC with regards to the Planning Performance Agreement. | No |
| GBC-S-6 | Guildford BC is dissatisfied that the EIA scoping comments were not incorporated into the PEIR. | This has been discussed at a subsequent meeting and noted by the project team. The Environmental Statement supersedes the PEIR. | No |
| ANON-5GEV- | Suggest delaying works on bridge adjacent to Woking | The design has been amended to avoid the need to replace Buxton Wood | Yes |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|--|------------------------|
| NGVS-N | Archery Club. | Bridge. There is now therefore no impact on the Woking Archery Club lease. | |
| PHP-S-1 | Object in the strongest possible terms to any land take from the grade 1 historic landscape of Painshill Park. | Highways England have amended the design to reduce the amount of land take the scheme requires in close proximity to the Gothic Tower. The new access arrangements do require land take from Painshill Park, however Painshill Park Trust have acknowledged that land take in the area of the park close to the A3 Southbound slip, whilst undesirable, would be more acceptable that impact land take adjacent to the Gothic Tower. | Yes |
| PHP-S-2 | Have asked if consideration could be given to burying the electricity pylons that run through Painshill Park land. | This is not within the scope of the scheme. | No |
| SCC-S-1 | Support the inclusion of a free-flow left turn A245 East - A3 North. | A free-flow left turn lane from the A245 eastbound to the A3 northbound is included in the scheme design. | Yes |
| SCC-S-2 | Request that a multi-million package of mitigation measures be included in the scheme for Ripley. | Noted. Our updated PCF stage 3 modelling started by looking at what happens with no scheme – in this scenario traffic in the AM peak increased from 1,800 vehicles an hour today to 2,400 vehicles in 2037. (2037 is the “design life” of the scheme which is what we work to, which is 15 years after the scheme opens. This is a 36% increase on today’s traffic. When we modelled the traffic through Ripley with the proposed scheme, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley, and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction is predicted to reduce by -2% in the 2037 same AM peak. These figures encompass all arms of the Newark Lane junction – i.e. Rose Lane and the high street as well. With regards to Newark Lane itself, today the junction sees 400 vehicles in the AM peak, and in 2037 if we “do nothing” this will fall to 270 vehicles. However, with the scheme, this falls further to 250 vehicles in the AM peak. | No |
| SCC-S-3 | Further design work at Ockham Park roundabout is required to ensure that it will meet modern standards. | The design for Ockham Park Junction has been revised to include full signalisation, Non-Motorised-User facilities, and a widened two lane approach from Ockham Road North. | Yes |
| SCC-S-4 | Concerned about extra queuing at Seven Hills Road junction as a result of Feltonfleet School new | The proposed alterations to the highway layout and traffic signals at the combined Painshill Junction and Seven Hills Road junction have been | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|------------------------|
| | arrangements. | modelled using the microsimulation tool S-Paramics. In 2037 the scheme is anticipated to result in an increase of flow of between 7 and 12% at peak times. The average delay per vehicle is anticipated to reduce by approximately 90 seconds in the both AM peak period hours. In the PM peak period, average delay is anticipated to reduce by 14 seconds between 1600 and 1700, although an increase of 30 seconds is predicted between 1700 and 1800. LINSIG junction modelling of the network predicts that all arms of both junctions will operate within capacity including all arms at the Seven Hills Road junction. | |
| SCC-S-6 | HE should consider linking Elm Corner into the potential Wisley Airfield Development. | An appropriate alternative access for the residents on Elm Corner has been developed as part of this scheme. The residents do not wish to be connected into any future development at Wisley Airfield, and it is not necessary for the delivery of this scheme. | No |
| SCC-S-8 | Bus services impacts need to be carefully considered. | Revised bus stop arrangements have been agreed with Surrey County Council (the effective operator of the 715 service), and RHS Wisley, who will provide a bus stop facility within their site. | Yes |
| SCC-S-9 | Concerned about the amount of impact the new Redhill Road bridge is going to have on the SCC countryside estate. | The proposed Redhill Road Bridge has been re-designed to be a Non-Motorised-User only bridge, reducing the land requirements on the Surrey County Council estate of that part of the scheme. | Yes |
| SCC-S-10 | Requests that two VMS signs and correct integration with HE systems be provided to Surrey CC as part of the scheme. | This is not within the scope of this project and has been fed back to SCC. | No |
| SCC-S-11 | Need to consider diversion routes and any mitigation costs for these during construction. | Traffic diversion routes during construction are considered in the design proposals. The impacts from additional traffic are considered in the Environmental Statement Chapters 5. | No |
| SCC-S-12 | Surrey CC requests a technical report outlining the possible mitigation measures for Ripley to be submitted. | In subsequent discussion with SCC, HE has stated that this will not be possible. | No |
| THA-S-1 | Object to the scheme on the grounds that preventing direct access to the A3 from the San Domenico site | This is noted. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|------------------------|
| | renders this site commercially unviable. | | |
| WPI-S-1 | WPIL have raised a technical objection to the Wisley Lane element of the RIS scheme. | Highways England believe that this technical objection has been resolved as a result of a revised design for the new Wisley Lane access. | No |
| WPI-S-2 | WPIL have raised a technical objection to the proposed arrangements of Old Lane. | This is noted. | No |
| WPI-S-3 | WPIL are seeking a change to the proposed alignment of Wisley Lane. Presented in Appendix A of Appendix 2. | The arrangement for Wisley Lane has been amended so that any future development on Wisley Airfield would be able to tie into this arrangement. | Yes |
| WPI-S-4 | Believe that WIS-11 presented in the consultation risk contradicting the Guildford Local plan and appeal scheme. | The arrangement for Wisley Lane has been amended so that any future development on Wisley Airfield would be able to tie into this arrangement. | Yes |
| WPI-S-5 | The alignment of WIS-11 would require agreement on purchase of land of CPO due to extant planning on the IVC. | This is noted. | No |
| WPI-S-8 | Overall, WPIL support the principles of the proposals at junction 10 of the M25. | This has been noted. | No |
| WPI-S-9 | Suggest that there is broad agreement between WPIL and HE on the revised layout in Appendix 1 of the consultation submission. | This has been noted. | No |
| WPI-S-10 | Provide a detailed rationale behind their suggested changes to WIS-011 on page 12 of the main submission. | The arrangement for Wisley Lane has been amended so that any future development on Wisley Airfield would be able to tie into this arrangement. | No |
| WPI-S-11 | WPIL seek further dialogue with HE relating to proposed arrangements to provide access to Old Lane from Elm Corner. | Dialogue with Wisley Property Investments Limited has been ongoing throughout the design process of the scheme. | No |
| WKB-S-1 | Due regard should be given to the traffic impact on the Painshill Interchange and Seven Hills Road junction. | The proposed alterations to the highway layout and traffic signals at the combined Painshill Junction and Seven Hills Road junction have been modelled using the microsimulation tool S-Paramics. In 2037 the scheme is anticipated to result in an increase of flow of between 7 and 12% at peak | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|---|------------------------|
| | | times. The average delay per vehicle is anticipated to reduce by approximately 90 seconds in the both AM peak period hours. In the PM peak period, average delay is anticipated to reduce by 14 seconds between 1600 and 1700, although an increase of 30 seconds is predicted between 1700 and 1800. LINSIG junction modelling of the network predicts that all arms of both junctions will operate within capacity. | |

Table H.1.2 Scheme design

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|------------------------|
| EBC-D-1 | Need to provide evidence of the benefit demonstrated by linking the Painshill Roundabout and Seven Hills Road signals. | The proposed alterations to the highway layout and traffic signals at the combined Painshill Junction and Seven Hills Road junction have been modelled using the microsimulation tool S-Paramics. In 2037 the scheme is anticipated to result in an increase of flow of between 3 and 8% through the Painshill Junction and between 6% and 17% at the Seven Hills Road junction at peak times. The average delay per vehicle is anticipated to reduce by approximately 90 seconds in the both AM peak period hours. In the PM peak period, average delay is anticipated to reduce by 14 seconds between 1600 and 1700, although an increase of 30 seconds is predicted between 1700 and 1800. LINSIG junction modelling of the network predicts that all arms of both junctions will operate within capacity. | No |
| ENV-D-1 | Would be happy to provide advice on bridge/culvert design at a later stage. | Noted. | No |
| GBC-D-1 | Consider connecting Elm Corner into the proposed Wisley Airfield development. | An appropriate alternative access for the residents on Elm Corner has been developed as part of this scheme. The residents do not wish to be connected into any future development at Wisley Airfield, and it is not necessary for the delivery of this scheme. | No |
| NG-D-1 | Detailed list of requirements in terms of designing and working in the vicinity of power lines. | Further discussion planned with National Grid to determine the detailed requirements for the proposed design and during the construction period is ongoing. | Yes |
| NR-D-1 | Need to discuss protection of the railway near to scheme construction. | The revised red line boundary does not extend to the section of the M25 that crosses over the New Guildford Line, which it did previously. Highways England understands that there are no railway lines now within the vicinity of the scheme. | No |
| OCK-D-1 | Support the use of low noise surfacing throughout the scheme. | Low noise surfacing will be used on all new sections of carriageway that will be developed as part of this scheme. | No |
| RHS-D-1 | Question the project team's view on the Wisley Lane junction. Is the belief that the junction is currently unsafe and do not consider this can be | Retaining the Wisley Lane left turn onto A3 would reduce the weaving distance between Ockham Northbound on slip and Northbound Junction 10 off slip. This would result in a substandard weaving length therefore would not be a compliant | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|---|------------------------|
| | improved or that is currently safe and wouldn't be under the new arrangement. | design and would be an unsafe design as per the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards. | |
| SCC-D-1 | Appropriate speed limits will need to be set on Wisley Lane. | The new Wisley Lane has been designed to accommodate a 30mph speed limit, allowing safe access to and exit from RHS Wisley. The exact extent of a 30mph speed limit on Wisley Lane outside of the boundary of the Highways England scheme is to be agreed and implemented by Surrey County Council. | Yes |
| SCC-D-10 | The impacts during construction will need careful consideration. when available we would ask to see consideration of effective and safe traffic management during construction. We would ask that info is provided as to how the impacts during construction are to be mitigated to the local road network and also to key businesses and facilities in the local area including RHS Wisley Gardens, Painshill Park and Feltonfleet School. We would ask that construction compounds identified are fully restored to at least the condition that existed prior to construction. | Both a Construction Environment Management Plan and a Traffic Management Plan will be put in place prior to the start of works, with the full cooperation of local stakeholders including emergency services. TM is subject to safety assessments. Incident management plans and detailed local operating agreement will be formulated. Other measures such as CCTV coverage, free recovery and speed compliance and enforcement measures will be included. | No |
| SCC-D-2 | Would support a free-flow left turn A245-A3 northbound. | A free-flow left turn lane from the A245 eastbound to the A3 northbound is included in the scheme design. | Yes |
| SCC-D-3 | Further design work at Ockham Park roundabout is required to ensure that it will meet modern standards. | The design for Ockham Park Junction has been revised to include full signalisation, Non-Motorised-User facilities, and a widened two-lane approach from Ockham Road North. | Yes |
| SCC-D-4 | Need to ensure that entry/exit to Old Lane is safe and fit for purpose. | An auxiliary lane is provided both at the exit and entry to/from Old Lane to ensure a safer merging / diverging arrangement. | Yes |
| SCC-D-5 | Consider connecting Elm Corner into the proposed Wisley Airfield development. | An appropriate alternative access for the residents on Elm Corner has been developed as part of this scheme. The residents do not wish to be connected into any future development at Wisley Airfield, and it is not necessary for the delivery of this scheme. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|---|------------------------|
| SCC-D-6 | How is the scheme proposing to link the new NMU route on Wisley Lane into Bridleway 8? | Bridleway 8 will intersect the Non-Motorised-User route just to the north of Wisley Lane, now that the Non-Motorised-User route is to run along the northern side of the A3 in this part of the scheme. There will, therefore, be a simple T-junction layout between the bridleway and the Non-Motorised-User route (to be classified as a restricted byway). | No |
| SCC-D-7 | Appropriate speed limit should be set for service roads on A3 southbound and designed carefully to encourage compliance. | Noted. | No |
| SCC-D-8 | will the proposed access via the new bridge link into Redhill Road? Due to potential increased traffic and more vulnerable users on Redhill Road the speed limit (currently 60) should be reviewed. | This bridge is now Non-Motorised-User only. | Yes |
| SCC-D-9 | The speed limit of the Painshill junction roundabout and the A245 between Painshill junction and Seven Hills road is currently national speed limit and should be reviewed to encourage safer speeds here and on the approaches to the junction. | Speed limits have been agreed with Surrey County Council, and this junction will be limited to 40mph. | Yes |
| WPI-D-1 | Proposed alternative alignment for WIS-011 to fit their development included in Appendix A | Noted and has been taken in to account in revised design. | Yes |
| WPI-D-2 | WPIL have provided a technical note related to road standards and drainage mitigation - Appendix 2. | Noted. Dialogue with Wisley Property Investments Limited has been ongoing throughout the design process of the scheme. | No |

Table H.1.3 Environmental Impacts

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|--|------------------------|
| EA-E-1 | Satisfied PEIR has screened in all the relevant flood risk constraints. | Noted. | No |
| EA-E-10 | Concerned about impact of widening of A3 on Bolder Mere - asks that we justify why encroachment on the lake is required and why other options with a lesser impact have been ruled out. State they are open to compensation for the loss of Bolder Mere Habitat being provided elsewhere on the scheme. Ask to be involved in these discussions. | The widening of the A3 requires unavoidable encroachment into Bolder Mere and surveys have been carried out to enable this to be accurately drawn. The Non-Motorised-User route has been moved to the west of the A3 to reduce encroachment and compensatory and mitigation measures are now included in the scheme design. Environment Agency have been consulted on this matter. The Water Framework Directive Assessment sets a context for the current design, explaining the evolution of the scheme at Bolder Mere to minimise impact. | Yes |
| EA-E-11 | Advise that all affected watercourses - including ordinary water courses - should be assessed for their potential to support otter and water voles and surveyed where appropriate. | Water vole and otter surveys were carried out in spring/summer 2018 of all affected watercourses. Please see Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| EA-E-12 | State they welcome our commitment for compensatory habitat creation areas - ask that where these areas adjoin water that tree planting is carefully planned to avoid excessive shading. | Comment noted. | No |
| EA-E-13 | State they are opposed to any loss of natural bank resulting from surface water outfalls. Ask that outfalls are set back from river bank to provide a semi-natural entry that doesn't require bank modification. | Comment noted. | No |
| EA-E-14 | Requests that red line boundary for scheme is appropriate for environmental mitigation with sufficient space for compensatory habitat creation areas. | The red line boundary will be sufficient to include all necessary mitigation. | Yes |
| EA-E-15 | State they support any improvement to road drainage from M25 and A3 - keen to see current drainage outfalls into Bolder Mere Lake altered so they have less detrimental impact to water quality. If this isn't possible they require justification and evidence to demonstrate the scheme will not increase concentration of pollutants. Suggest an alternative of treating the run-off before it enters the lake i.e. | The scheme includes improvements to road drainage infrastructure to reduce the level of pollutants reaching adjacent water bodies including Bolder Mere. Preliminary design for scheme redirects road runoff currently discharging to Bolder Mere via mechanical treatment to the ordinary watercourse downstream of Bolder Mere. Agreement of the details of these measures is included as a | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| | settlement tanks. | requirement of the Development Control Order for the Scheme. | |
| EA-E-16 | Request that no pollutants enter Bolder Mere Lake during construction (i.e. suspended solids) and ask that appropriate precautions are taken to ensure run off from increased traffic during the operating life of the project does not result in WFD deterioration or prevent future target status for the lake. | Run off during construction will be controlled by the contractor under a Construction Environmental Management Plan to ensure that pollutants including suspended solids do not reach Bolder Mere. The scheme has been designed to ensure no deterioration in Water Framework Directive status during the life of the project. | No |
| EA-E-17 | Ask for appropriate pollution measures to be put in place on south side of lake on Old Lane to ensure no impact from construction here. | Run off during construction will be controlled by the contractor under a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to ensure that pollutants including suspended solids do not reach Bolder Mere. The scheme will be designed to ensure no deterioration in Water Framework Directive status during the life of the project. | No |
| EA-E-18 | Ask for the opportunity to comment on scheme drainage proposals as they emerge in detailed design phase. | EA will be consulted on the design of drainage proposals during the next stage of development of the Scheme and issues will be raised in their Statement of Common Ground. | No |
| EA-E-19 | Remind us that all wastes produced on site should be taken to an appropriate authorised treatment or disposal facility. | Noted. | No |
| EA-E-2 | Satisfied with proposed approach and conclusions drawn in terms of flood risk impact to River Mole and its flood plain. | Noted. | No |
| EA-E-20 | Remind us that all soils and construction, demolition and excavation (CDE) waste should be assessed for hazardous properties (they provide guidance). | Noted. Waste acceptance criteria and standard soil analysis will be carried out on samples collected during the ground investigation which will assist in the waste material management process. Asbestos screening will be carried out for samples collected within Made Ground containing suspected asbestos containing material. | No |
| EA-E-21 | Request to see any CL:AIRE Definition of Waste: Code of Practice (DoWCoP) application in advance. | CL:AIRE (Contaminated Land: Applications in Real Environments) details will be provided in advance of application. | No |
| EA-E-22 | They encourage the re-use and recovery of wastes where appropriate. | Re-use and recovery of waste will be implemented in the scheme where possible. This will be assessed using series 600 (Appendix 2, 14 and 15) which containing screening values to ensure the | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| | | material is fit for reuse for samples collected during the Ground Investigation. | |
| EA-E-23 | Remind us that all waste leaving the site should be accompanied by relevant accurate duty of care or hazardous paperwork. | Noted. | No |
| EA-E-24 | Ask for more detailed information on ground water and land contamination further to the proposed site investigations outlined in section 10.3.3 of PEIR. | The Environmental Statement Chapter 8 includes all existing relevant information regarding ground water contamination. The assessment has been carried out on worst case scenario (i.e. contamination is assumed to be present wherever a source of potential contamination has been identified on maps or trade directories) Therefore the recommended mitigation measures may be over conservative in first instance. The site investigation intends to delineate the findings and bridge data gaps within the Environmental Statement. Human health and groundwater risk assessments have been undertaken within the Environmental Statement (Chapters 8 and 14) using existing data, and will be updated using data collected from the site investigation. | |
| EA-E-25 | Query water quality impacts not being considered within the table of potential key issues in consultation brochure - say they welcome a water quality impact assessment as a result of increased traffic drainage to water bodies such as Bolder Mere Lake. | Water quality impacts are a key issue for the scheme and a full water quality impact are included in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| EA-E-26 | Para 5.1.2 of PEIR - queries why Bolder Mere is not included? Important that precautions are taken to ensure harmful levels of pollutants do not discharge from widened road to lake. | Mitigation to address the impact of the scheme on Bolder Mere Lake is detailed in the <i>M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange (5.4) Water framework directive compliance assessment report (document ref TR010030/APP/5.4)</i> This comprises of a scheme configuration that minimises the encroachment of the road into Bolder Mere and a significant upgrade to road drainage that replaces a direct untreated discharge to Bolder Mere with a treated discharge to a watercourse downstream of the lake. Additional (specific) mitigation measures have also been developed as far as concept sketches and brief descriptions as detailed in the <i>M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange (5.4) Water framework directive</i> | Yes |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|--|------------------------|
| | | <i>compliance assessment report, Appendix F: Brief descriptions and concept sketches (document ref TR010030/APP/5.4).</i> These are recorded in the <i>M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange, Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan</i> . Highways England is committed to the implementation of these measures, or measures generating equivalent environmental benefit. | |
| EA-E-27 | Believe that work being done to Stratford Brook to alleviate flood should tie in with work to enhance habitat, offsetting any impact from the bridge and mitigating current invertebrate failure in this waterbody - this could involve re-aligning previously straightened sections of watercourse to improve morphology, reducing tree cover/ shading, providing mammal passage, improving fish passage and improving in-stream morphology by bank re-profiling and introducing coarse gravels. Would demonstrate natural capital net gain in line with Government's 25-year Environmental plan and in update to NPPF. | The mitigation for Stratford Brook is set out in Appendix F of the Water Framework Directive Assessment Report. An 'hierarchy of mitigation' is still being discussed with EA and this is dependent on the outcome of the feasibility study to determine whether it is possible/feasible to improve the passage of fish at this location. The feasibility study cannot be undertaken until after DCO submission. | Not at present |
| EA-E-28 | Say that Guilehill Brook should be considered in the WFD assessment due to its proximity to proposed construction compound (potential to be polluted). | Guilehill Brook is not within the study area (1 km from the Scheme). A 1 km study area has been chosen as research indicates that impacts associated with soluble pollutants will be sufficiently diluted beyond 1 km, thereby reducing any potential impact. | No |
| EA-E-29 | Request that WFD assessment assesses the cumulative impact of all scheme components that will affect each waterbody. | The Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment considers the cumulative effects of the Scheme as a whole. | No |
| EA-E-3 | Expect to see confirmation that there will be no impacts on floodplain storage or flow routes for the proposed compensatory habitat areas adjacent to the river mole at the detailed design stage. | We don't expect that the compensatory habitats will affect floodplain storage or flow rates. Please refer to Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| EA-E-30 | Referencing WFD assessment request that all localised impacts/ effects on waterbodies must be mitigated (or as last resort compensated) for. Expect that this will be detailed in the Ecology | Localised effects of the Scheme will be mitigated or compensated as reported in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|------------------------|
| | chapter of the ES. | | |
| EA-E-31 | Asks us to demonstrate that encroachment into Bolder Mere will not cause a reduction in water quality. | The scheme has been reviewed to avoid encroaching into Bolder Mere but proposals will be put in place to avoid reduction in water quality in any case. This is demonstrated in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement. Preliminary design for scheme redirects road runoff currently discharging to Bolder Mere via mechanical treatment to the ordinary watercourse downstream of Bolder Mere. The Non-Motorised-User route will now be diverted over the A3 and run northwards, along the western side of the A3. The lake will therefore see minimal impact and only localised groundwater control methods will be required whilst installing the diverted pipeline. | Yes |
| EA-E-32 | Say they support Natural England's recommendation for macrophyte and aquatic surveys at Bolder Mere to better understand distribution and abundance of key species and habitats - helping to inform appropriate mitigation strategy. | Noted. Surveys of Bolder Mere have been carried out and are reported in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement. Appendix D of the Water Framework Directive assessment includes an ecological survey and condition assessment completed by a specialist contractor (Ben Goldsmith Associates). | No |
| EA-E-33 | Recommend topographical surveys and ground investigations to understand how water levels fluctuate throughout the year and could be impacted by scheme. Mitigation should aim for natural, gently shelving profile to new lake edge to accommodate plant and invertebrate life. Mitigation could also include extending area of open water habitat to less desirable habitat. | Geology and soil (LG 12/11/2018) Noted, please refer to Environmental Statement Chapter 8 and Chapter 10. The proposed ground investigation described within chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement and the appendix document which summarised the scope of the investigation includes the installation of groundwater monitoring wells and monitoring work to identify groundwater levels. This will be carried out before construction works. High groundwater is expected to be localised therefore any works would not include large scale dewatering. | No |
| EA-E-34 | Chapters 7 and 8 of the PEIR make little reference to biodiversity enhancements and promoting waterbody recovery. Opportunities for enhancements should be taken in line with the 25-year Environment Plan and emerging national planning policy. Waterbody enhancements should aim to address waterbody failures. Bolder | Noted, references to the Water Framework Directive compliance assessment will be improved as the compliance assessment does discuss how the realignment and mitigation proposed for Stratford Brook does provide opportunities to restore sections of channel currently with poor morphological diversity to more natural form and | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| | Mere Lake is currently failing to achieve Good Ecological Potential due to its hydromorphology and phosphate levels – measures to address these issues should be explored. Equally, the Stratford Brook is failing to achieve Good Ecological Status, likely due to low flow issues and poor morphology. Measures to improve channel morphology would help to address these failures. | function. Enhancements to Bolder Mere are being explored e.g. improving water quality by stopping road runoff discharging into the lake. Appendix F of the Water Framework Directive assessment captures the current status of thinking on potential mitigation and enhancement at Bolder Mere and Stratford Brook and proposes feasibility studies are completed at the start of detailed design to inform a decision on which measures to take forward. | |
| EA-E-35 | The PEIR makes no mention of aquatic invertebrates, in particular white-clawed crayfish, which could be impacted by any physical works to the watercourses, for example river crossings. Say they have records of Signal crayfish in the main river Wey. An assessment should be made as to whether Signal crayfish could migrate between the river Wey and the affected watercourses. If it is concluded that Signal crayfish would not be able to easily migrate upstream - most likely due to the presence of a weir - then the watercourses should be assessed for their potential to support native white-clawed crayfish. | White-clawed crayfish survey of Stratford Brook was undertaken in autumn 2018. No crayfish evidence (native or invasive) was recorded, and the Brook was considered suboptimal for crayfish. | No |
| EA-E-36 | Notes it is an offence under the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act (SAFFA) to willfully disturb any spawn or spawning fish, or any bed, bank or shallow on which any spawn or spawning fish may be. Any in-channel works should therefore avoid the key spawning periods where fish are likely to be present. This is generally November to January for trout and March to June (inclusive) for coarse fish. If any de-watering is required (for example to install a river crossing or when encroaching into Bolder Mere Lake), a fish rescue may be required. Provides guidance on permits for moving fish. | Comments noted. | No |
| EA-E-37 | In reference to baseline conditions in the PEIR: Asks that as scheme progresses we request from them site-specific flood modelling data/flood risk information and used in conjunction with site-specific topographical survey, channel survey and geology data to fully understand the fluvial flood risk implications of the proposals. | Noted, we have liaised with the Environment Agency to obtain this information and used it to develop and assess the proposals. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|------------------------|
| EA-E-38 | In reference to Paragraph 8.4.18 of WFD compliance assessment says that Stratford Brook also appears to be at risk. It has a future target of 'good' by 2027 for invertebrates and mitigation measures may be required to ensure the development does not prevent this future target from being achieved. | Noted. | No |
| EA-E-39 | In reference to Paragraph 8.4.20 of WFD compliance assessment says it is not clear whether the assessment of highways outfalls will form part of a WFD assessment. | The results of the Highways Agency Water Risk Assessment Tool (HAWRAT) assessment now feed into the Water Framework Directive assessment. | No |
| EA-E-4 | Pleased to see our acknowledgement of the requirement to provide floodplain compensation for new road bridge over Stratford Brook - have provided us with their climate change guidance to allow us to determine the appropriate climate change allowance for each element of work. | Noted. | No |
| EA-E-40 | In reference to Paragraph 8.5.2 of WFD compliance assessment requests that correct environmental permits are obtained where required to ensure discharges do not detrimentally impact receiving waters. | Noted - all relevant environmental permits will be obtained. | No |
| EA-E-41 | In reference to Paragraph 8.5.9 of WFD compliance assessment says It is not clear whether the risks identified here been quantified in terms of change in water quality concentrations. | We assume this refers to Bolder Mere, - please refer to Appendix D of the Water Framework Directive assessment dated Dec 18 for an analysis of the impact of change in lake volume on P concentrations. | |
| EA-E-42 | In reference to Paragraph 8.5.16 of WFD compliance assessment says choice and extent of the mitigation measures is very important. Especially for Bolder Mere where there is little to no pathway between the source (road) and the receptor (water and its ecology). | Refer to Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement for specific impact assessment on Bolder Mere. | No |
| EA-E-43 | In reference to Paragraph 8.6.2 of WFD compliance assessment - says they do not have sight of appendix L. | Noted. | |
| EA-E-44 | Want clarity on the form pollution treatment measures might take for Bolder Mere Lake as there appears to be little space between the | We will share details of pollution treatment proposals as they are developed. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|--|------------------------|
| | road and the waterbody. | | |
| EA-E-45 | State that the WFD assessment to date is very qualitative and we trust that a more quantitative version will follow once more information is available. | A full Water Framework Directive assessment has been prepared to support the Environmental Statement Chapter 8. | No |
| EA-E-46 | In reference to PEIR Volume 2 - Appendices: Fig B9 suggests a watercourse diversion and culverting. Unless there are exceptional reasons, we would only accept a clear span bridge to be provided, to avoid culverting of the Stratford Brook. | A clear span bridge has been included in the design of the scheme. | |
| EA-E-47 | They are unclear of the exact location of the Buxton Wood footbridge. Please could this be clarified in future plans. | The location of the Buxton Wood footbridge is clearly shown on the scheme drawings, please refer to the Environmental Statement. | No |
| EA-E-48 | In reference to PEIR Volume 2 - Appendices - Paragraph D.3.45: It is noted that specific pollutants have been screened out of the assessment. However, we would anticipate that some of those screened out may be likely from road runoff, for example Lead. | The Water Framework Directive compliance assessment (dated December 18) relies on output from the Highways Agency Water Resource Assessment Tool (HAWRAT, Highways Agency, 2009) to assess impacts of Specific Pollutants, Priority Substances and Priority Hazardous Substances WFD quality elements in road runoff on the water environment of receiving water bodies. As such specific pollutants are screened into the assessment. Please see Chapter 8 of the ES. | No |
| EA-E-49 | In reference to PEIR Volume 2 - Appendices - Baseline WFD Status - D.3.49: The assessment does not appear to have considered the reasons for failure. This would be useful information for potential mitigation measures as a starting point. | The Water Framework Directive compliance assessment (dated December 18) reports Reasons For Not Achieving Good. | No |
| EA-E-5 | Asks us to consider soffit levels and span, design flows, scour at piers and abutments, flow velocity, afflux, inverts, parapets/ handrails, and deck design of bridges as well as floodplain compensation. | These have been considered in the design of the Scheme as it progresses. We have continued to liaise with the Environment Agency. | No |
| EA-E-50 | In reference to PEIR Volume 2 - Appendices - Paragraph D.3.105: they agree and would like more information on these plans. | Further details are available in the Environmental Statement. | No |
| EA-E-6 | Offer advice on Bridge and culvert design so that there is no obstruction to existing capacity or flood flow routes. | We intend to liaise closely with EA during the design of the Scheme to ensure that there is no reduction in capacity or flow rates. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|------------------------|
| EA-E-7 | Recommend engaging with relevant Lead Local Flood Authorities who are responsible for consenting works on non-main rivers. | Please see the Consents and Licenses Statement for more details. | No |
| EA-E-8 | Outlines existing issues with Stratford Brook and asks that the scheme does not exacerbate these issues and asks that design of the bridge is appropriate and any impact is off-set (i.e. habitat improvement/ channel morphology modifications). | Information on issues noted and will be considered in the design process so that impact on Stratford Brook is minimised The scheme will include improved pollution prevention measures to avoid contaminated run off affecting water resources in the area. | No |
| EA-E-9 | Concerns about location of construction compound adjacent to Stratford Brook - ask that it is set back as far as possible (min 10m) | Concern is noted and the construction compound will be set back from the Brook. | No |
| EBC-E-1 | Say that impact on setting of the Gothic Tower and landscape, including other heritage assets and veteran trees, is unclear | The impacts on the Gothic Tower have been minimised significantly. The effect of the Scheme on the wider Painshill Park is being considered and the scheme is being reviewed to minimise the effect on it. The impacts of the scheme will be reported in detail in the Environmental Statement. | Yes |
| EBC-E-2 | Requests that information in the ES is up to date insofar as the heritage assets and Painshill Park. | The ES will be based on the most recent available data but we are aware the Historic Environment Record has not been updated in recent years so contains some inaccuracies. | No |
| EBC-E-3 | Say they welcome involvement in future impact studies and landscape mitigation measures that are proposed in the vicinity. | Noted. | No |
| EBC-E-4 | Concerned about impact on SPA and SSSI - particularly land take and habitat connectivity. | The scheme has been designed to minimise the impacts on the Special Protection Area (SPA) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) as much as possible. A comprehensive package of compensation and enhancement measures for the Special Protection Area is proposed. The impacts of the scheme are reported in detail in Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| EBC-E-5 | Would welcome further details on proposed replacement land, requests early dialogue and confirmation that no replacement land will be in EBC (impact on buffer zones). | Further details are available in the Environmental Statement, Chapter 9. The replacement land proposals do not affect the buffer zones within the Elmbridge Borough Council area. | No |
| EBC-E-6 | They welcome sections of the PEIR that have incorporated their prior | Noted. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|------------------------|
| | feedback. They welcome further discussion on the ES. | | |
| EBC-E-7 | Wants more information on amount and location of temporary land take. | These areas have been set out in the scheme and information on them is available in the Environmental Statement (Chapter 9) and other documents. | No |
| ECR-E-1 | Ask that Old Elm Lane is stopped up, demolished and returned to nature - with unpaved footpath/ bridleway FP7 to join replacement bridge - this will biodiversity net gain. | The redundant section of Elm Lane will be stopped up but may be retained to provide access for maintenance vehicles to the A3 and as a route for equestrians, cyclists and walkers. | No |
| ECR-E-2 | Position of RHS bridge means pollution from traffic will be dispersed over Elm Corner, the SPA and SSSI - impacting human health and heathland ecology. | <p>Regarding your concerns over the area being affected by high pollution, it should be noted that Guildford Borough Council have been monitoring concentrations of nitrogen dioxide, the key pollutant associated with road vehicles, at a site in Elm Corner. In both 2016 and 2017, annual average concentrations of nitrogen dioxide were well below the national objective of 40 µg/m³, measuring 14 µg/m³ in both years, indicating relatively good air quality. The data is available on their website, at https://www.guildford.gov.uk/article/19807/Air-quality-monitoring.</p> <p>Regarding concerns over the location of the bridge, it is true that the prevailing wind direction is from the south west, however pollutant concentrations from road sources disperse rapidly in the atmosphere, and by 200 m are considered unlikely to be distinguishable from background sources. The study area for the air quality assessment is within 200 m of roads likely to be affected by a change in road traffic as noted in the Highways England guidance (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges HA207/07). As Elm Corner is beyond 200 m from the proposed bridge, receptors in this area have therefore not been needed to be included in the air quality assessment, as the effect of the scheme would be imperceptible.</p> | No |
| ECR-E-3 | Widening of A3 will require clearance of vegetation which will lead to more traffic being visible through the trees and more noise pollution - | There will be some tree loss through the widening of the A3 but this will be kept to a minimum. The scheme will include replacement | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|--|--|------------------------|
| | it will be a significant impact. | planting to mitigate for this loss. The planting could include low to medium height tree and shrub species to provide year round visual screening. Noise assessments indicate that there would not be a noticeable change in noise levels with the Scheme and will be reported in the Environmental Statement. | |
| ECR-E-4 | Operational phase of the scheme will result in visual impact, noise and air quality directly and indirectly. | The direct and indirect impacts of the Scheme are reported in the Environmental Statement (Chapters 5 & 6) and have been minimised as far as possible. | No |
| ECR-E-5 | Asks for Elm Corner to be added to the various lists of receptors and included in the Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) report for mitigation. | Elm Corner residents will be included in all the assessments of the effects of the Scheme. | No |
| FFS-E-1 | State the proposed works will lead to a likely increase in noise and pollution once completed. | The PEIR highlights the potential for these increases but final noise and air quality assessments are reported in the Environmental Statement. The scheme has been designed to limit adverse effects as far as possible. Please refer to the Environmental Statement Chapters 5 & 6. | No |
| FFS-E-2 | Serious concerns about the widened A3 and A245 and likely impact on the amount of pollution pupils are subject to as well as increased levels of noise (also mention removal of some tree cover). | The effects on the school are fully assessed in the Environmental Statement and appropriate mitigation included in the scheme where required. | No |
| GBCA-E-100 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix D3.1 to D3.132 - The methodology for WFD assessment appears in line with expected best practice for this type and scale of project. An in-depth check of the assessment and source data has not been undertaken. However, I have reviewed the key findings. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-101 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix D3.1 to D3.132 - The importance of mitigation to ensure WFD compliance, and the studies required to inform whether mitigation is suitable, should be emphasised in any concluding or summarising statements in this section. For example, with regards to Bolder Mere D3.67 indicates that: "Without mitigation, this loss of habitat could result in | Noted. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|---|--|------------------------|
| | deterioration in the overall Potential of the water body. We believe that suitable mitigation can be developed, thus preventing water body scale deterioration, but this needs to be confirmed" and D3.129 "This mitigation should be comprehensively developed as part of the design, and consulted on with the Environment Agency as a matter of priority." | | |
| GBCA-E-102 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix D3.1 to D3.132 - The focus of these sections is (understandably) WFD compliance however the opportunities for the scheme to make WFD improvements e.g. reduction of diffuse pollution from the region's road network (D3.83) should be fully considered at ES stage. | These are fully considered in the Environmental Statement (Chapter 5). | No |
| GBCA-E-103 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix D3.64 & D3.70 & D3.93 - Assume any new or extensions to in-river structures would be designed appropriately so that they would not be a further barrier to fish (or eels, ref. Eels (England and Wales) Regulations 2009). | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-104 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix D3.95 to D3.132 - Note, the following permanent features could also be temporary activities during construction: bridges, culverts, Channel widening, deepening, straightening or realigning, Drainage of road runoff (to surface water), Deep foundation protruding into aquifer (e.g. temporary coffer dams). | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-105 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix D3.99 and throughout - Note, barriers are not limited to fish, also eels (ref: Eels (England and Wales) Regulations 2009) also apply. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-106 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix D3.132 - Several references to SEPA (Scottish) guidance. Please check relevance, and confirm England/UK guidance is referenced where relevant and in the first instance. | Noted - please see the Environmental Statement for correct referencing. | No |
| GBCA-E-107 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment/ 8.1.2 - Clarify, "Generic and specific effects on the water environment during the construction phase and the operational | Noted - please refer to the Environmental Statement Chapter 8 for assessments. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|--|--|------------------------|
| | phase are identified and assessed." Many aspects are yet to be assessed, e.g. FRA yet to be completed for flood risk matters. | | |
| GBCA-E-108 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment/ 8.3.1 - Clarify "...to ensure that the proposed Scheme is designed to be compliant with the objectives of the WFD and to ensure sustainable drainage mitigation is incorporated into the design so as to not increase surface water flood risk in the areas highlighted." note, EA and LFA should be consulted on all sources of flood risk (fluvial, pluvial, groundwater, reservoir etc)? | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-109 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment/ 8.4.4 to 8.4.8 - 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment/ 8.4.4 to 8.4.8 - Clarify heading, do these sections refer to baseline condition for status of WFD surface water bodies? | The Environment Agency is the primary authority with regards to this issue and as such this comment has been agreed with Guildford Borough Council to be closed. | No |
| GBCA-E-110 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment/ 8.4.9 to 8.4.12 - For clarity, Bolder Mere water body should be added to previous section (and table 8.1). | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-111 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment/ 8.4.13 to 8.4.17 - Clarify heading, do these sections refer to baseline condition for status of WFD groundwater bodies? | The Environment Agency is the primary authority with regards to this issue and as such this comment has been agreed with Guildford Borough Council to be closed. | No |
| GBCA-E-112 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment/ 8.4.18 - "WFD compliance assessment" is not baseline data, relocate to relevant section of report. | The Environment Agency is the primary authority with regards to this issue and as such this comment has been agreed with Guildford Borough Council to be closed. | No |
| GBCA-E-113 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment/ 8.4.19 & 8.4.21 - These section indicates that: "Details of these abstractions are being obtained with a site specific Envirocheck report and will be assessed in terms of their sensitivity to the Scheme." whereas Chapter 10 (sections 10.4.52) indicates the information has already been obtained? Inconsistency with Chapter 10 but also indicates there is overlap between Chapter 7 and 10, re. abstraction and where and how these will be assessed in ES, need to | Envirocheck data sheets have been obtained which are referenced in Chapter 10 however an updated version is likely to be required as part of chapter 8 ES as the existing data may be out of date for the water and drainage assessment. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|---|--|------------------------|
| | clarify. | | |
| GBCA-E-114 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment/ 8.4.23 to 8.4.25 - The Surrey County Council or relevant District Authority Strategic Flood Risk Assessments (SFRAs) will provide a useful source of baseline data for all sources of flood risk. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-115 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment/ 8.4.23 to 8.4.25 - See previous comment on potential for reservoir flood risk (Bolder Mere). | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-116 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment/ 8.4. - No reference to source of baseline data for water supply or sewerage (presumably Thames Water asset records?). | Please refer to the Environmental Statement (Chapter 8) for record references. | No |
| GBCA-E-117 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment/ 8.5.12 to 8.5.14 - See previous comment on potential for reservoir flood risk (Bolder Mere). | Please refer to the Environmental Statement (Chapter 8) for record references. | No |
| GBCA-E-118 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment/ 8.6.2 - 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment/ 8.6.2 - Clarify, presumably flood risk mitigation requirements (e.g. compensatory storage) will be fully assessed as part of the proposed FRA, which will be appended to the ES? | Please refer to the Environmental Statement (Chapter 8) for record references. | No |
| GBCA-E-119 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment/ 8.5 - No reference to proposed assessment of impacts to water supply or sewerage network/infrastructure. | Please refer to the Environmental Statement (Chapter 8) for record references. | No |
| GBCA-E-120 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment/ 8.6 - No reference to potential mitigation measures for any impacts to water supply or sewerage network/infrastructure. | Please refer to the Environmental Statement (Chapter 8) for record references. | No |
| GBCA-E-121 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment/8.7 - All aspects scoped in - agree with this. However to provide full consideration, please address reservoir flood risk, water | Noted. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|---|--|------------------------|
| | supply and drainage networks and infrastructure, and incorporate in ES if deemed appropriate. | | |
| GBCA-E-122 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ 9.2.1 - With PRA should the study area not be adjusted to be appropriate to the current scheme rather than saying it's based on the previous optioneering? | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-123 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ 9.2.2 - 1.5km study area from DCO boundary for Landscape. Are there any elevated views that may have significant effects such as from the tower in Pains hill Park? | General lack of elevated views due to woodland surrounding the scheme, the Gothic Tower is an elevated view which has been picked up individually. | No |
| GBCA-E-124 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ 9.2.4 - How has the preliminary ZTV in Figure 9.6 been developed? This isn't clear and appears to just be an offset from the scheme rather than defined by topography or other physical features? | The Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) was defined through desk and site based assessments as well as professional judgment. | No |
| GBCA-E-125 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ 9.4.2 - There was a clear request from PINS to include the impacts upon the National Character Areas. It would seem sensible to include even if to report that there won't be impacts upon the wider character area. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-126 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ Table 9.2 - Table 9.2 Wisley is referred to as a historic garden rather than a Registered Park and Garden. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-127 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ 9.4.9 - How receptors have been identified sounds questionable given how this sentence is currently written. It sounds like you have been selective rather than incorporating all those within the ZTV and then scoping out those with no view/where are no impacts. | The report referred to was the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. The Environmental Statement supersedes the PEIR, with Landscape impacts detailed in Chapter 9. | No |
| GBCA-E-128 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ 9.5.1- It is likely that the scheme would cause adverse landscape and visual impacts'. Would seem appropriate to add 'significant adverse' to give clarity. | The report referred to was the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. The Environmental Statement supersedes the PEIR, and a full assessment of the landscape and visual impacts is provided in | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|---|---|------------------------|
| | | Chapter 17. | |
| GBCA-E-129 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ 9.5.10 - What about the presence of plant and machinery? | The report referred to was the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. The Environmental Statement supersedes the PEIR, and a full assessment of the landscape and visual impacts is provided in Chapter 17 | No |
| GBCA-E-130 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ 9.5.11 - The source of the operational impacts need to be identified in a similar manner to construction impacts. | The report referred to was the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. The Environmental Statement supersedes the PEIR, and a full assessment of the scheme effects is provided in Chapter 17. | No |
| GBCA-E-131 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ 9.5.11 - Why are impacts reported as a result of separate areas of the scheme rather than on the basis of the receptors addressing views to the scheme as a whole? | The report referred to was the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. The Environmental Statement supersedes the PEIR, and a full assessment of the cumulative effects is provided in Chapter 17. | No |
| GBCA-E-132 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ 9.5.17 - Impacts from road being at odds with local character and features. | The report referred to was the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. The Environmental Statement supersedes the PEIR, and a full assessment of the scheme effects is provided in Chapter 17. | No |
| GBCA-E-133 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ 9.5.19 - Significance of effect is not presented consistently throughout report. This is the first time it is mentioned. | The report referred to was the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. The Environmental Statement supersedes the PEIR, and a full assessment of the cumulative effects is provided in Chapter 17. | No |
| GBCA-E-134 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ 9.5.21 - Last sentence is unclear. | The report referred to was the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. The Environmental Statement supersedes the PEIR, with Landscape impacts detailed in Chapter 9. | No |
| GBCA-E-135 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ 9.7 - Summary doesn't report significance of effects or the future work that is proposed as part of the EIA? Consultees will be keen to see what is going to be | The report referred to was the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. The Environmental Statement supersedes the PEIR, and a full | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|---|--|------------------------|
| | included in the EIA. | assessment of the cumulative effects is provided in Chapter 17. | |
| GBCA-E-136 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ Volume 3 Figures - Landscape figures are empty under heading in Volume 3 PDF but appear within separate PDF with no title. | The report referred to was the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. The Environmental Statement supersedes the PEIR, with Landscape impacts detailed in Chapter 9. | No |
| GBCA-E-137 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ Figure 9.6 - ZTV appears to be small offset but does not seem to reflect physical features that may have an influence. | The Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) was defined through desk and site based assessments as well as professional judgment. | No |
| GBCA-E-138 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: 9. Landscape/ Appendix E.2.11 - Should read views 'from' residents, not 'to'. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-139 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: 9. Landscape/ Appendix E.3.3 - 500m study area is not very big. Justify why- intervening topography or vegetation encloses views? Also you don't mention 500m in 9.2.4 where you initially establish the study area in the main report. | The report referred to was the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. The Environmental Statement supersedes the PEIR, with Landscape impacts detailed in Chapter 9. | No |
| GBCA-E-140 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ E3.7 - It reads awkwardly when assessing on the basis of design element rather than looking at the impact on landscape as a receptor. This should be the main focus to allow the assessment to flow from baseline to reporting of impacts. | The report referred to was the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. The Environmental Statement supersedes the PEIR, with Landscape impacts detailed in Chapter 9. | No |
| GBCA-E141 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ E3.8 - The main report states that national character assessment has been scoped out which does not align with this paragraph. | The report referred to was the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. The Environmental Statement supersedes the PEIR, with Landscape impacts detailed in Chapter 9 and Cultural Heritage detailed in Chapter 11. | No |
| GBCA-E-142 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ E.18 - Assessing only high sensitivity receptors does not preclude significant effects on low and medium sensitivity receptors, if the magnitude is large enough. | The report referred to was the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. The Environmental Statement supersedes the PEIR, and a full assessment of the cumulative effects is provided in Chapter 17. | No |
| GBCA-E-143 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ E.18 - It is not clear what the assessment considers as 'distance views'. | The report referred to was the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|--|--|------------------------|
| | | The Environmental Statement supersedes the PEIR, with Landscape impacts detailed in Chapter 9. | |
| GBCA-E-144 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ E.19 - Vehicle travellers albeit not highly sensitive, are still legitimate receptors and should be considered in the assessment. | The report referred to was the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. The Environmental Statement supersedes the PEIR, and a full assessment of the cumulative effects is provided in Chapter 17. | No |
| GBCA-E-145 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape/ E.10 - Description of visual effects is not all that detailed and does not offer specifics. Seems quite generic and possibly underplayed without greater information. Why does it not address Year 1 and Year 15 rather than just Operation and include the positive contribution that mitigation will have? Unless there isn't any? It would be useful to include distances from the scheme for each receptor. Why are effects described per design feature rather than describing the change in view from each receptor? If a receptor would afford views to two elements this could be under reported as the cumulative effects of the impact on the view would not be described. e.g. looking north there would be views to x whilst in the south of the view there would also be changes with the introduction of Y. | The report referred to was the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. The Environmental Statement supersedes the PEIR, with Landscape impacts detailed in Chapter 9. | No |
| GBCA-E-146 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape - The report and appendices make reference to 'options' on a number of occasions but given PRA was made November 2017. | Noted - Changes to text will be reflected in subsequent updates. | No |
| GBCA-E-147 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 9. Landscape - One of the purposes of the PEIR is to identify ongoing and future work likely to be undertaken to complete the EIA. The landscape chapter does not address this, and nor does it provide the likely significance of effect of the scheme. It would be useful to have greater detail in the summary to really understand the impacts at a glance. | Noted - Changes to text will be reflected in subsequent updates. | No |
| GBCA-E-148 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 10. Geology and Soils/ Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) 10.4.24 - Can the UXO Pre-Desk Study Assessment be included as an Appendix? What are the | The Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) pre-desk study has been included as an Appendix. The recommendations are to obtain a full Unexploded Ordnance desk study, which will be available prior to | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|--|---|------------------------|
| | recommendations from the report? Report identified "several bombs have fallen in close proximity to the study area". Understood within 10.6.5 mitigation measures detailed desk study to assess UXO hazard level and UXO survey prior to intrusive GI. | the commencement of any groundworks (including the ground investigation). The recommendations of the full desk study may include the presence of a Unexploded Ordnance specialist on-site whilst breaking ground. | |
| GBCA-E-149 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 10. Geology and Soils/ Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) 10.4.24 - Footnotes - the reference does not match the text - should refer to the UXO Pre-Desk Study Assessment. Should footnote 38 be 39? | Noted - changes to text have been reflected in subsequent updates and in the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-150 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 10. Geology and Soils/Artificial deposits/10.4.30 - Is there any further information about the landfills – construction details, waste information, age of the landfills, refer to section 10.4.55? | The local authorities were contacted and the information obtained has been included in the Environmental Statement (Chapter 10) and appendices. | No |
| GBCA-E151 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 10. Geology and Soils/Artificial deposits/10.4.32 - Envirocheck data sheets confirmed potentially infilled land at four locations (where?) and infilled water bodies were identified at ten locations (where?) within the study area. | The details of the potentially infilled land have been added to the Environmental Statement Chapters 8 and 10. | No |
| GBCA-E-152 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 10. Geology and Soils/Artificial deposits/10.4.46 - Information on groundwater strikes - is there information on the resting ground level? | Existing groundwater level data have been included in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement, new site-specific data from the ground investigation will be included in follow up documents. | No |
| GBCA-E-153 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 10. Geology and Soils/Potential sources of contamination/10.4.60 - Reference number to Envirocheck is 2, however referenced as 36 within section 10.4.64. | Noted - Changes to text will be reflected in subsequent updates. | No |
| GBCA-E-154 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 10. Geology and Soils/Design measures/10.6.1 - Understood "Based on information available to date, assessment of potential risks/impacts/effects associated with the proposed Scheme have been largely evaluated qualitatively, with only limited ground investigation data to assess ground conditions on-site". | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-155 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 10. Geology and Soils/Groundwater vulnerability zones/10.4.50 - Groundwater vulnerability mapping has | Noted. Please refer to Chapters 8 and 10 of the Environmental | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|---|--|------------------------|
| | recently been updated to use up to date terminology. | Statement. | |
| GBCA-E-156 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 10. Geology and Soils/Table 10.2 - An indication of the distance to historical landfills should be included. | The distances to historical landfills will be included in the Environmental Statement Chapters 10 and 11. | No |
| GBCA-E-157 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 10. Geology and Soils/10.04.65 - Please specify which GAC have been used. Please also confirm whether there is a current and ongoing risk to human health from this material or whether this is a hypothetical risk if the site was redeveloped. | The generic assessment criteria used are obtained from a number of sources (Atkins' AtRisk, C4ULs etc.) The criteria to be used for the assessment of risk for human health and controlled waters will be included in the series 600 documents as part of the ground investigation (appendix 2, 14 and 15). | No |
| GBCA-E-158 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 10. Geology and Soils/10.04.70 - This paragraph appears to muddle receptors and pathways a little. Suggest this wording is looked at. | Noted. The receptors and pathways are clearly separated and identified within the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-159 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 10. Geology and Soils/10.5.4 - Will the CEMP really address the environmental impact associated with incidents during the operation of the scheme? This would normally expect this to only deal with the construction phase. | Noted - the Construction Environmental Management Plan will only deal with construction impacts; reference will be made to Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-160 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 10. Geology and Soils/10.5.10 - This section is not very clear. Suggest rewording to emphasise that these negligible effects are due to pollutant linkages that will not be altered by the scheme but that mitigation measures may result in beneficial effects. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-161 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 10. Geology and Soils/Table 10.4 - We are concerned that ongoing moderate risks have been identified even with the implementation of mitigation measures. It is also unclear how a moderate risk can be a negligible effect when we are introducing part of the pollutant linkage. | Noted. The Environmental Statement contains a thorough impact assessment with the associated significance based on the comparison of the operational phase impacts with the baseline conditions and construction phase (with mitigation measures) with the baseline conditions. Please refer to Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement for updated risk/mitigation consideration. | No |
| GBCA-E-162 | PIER Volume 1 Main Text: 10. Geology and Soils/Table 10.4 - There is a tendency to overstate beneficial effects throughout this table, particularly (but not only) in relation to pathways that the scheme does not appear to influence. For example, we have a moderate | Noted. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|--|--|------------------------|
| | beneficial effect in relation to pollution of controlled waters by off-site sources - are we really doing anything to improve this? Beneficial effects need to be reported where there is an improvement from the baseline condition. | | |
| GBCA-E-163 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: 10. Geology and Soils/ Table F3 - This table needs a review. Controlled waters consequences seem to be listed under a human health heading. Human health receptors - site end users is listed twice with the more severe consequences missing in both cases. Presumably one of these should refer to construction/site workers? The table specifically refers to grade 1 agricultural land but not other grades. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-164 | PIER Volume 1 Main Text: 10. Geology and Soils/10.1.4 - The scoping opinion rejects the proposal to address reuse of material in chapter 12. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-165 | PIER Volume 1 Main Text: 10. Geology and Soils/10.2.1 - The scoping opinion comments that there is no justification provided for the 500m spatial extent. This report should address this. | Noted. The Environmental Statement Chapter 10 includes an explanation/justification as to why the study area has been selected. Also, the study area is now 250 m radius (given the limited pathways). | No |
| GBCA-E-166 | PIER Volume 1 Main Text: 11. Cultural Heritage/11.2.1 Study area - Explanation of study area chosen does not explicitly state the evidence on which professional judgement has been based. 500m appears arbitrary and does not give comfort that long views and wider setting of heritage assets have been considered as part of the assessment. | Please refer to the Environmental Statement Chapter 11 for detailed assessment. | No |
| GBCA-E-167 | PIER Volume 1 Main Text: 11. Cultural Heritage/ 11.4 Baseline conditions - This section outlines what assets there are in the study area, however a more detailed summary of the heritage significance of these assets in relation to the potential impacts of the scheme is required. This is to ensure that the assessment and scheme complies with national planning policy. | Noted. Please refer to the Environmental Statement Chapter 11. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|--|--|------------------------|
| GBCA-E-168 | PIER Volume 1 Main Text: 11. Cultural Heritage/ 11.5 Potential impacts - Please refer to impacts on significance of heritage assets in line with national policy, not just change to an asset. The DMRB guidance predates current planning policy therefore should be adapted to ensure that the scheme complies with relevant current policy. | Noted. Please refer to the Environmental Statement Chapter 11. | No |
| GBCA-E-169 | PIER Volume 1 Main Text: 11. Cultural Heritage/ Table 11.1 Construction impacts - This table should summarise what the temporary and permanent construction impacts are and what impact they have on the significance of the heritage asset. For example where plant and equipment are used this will introduce noise and visual disturbance into the quiet rural setting of the heritage asset. | This is detailed in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-170 | PIER Volume 1 Main Text: 11. Cultural Heritage/11.5.10 Operation - The potential operational effects on heritage assets are not explained. | Noted -these are set out in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-171 | PIER Volume 1 Main Text: 11. Cultural Heritage/ Table 11.2 Operation Impacts - This table should summarise what the operation impacts are and what impact they has on the significance of the heritage asset. For example, the increased traffic movement will increase the visual and aural disturbance to the quiet, still, rural setting of the asset. | Noted -these are set out in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-172 | PIER Volume 1 Main Text: 11. Cultural Heritage/ 11.6 Potential mitigation measures - Potential mitigation to setting impacts need to be explored as does the potential for any enhancements which may be possible as a result of the scheme. | Noted -these are set out in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-173 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix G Cultural Heritage, G.1.20 Guidance - A new edition of GPA3 has been issued, also Historic England Conservation Policies and Principles should be referred to help establish the significance of heritage assets. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-174 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix G Cultural Heritage, table G1 | Noted. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|---|---|------------------------|
| | - Negligible value. The description and example need to be reviewed. If it is insufficient to warrant consideration in planning decisions then under the definition of heritage assets in the NPPF it is not a heritage asset and therefore should identified as such or assessed as such. | | |
| GBCA-E-175 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix G Cultural Heritage, table G4 - The descriptions should include a summary of significance and the assets setting rather than a description of features. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-176 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix G Cultural Heritage, table G5 - The descriptions should include a summary of significance and the assets setting rather than a description of features. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-177 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ 12.1.1 - Mentions the materials and waste associated with operation. Operation was scoped out in the Scoping Report. | Noted | No |
| GBCA-E-178 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ 12.1.1 - No mention of what the assessment has been undertaken in accordance with. | Noted – this is clarified in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-179 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ 12.1 - No legislation, best practice or guidance section after section 12.1 or ref to where this is found if part of a different vol/report. | Noted – this is included in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-180 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/12.2 - This is part of a methodology section but there appears to be no methodology section. | Noted – this is included in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-181 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ 12.2 - Not stated that there is no guidance available for defining the study area to be used for the materials assessment and as a result that study area in which this assessment will use, that will be adopted in the ES has been determined through professional judgment, by the influences of the scheme etc. | Noted – this is included in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-182 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ 12.3.1 - Where | Please refer to Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|--|---|------------------------|
| | is the assessment methodology that will be consulted on? | | |
| GBCA-E-183 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ General - No assumptions and limitations stating e.g. that quantities of waste and materials are not yet available, and the use of cut/fill volumes is likely to change as the scheme design progresses and that any cut is assumed to be suitable for reuse etc. | Noted – this is included in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-184 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ General - No approach to the assessment. | Noted – this is included in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-186 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ 12.4.3 - D183Desk based information has been gathered, but from what sources of information? Something along the lines of, 'using a number of readily available sources such as...', ideally needs to be inserted. | Noted - please refer Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement for assessments. | No |
| GBCA-E-187 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/12.4.5 - In respect to the Scoping Statement issued by SCC. The paragraph says that the 'calculated capacity will be included as part of the baseline' (for which part the PEIR or the ES) 'if available at the time of assessment'. This should be included in the ES. | Noted – this is included in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-188 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ 12.4.6 - Whole paragraph on operational wastes, which has been scoped out. Just say that operational waste will be minimal due to [whatever reason] and has therefore been scoped out of the assessment. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-189 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ 12.4.8 - Mentions that the national demand for key construction materials will be estimated but there is nothing on steel. Demand for steel in the UK was 10.9Mt in 2016. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-190 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ Table 12.1 - Breakdown the Aggregate into the different types e.g., crushed rock, sand and gravel and recycled. | Noted. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|---|---|------------------------|
| GBCA-E-191 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ Table 12.1 - No data source identified. | Noted– this is included in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-192 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ 12.4.9 - Data on aggregate use in Surrey should be included. | Noted– this is included in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-193 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ 12.4.10 - The waste baseline only identifies hazardous waste. There is no data for non-hazardous/inert, which is large quantities could have a significant impact. 2015 is not the most recent information. The Waste Management Plan for England data sources include data for 2016 and these are regional. | Noted– this is included in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-194 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ Table 12.2 - No data source identified. Data on landfill, transfer/treatment, incineration, use of waste in construction as well as waste disposed on land should be referenced. | Noted– this is included in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-195 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ 12.4.12 & 12.4.13 - No baseline for non-hazardous or inert waste is included. What about potential for hazardous/contaminated waste arisings - e.g. any historic landfills within 500m of the scheme. Not identified potential contamination risks from historic land uses, existing use of motorway etc. No reference to other relevant chapters e.g. geology and soils/ground contamination etc. which would identify the sources of contamination. | Noted– this is included in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-196 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ Table 12.3 - No data source identified. Not clear what this table is showing - text in 12.4.13 suggests it is the national hazardous waste infrastructure capacity, but table heading says baseline - not consistent. What about other data sources e.g. Waste Management for England 2016, which provides info on regional hazardous waste - Surrey, South East and England comparisons. | Noted– this is included in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-197 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ 12.5.1 - Should | Noted– this is included in Chapter 12 of the Environmental | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|---|--|------------------------|
| | this be potential effects? Split section into Construction the material resources and operation makes it easier to read. Nothing to say that the scheme is likely to require large quantities of material resources or what is outside the scope of the assessment e.g. it is outside the scope of the assessment to assess environmental effects associated with raw materials extraction, and processing and manufacture of products, as these are likely to be subject to separate environmental assessments. What about effects associated with transportation? Ref to transport chapter. | Statement. | |
| GBCA-E-198 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Materials and Waste/ 12.5.2 - What is the current recorded baseline capacity? Excluding the SCC scoping statement. | Please refer to Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-199 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Materials and Waste/ 12.5.3 - Have a separate heading for operational waste. State why operational waste has not been assessed. | Noted– this is included in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-200 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Materials and Waste/ 12.6.1 - Will the impacts be potential large/significant? | Please refer to Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-201 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Materials and Waste/ 12.6.2 - Mitigation measures are necessary in order to reduce the env effects of both CD&E and operational phases of the scheme.' What about design? The biggest opportunities to reduce impacts can occur in the design stage. There are no impacts from the operational phase as this has been scoped out. | Please refer to Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. The design has been reviewed to reduce impacts. | No |
| GBCA-E-202 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Materials and Waste/ 12.6.5 - This is the first time design is mentioned. Majority of the chapter discusses CD&E waste. Industry study specs can be challenged which can reduce waste, no mention of minimal use of primary material resources or eliminating waste in respect to designing out waste or that it should follow the waste hierarchy. | Please refer Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. The design has been reviewed to reduce impacts. | No |
| GBCA-E-203 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Materials and Waste/ 12.6.7 - Has a | Detail on cut/fill balance and materials need resulting are reported | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|--|--|------------------------|
| | cut/fill balance been calculated? Even if specific quantities of materials have not been quantified or the cut/fill may change. Make assumptions that all cut materials would be suitable for reuse on site. This then allows the calculation of imported fill requirements. | in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | |
| GBCA-E-204 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ 12.6.9 - First bullet - not related to on-site management of waste and materials, these should already be done prior to going on site. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-205 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ 12.6.9 - 2nd bullet - CEMP and SWMP should be in full first time used and also need to expand on the sentence to say why these are needed. E.g. preparation of a CEMP, SWMP and MMP (where appropriate) ensures any adverse effects are managed etc. If these are developed and used appropriately any potentially significant effects resulting from material resource use and waste generation could be reduced. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-206 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Materials and Waste/ 12.6.9 - No mention of reusing excavated materials for fill or landscaping as a mitigation measure. | Please refer to Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-207 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ 12.6.11 - Unavoidable wastes rather than all CD&E wastes generated. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-208 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ 12.6.12 - This is a Principal Contractor requirement and is not something that can be stated here. It is not up to the developer to select a waste contractor. At best these requirements should be moved into the CEMP and not in the PEIR. | This will be confirmed once a principal contractor is appointed. | No |
| GBCA-E-209 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ 12.7 - This should be a summary of the chapter. The table, in its current form, does not add anything of use to the summary. Ideally a table with discipline (e.g. waste, materials), potential effect (with info pulled from the doc) and then the proposed mitigation (again taken from the doc) would provide a more useful summary. | Noted. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|---|--|------------------------|
| GBCA-E-210 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste/ General - This chapter does not provide the relevant baseline information to base an assessment of impact on. There is key information missing and information relating to operational aspects (that have been scoped out and do not required further consideration. There is no methodology identified (or ref to where this might be found if not included in the PEIR) or a clear approach to the assessment. There is ref to the IAN153/11 but not to the DMRB Vol 11 section 2 part 5 or even the DMRB generally. There are no data sources ref against tables to make finding the information easier. There are no assumptions and limitations written into the report. There is no estimated cut/fill information to help identify whether import of material is required or potentially significant. There is no mention of a carbon assessment or ref to other relevant chapters which would aid assessment e.g. transport, geology and soils, air quality, noise and vibration etc. There is a cross-over of the use of effect and impact (not consistent). The mitigation measures are too specific for this level of report. Some of those mitigation measures should be identified in the main ES or and then fed into the CEMP/SWMP. This report does not provide enough useful baseline information required for a Preliminary Environmental Information Report. None of the comments made in respect to the Scoping Report have been added/updated in the PEIR and the text remains the same, therefore the comments in the Scoping Report still apply. | Please refer to Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-211 | PEIR NTS: 12. Materials and Waste/ General - There is NO Materials and Waste section in the PEIR Non-technical summary. Would expect something in here. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-212 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: 12. Materials and Waste/ General - Only part of the legislation section has been amended based on comments relating to the Scoping Report, removal of non-relevant legislation has not happened, and this section is longer than it needs to be. The methodology section includes additional information which has not | Please refer to Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|--|--|------------------------|
| | been included in the PEIR. Will carbon be calculated and assessed in relation to the material resources used and waste generated? The level of assessment is limited in detail. There is no option to decide a simple assessment for waste (based on professional judgment) and a detailed assessment (assigned through an assessment of embodied carbon emissions – as required for HE projects) for materials based on the fact that waste arisings is difficult to quantify whereas the materials assessment (can be based on the BoQ). How do other relevant chapter info fit within the assessment methodology? | | |
| GBCA-E-213 | PEIR Volume 3 Figures: Materials and Waste - No figures used, although it would be useful to include figures relating to landfills/waste facilities in the local area that may be impacted on by the waste generated from the scheme construction. Info relating to historic landfills (if any in the area) etc. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-214 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste / 12.2 Study area - A description of how the study area has been determined is required. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-216 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste / 12.2 Study area - The study area section states the following: 'For material resources, the study area includes the demand for key construction materials nationally and it is acknowledged that the impacts may occur outside of the national study area. However, as per IAN 153/11, this is considered outside of the assessment scope.' IAN 153/11 does not exclude the assessment of any impacts except for the impacts associated with the extraction of raw materials and the manufacture of products. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-217 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste / 12.4 Waste infrastructure baseline - f the CD&E waste capacity information is not available from Surrey County Council at the time of writing the ES, the Waste Management for England 2016 produced by the Environment Agency provides some data/information on waste | Please refer to Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|--|---|------------------------|
| | infrastructure at the County, regional and national level. | | |
| GBCA-E-218 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste / 12.4 Waste infrastructure baseline - The baseline section should be expanded on. It considers national material resources but not more local/regional sources, which is where the impact will be greater. In addition, the baseline data will need reviewing to include more up to date data and sources as it is currently limited to AMR's and Waste Interrogator tools, other sources are available through the DEFRA and EA statistical data and summaries. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-219 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste /12.5 Potential impacts - It is recommended that an estimate of the quantities of primary/virgin materials to be used is made, and an assessment of the impacts of this on the depletion of these resources is undertaken. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-220 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste / 12.6 Potential mitigation measures - Specific examples of how waste has been designed out of the design of the scheme should be identified and presented. | Noted, please refer to Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-221 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 12. Materials and Waste / General - There is no evidence that contaminated land is identified or how/what sources of info will be used to do this, but it is mentioned and is said to be considered separately. As this is a material/waste is needs to be considered in the ES as part of the waste assessment. There is also no cross ref to other specific topics e.g. transport for waste and materials import/export, air quality and contaminated land/geology and soils. | Please refer to Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-222 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: H. Materials and waste / Planning and policy context - The legislation section for the ES could be more concise and only relevant legislation should be included. Some key legislation and policy docs/guidance are missing e.g. landfill regs and the Waste Prevention Programme. We suggest removing legislation references to packaging, WEEE, asbestos, batteries and | Noted | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|---|---|------------------------|
| | accumulators CLP and PCB's as these are quite specific and for road schemes, where relevant, are mainly covered under other legislation. | | |
| GBCA-E-223 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: H. Materials and waste / Methodology - The source of the criteria for classifying the magnitude of environmental effects needs to be stated in the ES. | Please refer to Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-224 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ 13.4.20 - It is possible to infer the ALC Grade of an area based on published soil information and carrying this over to other areas there is the potential that the farmers may have improved the land after the surveys were undertaken etc. Therefore in line with the DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Part 6 Chapter 10, is an ALC survey going to be undertaken for agricultural land within the study area? Additionally, a figure here would be very useful to provide context as to how surveys/soil data/1:250,000 map are correlated. | Detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) surveys were carried out in early 2018 of Park Barn Farm, Nutberry Farm, Pond Farm and parts of the SWT managed commons. Access was not available on other land parcels. Detail from the 1:250,000 provisional Agricultural Land Classification map is included in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-225 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. Agricultural Land/ 13.4.21 to 13.4.31 - Will there be any impacts to farm accesses? and/or irrigation systems? Additionally, same question as per JH point 2. | The Environmental Statement confirms that impacts to access during construction will be temporary in Chapter 13. No irrigation schemes are affected. | No |
| GBCA-E-226 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Table 13.7 - Some of the comments in the table appear to confuse the sensitivity of agricultural land with that of the farm/Agri business. This is likely to be due to the table's title which would seem more appropriate as 'Sensitivity of agricultural receptors'. Were we looking solely at the sensitivity of agricultural land, the sensitivities given should be based on the envisaged ALC grade. | Farms and land-based enterprises are clearly distinguished from agricultural soils in the Environmental Statement in terms of sensitivity, impacts etc. | No |
| GBCA-E-227 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ General - There needs to be a clear definition of what is included under the title of 'Agricultural Land' / 'Agricultural soils' / Agricultural Holdings etc. as these terms are used interchangeably in some cases but mean different things. | Noted, this is clarified in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-228 | PEIR NTS: 13. People and Communities/ General - The NTS | This is included in the Non-Technical Summary of the | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|--|---|------------------------|
| | contains no text with reference to the impacts on Agri land/farms. Would suggest some is needed even if to state no/negligible impacts envisaged. | Environmental Statement. | |
| GBCA-E-229 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Study area. 13.2.3 - These are not explicitly the DMRB topics for people and communities (or the previous topic of community and private assets). It's not therefore 100% clear whether issue like severance will be assessed. | We can confirm that severance has been assessed in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement for private dwellings (changes in access), community assets (severance) and Non-Motorised-Users (severance). | No |
| GBCA-E-230 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Study area 13.2.3 - While 500m is more than acceptable, the typical study area for most People and Communities topics (in line with existing DMRB guidance is 250m). | Noted. A 500m People and Communities study area was determined considering the scope of the Scheme and using professional judgement. In the response to the Scoping Report, Guildford Borough Council suggested additional villages to be included in addition to the 500m study area. This has since been discussed and agreed with Guildford Borough Council. The exception to this is the Study Area for Private Dwellings which has been reduced to 250m in line with other People and Communities assessments. | No |
| GBCA-E-231 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Private Dwellings 13.4.1 - Private dwellings are identified in the 'vicinity' of the scheme. It's not clear whether they lie inside of or outside the 500m study area. | Noted. This wording has been amended in the Environmental Statement. The dwellings identified are within the study area and are shown within the Environmental Statement. It should be noted that the study area for Private Dwellings has been reduced down to 250m in line with other People and Communities assessments. | No |
| GBCA-E-232 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Community assets 13.4.2 - Some indication of the location of community assets or their proximity to the scheme would be valuable here. | The community assets were included in the PEIR figures and are shown in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-234 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ local businesses 13.4.4-5 - If the assets described are community resources, they should be listed in the community resources baseline. At present, identifying sites as businesses and then saying they will be discussed as community resources is unhelpful. | Noted. This comment has been addressed in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement and they are included in the community assets baseline. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|--|--|------------------------|
| GBCA-E-235 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ 13.4.32 and 13.4.33 - Development land is inconsistently presented. Development land in Guildford refers to 'the study area' presumably relating to the 500m study area identified earlier on. However, the Elmbridge refers to planning applications 'within Elmbridge'. It's not 100% clear that the Elmbridge ones are relevant, or within the study area. | Noted. This terminology has been amended in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement and was meant to refer to development land within the study area in Elmbridge. | No |
| GBCA-E-236 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Baseline. General - The level of detail in this section varies significantly, underscoring the points above regarding details of residential, business and community receptors, particularly as these are most likely to be directly affected. | Noted. The level of detail in the baseline is now consistent. | No |
| GBCA-E-237 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ 13.4.37 - Severance is introduced here for the first time as a separate sub topic with the NMU sub-heading. This is a usual sub-topic to include but feels like it has come out of nowhere and includes no pre-seeding in the PEIR. | Noted. Severance is now introduced appropriately in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-238 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ 13.5.1 - 13.5.5 - These paragraphs focus on setting out a method of assessment - is there merit to including a specific methodology section or sub-section to make this clear? | Noted. The methodology is now set out in the Environmental Statement in Chapter 13. | No |
| GBCA-E-240 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Table 13.3 - In terms of a locally significant effect, how is local defined here? Is this simply within the 500m study area? If so, it would be better to say this, but I don't know how this would vary against a non-locally significant effect. | Noted. The use of 'locally significant' is no longer used in the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-241 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ General - Treatment of mitigation measures is somewhat inconsistent. Some sections seem to imply that mitigation measures are included, while others do not. There is no statement preceding this section to identify how mitigations are considered in the chapter. | Noted. Design, mitigation and enhancement measures are set out in Section 13.9 of the Environmental Statement. Assessment of effects is post-mitigation where relevant mitigation is proposed. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|--|---|------------------------|
| GBCA-E-242 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ 13.5.6-13.5.7 - The paragraph states: 'Access changes continue, albeit the same, during operation' - surely this simply means that changes are permanent, but nonetheless arising during construction. Given that all impacts on residential dwellings are identified as occurring during the construction phase, what is left to assess during operation? And why list additional properties here? Would they not be better in the baseline? | Noted regarding access arrangements terminology and this has been corrected in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement. The additional properties are included in the baseline of the Environmental Statement. Changes to access are assessed for the construction phase, if this is maintained in the operational phase then it is agreed that no further assessment is required. | No |
| GBCA-E-243 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ 13.5.8-13.5.10 - A description of how the study area has been determined is required. | Noted. This is now included Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement. A 500m People and Communities study area was determined considering the scope of the Scheme and using professional judgement. It should be noted that the study area for Private Dwellings has been reduced down to 250m in line with other People and Communities assessments. | No |
| GBCA-E-244 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Table 13.4 - Where in table 13.3 'significant' was stated in the final column, this is not done in table 13.4 or in most subsequent tables. | Noted. This has been amended in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement and the tables include a significance column where required. | No |
| GBCA-E-245 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ . Table 13.4 - Receptor sensitivity is its own column in this table. Consistency of presentation would aid readability with this. | Noted. This has been amended in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement and the columns are now consistent. | No |
| GBCA-E-246 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ 13.5.17 - 13.5.20 - The definition of amenity seems to differ here to how it is described in the private dwellings section. This should be set out in the most detail when it is first discussed. | Noted. The detail has now been brought forward to Chapter 13. The following text has been moved from community assets to private dwellings with appropriate amendments made: <i>1.5.13 A qualitative assessment of the potential impact of the Scheme on the amenity of [private dwellings] during construction and operation has been adopted and draws upon the conclusions of the traffic, air quality, noise, vibration and visual impact assessments.</i> | No |
| GBCA-E-247 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ 12.5 and 13.6 - The significance of effects on local businesses is not included | Noted. The significance discussions are included in the Environmental Statement. The methodology has been revised and | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|---|---|------------------------|
| | in these tables. This is explained but seems somewhat inconsistent. Better to potentially exclude all significance discussion until the ES, rather than include it in some areas and not others. | now uses the standard sensitivity, topic specific magnitude and standard significance tables. | |
| GBCA-E-248 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ 13 Potential impacts. Table 13.2 - Elmbridge BC development sites are shown to be within the DCO boundary - so will experience land take. This is not clear in the baseline section, as noted above. | Noted. The Elmbridge Borough Council Development Land Table has been updated and the baseline section has been updated to clearly state that there will be land take. | No |
| GBCA-E-249 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Table 13.2 - The heading 'assessment score' is used in the table - is this the magnitude of the impact, the likely significance of the effect, or something else? | This heading has been amended to ensure consistency. | No |
| GBCA-E-250 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Tables generally. - The assessment tables present inconsistent information on the work done to date and include omissions (which, it is acknowledged, are stated after the tables). It would be good to make all tables consistent and some throughout could be given to either adding in rows for resources where effects are not yet known, or stating clearly that only direct effects are included (if that is the reason for certain omissions). | Noted. Chapter 13 in the Environmental Statement and the information provided is now consistent. | No |
| GBCA-E-251 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Headings generally. - Some inconsistency with heading font styles, which can be confusing when navigating what is a very dense and complicated chapter. | Noted. Formatting and heading styles have been updated in the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-252 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Agricultural Land 13.4.20 - It is noted that the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) 1:250,000 Provisional ALC Maps have been used to provide an indication to the quality of agricultural land within the study area. It is also noted that it is assumed that none of the agricultural land within the study area is likely to be of BMV quality, based on published soil information. The principal factors influencing agricultural production include climate factors (principally average | Detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) surveys were carried out in early 2018 of Park Barn Farm, Nutberry Farm, Pond Farm and parts of the Surrey Wildlife Trust managed commons. Access was not available on other land parcels. Detail from the 1:250,000 provisional Agricultural Land Classification map is included in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|---|--|------------------------|
| | annual rainfall and temperature), site factors (such as gradient, relief and flooding), soil factors (including texture, structure, depth, stoniness and chemical status) and interactions between the factors such as soil wetness and soil draughtiness for selected crops. In line with the DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Part 6 Chapter 10, usually an ALC study would be undertaken to confirm the quality of land, particularly on greenfield land to inform the environmental baseline and subsequent decision making. Is an ALC survey going to be undertaken for agricultural land within the study area? | | |
| GBCA-E-253 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Agricultural Land 13.4.21 to 13.4.31 - It might be helpful to state the source of this information. For example, have individual farms been consulted regarding husbandry, use of land etc. or has a site visit been undertaken to confirm this section? | The methodology for data collection (site surveys and meetings) is covered in the Environmental Statement Chapter 13. | No |
| GBCA-E-254 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13 People and Communities/ Non-Motorised Users 13.4.35 - The PEIR states that formal PRoW identified from the Surrey County Council Rights of Way Interactive map will be considered as part of the impact assessment. Will other NMU routes such as footways, shared footways and cycleways (as identified in Volume 3 Figure 13.1) or undesignated footpaths be considered in the impact assessment for the ES? | In addition to formal Public Rights of Way (PRoW), Non-Motorised-User (NMU) routes such as footways, shared footways and cycleways have also been considered as well as undesignated footpaths. | No |
| GBCA-E-255 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Agricultural Land 13.5.25 - 13.5.26 - Will an ALC survey be undertaken to confirm the quality of land which would be acquired during the construction phase? | Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys were carried out in early 2018 of Park Barn Farm, Nutberry Farm, Pond Farm and parts of the Surrey Wildlife Trust managed commons. Access was not available on other land parcels. | No |
| GBCA-E-256 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. Agricultural Land 13.5.26 - The permanent impacts on agricultural land in this section and also the replacement land should be included as these effects would be during operation as well. | These impacts are included in the Environmental Statement in Chapter 10. | No |
| GBCA-E-257 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Agricultural Land Table 13.8 - This table clearly sets out the potential impacts on | There is no severance of agricultural land. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|---|---|------------------------|
| | different agricultural holdings. To confirm, is there potential for any agricultural land to be severed, which could also affect the management of these agricultural holdings? | | |
| GBCA-E-258 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Agricultural Land Tables 13.9 to 13.11 - These tables should be clarified to distinguish between construction and operation effects for magnitude of impacts, residual impacts and significance. | Construction and operation stage impacts are distinguished in in separate tables in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-259 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: These tables should be clarified to distinguish between construction and operation effects for magnitude of impacts, residual impacts and significance. Will changes in journey length and /or time as a result of the scheme be calculated for individual routes within the ES, as set out in the Scoping Report methodology (Section 13.7.47)? | Noted. Construction and operation stage impacts are distinguished in in separate tables in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-260 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Non-Motorised users: Changes in Amenity 13.5 - Changes in amenity for NMUs for individual routes in the ES should be identified to clearly show the locations where amenity is likely to change. | Noted. This has been addressed in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E261 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Non-Motorised users: Changes in Amenity - The construction / operation sections for assessment of changes in amenity for NMUs do provide a descriptive approach as set out in the scoping report. In the ES, will references be made to traffic flows as required by DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Part 8, particularly in locations where NMUs would have to cross the road? | Comment noted. Reference is made to traffic flows in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement, using information from the Traffic Model. | No |
| GBCA-E-262 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13 People and Communities/ Non-Motorised users: Severance 13.5.59 - It is noted that the temporary closure of crossings over the A3/ M25 may substantially changes journey distance or times. Will mitigation be considered to minimise adverse effects, such as provision of temporary crossings? | Noted. Mitigation measures including signed diversions will be provided. This is detailed in Section 13 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-263 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Non- | In accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|---|---|------------------------|
| | motorised users: Journey length, amenity and severance 13.5 -Will significance criteria be used to assess effects of the scheme on NMUs changes in journey lengths and amenity? | Volume 11, Section 3, Part 8, new severance has been described using a three-point scale. | |
| GBCA-E-264 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 13. People and Communities/ Potential mitigation measures 13.6 - It is agreed that additional mitigation measures should be implemented where significant adverse effects are identified. | Noted. Detail is provided in the Design, Enhancement and Mitigation Measures of chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement | No |
| GBCA-E-265 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: I. Non-Motorised Users: Journey length & Local Travel Patterns - Will significance criteria be used to assess effects of the scheme on NMUs changes in journey lengths and local travel patterns? | A significance of criteria was used in the assessment and comprises a matrix including the receptor sensitivity and magnitude of impact. | No |
| GBCA-E-266 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: I. Non- Motorised Users: Changes in Amenity - Will significance criteria be used to assess effects of the scheme on NMUs changes in amenity? | The Significance of effect is the product of the sensitivity of receptors and magnitude of impact, of the effects described, moderate and major effects are considered 'significant'. The matrix is located in the methodology of the P&C Chapter 13 Table 13.5) and is based on the DMRB Volume 11, Section 2, Part 5, HA 205/08, Table 2.4. | No |
| GBCA-E-267 | PEIR Non-Technical Summary: 9. People and Communities/ 9.1.3 - Whilst it is made clear that mitigation would be included for NMUs including replacement paths and crossings, and enhancing the junctions. At this stage is there still the potential for some journey length increases/ adverse effects in terms of amenity during both construction and operation? | Comment noted. The Non-Technical Summary for the Environmental Statement provides detail on journey lengths and amenity for Non-Motorised-Users. | No |
| GBCA-E-268 | PEIR Non-Technical Summary: 9. People and Communities/ 9.1.4 - Whilst there would be temporary adverse effects on some business, farms and landholders, there would also be some permanent effects. This needs to be made clear in the text. | Noted. This is now made clear in the text in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|--|---|------------------------|
| GBCA-E-269 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 14. Climate/ 14.4 - A regional baseline climate of Southern England should be added to ensure greater regional application of the effect if the scheme on climate change and the vulnerability of the scheme to climate change. | The effects of the Scheme on climate are global in nature, as there is a single receptor (the atmosphere) which is global, and a single impact (global warming) which is also global. Emissions from the Scheme will cause an increase in average global temperatures. The regional climate is therefore not relevant from an Effects on Climate perspective. | No |
| GBCA-E-270 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 14. Climate/ 14.4.3 - In setting the scheme baseline emissions, what calculation tool has been used and will the same tool be used for this Scheme? CKB is mentioned in the summary but no explanation of the tool is given. | The emissions set out in 14.4.3 were taken from a previously published report. This is referenced below the data table, and the methodology for calculating these emissions is explained in that report. | No |
| GBCA-E-271 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 14. Climate/ 14.4.13 - Explanation of why the high emission scenario has not been explained. | Noted – this has been included in Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-272 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 14. Climate/ 14.5.1 - Explanation of how the Stage D emissions have been quantified and contribute to the in-use emissions is required. Stage D emissions are not explained with sufficient detail - where these emissions are coming from is required. | The PEIR states that this part of the study area will include direct emissions from vehicles using the wider road network as determined by the traffic reliability area, as outlined in the air quality assessment (defined as the Affected Road Network, ARN). | No |
| GBCA-E-273 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 14. Climate/ 14.6.1 - Bearing in mind there is currently no DMRB methodology or guidance on how to carry out a "simple" or "detailed" assessment for Climate, how did you draw the conclusion that a "simple" assessment is necessary? | This was based on professional judgement, which considered that a high-level assessment using bulk material calculations is a proportionate approach considering the magnitude of the potential impact. To avoid confusion with specific guidance in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges for other topic areas, reference to 'simple' or 'detailed' methodology will be removed from the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-274 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 14. Climate/ Section 14.7.3 - The Highways England Carbon Calculation Tool should be used for the final carbon footprint to be reported in the ES, as this will allow the Scheme to be compared with other Highways England schemes. | Noted. The Highways England Carbon Calculation Tool has been used for final reporting in Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-276 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 15. Assessment of Cumulative Effects / Potential effects - Combined effects - The combined effects outlined in this section on landscape and visual due to different elements of | Noted. This has been addressed in the Environmental Statement Chapter 15. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|---|--|------------------------|
| | the scheme should not be considered as combined effects in this section, these should be considered as part of the assessment in the landscape and visual effects assessment as this elements all form part of the scheme. The combined assessment should focus on the impact interactions associated with the scheme upon separate environmental receptors, e.g. the combined effect on landscape may result from the effects on the local landscape character and effects on the historic landscape. | | |
| GBCA-E-277 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 15. Assessment of Cumulative Effects / Potential effects - Combined effects - The combined effects assessment should consider all environmental topics and not just landscape and visual. | Noted. This has been updated in the Environmental Statement and the combined effects assessment considers all environmental topics. | No |
| GBCA-E-278 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 15. Assessment of Cumulative Effects / Potential effects - Cumulative effects - Table 15.5 notes that the operational air quality cumulative assessment is already taken into account in the air quality assessment as it makes use of the traffic modelling data, this should also be the case for the noise and vibration assessment and should be stated. The operational cumulative effects for noise and vibration reference the Smart Motorway development, however this development should be included in the traffic model, and as just noted the noise and vibration assessment should therefore already taken into consideration the operational cumulative effects. | Noted. Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement now highlights that air quality and noise and vibration effects have already been taken into consideration in the operational cumulative effects. | No |
| GBCA-E-279 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 15. Assessment of Cumulative Effects - The PEIR did not mention any policy context in regards to Cumulative effects, usually it is best practice to quote the NPSNN, for example as below. This needs to be mentioned in the ES. "The need to consider cumulative effects in planning and decision making is set out in planning policy, in particular the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) ; paragraph 4.16 states that "When considering significant cumulative effects, any environmental statement should provide information on how the effects of the | Noted. This has been added Chapter 17 in the Environmental Statement. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|------------|--|--|------------------------|
| | applicant's proposal would combine and interact with the effects of other development (including projects for which consent has been granted, as well as those already in existence)."" | | |
| GBCA-E-28 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 7. Biodiversity / Section 7.4 Table 7.1 - There is a lack of consistency in the citation descriptions in this table. Particularly for Thames Basin Heaths SPA and Ockham and Wisley LNR, with descriptions not as clear for these sites. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-280 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 15. Assessment of Cumulative Effects / Table 15.4 - A 'level of certainty' for each development in the table has not been assigned. In accordance with PINs Advice Note Seventeen, this should be done for each development (see Table 3 in PINs Advice Note Seventeen) and presented within the ES. | Noted. This has been included in Appendix Table 17.1 using the tiered system included in PINS Advice Note Seventeen. | No |
| GBCA-E-281 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 15. Assessment of Cumulative Effects / Table 15.5 Cumulative Effects Summary - The Council is concerned about the potential cumulative effects for Air Quality on nearby human and ecological receptors due to construction and operation of the other developments (M25 Junction 10 -16 Smart Motorway Programme; the former Wisley Airfield; and two proposals for the Royal Horticultural Society Gardens at Wisley). No suggested mitigation is given in the PEIR therefore detailed mitigation measures should be presented in the ES. | Noted. Typical mitigation measures during construction are provided in the Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures (Chapter 13) in the Environmental Statement, however, the contractor will provide specific measures within the Construction Environmental Management Plan, which will provide mitigation for effects arising from the scheme. | No |
| GBCA-E-282 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 15. Assessment of Cumulative Effects / Table 15.5 Cumulative Effects Summary - At the PEIR stage the potential impacts on landscape and visual effects have not yet been identified, given the setting of the scheme and interaction with the M25 10 - 16 Smart Motorway Programme scheme, impacts are likely and we will be expecting to see thorough consideration of these in the ES. | Noted. The assessment has been updated in Chapter 17 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-29 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 paragraph 7.4.17 - States two notable species were recorded during surveys, what surveys? Was an NVC undertaken? Location of | Surveys and results are described in detail in the Environmental Statement and technical appendices. Please refer to the | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| | surveys? More detail will be required in the ES. | Environmental Statement Chapter 7. | |
| GBCA-E-30 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 paragraph 7.4.18 - Bat species should be referred to by the full name. i.e. Natterer's - Natterer's bat, brown long-eared - brown long-eared bat, Daubenton's - Daubenton's bat, Leisler's - Leisler's bat, whiskered - whiskered bat, Bechstein's - Bechstein's bat. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-31 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 paragraph 7.4.19 - Why are these records presumed to be hibernating bats? Because they are in an Ice House? More explanation is required and will be expected in the ES. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-32 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 paragraph 7.4.19 - Which species were recorded 'likely to be in houses' and what is the justification for this assumption. | Please refer to the Environmental Statement Chapter 7. | No |
| GBCA-E-33 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 paragraph 7.4.20 - Paragraph states that Mole Gap to Reigate Escarpment SAC is located 7.8km from the scheme, however table 7.2 states that it is 6.9km from the scheme - which is it? Same goes for Ebernoe Common SAC the text states it is 29.5km from the scheme but table 7.3 states it is 29.3km from the scheme. | Discrepancies have been resolved in the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-34 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 paragraph 7.4.21 - More detail is required for the 2017 surveys, when were surveys conducted, have any roosts been identified, if so where? This is a baseline section, so it needs to detail what is already known. Figure 7.2 shows that roosts have been identified, this needs to be stated and to refer to Volume 3 figure 7.2 for roost locations. When are the further roost surveys planned in 2018 and where? The text is not clear and is vague. This also needs to refer to Appendix C for the survey methodology used as methodology is not stated in the text. | Detail is provided in the Environmental Statement and associated technical appendices, please see Chapter 7. | No |
| GBCA-E-35 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 | Detail is provided in the Environmental Statement, please see | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|------------------------|
| | paragraph 7.4.22 - This sentence is unclear when it says surveys are currently being undertaken but at the same time states they were completed in October 2017. Again, more detail as to what was found is required, where surveys were undertaken, what was the quality of habitat like, how many transects, how many transects per month per carried out? / no reference to Appendix C section C.3 (methodology) or Volume 3 figure 7.2 (bat species survey). | Chapter 7. | |
| GBCA-E-36 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 paragraph 7.4.23 - The text needs to state how many traps were used, as harp traps are small, so cover a small area, even though using an acoustic lure. So, it's a question of have enough traps been used to be effective is determining presence/likely absence. The text also needs to explain how many trapping sessions were done per quadrant, as they only note that two of the sessions were done in the July/August period. They haven't noted how long they were trapping for, i.e. they did a minimum of 4 hours. | Detail is provided in the Environmental Statement, please see Chapter 7 and Appendix 7.7. | No |
| GBCA-E-37 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 paragraph 7.4.24 - The 'surveys to date' is not a particularly informative phrase. More detail is required here detailing which bats species were identified during which survey types. | Surveys have now been completed. Detail is provided in the Environmental Statement, please see Chapter 7. | No |
| GBCA-E-38 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 Bats in general - Nothing mentioned about ground tree assessment? When where they undertaken, what was found, the methodology? Reference to the Figure in Volume 3? No mention of crossing point surveys (which are included in Appendix C) or static surveys - depending on the quality of habitat a certain number of statics should be placed along the transect routes. | Detail is provided in the Environmental Statement, please see Chapter 7 and Appendix 7.6. | No |
| GBCA-E-39 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 paragraph 7.4.27 - No mention of HSI surveys. | Detail is provided in the Environmental Statement, please see Chapter 7. | No |
| GBCA-E-40 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 paragraph 7.4.27 - eDNA surveys undertaken in spring? When in | Further surveys were undertaken in 2018. Detail of all surveys is | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|------------------------|
| | spring? eDNA can be started from mid-April. 13 ponds out of 65 watercourses and 53 ditches subject to a survey, why were the other water courses / ditches ruled out, there is no explanation. Are the ponds numbered? If so pond numbers should be used instead of writing the location of the pond. It gives the reader something to refer to and is much easier to understand. | provided in the Environmental Statement, please see Chapter 7. | |
| GBCA-E-41 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 paragraph 7.4.28 - It's not clear why population estimate surveys were undertaken on the two ponds and on the large pond (pond numbers not given) and eDNA surveys not undertaken? Assuming because they within 250m of Bolder mere Lake and could potentially form a metapopulation? Again, survey methodology is not referred to. | Due to previous confirmation of presence by Surrey Wildlife Trust. Detail is provided in Environmental Statement Chapter 7. | No |
| GBCA-E-42 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 Paragraph 7.4.33 - State when in 2016 and 2017 these surveys were undertaken. | Detail is provided in the Environmental Statement, please see Chapter 7. | No |
| GBCA-E-43 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 Reptiles in general - Were smooth snakes not considered? Heathland is also suitable for smooth snakes, no justification for ruling this species out. | The heathlands have been monitored for many years and there are no records of smooth snakes. They are therefore considered to be absent from Ockham and Wisley Common and have not been considered in the assessment. | No |
| GBCA-E-44 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 paragraph 7.4.41 - Some further surveys will be carried out in spring 2018? This is very vague and doesn't explain which surveys and where? No reference to Appendix C for survey methodology or Figures. | Detail is provided in the Environmental Statement, please see Chapter 7. | No |
| GBCA-E-45 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 .44 - States one survey undertaken in September 2017. Guidelines state that two surveys for water vole are required - one April to June and one July to September. Will this be subject to further survey (April to June) 2018 so presence or absence can be confirmed? Or are they saying that due the presence of mink, no further surveys are deemed necessary? Has Stratford Brook been considered for water vole and | Surveys were undertaken in 2018 of all waterbodies affected by the Scheme. Details provided in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|------------------------|
| | otters? This seems to be a large watercourse affected by the work within the DCO boundary. | | |
| GBCA-E-46 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 .44 - No details are given of how many watercourses potentially suitable for water voles are within the scheme footprint (although looking at the GCN figure in volume 3, there are numerous waterbodies/ditches within the scheme footprint). No explanation of why these have been ruled out. No drawings to show where water vole and otter surveys have been undertaken. Do the water courses have numbers? | Details provided in Environmental Statement Chapter 7 and appendix 7.15. | No |
| GBCA-E-47 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 paragraph 7.4 .45 - Did the Bolder Mere lake surveys fit with the timings of water vole surveys? To say there were surveyed during the Extended Phase 1 survey and GCN surveys is not clear. If the surveys did not follow standard guidelines, it needs to be justified. | Additional water vole and otter surveys have been undertaken. Details provided in Environmental Statement Chapter 7 and appendix 7.15. | No |
| GBCA-E-48 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 paragraph 7.4 .47 - Badger walkover surveys should ideally be undertaken during the winter months when there is little vegetation to obscure evidence. Refer to Appendix C methodology. | The majority of the survey was undertaken before vegetation growth in spring. Details are provided in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-49 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 paragraph 7.4.50 - More detail of surveys is required, including dates and times, have these been undertaken within the current guidelines. Makes no reference to Figure 7.7 in Volume 3 for survey areas, Appendix C for methodology. | Details are provided in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-50 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 paragraph 7.4 .58 - No reference to Volume 3 Figure 7.8 for Invertebrate surveys areas or to Appendix C for the methodology used. No mention of when surveys were undertaken, which should be stated here. | Details are provided in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement. and appendix 7.14. | No |
| GBCA-E-51 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.4 paragraph 7.4.61 - Is there a plan showing where invasive plants | Noted. A plan will be provided. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|--|------------------------|
| | were found? Pond numbers not given that contain pygmy weed. Which woodlands were Rhododendron found in? | | |
| GBCA-E-52 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.5 - More detail required as to what compensation for loss of ancient woodland might be e.g., trees must be replanted 10 for everyone lost. Has a CPO been considered for this? No mention of potential mitigation or compensation for the loss of part of the LNR. What will the mitigation be if there is no funding for multi-functional bridges linking quadrats? | A detailed compensation package has been designed with stakeholders and is described in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement and Habitats Regulations Assessment. | No |
| GBCA-E-53 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.5 Paragraph 7.5.1 - How will the bridge be designed to encourage the movement of heathland species. Need more information that it will contain vegetative habitat to justify this. | A separate feasibility study for the green bridge is being undertaken. Detail are provided in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-54 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.5 Paragraph 7.5.1 - Where there is no funding for the multi-functional bridge, what is the alternative option to mitigate the impacts this bridge will be addressing? | The scheme is not causing any severance of habitat between the land parcels on either side of the A3 and M25. Therefore, the green bridge(s) are considered non-essential mitigation and a feasibility study has been funded under a separate funding programme. A detailed compensation package has been designed with stakeholders and is described in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-55 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.6 - Agree with Valuation of resources. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-56 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.6.10 - No mention of potential water pollution as an indirect impact or lighting (if there is any) if not I think this needs to be stated. | Noted - please see Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-57 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.6.26 - This should be included in potential compensation and mitigation section above. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-58 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / Section 7.6.27 - Agree with significant effects. In table 7.8 under ancient woodland no | A detailed compensation package has been designed with stakeholders and is described in Chapter 7 of the Environmental | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|---|------------------------|
| | mention is made to replanting 10 to 1. | Statement. This does not refer to ratios. | |
| GBCA-E-59 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: Chapter 7 Biodiversity / section 7.4 - Chapter 7 Biodiversity / section 7.4 - There is no survey constraints or limitation section, (noted this is in the appendix, it should be in the main report). | Detail provided in Environmental Statement, please see Chapter 7. | No |
| GBCA-E-60 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 River Corridor Surveys - This does not give the methodology used and what guidelines were followed. It is pretty much the same text as in the main PEIR. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-61 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.7 - This paragraph is vague, no details given about which surveys have been undertaken and which surveys will be continuing. | Noted, please refer to the Environmental Statement Chapter 8 for the detail. | No |
| GBCA-E-62 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.8 - When is the Preliminary Design Stage? | Detail of the scheme programme provided in Environmental Statement, Chapter 2. | No |
| GBCA-E-63 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.9 - No NVC methodology given, or what guidelines were followed, just states that an NVC surveys was undertaken in August 2016. There is no reference to NVC surveys in the main document. | Noted, please refer to the Environmental Statement Chapter 8 and Appendix 7.5 for the detail. | No |
| GBCA-E-64 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.10 - Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.10 | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-65 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.14 - The methodology is very light. Some of this text should be in the main document. | Noted. Methodology and results are to be kept in appendices to manage the size of Chapter 7. | No |
| GBCA-E-66 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.16 - No mention of what guidance was used for crossing point surveys. These surveys are not mentioned in the main report. | Noted. See appendix 7.6 for details. | No |
| GBCA-E-67 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.19 - This is the same text as in the main document. No mention | Noted. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|------------------------|
| | of guidance followed. | | |
| GBCA-E-68 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.21 - Reference to the Figure should be in the main document. The figure stated is incorrect it should be figure 7.4 not 7.5. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-69 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.22 - There is mention of HSI surveys being undertaken but no details of methodology. This section should just state methodology and not details like how many ponds were subject to a survey. This is included in the main report. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-70 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.27 - This paragraph does not need to be in the appendix, it should only be in the main report. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-71 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.29 - Methodology light, should state methodology instead of stating refer to good practice guidelines. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-72 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.30 - This text should be in the main report. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-73 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.31 - This text should be in the main report. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-74 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.32 - This text should be in the main report. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-75 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.33 - This text should be removed from the appendix and only included in the main report. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-76 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.34 - This text should be removed from the appendix and only included in the main report. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-77 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph | Methodology described in Appendix 7.10. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| | C.3.35 - Methodology light, should state methodology instead of stating refer to good practice guidelines. Was a different methodology used for sand lizard surveys? | | |
| GBCA-E-78 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.36 - This text should be in the main report. | Detail provided in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-79 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.38 and C.3.39 - No methodology given or what guidelines were followed. This is the same text as in the main report. | Detail provided in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-80 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.40 - No methodology given or what guidelines were followed. This is the same text as in the main report. | Detail provided in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement | No |
| GBCA-E-81 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.41 Bird Surveys - Text is much the same as the text in the main report, no details given of what methodology or guidelines were followed. | Detail provided in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement and appendix 7.13. | No |
| GBCA-E-82 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.47 invert surveys - Much of the text is the same as in the main report and should be in the main report, not the appendix. Does not state what guidelines were followed. | In the Environmental Statement, invert survey methodology and results are covered in Appendix 7.14. | No |
| GBCA-E-83 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix C / Section C.3 paragraph C.3.59 invert surveys - Limitations should be in the main report. | In the Environmental Statement, invert survey methodology, results and limitations are covered in Appendix 7.14. | No |
| GBCA-E-84 | PEIR Volume 3 Figures: Figure 7.1 Phase 1 Habitat Survey - No target notes on the Phase 1 Habitat map. It's not clear what the survey buffer is. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-85 | PEIR Volume 3 Figures: Figure 7.2 Bat Species Survey - Area excluded from night surveys -PSE area, what is PSE? Bat numbers are confusing. Seems to be a random transect in the South-east Quadrant with no information. No information on crossing point surveys or where statics are located. | Detail provided in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement and appendix 7.6. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|---|------------------------|
| GBCA-E-86 | PEIR Volume 3 Figures: Figure 7.4 Great Crested Newt Survey - There is no key for the ponds or ditches in black text. Pond numbers should be referenced in the report. | Detail provided in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBCA-E-87 | PEIR Volume 3 Figures: Figure 7.7 Breeding Bird Survey - This map does not tell you much, where were notable species found, the abundance or the species richness? | Detail provided in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement and appendix 7.13. | No |
| GBCA-E-88 | PEIR Volume 3 Figures: Figure 7.8 Invertebrate Survey - Little detail given, were no surveys carried out in the south-east quarter? | Detail provided in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement and appendix 7.14. | No |
| GBCA-E-89 | PEIR Volume 3 Figures: Figure 2.2 Environmental Constraints Plan - There is no reference to SACs or conservation areas in the Key. It is not clear if they are on the map. | Not on the map. | No |
| GBCA-E-90 | PEIR Volume 3 Figures: Figures in general - All the figures need to have the quadrat sections labelled. Just very basic information given. | Noted. | No |
| GBCA-E-91 | PEIR Volume 3 Figures: Figure 9.8 Preliminary Environmental Design - The view point should be marked on a map, showing which direction they were taken. | Noted - any further updates to the figures will incorporate a different icon. | No |
| GBCA-E-92 | PEIR Volume 3 Figures: 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment / Part 1 - Road Drainage and Water environment figures have not been used/developed. Flood Zones are however presented in the "Project Figures" section. There are other open source flood and water data that have not been provided - i.e. EA extent and depth maps for surface water and reservoir flood risk https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map?eastings=507936&northing=160776&address=100062356869 . | Surrey County Council is the primary authority with regards to this issue and as such this comment has been agreed with Guildford Borough Council to be closed. | No |
| GBCA-E-93 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment - The EA online long term flood risk maps indicate that Bolder Mere is classed as a Reservoir and parts of site (existing A3 carriageway) and proposed works are at risk of flooding if this | Surrey County Council is the primary authority with regards to this issue and as such this comment has been agreed with Guildford Borough Council to be closed. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| | dam/reservoir were to fail. The EA (regulator for Reservoirs under the Reservoir Act 1975) should be contacted to ascertain the status of Bolder Mere, and their advice sought on the scope for the assessment for proposed ES. | | |
| GBCA-E-94 | PEIR Volume 1 Main Text: 8. Road Drainage and the Water Environment - It is observed that a number of the suggestions provided by the EA in the Scoping Opinion (Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State) in relation to the format of the Road Drainage and Water Environment chapter have not been taken forward in the PEIR. | Surrey County Council is the primary authority with regards to this issue and as such this comment has been agreed with Guildford Borough Council to be closed. | No |
| GBCA-E-95 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix D2.1 to D2.5 - Clarify that the "Surface water" methodology presented in these sections refers to the proposed assessment of surface water quality not flood risk or WFD. | Surrey County Council is the primary authority with regards to this issue and as such this comment has been agreed with Guildford Borough Council to be closed. | No |
| GBCA-E-96 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix D2.6 - Clarify that the "Groundwater" methodology presented in these sections refers to the proposed assessment of ground water quality not flood risk or WFD. Specialist to confirm approach proposed is suitable? Will this be covered in Chapter 10? | The Environment Agency is the primary authority with regards to this issue and as such this comment has been agreed with Guildford Borough Council to be closed. | No |
| GBCA-E-97 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix D2.7 - The FRA will need to be informed by a range of inputs, such as bridge designs, highway designs etc. not just the drainage design. The FRA can also be used to inform the designs. | Noted – the development of the Flood Risk Assessment was an iterative process with the design. | No |
| GBCA-E-98 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix D2.10 - "The scoping WFD assessment suggests that the Scheme would be compliant with the requirements of the WFD" doesn't match with the conclusion of D3 (Figure D.3, page 77 and Figure D.4, page 79) which indicates that the mitigation is required to avoid adverse widespread/prolonged effects and/or minor/localised adverse effects are likely. | The Environment Agency is the primary authority with regards to this issue and as such this comment has been agreed with Guildford Borough Council to be closed. | No |
| GBCA-E-99 | PEIR Volume 2 Appendices: Appendix D2.11 - The methodology for | Noted. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|--|------------------------|
| | WFD assessment appears in line with expected best practice for this type and scale of project. | | |
| GBC-E-1 | State they responded to the stakeholder consultation on the Draft Environmental Scoping Report (13 December 2017 – 11 January 2018). | Noted. | No |
| GBC-E-10 | Referencing road drainage, geology and soils, materials and waste: the Council supports the representations made by Surrey County Council. The Council would also express dissatisfaction that the PINS Scoping Opinion recommendations and the Council comments on the ES Scoping report have not been addressed by Highways England in the PEIR. | Support for Surrey County Council noted. Comments on the Scoping Opinion have been addressed in the Environmental statement (Chapters 8, 10 and 12). | No |
| GBC-E-11 | In terms of heritage, there is a lack of detail on the heritage significance of the assets identified in relation to the potential impacts of the scheme. The Council would expect to see a more detailed summary of the heritage significance of these assets in relation to the potential impacts of the scheme. | Noted – Statements of Significance are included in the Environmental Statement (Chapter 11). | No |
| GBC-E-12 | Highways England's Carbon Calculation Tool should be used for the final carbon footprint to be reported in the Environmental Statement. Using this methodology for assessment will allow the DCO scheme to be compared with other Highways England Schemes. The Council requests Highways England's Carbon Calculation Tool is used in the Assessment and report in the Environmental Statement. | Noted. The Highways England Carbon Calculation Tool has been used for final reporting in the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBC-E-13 | The PEIR details potential mitigation measures within each topic chapter. However, the report does not consider any environmental enhancement measures (measures that go above and beyond mitigation). The Council considers compensatory measures should be considered throughout the preliminary design of the Scheme due to the sensitive nature of the environment in this location. This is in line with The Surrey Transport Plan Strategic Environmental Assessment which recommends that 'new transport related developments and all maintenance works be designed and delivered | The scheme will include enhancement measures and we will liaise with GBC to develop these as the scheme progresses. Please see the Environmental Statement for detail. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| | in ways that minimise any risks of adverse impacts on landscape, townscape and the visual character of the areas affected, and maximise the opportunities for improvement and enhancement.' GBC requests meetings to begin this process asap with other affected authorities. | | |
| GBC-E-14 | State that the online materials omitted Vol 3 figures of the PEIR on the day consultation launched. Note that this was rectified | Noted. | No |
| GBC-E-15 | The Council is dissatisfied that Highways England did not take its comments on the Environmental Scoping Report, incorporated into the PINS Scoping Opinion, into account in the production of the PEIR. The Council invested significant resources in responding and the majority of comments made remain outstanding. | Comments on the Scoping Report have been fed into the preparation of the Environmental Statement. There is not a strict requirement for comments to be included in the PEIR and the programme for project did not allow sufficient time for comments to be included. | No |
| GBC-E-16 | State they will be responding to be responding to the Environmental Statement / Environmental Impact Report and Transport Assessment as well as scoping work and preparation of Local Impact Report(s) and Statement of Common Ground (SOCG). | Noted. | No |
| GBC-E-2 | State they made a significant number of comments on the Draft Environmental Scoping Report in response to the consultation undertaken by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS). The Scoping Opinion issued by PINS and the Council's commentary on the Draft Environmental Scoping Report is available on the PINS website ¹ . | Noted. | No |
| GBC-E-3 | State they have consultant Mott MacDonald who has undertaken a technical review of the PEIR on behalf of the Council. | Noted. | No |
| GBC-E-4 | The Council is concerned about the land take that is required for the scheme, especially as Common Land, Access Land and SPA and SSSI land is required. The Council would like to be reassured that the replacement land is of a similar quality as that taken. The Council requests that details of the quality and features of the land taken versus the replacement land offered to be detailed in the Environmental Statement (ES). | Replacement land will be provided as part of the scheme and has been chosen to offer similar characteristics as that taken. Full detail of the replacement land and its condition is provided in the Environmental Statement (Chapter 8). | Yes |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|---|------------------------|
| GBC-E-5 | The loss of SPA land is a concern for the Council. Paragraph 2.3.8 of the PEIR does not mention the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA). The HRA and the need to potentially move to IROPI is a big risk, which is not drawn out particularly clearly in the PEIR and must be adequately covered by the ES and HRA. The conclusions state that mitigation and compensation measures necessary to reduce significance are yet to be finalised but these must be agreed and included by the time of DCO submission. | Concern noted and a Habitats Regulations Assessment including the 'Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest' (IROPI) case have been prepared to support the DCO application along with the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBC-E-6 | Until the Council and Surrey County Council as the Local Highway Authority is able to review and be satisfied as to the traffic impacts we are unable to agree or make substantive comment on the air quality and noise impacts of the scheme. | Noted -the noise and air quality effects are reported in Chapters 5 & 6 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| GBC-E-7 | the Council is concerned about construction traffic, noise and dust. The construction impacts, and in particular the impact for Ripley and RHS Garden Wisley need to be made clear in the Environmental Statement and the Construction management Plan. | Construction effects are reported in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement and an outline Construction Environmental Management Plan has been prepared to support the DCO application. | No |
| GBC-E-8 | There is a lack of consistency on the level of detail provided on people and communities in the PEIR. The Council requests that the impacts on people and communities and the mitigation proposed is clearly set out in the Environmental Statement. | Comment noted - effects on People and Communities is set out in full in the Environmental Statement in Chapter 13, including proposed mitigation. | No |
| GBC-E-9 | The Council request that details on the surveys undertaken for biodiversity is provided in order to consider the methodology and validity of the assessments undertaken. Details on the surveys undertaken should be included in the Environmental Statement. | Details of surveys are included in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement and associated appendices. | No |
| HE-E-1 | State they have considered the PEIR in terms of their response. | Noted. | No |
| HE-E-10 | Interested in how quiet road surfaces and acoustic barriers might lessen noise and how proposed works might change the character of the existing interface between the A3 and RHS Wisley. | This is detailed in the Environmental Statement, Chapter 6. | No |
| HE-E-11 | Want to be satisfied that traffic movements will not have an adverse | The changes in traffic levels and their effect on heritage assets are | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|--|------------------------|
| | impact upon nearby settlements where these are conservation areas, contain listed buildings or both. For example Ripley is a conservation area and although it has origins as a settlement on the old A3 we will be interested as to whether through traffic there will be increased and what the effect on historic environment significance might then be. | reported in the Environmental Statement, Chapter 11. | |
| HE-E-12 | State the bell barrow is a very impressive example of its type. | Noted. | No |
| HE-E-13 | Acknowledge that is not directly impacted by the proposals but parts of the enlarged J10 would be closer to it and this raises issues for its setting, both visually and for noise. There is very clear noise intrusion at present and we suggest that baseline noise data at the designated heritage asset should be obtained now so that the effects of the proposed changes can be demonstrated. The aim should be to reduce harm from such issues. | Comment noted, noise baseline surveys in the commons have been carried out and it is our intention to reduce the adverse effects of noise and visual impact on the monument. | No |
| HE-E-14 | Suggestion: Between the barrow and the existing road are undulating mounds with some tree cover. The preliminary design (landscaping plan - fig 9.8 sheet 3/10) shows new tree cover along this edge and this could be an appropriate way of dealing with this boundary, perhaps by first understanding and then enhancing the earthworks that are now present. Vehicles are visible from the barrow, but more as glimpses through the trees, and we think that any proposal for a fence or solid boundary/noise screen could be intrusive and might increase harm by blocking the wider views from and of the context of the barrow. Low bunding and tree planting could be most effective. | Comment noted, and suggestions have fed into the design of the mitigation for the scheme. | No |
| He-E-15 | Note that Solutions as to how best to limit harm to the significance of the scheduled barrow will need to be based on an enhanced understanding of the potential for other archaeological remains in its surrounds, be these visible as earthworks or buried. | Noted. | No |
| HE-E-16 | Understand that walk-over surveys and use of LIDAR data has taken place and we would be pleased to see reporting of this, probably as a desk-based report. We think that some intrusive investigations may | The findings of environmental and other surveys are included in the Environmental Statement and intrusive investigations were carried | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|---|------------------------|
| | be needed in order to evaluate the archaeological potential of the land in which new road construction or mitigation measures will take place. We would be pleased to discuss the probable need for trial trenching and the timing of this i.e. before or after a DCO application. The aim should be to understand the potential for nationally important but undesignated archaeological remains associated with the barrow site since the presumption should be that such evidence is preserved in situ. Investigation to provide a record of significance would be a less good outcome. | out as part of the development of the scheme. | |
| HE-E-17 | Agree that the bell barrow would be less affected by the proposals but bringing the road closer could erode some of its wider setting. | Noted. | No |
| HE-E-18 | Suggest that mitigation for any harm to both scheduled monuments would be sensible to agree and implement improved management of the barrows as a pair. This would be a heritage benefit which could include the research potential in better understanding the significance of the archaeological remains and interpreting this to visitors. | Noted, we have liaised with Historic England to develop mitigation for the barrows and other features affected by the Scheme. | No |
| HE-E-19 | State that the condition of the bath house monument requires improvement. | Noted. | No |
| HE-E-2 | State that pre- DCO application engagement will be subject to cost recovery by Historic England and to this end we have agreed a cost estimate under our Extended Pre-Application service (see www.HistoricEngland.org.uk/EAS). | Noted. | No |
| HE-E-20 | Site visits from public land mean they have not been able to gain a full understanding of their present character and condition of both the roman bath house and the hengiform monument. Suggest a joint site visit at an early stage of the EIA process. | We would be happy to have a joint site visit with Historic England to look at all the historic features affected. | No |
| HE-E-21 | concerned for the future of the Roman bath house which is included on Register of Heritage at Risk as being in a declining condition - concerns for the potential of works to cause harm to any as yet | The proposals are not expected to affect the Roman bath house, but we will liaise with Historic England to explore ways of preserving this asset. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| | unrecognised but potentially nationally important archaeological remains and for the setting of the scheduled bathhouse. | | |
| HE-E-22 | Similar concerns exist for the hengiform monument as for the bathhouse. Both are scheduled monuments and a heritage benefit to mitigate harm would be to improve the management of these (and therefore their risk status) and to learn more about their significance through research into their contexts. | We will work with Historic England to develop management proposals and learn more about their significance. | No |
| HE-E-23 | think that of all the proposed road improvements those at Painshill Park are potentially the most harmful to the historic environment. This is a designated heritage asset of the highest significance. We do not accept the above assessment (of moderate adverse) of the levels of harm and we wish to understand more about the detail of the proposals, including whether less harmful solutions are possible. | Comments noted, and we have developed proposals that will substantially reduce the effect on Painshill Park. | Yes |
| HE-E-24 | They would like to see the Statements of Significance prepared for the historic landscape as a whole and also that specific for the Gothic Tower to understand how the contribution of the existing landscape character and the setting around the tower to historic significance has been assessed. | A statement of Significance for the Gothic Tower has been produced and is included in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement. The design has been altered to reduce impact. | Yes |
| HE-E-25 | They consider that the immediate surrounds of the Gothic Tower II* listed building are important (not just views from it). | Noted. Design has been altered to reduce impacts. | Yes |
| HE-E-26 | They have a strong concern for the setting of the Gothic Tower (II*) under the proposed new over bridge adjacent to it and we want to start discussion of the detailed design for this so that we might come to a view about the level of harm that this would cause. We need as part of this to understand why less harmful solutions, such as a crossing at the San Domenico site have not been adopted. The setting of the tower is at present badly marred by the proximity of electricity pylons and one way to mitigate other harm to be caused to the heritage assets would be to address this harm. | Comments noted, and we have developed proposals that will substantially reduce the effect on Painshill Park and the Gothic Tower in particular. | Yes |
| HE-E-27 | Acknowledge that undergrounding of power supplies is an expensive | Noted but this will not be possible with the scheme. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|--|------------------------|
| | task but even a short length of this nearest the tower would be beneficial. | | |
| HE-E-28 | Want to discuss what the project might be able to deliver including by making use of other environmental improvement funds. | Noted - discussions have been ongoing with regards to alternative funding sources and opportunities. | No |
| HE-E-29 | In terms of the northern boundary of Painshill Park - want to understand both how much land would need to be taken from the heritage asset and how a new boundary would be formed with the remaining historic park. The contribution that the land currently makes to the significance of the designated heritage asset needs to be understood and this includes important structures close to this northern boundary. The Turkish Tent and the Temple of Bacchus are not designated heritage assets as they are recent recreations of lost features, but these are nevertheless contributors to the significance of the landscape and locations designed for a specific visitor experience, | Noted. Amendments to the design have reduced impact on the Park | Yes |
| HE-E-3 | State they think that the PEIR is mostly a description of the baseline heritage data and a statement of the methodology that will be followed under Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to produce the Environmental Statement. | Noted, full details of the assessment are included in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| HE-E-30 | Want to understand the detailed design of a new northern boundary of the park with the widened A3 and/or new access roads. This should include the loss of any trees to road widening and any consequent replacement tree planting to provide screening. Tree removal could threaten the future of other existing trees by changing their environment and with this any vulnerability to wind damage. | Noted. Amendments to the design have reduced impact on the Park. | Yes |
| HE-E-31 | Want to see details of any proposed acoustic barriers - think that noise is a significant issue for the park and we think that baseline data should be obtained for the heritage asset now so that future effects can be demonstrated. The aim should be that existing noise levels are reduced, including by mitigation measures such as quiet | Noise is an important issue and the A3 will include a low noise surface. We have considered the use of noise barriers where the scheme has a noticeable effect on noise and barriers would be effective in reducing noise. Noise is addressed in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| | road surfaces. | | |
| HE-E-32 | State For the record they confirm their understanding that the II* Painshill Park House and its associated grade II buildings do not appear to be harmed by the proposals. | Noted. Scheme amendments have reduced impact on the Park. | Yes |
| HE-E-33 | Concerns that plans show areas immediately south of the Roman site would be planted with interspersed woodland glades with only some grassland between and that this would be as part of enhanced public access land. HE believe this could be detrimental to the current setting of the bathhouse by creating a more enclosed landscape under which it would be more difficult to appreciate its unique location in the landscape adjacent to the river. Although there is no public access at present the monument is part of a well-established and generally well-managed agricultural landscape. Any change to this landscape character will require careful consideration and for land affected by mitigation proposals for non-historic environment reasons (such as public access or habitat recreation) its archaeological potential will need to be demonstrated. Work to do this should first consider LIDAR data and geophysical survey techniques but we do not rule out the potential need for trial trenching to address these issues. | We will liaise with Historic England in developing proposals in this area to avoid detrimental effects on the Roman bath house. | No |
| HE-E-4 | State they are not yet in a position to agree that the assessment of effects made in tables 11.1 and 11.2 of the PEIR are correct or that they should be carried through unaltered to the Environmental Statement - they request more information and discussion. | Noted, further detail is included in the Environmental Statement. | No |
| HE-E-5 | Disagree with how we have graded listed building - suggest our approach is unhelpful and that the degree of legal protection for a listed building is no different between the grades therefore all listed buildings should start from the base of high value, as being nationally designated. If a distinction is needed between grade II and grades II* and I, then the latter could be elevated to very high value. | The disagreement over the assessments of listed buildings has been resolved through clarifications in the ES to differentiate the assessment of the value of listed buildings in terms of statutory heritage protections (all buildings on the list are considered to be of high value in terms of the need for statutory protection) and the value of listed buildings for the determination of environmental impacts (wherein Grade II listed buildings hold a lower value). | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|------------------------|
| | | This will be addressed in the Statement of Common Ground being prepared as part of the DCO submission. | |
| HE-E-6 | Think we put too much emphasis views to and from heritage assets (in terms of setting) and thus too little attention is paid to other ways in which a place can be experienced. Provide us with their guidance note for this. | This has been addressed in the ES through the statements of significance and further assessments of setting, relating to how the surroundings of an asset contribute to their significance. This will be addressed in the Statement of Common Ground being prepared as part of the DCO submission. | No |
| HE-E-7 | Want more detail on the design of construction within RHS Wisley at the NE corner where the existing footbridge will be rebuilt as a road bridge - want to consider this before we can agree what the effect on the significance of the heritage asset will be. Want to consider our statement of significance. | Full details of the scheme are provided along with the Statement of Significance in the Environmental Statement, Chapter 9. | No |
| HE-E-8 | Wish to know more about any signage (including gantries) and lighting on the A3 and whether these are visible from within the registered landscape at RHS Wisley. | Details of lighting and signage are included in the Scheme drawings and their visual impact on RHS Wisley is reported in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| HE-E-9 | State The experience of people at RHS Wisley, be these visitors or staff employed there, is part of how its significance is appreciated. We will wish to understand how noise levels will be affected by the proposals and we suggest that data should be obtained for the designated heritage asset. The aim should be to achieve an improvement over the existing situation and certainly not to make matters any worse | A full noise assessment has been undertaken to understand the effect of the scheme and identify any necessary mitigation. This is reported in the Environmental Statement, Chapter 6. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|------------------------|
| PHE-E-1 | We recognise that the PEIR has been produced as part of ongoing Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process and have considered the submitted documentation with reference to the recommendations provided in our scoping response. | Noted. | No |
| PHE-E-2 | The proposed methodology is in line with current guidance and good practice. We would look forward to seeing the detailed quantitative and cumulative assessments proposed. | Noted. | No |
| PHE-E-3 | They understand that a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (or similar plan) will be prepared, it is expected that this will include suitable measures for assessment, management and control of potential emissions. We would strongly recommend that the promoter circulates a draft of the proposed CEMP at the earliest opportunity to allow interested parties to comment prior to the submission of the application for a DCO. | Noted - we will discuss the Construction Environmental Management Plan with interested parties where appropriate. | No |
| PHE-E-4 | The current submission (S42 public consultation) does not include a comprehensive traffic assessment. The assessment of transport and vehicle movements is essential for the full consideration of transport related air quality and potential public health impacts associated with both the construction and operational phases this project. It is also unclear if any evaluation is to be undertaken once the scheme is operational. | A traffic assessment is provided as part of the DCO application and forms the basis of noise and air quality assessments. Please see Chapters 5 and 6 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| PHE-E-5 | It was understood from the previous scoping consultation that a separate Health Impact Assessment (HIA) would be produced. It is assumed that this will still be the case and that it will summarise key information, environmental risk assessments, proposed mitigation measures, conclusions and residual impacts, relating to human health. Compliance with the requirements of National Policy Statements (NPS) and relevant guidance and standards should also be highlighted. We also recommend that the proposer engages with the Local Authority Public Health teams to ensure that the local perspective on public health is fully addressed. | Health impacts are reported as part of the Environmental Statement (Chapter 14) and this is based on information from Local Public Health Authorities. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|--|------------------------|
| PHE-E-6 | The current documentation makes no reference to EMF emissions from the site. We recommend that the proposer: a. Identify if the proposed development has electricity generation and/or distribution infrastructure that may result in the emission of electric and/or magnetic fields such that there is the potential for an adverse impact on public health. Where electricity generation and/or distribution equipment is identified an assessment of potential EMF exposures should be included. b. Should the proposer believe that EMF can be scoped out of the assessments they should clearly state their assumptions and rationale in the application for DCO submission. | Electromagnetic Field (EMF) radiation has been scoped out and the assumptions and rationale stated in the DCO submission. | No |
| RHA-E-2 | State did not read PEIR. | Noted. | No |
| RHS-E-1 | State the inclusion of south facing slips will lead to reduced and simplified travel and consequent environmental impact. | Noted. As stated by the Road Minister, South facing slips are not part of this scheme requirements or budget. | No |
| RHS-E-2 | The environmental and heritage impacts of the scheme on noise, air quality, and the knock-on effects to the local environment and health of the listed garden and the largely RHS owned village and its occupants. As a nationally important heritage asset in a heavily designated area, we urgently require further information so that we may comment in more detail. | Further detail is provided in the Environmental Statement, please see Chapters 5,6, 13 and 14. | No |
| RHS-E-3 | Say there is a need for proposed mitigation measures against noise, airborne pollution, and light pollution both during the construction phase and permanently. | Noted - the scheme includes all necessary mitigation measures. | No |
| RHS-E-4 | Say there is a need for further examination of the Environmental Information, which has been issued as preliminary at present only. | Further detail is provided in the Environmental Statement. | No |
| RHS-E-5 | the Society remains very deeply concerned on the impact to the garden and surrounding area and users if the Scheme remains as described in the Statutory Consultation Brochure. | The effects on the garden and the surrounding area have been minimised as far as possible. The scheme has undergone further development to reduce adverse effects. | Yes |
| RHS-E-6 | Say that Ownership, Land Designation and Access rights in relation | Noted. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| | to the original M25 construction 30 years ago, and the current Junction 10 proposals, to be resolved as part of the scheme. We are seeking accurate drawings showing the extent of all land take (not just at the Wisley Lane entrance to the RHS but also any other land take of RHS land as may be required by the Scheme including Wisley Village land); proposed uses and access arrangements that will clarify the confusion that exists at present. | | |
| RHS-E-7 | Want more information on Compensation arrangements for all RHS landholdings both to be taken and which may be adversely affected as a result of the Scheme. | Highways England will liaise with land owners directly. | No |
| SCC-E-1 | The Council has consulted with the Cabinet Members from Transport and the Environment. | Noted. | No |
| SCC-E-10 | The Council asserts that there appears to be an over reliance on trees to provide screening. The council is concerned that some of these trees may need to be removed at some stage for conservation reasons as the areas ecological importance is for open heathland. There is also concern that cutting swathes into plantations during the works and exposing trees that were previously protected will make these more susceptible to wind throw and create additional maintenance liabilities for SCC. | The scheme includes a comprehensive series of environmental proposals that will maintain screening and enhance the heathland. The proposals been discussed with relevant bodies to gain agreement as far as possible. The effects of windthrow on newly exposed trees are considered and managed in the scheme. | No |
| SCC-E-11 | In relation to replacement land the council understands that HE is looking at a ratio of 3:1. The council reiterates that in view of the potential impacts on different designations, the exchange land needs to be carefully considered. Exchange common land may not be suitable to act as well as exchange land for the SPA/ SSSI for example. | The scheme includes a comprehensive package of replacement and compensation land. The replacement common land/public open space will be managed to provide conditions that would make it suitable as Special Protection Areas (SPA)/Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) as well as for recreation although it may not be designated as SPA/SSSI initially. The ratios of replacement land and SPA compensation have been developed from precedent and discussions with stakeholders. | No |
| SCC-E-12 | The council states that the land to be lost has a high nature conservation value that cannot be compensated by supplying a like for like land area unless the exchange land has a similar nature | The scheme includes replacement/compensation land that either is of equivalent value to that lost or which has the potential to be. The scheme includes all necessary works to make the land parcels | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|------------------------|
| | conservation value. If this cannot be found, a mechanism for bringing any exchange land up to the required standard will be required. It will be important to understand the amount and location of temporary land take needed during the construction of the project | acquired capable of achieving the same standard as those lost. Surveys and investigations will take place to understand conditions at the sites lost and those replacing or compensating for them. Accurate measurements of the land lost will be taken to support this. | |
| SCC-E-13 | The council has many interests in the landscape of the area affected by the scheme - the area is identified as sandy woodland and softens the impact of two major roads cutting through this woody heathland area. They expect to see this character maintained in the landscape work. Additionally, the scheme impacts on two significant gardens and parts are contained in the SPA. The council will need to see the outline landscape scheme and be involved in the detailed design to reduce impact on these key features. | We understand and appreciate the landscape context of the scheme including the two gardens and are doing everything we can to minimise the effect of the scheme and maintain the character of the area. We would be happy to share the landscape scheme with the council at preliminary and detailed design stages and involve them in the development of proposals. Proposals at Painshill Park have been altered to reduce land take impacts accordingly. | Yes |
| SCC-E-14 | The council asserts the scheme will result in some minor incursion into the Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) that extend across the former Wisley Airfield and Ockham Park, to the south-east of J10 of the M25, and the one that extends across Wisley and Pyrford to the west of the A3. The effect on MSAs should be addressed as part of the planning submission | The Mineral Safeguarding Areas are assessed in the Geology and Soils chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement and in Chapter 5 of the Planning Statement. The project has also consulted with appropriate statutory bodies regarding our impact to Mineral Safeguarding Areas. | No |
| SCC-E-15 | The Waste Planning Authority will not be taking forward the site allocated in the 2008 Surrey Waste Plan as a potential site for the development of aggregates recycling. The WPA consider it unlikely to receive a waste related development due to the site being allocated in Guildford Borough's Submission Local Plan for a new settlement. | Noted. | No |
| SCC-E-16 | The WPA encourage sustainable construction techniques to maximise recycling of Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste that the project generates - the developer may want to consider the SWP allocated site. | Noted. | No |
| SCC-E-17 | The council asserts that they are unable to agree with the proposed | Noted and we will continue dialogue with the council to demonstrate | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| | approach to mitigating the potential adverse environmental impacts of the proposed scheme as it is difficult to assess the adequacy of the mitigation measures when the impacts have not been fully assessed - they ask to be provided with this information. They also ask that as part of the mitigation hierarchy that compensation measures also need to be considered along with the need to identify biodiversity gains. | the effects of the scheme and the mitigation and compensation measures proposed. We are anticipating that there will be biodiversity gains with the scheme. | |
| SCC-E-18 | In light of the likely impacts identified in para 7.7.2 of the PEIR main text. The council questions whether there is currently sufficient extent for mitigation and compensation together with land to achieve them. They also question mitigation being put forward and then caveated to 'subject to available funding' - they say mitigation being subject to a cost caveat is inappropriate at this stage and that needs for mitigation is driven by the impacts of the scheme. | The scheme includes all land necessary for mitigation and compensation with these having been discussed and agreed with the relevant statutory environmental bodies. The mitigation and compensation is driven by the impacts of the scheme and is included where necessary. | No |
| SCC-E-19 | The council asks that air quality and noise impacts/ mitigation are addressed in consultation with Elmbridge, Guildford and Woking borough councils. | We will liaise with local authorities as we develop the assessment and mitigation proposals. | No |
| SCC-E-2 | The Council are aware that NMU routes may impact SCC countryside estate and designated nature conservation sites - these impacts need to be quantified and mitigated. | These are covered in Chapters 7 and 13 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| SCC-E-20 | The Council asks that we provide them with the 'Link and Nodes Traffic Diagram' requested under para A1.4 to clearly demonstrate how the changes in traffic flows impact on air quality and noise and suitable mitigation be provided. | This information is included in the Environmental Statement, Chapters 5 and 6. | No |
| SCC-E-21 | The Council acknowledges that the PEIR's approach is to avoid direct impact to designated heritage assets if possible but they go on to say that where impact is unavoidable then a full assessment of the significance of an asset whether designated or not is required in order to make informed decisions regarding appropriate mitigation. | Statements of Significance have been produced and provided where required. | No |
| SCC-E-22 | The council state they are satisfied that the baseline work done so far | Noted. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| | when combined with the proposed further evaluation and survey work will enable informed decisions to be made regarding the nature of the cultural heritage resource and enable appropriate mitigation to be put in place. | | |
| SCC-E-23 | The council welcomes the PEIR stating the design seeks to avoid heritage assets where possible and minimises land take where unavoidable - they continue that mitigation measures proposed seem appropriate although they acknowledge that these need further development following detailed investigations. They state that it will be for HE (note: I assume Historic England and NOT Highways England) to advise on measures that directly impact upon scheduled monuments, Grade 1 Parks and Gardens or listed buildings. | Noted - we have liaised and consulted with Historic England to develop the assessment of impacts and mitigation measures where appropriate. See Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| SCC-E-24 | The council recommends that in the PEIR that sources of the desktop information are cited: National Biodiversity Network, MAGIC or Surrey Biodiversity Information Centre etc. | Noted. | No |
| SCC-E-25 | The council asserts that is unclear in the PEIR whether the potential exchange land has been or will be subject to ecological surveys - this is necessary to ensure no habitats or species are adversely harmed and that exchange land can function in the way it is proposed. | Noted - this has been clear in the Environmental Statement (see Chapter 7). The exchange land will be surveyed for trees with potential bat roost features and for badgers. The enhancement works will ensure that all trees with bat roost potential area retained, and all badger setts are avoided. Enhancement works will be undertaken under a Precautionary Method of Working to ensure that protected species that may be present are not harmed. | No |
| SCC-E-26 | the council asserts that there is a lack of clarity in the PEIR when referring to the impacts of the scheme across different areas. E.g. Ecological Zone of Influence versus 'footprint of the scheme' -the latter should be defined. Does it include all the side roads, rights of way diversions, temporary land take for construction etc. | The 'footprint of the scheme' is detailed in the Environmental Statement and this includes all works needed for the scheme. | No |
| SCC-E-27 | Council asserts that in Chapter 12 (minerals and waste) of the PEIR, no reference is made in the sections on baseline information to a number of publications that the council produce and that are relevant, including the Annual Monitoring Reports, the Local Aggregate | These are referenced in the Environmental Statement, see Chapter 12. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| | Assessments, and the South East Aggregates Monitoring Report - all of which can be accessed on the SCC website | | |
| SCC-E-28 | Council says that in respect of predicted future waste infrastructure capacity, there are a number of references in PEIR to SCC's stated intent to calculate future need for construction, demolition and excavation waste management capacity. This work has been done and the report is on the SCC website | Noted and the information is included in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| SCC-E-29 | The Council asks that Highways England clarifies the mechanism by which matters associated with mitigation will be written into the DCO and/or planning requirements and obligations. | The mitigation is shown on the DCO plans, included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments and is set out in the Requirements for the project. | No |
| SCC-E-3 | The Council welcome working with HE to help achieve NMU routes that connect appropriately to the PROW network and connect to walking and cycling routes beyond the scheme. The scheme provides an opportunity to undo and mitigate fragmentation issues caused by the existing A3/M25 on the cycling and PROW network, create opportunities for sustainable travel links, create opportunities for recreational use recognising environmental impact, and make a circular 'family' recreational cycle friendly route around the common that links RHS Wisley, Byfleet, Cobham, Wisley and Ripley. | <p>Comment noted - we have worked with Surrey County Council to develop proposals for Non Motorised User routes.</p> <p>The proposals will result in a clear step-change improvement to the provision for Non Motorised Users, improving existing journeys considerably, and making new ones possible e.g. via new bridges and controlled crossings.</p> | Yes |
| SCC-E-30 | The council asks Highways England to confirm the nature and timetable for the remaining stages and documentation in relation to the scheme i.e. SoCG, Planning Statement, EIA and the DCO. | The timetable and remaining stages of documentation have been discussed with Surrey County Council to enable them to plan ahead and resource accordingly. | Yes |
| SCC-E-4 | The Council urges HE to continue dialogue with Painshill park in respect of the proposed alternative link road and overbridge arrangement that currently impacts on Painshill Park - they ask HE to consider alternative access arrangements to minimise impacts on Painshill Park and the SCC countryside estate. | Dialogue with Painshill Park Trustees has continued and alternative access proposals have been developed with a junction proposed on Painshill southbound slip road. Redhill overbridge has been redesigned for Non Motorised User access only that minimise impact on Painshill Park. | Yes |
| SCC-E-5 | The Council states that the impact on flood zones, Main River and ordinary water courses will need to be taken into account including mitigation of any current flooding of the strategic and local road | The impacts of the scheme have been considered and consultation has continued with the Environment Agency and Surrey County Council to develop mitigation measures. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|------------------------|
| | network in the vicinity of the proposed scheme. They understand that EA are being consulted which should clarify the position and requirements and they ask to see the mitigation in this respect. | | |
| SCC-E-6 | The council asserts that there will be highway 'wet spots' (locations where flooding occurs in times of local intense rainfall - they list them as: A245 west bound dual carriageway off Painshill roundabout; areas by J10 roundabout; between the A3 and Wisley airfield; by Ockham junction roundabout/ Stratford brook) affected by the scheme. The council (as the lead local flood authority) is concerned about increased run off caused by the scheme and ask that mitigation/ compensation is provided. They say there is a need to regulate the run off from the increase in gross impermeable areas created by the scheme. | Thank you for information on areas of flooding on the carriageway. The scheme includes new mitigation for run off which will mitigate the effects of the increased impermeable area. Please see the Environmental Statement for further detail. | Yes |
| SCC-E-7 | The council states that the scheme as proposed will have a major impact on designated nature conservation sites and compensatory mitigation should be provided. | Noted, the scheme provides appropriate compensation and mitigation proposals. | No |
| SCC-E-8 | The council are concerned about how access will be provided and maintained to Wisley and Ockham Commons both during construction and then following completion; to ensure safe access for cyclists, riders and walkers across the A3/ M25. Access arrangements will need to be communicated | <p>The Scheme includes a comprehensive package of measures to maintain access during construction and operation and enhance these where possible. These will be communicated to Surrey Wildlife Trust and provided to the public at appropriate times.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement Chapter 13 assesses the potential effects on Non Motorised Users and the Commons during Scheme construction and once operational.</p> | No |
| SCC-E-9 | Delivery of NMU routes will have additional impacts on the SSSI, SPA and Common Land - they ask if alternatives have been investigated or mitigation identified. | The Non Motorised User routes have been discussed with Surrey Wildlife Trust to achieve the least damaging layouts which maintain and enhance access for users. | No |
| SWT-E-1 | Comments of the Surrey Wildlife Trust are confined to issues concerning the protection of the natural environment, including the conservation of Surrey's biodiversity. | Noted. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|------------------------|
| SWT-E-10 | The Trust welcomes the scheme's objective to Ensure through good design, that an appropriate balance is achieved between functionality and the Scheme's contribution to the quality of the surrounding environment, addressing existing problems wherever feasible, avoiding, mitigating or compensating for significant adverse impacts and promoting opportunities to deliver positive environmental outcomes. | Noted. | No |
| SWT-E-11 | The Trust has reservations concerning the intention to upgrade the BOAT connecting Old Lane to Elm Lane. We fear this will be mis-used and exacerbate site management and security problems at the Bolder Mere car-park. We would prefer this public right-of-way to be down-graded to the status of bridleway, but should this option be taken forward we recommend that vehicular access is made controllable by Elm Corner residents via a security coded gate or similar. | Reservations noted and the design team will consider the viability of controllable vehicular access in relation to the status of the BOAT as a public right of way. Access to Old Lane via the BOAT is the preferred choice for access of the Elm Corner residents. | No |
| SWT-E-12 | The Trust welcomes the new two-way access road connecting Birchmere Scout Campsite, Hut Hill Cottage and Pond Farm to Old Lane at the Ockham Bites site via a rebuilt Cockrow overbridge. It supports the 'multi-use bridge' to provide habitat connectivity between ecologically valuable land on either side of the A3. | Noted. Funding for a feasibility study for a multi-use bridge as a green bridge has been secured. Note this does not include full design or construction funding. | No |
| SWT-E-13 | The trust welcomes the Reinstatement of Clearmount Bridge across the amended M25 as an accommodation/bridleway bridge. The trust urges that Clearmount Bridge is indeed reinstated with the retrofitted 'green bridge' element. | Funding for a feasibility study for a multi-use bridge as a green bridge has been secured. Note this does not include full design or construction funding. | Yes |
| SWT-E-14 | The trust has serious reservations as Pond Farm being used as replacement land - we have always indicated that this land is essentially unavailable for this purpose. Not only are the fields comprising this area entirely unsuited for replacing lost heathland, they are also used presently for the delivery of one of the key management operations directly involved in securing the favorable status of the wider Thames Basin Heaths SPA (via the Trust's | Pond Farm has now been removed from the land requirements. | Yes |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|--|------------------------|
| | conservation grazing programme). Any change in the current status of this land, including its public accessibility, would significantly compromise this delivery and no compensatory solution has yet been proposed. the Trust maintains strong reservations over the inclusion of Pond Farm as part of the replacement land and is likely to eventually object to this, if no suitable compensation solution can be agreed. | | |
| SWT-E-15 | The trust requires further clarity on the sufficiency of replacement land as they believe there appears to be a significant shortfall in the desirable quantum of replacement land, of potentially over 50%, and even with the inclusion of Pond Farm (using the multiplier ratio of 3:1). | The Surrey Wildlife Trust, Natural England and RSPB have proposed a ratio of 1:1 for compensation land and 3:1 for enhancement areas. The proposals for the compensation package have been agreed with all stakeholders. | Yes |
| SWT-E-16 | we would not condone any diminution of the SPA/SSSI and clearly support its replacement in principle, the Pond Farm fields are, for us, non-negotiable (as replacement land). | Noted and Pond Farm has now been removed from the land take requirements. | Yes |
| SWT-E-17 | In discussing the restoration of land taken temporarily for the duration of the construction phase - The option of returning the land to a different condition would seem to us an ideal opportunity to address some of the shortfall in replacement land to support the optimum desirable Priority habitats for this situation. | Comment noted, and we will work with Surrey Wildlife Trust to develop the proposals for the restoration of land taken temporarily. | No |
| SWT-E-18 | Concerning Public Rights of Way, the Trust would urge caution over any changes to the existing situation as regards NMU access, whereby visitor access would be increased on particularly sensitive areas of Ockham and Wisley Commons. Here it will be important to anticipate the potential large new population using the commons that would arise from the proposed Former Wisley Airfield development. | Concerns over alterations to rights of way noted - the scheme aims to avoid bringing users into the more sensitive areas of the Special Protection Area. Where footpaths are converted to bridleways, surfaces will not be altered or widened, and they will not be specifically signed or promoted as cycle routes. Where footpaths are converted to bridleways, surfaces will not be altered or widened, and they will not be specifically signed or promoted as cycle routes. | No |
| SWT-E-19 | The trust asks whether the DCO boundary encompasses the entire scope of all works associated with the Scheme? They anticipate | The DCO boundary will encompass all of the area required for any works associated with the scheme and have been adjusted to | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| | some further necessary adjustment of the boundary in response to your ongoing consultation with key stakeholders in finalising the Scheme's mitigation and compensation strategy - is this correct? | reflect alterations to the scheme as the design progressed. | |
| SWT-E-2 | The Trust welcomes the widened sections of road being surfaced in a 'low noise surface' which would help reduce noise levels | Noted – all of the widened sections of the A3 will now have a low noise surface. | No |
| SWT-E-20 | The trust asserts that the M25/A3 Junction 10 has only become “..set within a predominantly wooded area” within relatively recent history. This is important to bear in mind when framing the ideal vision for achieving a genuine net biodiversity gain from the Scheme | Noted. | No |
| SWT-E-21 | The trust asserts (in relation to PEIR 3.3.20 - legal and policy) the correct relative legislation is the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. | Noted. | No |
| SWT-E-22 | The trust has made some suggestions to the PEIR text: "In para. 7.4.7 (Habitats); it would be helpful to add the text in red as follows “..The most abundant habitat within the Scheme, immediately surrounding M25 Junction 10 is mixed secondary woodland developed over former heathland, with Scot's pine (Pinus sylvestris), silver birch (Betula pendula) and pedunculate oak (Quercus robur) the most frequent species.” | Suggestions noted. | No |
| SWT-E-23 | The trust believes the list of HPI (PEIR 7.4.11) is clearly derived from the Natural England Priority Habitats Inventory, which could be viewed as somewhat incomplete at least in this part of the country i.e.. Bolder Mere lake is not included here as either a 'Standing open water' or a 'Pond'. The bog on Wisley Common would elsewhere be identified as a 'Lowland fen', at least in part, but this omission is a further inconsistency of the Natural England data-set. | Surrey Wildlife Trust's view on the Natural England Priority Habitats Inventory is noted and has been considered when developing the Environmental Statement for the scheme. | No |
| SWT-E-24 | The trust asserts The list of Water Framework Directive surface waterbodies in para. 7.4.12 (PEIR) inconsistently omits Bolder Mere lake. | Noted – this has been reviewed as the scheme was progressed and the Environmental Statement developed. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| SWT-E-25 | The trust asserts that only one of para. 7.4.16's list of 'notable plants' is actually a SPI (i.e.. Pillwort <i>Pilularia globulifera</i> , which incidentally is one of several species for which the Ockham & Wisley Commons SSSI is notified that is now locally extinct here). | Noted. | No |
| SWT-E-26 | They assert that it is current impossible to comment further on the impact and mitigation strategy for badgers within the Scheme as a detailed assessment of the extent of this main sett and the potential for presence of associated outlier setts has not been undertaken at this stage. | Noted. Badger surveys were undertaken during 2018 to enable the assessment of the effect of the scheme on badger setts. | No |
| SWT-E-27 | The trust asks questions about the green bridges: is there any degree of priority implied here for one bridge over the other, should available funding prove competitive? And by extension, has any prioritisation been established across the full range of measures when funding inevitably becomes a limiting issue? Some early indication of the available budget may be helpful here, to guide general stakeholder input and expectations, and in particular the Trust's recommendations in this regard. | Funding has been secured to conduct a feasibility study for the green bridges, but this does not include detailed design or construction costs. | No |
| SWT-E-28 | The trust asserts that fig 9.8 is confusing (DCO boundary is inconsistent) as Presumably the "...Restoration of heathland and sandy habitats within temporarily cleared areas of woodland within the SPA/SSSI..." would take place within the defined DCO boundary only. However, the "...Felling of some wooded areas within the north-west quadrant, in order to encourage heathland regeneration and increase the existing areas of heathland", and "...Management of existing areas of Scots pine plantation within the north-east quadrant, in order to encourage a more diverse woodland structure" would be undertaken, at least in part, beyond the DCO boundary. | Noted - the replacement land area boundaries on Figure 9.8 are incorrectly drawn in blue when they should be in red to show they are included in the DCO boundary. | Yes |
| SWT-E-29 | The trust understands that Woodland planting appears to be intended for almost all of the embankments around the new Junction 10, and for some distance from it along the verges of both the A3 and M25. They believe this would amount to a wasted opportunity to create the | The design seeks to balance the need for screening of the roads and traffic with the habitat creation. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| | most deserving Priority habitats in this particular vicinity, which are Lowland heathland and/or dry acid grassland. | | |
| SWT-E-3 | The Trust welcomes the environmental barriers on the M25 being replaced to a superior specification (in respect of the barriers) that offer improved performance in terms of traffic noise attenuation. | Noted. | No |
| SWT-E-30 | The trust asserts that the primary biodiversity conservation directive at Ockham and Wisley Commons remains that of addressing woodland succession to maintain the open heathland and associated wetland communities. The formal citation notifying its owners and occupiers of the 'features of interest' for which this SSSI is considered special ² articulates this very clearly, and also provides context for the historical heathland losses here and elsewhere across the country. Consequently, the management imperative here is for restoring and creating Lowland heathland (as well as acid grassland and associated wetland habitats), to reclaim this lost resource at every opportunity. The recent Surrey Nature Partnership publication The State of Surrey's Nature ³ provides further evidence for the urgency in Surrey to expand and maintain open semi-natural grassland and heathland habitats over other, especially secondary woodland habitats, as indicated by their comparative importance for supporting our most nationally threatened and declining species. The list of such species for Surrey's heathland sites is particularly long, including many vascular and lower plants, as well as invertebrates across a range of orders. | The design seeks to balance the need for screening of the roads and traffic with the habitat creation. | No |
| SWT-E-31 | The trust asserts that the construction of the original intersection of the A3 and M25 exacted further local losses on the heathland resource at Ockham and Wisley Commons, and furthermore fragmented them into four largely isolated quadrants. In the last two decades the Trust has, in agreement with both Natural England and owners Surrey County Council, implemented a management plan that has significantly increased the size of the open heathland units. Although this initial work is complete there remains considerably | The design seeks to balance the need for screening of the roads and traffic with the habitat creation. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|--|------------------------|
| | more that could be achieved in this regard. Recovering and securing the status of the most threatened species on site will be significantly benefitted by increasing the available extent of their preferred habitat(s). | | |
| SWT-E-32 | The trust asserts The Surrey Nature Partnership has set objectives and targets for Priority habitat restoration and creation over a wider Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA) ⁴ that includes Ockham and Wisley Commons (and most of the Junction 10 Improvement Scheme), that are designed to directly contribute to the high-level Outcomes of the current national Biodiversity Strategy, Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services. These targets prioritise Lowland heathland, Lowland dry acid grassland and Wet woodland for this BOA (i.e. conveying no particular priority on Lowland mixed deciduous woodland). | Noted. | No |
| SWT-E-33 | In relation to the proposed compensation land at Park Barn Farm. If the Trust is intended as the preferred occupier/manager of this land, then we would request it be fully fenced and have a piped water supply installed to facilitate a full range of possible management methods. | Noted – appropriate facilities will be developed at the detailed design stage. | Yes |
| SWT-E-34 | The trust would advise against planting additional woodland over existing open grassed areas; there are likely to be more useful options ecologically, including (in the case of the land adjacent to Hatchford Wood) adjusting the hydrology and creating wet grassland/fen-like habitat. | Surrey Wildlife Trust's suggestions for mitigation are noted and have been considered further during the schemes development. However, the scheme will lead to woodland loss, so planting of woodland will be necessary in some locations and will provide the additional benefit of linking exists areas of woodland. | No |
| SWT-E-35 | Concerning the summary of potential impacts of the Scheme on biodiversity at para. 7.6.24 (also presented as 'Significant nature conservation effects' within Table 7.8). The most obvious generic mitigative response to this collective impact would be to increase the available area of the primary Priority habitat of concern driving the iterative statutory designation of this site, which is Lowland heathland, whether by restoration or creation. This has already been | Suggestion on mitigation noted and it has been considered further during the development of proposals. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|--|------------------------|
| | proposed indirectly by identifying replacement land for appropriate management, to meet an assessed required minimum area. | | |
| SWT-E-36 | The trust suggests that if part of this land is to be managed as habitat other than Lowland heathland, there is even more reason to find additional compensatory land. Using the definitions cited above in para. 4.5.2, this could either constitute mitigation or enhancement, but is nonetheless necessary in order to fully “..promote the opportunities to deliver positive environmental outcomes” uniquely offered by the Scheme. This then, supports the basis for the Trust’s request of Highways England to include a mechanism within the mitigation and compensation strategy to facilitate restoration and long-term maintenance of the remaining available Lowland heathland on Ockham and Wisley Commons. There are presently some 60-70 ha of coniferous woodland across the site. | The scheme will include proposals to enhance parts of the area designated as Special Protection Areas to promote Lowland heathland. | No |
| SWT-E-37 | The trust suggests that all other public access bridges to observe a design that does not preclude their use by wildlife. | Noted. | No |
| SWT-E-38 | The trust suggests that all widened existing road verges should be clear-felled to a tree’s length from the road edge in order to facilitate mowing of the road verge; reduce the risk of trees falling onto roads causing travel disruption; reduce management costs; and to secure further useful open habitat. | Suggestion noted but needs to be balanced by the need to provide tree screening for the roads and traffic. | No |
| SWT-E-39 | The trust suggests that in addition to mitigation measures designed to prevent potential pollution of the water environment (section 8.6 Potential mitigation measures), additional measures might attempt to assist eradication of aquatic invasive species issues on Ockham and Wisley Commons, for example Crassula helmsii in Wisley Common bog and at Bolder Mere Lake. | Suggestion noted – mitigation measures related to the effects of the scheme itself have been identified. | No |
| SWT-E-4 | The Trust hopes there is a similar commitment to noise barriers on the A3. | Noise barriers will be provided where justified by the predicted noise levels. The situation regarding barriers on the A3 is complicated by the requirement to maintain open access to the | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| | | common land on either side. | |
| SWT-E-40 | The trust suggests that Mitigation for impacts of widening the A3 at Bolder Mere lake, including the replacement of the stream culvert there, could incorporate an enhanced ability to manipulate its hydrology. | Suggestion noted. | No |
| SWT-E-41 | The trust suggests the historic icehouse in Hatchford Park has been used by bats as a hibernaculum. This use could be secured and further enhanced. | Suggestion noted. | No |
| SWT-E-42 | The trust suggests The Scheme should attempt to significantly reduce light pollution onto the Commons from present levels. | The scheme has been designed to minimise light spill onto the surrounding area where feasible. | No |
| SWT-E-43 | The trust suggests the facilities at Bolder Mere car-park could be improved. Enhanced visitor interpretation could be provided in a readily accessible format (to include content on biodiversity net gain achievements from the scheme). Highways England would enable this by securing the necessary planning permissions as part of the Scheme. The car-park will require resurfacing and must be securable at night (both entrance and exit routes) to curb vandalism of the facilities and to prevent illegal access/theft from Pond Farm and Birchmere. | Suggestion noted, and we will liaise further with SWT over proposals for the car park as we move into detailed design. | No |
| SWT-E-44 | The trust suggests The Trust and Surrey County Council have been unable to restore the mausoleum at Hatchford Wood due to the extended delay in exchange land transfer. Highways England could secure funding for the restoration. | It is anticipated that the exchange land transfer will be facilitated by this scheme. Options for securing funding for works such as the restoration of the mausoleum in association with works of the scheme itself are currently being considered. | No |
| SWT-E-45 | The trust challenges “..that the mitigation and compensation proposals that have been provided in this report have taken into account the requirements of the NPSNN (as set out in section 7.12), [note the Main Text report in fact has no section 7.12] by providing green corridors, minimising habitat fragmentation, enhancing existing habitats and creating new, linked habitats and the provision of vegetated multi-functional bridges to expand the range of existing | Challenge noted - proposals have been developed that achieve the mitigation and compensation requirements for the scheme. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| | notable and legally protected species populations in the local area.” - the trust notes consultation with stakeholders will continue to guide the final mitigation and compensation strategy. | | |
| SWt-E-5 | The Trust has already and will continue to suggest measures to prevent, reduce or offset adverse effects on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, the Ockham and Wisley Commons SSSI and three ancient woodlands to make the very best of the positive opportunities arising from the scheme. | Noted. | No |
| SWT-E-6 | the Trust has already and will continue to suggest measures to prevent, reduce or offset adverse effects on some notable and protected species. | Noted. | No |
| SWT-E-7 | The trust welcomes continued consultation with stakeholders to guide the final mitigation and compensation strategy for the Scheme. | Noted. | No |
| SWT-E-8 | The Trust welcomes the building of new pollution prevention measures to make sure that pollutants are prevented from reaching local rivers and groundwater. They also support new balancing ponds that will hold back surges in water from the roads discharging too quickly into watercourses as well as the creation of new flood storage capacity at Stratford Brook to compensate for the floodplain lost through construction of the new Wisley Lane access. | Noted. | No |
| SWT-E-9 | The Trust welcomes the scheme's objective to Avoid, mitigate and compensate for adverse effects on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and other statutory designated nature conservation sites and promote opportunities. | Noted. | No |
| WBC-E-1 | The Council does not have any comments to make on the potential environmental issues associated with the preferred route as these issues are outside of the Borough. | Noted. | No |
| WBC-E-1 | The Council requests that the potential impact of the proposals on the surrounding network, including during the construction phase, form | Noted. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|------------------------|
| | part of the scope of any Environmental Statement submission | | |
| WPIL-E-1 | Technical Note produced by WSP in Appendix 2 outlines: - Drainage mitigation to deal with run off from WIS-11 bridge over the A3 and the bridge crossing the Stratford Brook which would both impact on SANG. | Please see Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement | No |
| WPIL-E-2 | We have however noted that there is a lack of substantive information on traffic in the consultation material. This limits our ability to comment on these matters [the PEIR], notably for air quality and noise, and critically whether the proposed highways measures are effective. WPIL also request more substantive traffic flow data in view of the close relationship of the RIS scheme to its development proposals and the need to review the PEIR in that context. | The PEIR was based on the available information at the time, which included the results from the assessments undertaken at Stage 2. The Environmental Statement supersedes this PEIR. Further detail on traffic is provided as part of the DCO application, see Chapter12 of the Environmental Statement. | No |

Table H.1.4 Stakeholder specific issues

No relevant issues raised

Table H.1.5 Traffic and economic modelling

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|---|------------------------|
| EBC-M-1 | Concern that current scheme modelling underestimates quantum of growth. New Local Plan being developed. Also need to account for additional growth as a result of Heathrow expansion. | All development assumptions provided by Elmbridge, Woking and Guildford have been included. No increase in growth has been made for Heathrow's plans in line with advice provided by the Department for Transport (DfT). | No |
| EBC-M-2 | Scheme appears to move congestion from the SRN to LRN. Is this the case? | An intended aim of the scheme is to attract traffic to the Strategic Road Network. Across a wide area the scheme supports this aim by reducing vehicle kilometers travelled on the Local Road Network. In the immediate vicinity of the scheme there will be some increases in flow however, there is mitigation in the form of signal and junction improvements at Seven Hills Road, Painshill and Ockham junctions. | No |
| GBC-M-2 | Evidence that the M25J10 scheme could accommodate additional traffic capacity provided as a result of A3 widening at Guildford. | There are no details for a committed scheme on the A3 at Guildford therefore it has not been included in the forecasting. | No |
| GBC-M-3 | Want to see the Transport Assessment and the Stage 3 modelling work when available. | Highways England has now issued the LMVR and Forecast report. | No |
| GBC-M-4 | Network diagram showing Do min and Do Some flows with respect to the scheme. See letter for additional modelling requests. | Highways England has now issued the LMVR and Forecast report. | No |
| SCC-M-1 | Request that the scheme demonstrates how it is going to improve the phasing of traffic lights between Painshill Roundabout and Seven Hills Road. | The operation of the A245/Seven Hills junction is covered in detail within the PCF3 Traffic Forecasting Report. Highways England have worked with Surrey County Council to determine the best way of improving the signals. Widening to three full lanes in each direction between Seven Hills and Painshill will improve operation. | No |
| SCC-M-10 | Request that modelling considering the impact of future A3 widening of this scheme be presented to SCC | There are no details for a committed scheme on the A3 at Guildford therefore it has not been included in the forecasting | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|--|------------------------|
| SCC-M-2 | Concerned about extra queuing at Seven Hills Road junction as a result of Feltonfleet school new arrangements. | The operation of the A245/Seven Hills junction is covered in detail within the PCF3 Traffic Forecasting Report. Highways England have worked with Surrey County Council to determine the best way of improving the signals. Widening to three full lanes in each direction between Seven Hills and Painshill will improve operation. There is likely to be additional queuing on Seven Hills Road South as a result of additional vehicles, although green time will be increased. | No |
| SCC-M-3 | Provide stage 3 modelling data when available. | Highways England has now issued the LMVR and Forecast report. | No |
| SCC-M-4 | Clarify if HE intend to widen the A3 across the junction, and if not, whether modelling supports this. | Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) TD22 calculations show that even with growth to 2037, 3 lanes on the A3 through the junction would not be necessary. The cost of widening to 3 lanes through the junction would exceed the available budget. | No |
| SCC-M-5 | Request to see a links and nodes diagram for the scheme. | Highways England has now issued the LMVR and Forecast report. | No |
| SCC-M-6 | PM peak local road network figures. | Highways England has now issued the LMVR and Forecast report. | No |
| SCC-M-7 | Provide information about how local growth has been incorporated into the modelling. | Woking, Elmbridge, Guildford have specific sites (from Local plans) constrained to the Trip End Model Presentation Program (TEMPO), all other areas have TEMPO growth assumption. | No |
| SCC-M-8 | Sensitivity testing about the impact on Ripley of the closure of Wisley Lane. | The impact on Ripley is captured by the modelled core scenario. | No |
| SCC-M-9 | Traffic modelling of the impacts on the A245 widening on the Seven Hills Road roundabout. | Highways England has now issued the LMVR and Forecast report. | No |
| TfL-M-1 | How much growth in Surrey does the scheme release? | The scheme itself isn't intended to "release" any specific housing or employment developments. What the scheme does is create enough capacity in the network to mitigate for all planned | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|---|------------------------|
| | | development in the Guildford/Woking/Elmbridge local plans. | |
| TfL-M-3 | What growth assumptions for Surrey and GLA have been made? | Woking, Elmbridge, Guildford have specific sites (from Local plans) constrained to the Trip End Model Presentation Program (TEMPRO), all other areas have TEMPRO growth assumption. | No |
| TfL-M-5 | No mention of RBK and Elmbridge proposals such as Chessington Link Road. | Forecasting only takes into account committed or near certain schemes. | No |
| WHP-M-1 | Concern about revised access and new housing leading to congestion at Ockham park roundabout Request to receive traffic modelling on the flows at Ockham Park Roundabout. | Highways England has now issued the LMVR and Forecast report. | No |

Table H.1.6 Planning

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|---|------------------------|
| FFS-S-4 | Need to ensure that the scheme red line boundary doesn't impinge on planning permission the school currently has. | The Project has been in discussions with Feltonfleet School and the red line has been drawn so as not to impinge on the school's proposals. This is discussed in the People and Communities Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement (Development Land). We are in ongoing discussions with Feltonfleet School and expect this to be raised in the development of a Statement of Common Ground or third party agreement. | No |
| GBC-M-1 | Suggest that additional Local Plan allocated sites are included in the assessment of cumulative effects. See letter for list taken from Submission Local Plan. | The Guildford Submission Local Plan allocated sites are included in the Cumulative Effects Assessment where they are in the Study Area. The other identified site allocations are included in the Traffic Model. | No |
| SCC-P-1 | Provide information about how local growth has been incorporated into the modelling. | Woking, Elmbridge, Guildford have specific sites (from Local plans) constrained to the Trip End Model Presentation Program (TEMPO), all other areas have TEMPO growth assumption. | No |
| TfL-P-1 | How much growth in Surrey does the scheme release? | The scheme itself isn't intended to "release" any specific housing or employment developments. What the scheme does is create enough capacity in the network to mitigate for all planned development in the Guildford/Woking/Elmbridge local plans. | No |
| TfL-P-2 | What growth assumptions for Surrey and GLA have been made? | Woking, Elmbridge, Guildford have specific sites (from Local plans) constrained to the Trip End Model Presentation Program (TEMPO), all other areas have TEMPO growth assumption. | No |
| TfL-P-3 | No mention of RBK and Elmbridge proposals such as Chessington Link Road. | We have not been made aware of current intentions to implement a Chessington Link Road. Forecasting only takes into account committed or near certain schemes. | No |
| WBC-P-1 | Waverley have formally adopted their Local Plan part 1 in Feb 2018. | Comment duly noted. | No |
| WPI-P-1 | Impact of proposal on the extant consent for an In-Vessel | The project team have discussed the proposed Scheme with the | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|--|------------------------|
| | Composting (IVC) plant on former Wisley Airfield. | <p>Wisley Property Investments Limited team and made updates to address their concerns. The Project Team will maintain communications with WPIL.</p> <p>The impact of the Scheme on the extant consent for the In-Vessel Composting plant is assessed in the Environmental Statement (Development Land). The development is also included in the Cumulative Effects Assessment longlist of 'Other Development' but not progressed through to the Short List due to its delivery not being considered likely. This is also discussed in the Planning Statement.</p> | |
| WPI-P-2 | <p>Relation of the RIS scheme with emerging Guildford Local Plan</p> <p>The proposal needs to have full regard to the emerging Guildford Local Plan.</p> | The Planning Statement includes an assessment of the Scheme against the GBC Submission Local Plan (December 2017) and any subsequent updates following the Local Plan Examination. | No |
| WPI-P-3 | Table in letter listing proposed planning conditions and how these can be incorporated into RIS development requires detailed consideration. | Noted. Highways England will continue to work with Wisley Property Investments Limited, Guildford Borough Council and Surrey County Council with regards to any future submission on the former Wisley Airfield site. | No |

Table H.1.7 Safety

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|---|------------------------|
| EBC-Sa-1 | Concern over increased queuing at A256 causing driver frustration and a reduction in safety. | (Assuming that this is referring to the A246) One of the key benefits of this scheme is that it will increase capacity on the A3 through this location and reduce demands on surrounding roads. | No |
| RHS-D-2 | Examination of the 'Serious' accident classification would suggest that none are due to weaving movements from Wisley Lane. | Accident statistics do not record 'weaving' as a contributory factor per se and accident data does often not provide sufficient detail to establish the complete facts of every collision. However it is clear that the current layout requires 'weaving' activity (i.e. lane changes). Lane changes are a significant contributory factor in collisions across the scheme area. | No |
| RHS-D-3 | Based on the data and information provided within the various supporting documents to the PRA scheme, no evidence has been provided which demonstrates that there is an existing weaving accidents issue resulting from the Wisley Lane connection with the A3, despite the sub-standard nature of the existing merge arrangements'. | A separate Technical Note has been produced and considered by Highways England's Chief Engineer. This has been part of our ongoing discussions with RHS Wisley and Highways England has no change to that position. | No |
| RHS-D-3 | Based on the data and information provided within the various supporting documents to the PRA scheme, no evidence has been provided which demonstrates that there is an existing weaving accidents issue resulting from the Wisley Lane connection with the A3, despite the sub-standard nature of the existing merge arrangements' | The A3 around Wisley Lane (northbound link comprising 1.2 miles from Ockham to the M25 slip road) has seen 29 injury collisions over the past 5 years, with five of these being serious. This level of collisions is 49% higher than national statistics for dual carriageway trunk road of this type indicating that the current link and left-turn junction layout at Wisley Lane perform poorly in safety terms. Collisions on Wisley Lane itself at the junction with the A3 have not been included, but removal of the A3 / Wisley Lane conflict point associated with these collisions is a significant safety improvement. | No |
| SCC-Sa-1 | Appropriate speed limits on Wisley Lane are required. | The junction of Wisley Lane with the A3 will be remodelled by the scheme. Wisley Lane speed limits on Wisley Lane are subject to ongoing discussion with Surrey County Council. | No |
| SCC-Sa-2 | Need to ensure the new Old Lane access to A3 is safe and | The junction at Old Lane is being re-modelled and includes | Yes |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|------------------------|
| | fit for purpose. | deceleration and acceleration lanes to allow traffic to leave and join safely. | |
| SCC-Sa-3 | Concern that elements of the scheme, such Ockham roundabout may have a negative effect on safety. | Safety is a key priority for Highways England and this project is following a strict safety governance regime. This involves input from safety specialists and stakeholders. A comprehensive safety plan has been drawn up and targets have been set to reduce collisions on the scheme. | Yes |
| SCC-Sa-4 | Safe crossing facilities at Painshill Park are required. | The existing provision of crossing points for pedestrians and cyclists is poor. The scheme will provide signalised crossings which will improve safety on an important route with schools nearby. It will also link to the upgraded pedestrian and cycle path along the A3 towards Guildford. | Yes |
| SCC-Sa-5 | RSAs to be sent to SCC when these are available. | Noted and this picked up with Surrey County Council accordingly. | No |
| SCC-Sa-5 | RSAs to be sent to SCC when these are available. | Noted and this picked up with Surrey County Council accordingly. | No |

Table H.1.8 Construction

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------|
| SCC-Sk-1 | Need to consider the local road network impacts during construction, particularly if any SCC structures are required in the diversion routes. | The impacts from additional traffic will be considered in the ES Chapters 5 and noise. | No |
| PHE-Sk-1 | Consultation doesn't provide enough assessment on traffic related health impacts in both the construction and operational phases. | Health impacts are included in the Environmental Statement. Please refer to the ES Chapters 5, 13 and 14. | No |
| EA-Sk-1 | Construction compound needs to be set a minimum 10m back from the bank top of Stratford Brook. | Noted. | Yes |
| WPI-Sk-1 | WPIL would be happy to provide HE with temporary rights of access to build the new road. | Noted. | No |
| WPI-Sk-2 | WPIL is content to provide a construction compound within the wider development site for the construction of the bridge. | Noted and is part of ongoing discussions. | No |
| PHP-S-1 | Object in the strongest possible terms to any land take from the grade 1 historic landscape of Painshill Park. | All land take from Painshill Park has been considered meticulously to minimise the impact on the Park. Engagement with Painshill Park and all landowners in this area have been ongoing for some time. Approximately 15 options have been considered. The current design considers land take, property owners, Non-Motorised-User (i.e. pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian) routes, the Grade 2 country park, environmental and ecological issues, Ancient Woodland, major utility diversions and paramount to all, safety of road users. The land take figures are as follows: Permanent land take: 0.568 Ha Temporary possession: 0.032 Ha HE land to be reacquired: 0.430 Ha. | Yes |
| PHP-S-2 | Have asked if consideration could be given to burying the electricity pylons that run through Painshill Park land. | Not in scope of this scheme. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Changes to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|---|------------------------|
| WPI-S-1 | WPIL have raised a technical objection to the Wisley Lane element of the RIS scheme. | Noted and alteration has been made in discussion with Wisley Property Investments Limited. | Yes |
| WPI-S-8 | Overall, WPIL support the principles of the proposals at junction 10 of the M25. | Noted. | No |
| WPI-S-11 | WPIL seek further dialogue with HE relating to proposed arrangements to provide access to Old Lane from Elm Corner. | Highways England makes no change to the plan to keep Old Lane open and to provide access to Elm Lane by converting the existing Byway Open to All Traffic (B.O.A.T). | No |
| RHS-S-2 | Support the decision to abandon WIS-01 proposal. | Noted. | No |
| RHS-SA-1 | Examination of the 'Serious' accident classification would suggest that none are due to weaving movements from Wisley Lane. | Accident statistics do not record 'weaving' as a contributory factor per se and accident data does often not provide sufficient detail to establish the complete facts of every collision. However it is clear that the current layout requires 'weaving' activity (i.e. lane changes). Lane changes are a significant contributory factor in collisions across the scheme area. | No |
| RHS-SA-2 | Based on the data and information provided within the various supporting documents to the PRA scheme, no evidence has been provided which demonstrates that there is an existing weaving accidents issue resulting from the Wisley Lane connection with the A3, despite the sub-standard nature of the existing merge arrangements'. | The A3 around Wisley Lane (northbound link comprising 1.2 miles from Ockham to the M25 slip road) has seen 29 injury collisions over the past 5 years, with five of these being serious. This level of collisions is 49% higher than national statistics for dual carriageway trunk road of this type indicating that the current link and left-turn junction layout at Wisley Lane perform poorly in safety terms. Collisions on Wisley Lane itself at the junction with the A3 have not been included, but removal of the A3 / Wisley Lane conflict point associated with these collisions is a significant safety improvement. | No |

H.2 S42 and S44 regards table – Targeted consultation (November-December 2018)

Note: This regard tables only includes response to the targeted consultation conducted as a result of design changes following the Statutory Consultation.

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Change to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|--|-----------------------|
| TC-001 | Rearrangement of replacement land, J10 NE quadrant, near Pointers Road. Suggested various alternative areas of land take to those which are proposed as part of the scheme. Would like to retain certain areas, in particular those with planning consent. | The replacement land proposals were refined following DF3.1 design changes to accommodate landowners' wishes regarding avoiding certain areas. | Yes |
| TC-002 | Noise barrier requested in the Painshill area of the A3 to protect residents. | Noise barriers are being implemented where necessary, following noise assessments. Requirement assessed - noise barrier not required at this location. | No |
| TC-003 | Request to move Painshill local access road adjacent to A3, rather than through Heyswood Campsite. | Option investigated and drawing produced. Discussion with Natural England advised that the scheme must avoid Ancient Woodland. Therefore, this option cannot be progressed. | No |
| TC-004 | Bridleway conflict with WPIL property industrial building/employment zone Reconsider the route of the proposed bridleway to accommodate the proposed employment area and to facilitate access to both the employment area and the Wisley Airfield spine road in a safe and efficient manner from the proposed Wisley Lane diversion. This may require the deletion or adjustment of the proposed bridleway route. | This has been agreed. The existing bridleway has been revised and now runs along the edge of a carriageway instead, then via the traffic signals to WPIL land holding. | Yes |
| TC-005 | Painshill NMU route to be moved adjacent to the A3. | This option was being explored but has been superseded with the rerouting of NMU to northbound A3 instead. This proposal for an NMU route adjacent to the A3 northbound is now being | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Change to the scheme? |
|------------------|---|---|-----------------------|
| | | progressed. | |
| TC-006 | Painshill LAR to be moved into the gas compound to reduce land take. | Option investigated and drawing produced. Discussion with Natural England advised that the scheme must avoid Ancient Woodland. Therefore, this option cannot be progressed. | No |
| TC-007 | Reduction in size of the SPA land adjacent to Elm Lane as the buffer zone for this impinges on the WPIL / Guildford Local Plan housing allocations. | Red line boundary changed – buffer no longer in conflict with Housing allocations. | Yes |
| TC-008 | Allow sufficient land near Manor Pond to allow for pollution control if required by Environment Agency. | An attenuation pond adjacent to the A245 near Manor Pond is being progressed which will allow for additional potential land required for the pond, outfall pipe and maintenance access. | Yes |
| TC-009 | Review replacement land at Old Lane in response to consultation. | This has been reviewed as a result of Design Fix 3.1 and is detailed in the Environmental Statement. | No |
| TC-010 TC-038 | Noise barriers requested for the length of the Painshill Park frontage with the A3. | Discussion with Natural England advised that the scheme must avoid Ancient Woodland. Therefore, this option cannot be progressed. | No |
| TC-011 | Indicate that there is a cycle route around the whole of Ockham Park Roundabout. | This option has been investigated and cannot be progressed as there is only sufficient space available on the northern side of the roundabout. | No |
| TC-012 | Upgrade the crossing of Ockham Park Roundabout on the north side of Ockham Park Roundabout (and Pegasus crossing). | This option has been investigated and cannot be progressed as there is insufficient space available to provide a Pegasus crossing. | No |
| TC-013 | Bus stop on the northbound on-slip (near Mill Lane). | This option has not been progressed as there is a bus stop near here on the B2215 Portsmouth Road from Ripley and the suggested bus stop is not in a safe location on the slip road. | No |
| TC-014 | Highways England should adopt the NMU route and redesign to minimise orphaned private land. | This is not Highways England policy. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Change to the scheme? |
|------------------|--|--|-----------------------|
| TC-015 | Changes to A245/Seven Hills Road junction: A free flow left slip into Seven Hills Road (s), blocking of right turn and ahead movements from Seven Hills Road (n). | Suggestion to be adopted. | Yes |
| TC-016 | Include all of Seven Hills Road (S) in the red line boundary (<i>linked to TC-015</i>). | As all of this road is not required for the scheme it cannot be included in the red line boundary. | No |
| TC-017 | Include Old Byfleet Road in the red line boundary (<i>linked to TC-015</i>). | As all of this road is not required for the scheme it cannot be included in the red line boundary. | No |
| TC-018 | Rerouting of the Heyswood access road either closer to the A3 or around the campsite to avoid sight of camp, loss of Heyswood land, improve safeguarding opportunities and lessen impact of air pollution. | Discussion with Natural England advised that the scheme must avoid Ancient Woodland. Therefore, these options cannot be progressed. This proposal for an NMU route adjacent to the A3 northbound is now being progressed and the LAR will terminate at Court Close Farm, the adjacent property. Hence the LAR will be used by the residents and maintenance vehicles with no emergency vehicle access, to lessen impact on site | No |
| TC-019 | Use of noise reducing tarmac. | This is being implemented where necessary. | No |
| TC-020 | Proposed construction site compound for topsoil storage in this area should have appropriate restoration conditions attached to any approval. | This is a DCO requirement and will be done. | No |
| TC-021 | Fencing and other accommodation works associated with the Painshill access road to be kept simple to reduce visual impact | This will be taken on board during detailed design. | No |
| TC-022 TC-025 | Requested removal of three pylons to improve the visual impact (particularly on the Gothic Tower and Temple of Bacchus). | This is outside of the scope of this project. | No |
| TC-023 | Painshill LAR and NMU route to be moved adjacent to the A3. | Discussion with Natural England advised that the scheme must avoid Ancient Woodland. Therefore, the NMU option close to the A3 cannot be | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Change to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|--|-----------------------|
| | | <p>progressed.</p> <p>This proposal for an NMU route adjacent to the A3 northbound is now being progressed and the LAR will terminate at Court Close Farm, the adjacent property. Hence the LAR will be used by the residents and maintenance vehicles with no emergency vehicle access, to lessen impact on site.</p> | |
| TC-024 | Noise barriers requested along the A3 (in particular close to the Gothic Tower, Temple of Bacchus and Elysian Plain). | Discussion with Natural England advised that the scheme must avoid Ancient Woodland. Therefore, this option cannot be progressed. | No |
| TC-026 | Noise reducing tarmac to be applied to the section of M25 east of J10. | This is outside of the scope of this project. | No |
| TC-027 | Suggestion that the central reservation be utilised to provide access to RHS Wisley. | This has been previously considered and rejected, as it is not possible here due to narrow width and levels. | No |
| TC-028 | Request that the 'old A3 road' stays open as public access. This is to benefit the businesses along Redhill Road who regularly use the old A3 for HGVs instead of using Redhill Road to access the A245 as they believe it is safer. | It is not possible to provide a diverge from the A3 northbound slip road to Redhill Road due to safety reasons. There is insufficient weaving length from J10 free left turn to the suggested diverge. | No |
| TC-029 | Changing the shape of the land take from property (5 acres). The additional land needed to maintain the 5 acres taken would have to be found elsewhere on the farm. | Land requirements have been discussed in detail and now closed out. | Yes |
| TC-030 | Offered an alternative section of land (approx. 2.5 acres in size) which could be taken to reduce the amount of land taken proposed on the main part of the farm. | Land requirements have been discussed in detail and now closed out. | Yes |
| TC-031 | Suggestion to run the replacement land along the side of Old Lane heading south to the 'Black Swan Pub'. Would reduce land take from property, though would involve negotiations with other landowners | Land take in this location was reduced following DF3.1 design changes. | Yes |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Change to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|---|-----------------------|
| TC-032 | Alternative route around southern boundary of Heyswood running adjacent to Painshill Park. | <p>Option investigated and drawing produced. However, it is a circuitous route, would have cost implications and is very close to Painshill Park, meaning it is unlikely to be an acceptable option.</p> <p>The proposal for an NMU route adjacent to the A3 northbound is now being progressed and the LAR will terminate at Court Close Farm, the adjacent property. Hence the LAR will be used by the residents and maintenance vehicles with no emergency vehicle access, to lessen impact on site.</p> | No |
| TC-033 | Property would potentially prefer a wider LAR of 5.5m to access site. | The proposed LAR is already above standard required width for access requirements, therefore additional width is not necessary. | No |
| TC-034 | Concerns about changes being made to the Seven Hills Road/Byfleet Road junction, in that the left hand only turn from Byfleet Road onto Seven Hills Road will be changed to allow traffic to go straight onto the new third lane, encouraging speeding in close proximity to property and raising the risk of an incident. | The A245 east bound approach is 3 lanes on the approach to the traffic signals. The inside lane is proposed to be ahead and left turn. A safety audit has been carried out and did not raise any concerns. The road will be subject to a 40mph speed limit. | No |
| TC-035 | Requested resurfacing of the Seven Hills Road/Byfleet Road junction if possible, as this is in poor condition. | This will only be undertaken if directly required as part of the scheme. | No |
| TC-036 | Detailed designs of the RHS Wisley bridge should consider the Grade II* registered garden, to mitigate any detrimental impact. | This is noted and will be considered during detailed design. | No |
| TC-037 | Requested that the proposed overhead gantries and associated lighting either side of the proposed new Wisley Lane Bridge are not visible from within the registered RHS Wisley landscape. | This is noted and will be considered during detailed design. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Change to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|---|-----------------------|
| TC-039 | Design of the attenuation features adjacent to the new slip road at Ockham to maximise biodiversity and not consisting of any bed or bank reinforcement. Any outlets into the Stratford Brook should be designed with a natural entry route. | This is noted and will be considered during detailed design. | No |
| TC-040 | Suggestion to make Redhill Road into a one-way road which has direct access from the A3. | This has been investigated and will not be progressed as part of the scheme and is not supported by local highway authority. | No |
| TC-041 | Suggestion to build an alternative route avoiding Heyswood Campsite. | Discussion with Natural England advised that the scheme must avoid Ancient Woodland, therefore limited alternative routes. However, further investigation into rerouting NMU to northbound A3 is being undertaken and option to terminate LAR at adjacent property (no emergency vehicle access) also being examined, to lessen impact on site. | No |
| | Also suggested looking at vertical expansion of the A3 instead of expanding horizontally across the ground, i.e. tunnels or flyover possibilities. | Alternative options rules out during pervious design and consultation stages, for example Option 9 (flyover structure). | No |
| TC-042 | Suggestion that the two-way service road planned on the north side of the A3 can be connected to the access way near Heyswood. Suggestion to extend the access way in front of Heyswood campsite over a bridge crossing the A3 to connect to the service road on the north side of the A3. | A vehicular bridge crossing over the A3 has previously been rejected in favour of the current NMU bridge. | No |
| TC-043 | Objections to the "Newly proposed Special Protection Area compensation land" (at 3 locations) and requested further information and analysis of alternatives. | Compensation land proposals were refined following DF3.1 design changes, including omission of the two locations giving rise to this objection. | Yes |
| TC-044 | Seeking clarity on the intentions, land area and timing of the use of this land for topsoil storage and construction compound use. The preference is for this land to be removed from the DCO or as a second preference it be made very clear that this land is to only be used temporarily. | This will be a temporary land take and usage. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Change to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|---|-----------------------|
| TC-045 | Objection to the proposed additional red line area as flood compensation. The flood compensation area should be removed from the DCO as it is not necessary. | This flood compensation area has been removed from the red line boundary. | Yes |
| TC-046 | Request that the red line (and permanent land take) is minimised in this area in order to avoid the loss of developable land within the allocation boundary of Allocation A35. This should include limits of adoption and fence-lines to be as close as possible to the built highway. The fence should be shown directly adjacent to the proposed highways land for adoption. | Further engagement has been undertaken and the position of the fence line will be determined in detailed design. | No |
| TC-047 | Upgrades to or new public rights of way to create a bridleway linking the off-slip at Ockham Lane with the proposed Wisley Lane. A tie-in access is required from the proposed Wisley Lane to the employment area. | This has been agreed. The existing bridleway has been revised and now runs along the edge of a carriageway instead, then via the traffic signals to WPIL land holding . | Yes |
| TC-048 | Identification of land required for construction compounds and access routes is larger than anticipated. Needs to be phased with Allocation A35 SANGs. | Noted and further detail is included in the Environmental Statement. | No |
| TC-049 | Requested confirmation that the New Haw Viaduct is an existing structure to which no works are planned under the scheme or any other current scheme. | Not confirmed, this is outside of the scope of this project. | No |
| TC-050 | Concern over the possible increase in traffic using the bridge over the River Wey Navigation at Pyrford. Should there be a material increase in traffic, would expect HE to implement appropriate measure to mitigate any adverse impacts on the fabric of the bridge. | Noted. | No |
| TC-051 | Has the possibility of extending the noise barriers further south along the A3 be investigated? What would their visual and audible impact be? | Noise barriers are being implemented where necessary, following noise assessments. In addition, discussion with Natural England advised that the scheme (including noise barriers) must | Tbc |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Change to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|--|-----------------------|
| | | avoid Ancient Woodland. | |
| TC-052 | Encourages discussion around how Highways England might be able to help in lessening the visual damage of the electricity pylons in the Painshill Park area. | This is outside of the scope of this project. | No |
| TC-053 | Request stronger ecology aims and commit to achieving biodiversity net gain for the scheme. | This is noted. | No |
| TC-054 | In respect of existing National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) infrastructure, this will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus including compliance with relevant standards for works proposed within close proximity of its apparatus; providing that the order affects NGET apparatus in any way. | This is noted. | No |
| TC-055 | Suggests that we remove the pylons which "infringe the beauty of Painshill Park" and bury the associated cables underground and also hopes that Highways England reduces noise disturbance by means of noise barriers in appropriate locations. | Pylon removal is outside of the scope of this project Noise barriers are being implemented where necessary, following noise assessments. In addition, discussion with Natural England advised that the scheme (including noise barriers) must avoid Ancient Woodland. | No |
| TC-056 | The NMU route will pass along the edge of the ecologically sensitive Wisley Common, where drainage north towards the wetland features in the interior of the common must not be impeded. The specification for the NMU route therefore requires careful thought; for example, a tarmac surface would not be suitable here, if so intended. Drainage channels must be carefully culverted beneath the route, as this area can be very wet seasonally, especially at the south-western (Wisley Lane) corner. | This is noted, the scheme will use a surface suitable for NMU usage and will include adequate drainage. | No |
| TC-057 | No mention of any other of the structural specifications for the green/habitat bridge. The margins need to have a solid barrier of a minimum recommended height of 1m, preferably higher. This is to provide some degree of visual/noise/pollution | This is noted and will be considered during detailed design. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Change to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|--|-----------------------|
| | screening; present a physical barrier to wildlife being blown or falling onto the carriageway; and to prevent erosion of the habitat substrate from wind and precipitation. | | |
| TC-058 | Understand the constraints on the design of the replacement Cockcrow Bridge, not least its funding, and appreciate that a full 50 metre width would be a challenge to build, felt that this project merits a green/habitat element specification substantially wider than 10m in order to confidently achieve its objective. | It is not feasible for the green bridge to be wider than 10m. | No |
| TC-059 | Suggests that noise barriers are equally necessary alongside the A3. At the very least, the mitigation for ecological impacts at Bolder Mere (part of the SPA/SSSI/LNR and a Water Framework Directive surface waterbody) should include both noise baffling and visual screening for this sensitive receptor site. | Noise barriers are being implemented where necessary, following noise assessments. Requirement assessed - noise barrier not required at this location. | No |
| TC-060 | Forestry Commission - Refers to National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 175c): "development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and suitable compensation strategy exists" Also suggests that deforestation proposals are considered as part of that EIA. | Noted, the scheme is designed to minimise any loss of Ancient Woodland. | No |
| TC-061 | Suggestion for a lower speed limit on the A245 and that it be resurfaced. | Lower speed limited proposed (40mph) agreed with local authority. Resurfacing will only be undertaken if directly required as part of the scheme. | Yes |
| TC-062 | Request to consider alternative proposals for RHS Wisley to improve journey time, concerns for the future air quality, request to see the modelling relevant to Ockham Roundabout, specific comments with regards to future bus service provision, request details of NMU routes nearby. | Noted and discussions and information sharing with RHS Wisley has been ongoing. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Change to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|-----------------------|
| TC-063 | Ask for a brown sign indicating the exit for Painshill at M25 Junction 10 in both directions. | If there is not a sign already in the signing plans, one will be added. | Yes |
| TC-064 | Regarding Painshill Park - noise barriers running from the northwest corner of the landscape for approximately 1/3rd of a mile would help to reduce the noise pollution in this area. | Noise barriers are being implemented where necessary, following noise assessments. In addition, discussion with Natural England advised that the scheme (including noise barriers) must avoid Ancient Woodland. | No |
| TC-065 | Regarding Painshill Park - the pylons could be removed and the cables buried as part of the work on the A3. | This is outside of the scope of this project. | No |
| TC-066 | NMU link from A3 northbound south of Ockham junction to Portsmouth Road B2215. Cycle ban on A3 between Ockham junction and Painshill junction. A link on A3 northbound south of Ockham junction is required for cyclists to exit the A3. Recommends a change in design. | A cycle link between A3 northbound carriageway and B2215 Portsmouth Road is now proposed. | Yes |
| TC-067 | NMU link from Wisley Lane to Ockham southbound slip road. Realign NMU route to avoid WPIL buildings. Recommends a change in design. | This has been removed altogether and now avoids these buildings. | Yes |
| TC-068 | Wisley NMU by Hut Hill. Investigate realignment of NMU route to avoid a badger sett. | Topographic survey undertaken to investigate this issue. The same NMU horizontal alignment will be retained however the vertical alignment will be amended to reduce impact on the badger sett. | Yes |
| TC-069 | Painshill NMU route moved closer to A3 to save trees. Additional retaining wall required. | The proposal for an NMU route adjacent to the A3 northbound is now being progressed and the LAR will terminate at Court Close Farm, the adjacent property. Hence the LAR will be used by the residents and maintenance vehicles with no emergency vehicle access, to lessen impact on site. | No |
| TC-070 | Painshill NMU and LAR to be moved to reduce impact on Heyswood site. | Option investigated and drawing produced, would mean additional Ancient Woodland land take. Discussion with Natural England advised that the | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Change to the scheme? |
|-----------|---|---|-----------------------|
| | | scheme must avoid Ancient Woodland. Therefore, this option cannot be progressed. | |
| TC-071 | Move Painshill LAR between pylon and gas compound. Potentially widen LAR to 5.5m width. | This has been checked and there is insufficient space between the pylon and the gas compound fence for the required LAR, verges and clearance to the pylon. The proposed LAR is already above standard required width for access requirements, therefore additional width is not necessary. | No |
| TC-072 | A3 moved to northwest to lessen impact on Painshill properties along southbound A3. | Further investigation of this option undertaken and drawing produced. Option deemed unfeasible due to amount of land needed for widened carriageway, hardstrip, widened verge and local access road. Also issues with achieving the full stopping sight distance on the A3, along with impact on Long Orchard, San Domenico and Feltonfleet school land. As well as impact on Ancient Woodland north of gas compound. | No |
| TC-073 | A245 carriageway realignment to move retaining wall away from Manor Pond. | Retaining walls and Statutory Undertakers diversions would be required as well as more land take from Feltonfleet School. In addition to full reconstruction of A245 carriageways and central reserve. Therefore, not being progressed. | No |
| TC-075 | A245 NMU route alongside westbound carriageway between Painshill Junction and Seven Hills Road Junction. Changes to A245/Seven Hills Road junction: A free flow left slip into Seven Hills Road (s), blocking of right turn and ahead movements from Seven Hills Road (n). | The proposal for an NMU route adjacent to the A3 northbound is now being progressed and the LAR will terminate at Court Close Farm, the adjacent property. Hence the LAR will be used by the residents and maintenance vehicles with no emergency vehicle access, to lessen impact on site. Suggestion to be adopted. | Yes Yes |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Change to the scheme? |
|-----------|--|--|-----------------------|
| TC-076 | Painshill NMU route to be moved to northbound A3 to avoid Heyswood site. | A re-routing of the NMU route has been agreed. | Yes |
| TC-077 | Spur from the Painshill roundabout/use of the existing NMU route joining the roundabout via a two-way spur road off the existing roundabout. | <p>There is insufficient space between the A245 Portsmouth Road and the A3 southbound slip road to provide a signalised junction to a suitable standard.</p> <p>The access road approach to the roundabout would have to be widened to a suitable curvature resulting in the demolition of the West and East Lodge which are listed buildings.</p> | No |

H.3 S42 and S44 regards tables – Additional targeted consultation (April 2019)

Note: This regards table only includes response to the targeted consultation conducted as a result of design changes following the targeted consultation of 2018 and resulting in Design Fix 3.1.

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Scheme change? |
|-----------|--|--|----------------|
| ATC-01 | Requests narrative reasoning to explain 1. the removal of the proposed bridleway connecting the realigned Wisley Lane to the bus stop on the southbound off-slip to Ockham Park Junction. 2. The removal of the bridleway through the northern side of Ockham Park Junction. | 1. Consultation with all three Local Authorities and Causeway Land Investments LLP led to the decision to remove the proposed bridleway connecting the realigned Wisley Lane to the bus stop (on the southbound off-slip to Ockham Park Junction). The design was altered based on feedback we received and recognition that the initial design could cause issues over future land use proposals. 2. The removal of the bridleway through the northern side of Ockham Park Junction was due to the potential safety risks highlighted, these include a lack of adequate provision for equestrians due to the width constraints under the bridge. A shared footway and cycle track will be provided, as it does not face the same width constraints as horse users. | No |
| ATC-02 | Concerns over blocking the access route to the Gothic Tower onto the A3, prevents emergency access and the ability to maintain and restore this area of the park. | This access will no longer be available due to the widening of the A3 at this point. The project team has confirmed with Surrey Fire and Rescue that the access road did not form part of its contingency plans they were not concerned that it has been removed. | No |
| ATC-03 | Requests confirmation if the scheme excludes or includes: 1. the telecoms mast in Breach Hill Wood, 2. The dog enclosure in Breach Hill Wood, 3. The animal shelter site in Chatley wood. States the requested land take is unclear. | Following a meeting which took place on 02/05/2019, design changes have been agreed with both land owners. Land parcel acquisition to be amended. | Yes |
| ATC-04 | EBC request a narrative to explain why the NMU relocation is classified as 'non-material' in the additional consultation documentation. | Highways England can confirm that NMU relocation is classified as 'non-material' as there is only an enhancement to the current scheme provisions with no major new works to move the NMU route to the opposite side of the A3. The changes include a 50m section of cycle track/footway and several secure gates or barriers to the previous consulted design. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Scheme change? |
|-----------|---|--|----------------|
| ATC-05 | EBC request a narrative to explain the environmental changes in regard to the additional consultation material, specifically wanting to know what is happening on the boundary of EBC and GBC. | <p>HE can confirm that following consultation with all three Local Authorities and Causeway Land Investments LLP, has led to the decision to remove the proposed bridleway connecting the realigned Wisley Lane to the bus stop (on the southbound off-slip to Ockham Park Junction). The design was altered based on the feedback we received and recognition that the initial design could cause issues over future land use proposals.</p> <p>The removal of the bridleway through the northern side of Ockham Park Junction was due to the potential safety risks highlighted, these include a lack of adequate provision for equestrians due to the width constraints under the bridge. A shared footway and cycle track will be provided, as it does not face the same width constraints as horse users.</p> | No |
| ATC-06 | Query about Seven Hills Road junction. On completion of the works there will no longer be a right turn for traffic exiting Seven Hills Road (N). What is the reason for this and what is the proposal for people wanting to drive to Byfleet. How will the lane allocations change? | <p>The amendments to the junction modification were made following feedback to the previous targeted non-statutory consultation, held in November-December 2018, and subsequent engagement with Surrey County Council and Feltonfleet School. It is proposed that traffic exiting Seven Hills Road (north) wanting to travel towards Byfleet will go eastbound on the A245, perform a U-turn at Painshill Junction to return westbound on the A245 through Seven Hills Junction towards Byfleet. The removal of the right-turn from Seven Hills Road (north) allows for the overall capacity improvement to the junction, and tests have shown that the junction will perform better as a result of this change, with journey times for all traffic and movements being improved, although some drivers will be deterred from making the movement that they presently make.</p> <p>All movements from Seven Hills Road North will have to turn left at the stop line, and the lanes will be marked as such. The left-hand lane on the A245 eastbound stop line will be allocated to allow for left and straight-ahead movements.</p> | No |
| ATC-07 | Proposed site compound locations raise concerns. Proposed location at Seven Hills Road is close to a known bat roost. Important to consider the NE advice on how to minimise disturbance of bats. Site compound to the NE of | Concerns regarding site compounds are noted. The locations of these have been chosen by balancing the requirements of construction with the adverse environmental effects of them. The size and layout of the compounds has also been developed to minimise adverse effects. We would be pleased to discuss the details of the compounds and the operation | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Scheme change? |
|-----------|--|--|----------------|
| | Cockrow Bridge is close to high quality open health land which supports woodlark and nightjar birds. Important to put in measures to minimise the risk of increased disturbance. Site compound proposal at Elm corner also raises concern as it is next to woodland which supports roosting bats. NE has provided advice on measures to mitigate for the loss of a tree used as a bat roost and these measures may be jeopardised by poor compound design. NE can also advise on reducing this risk. | of them with Natural England as the project proceeds to ensure that we are doing all we can to minimise the impact on the sensitive local environment. | |
| ATC-08 | NE is satisfied with the SPA proposals, and the efforts to minimise loss of Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the Heyswood campsite. | Noted with thanks. | |
| ATC-09 | NE is pleased with the additional habitat enhancement proposed at Bolder Mere. | Noted with thanks. | |
| ATC-10 | Very happy with the scheme design changes around the Heyswood Campsite. Suggests a second gate is required at the west end of the campsite where the access road continues to Court Close Farm, to make the campsite enclosed and fully secure. | Noted and this will be considered during detailed design. | |
| ATC-11 | With reference to landowners property: Concern there is loss of an area formerly used for residential use. Loss of potential development with little compensation. Would like to choose the specification of fencing defining the boundary of the retained land. Are any additional rights of way or access required over the retained land? Will HE relocate the water meter if necessary due to the current proposed acquisition? Would like confirmation that adequate fencing will be erected to prevent common land (being purchase by HE from this | Fencing requirements and the relocation of the water meter will be considered during the detailed design phase of scheme design. | |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Scheme change? |
|-----------|--|---|----------------|
| | land owner) being used by travelers. | | |
| ATC-12 | Concern the new proposal for a footpath at Old Lane will create a negative impact on the retained land, and challenges to ensure people stick to the footpath and not the private land. Would like to see details for the future land management. | Noted, this will be addressed at a later stage in the scheme. | |
| ATC-13 | Painshill Park objects to only one of the proposed changes. In a previous meeting (15/11/2018) assurances were given that the Trust will be able to use the access from for emergency purposes and for service vehicles. The proposal objected to looks to remove the access road running from Painshill entrance to the entrance of Heyswood Campsite (approx. 400 yds). This will prevent emergency and service vehicles accessing the western end of the park. The removal of this road is strongly opposed, as it is a breach of safety standards. | This access will no longer be available due to the widening of the A3 at this point. The project team has confirmed with Surrey Fire and Rescue that the access road did not form part of its contingency plans they were not concerned that it has been removed. | |
| ATC-14 | Writing on behalf of a constituent who is concerned about the closure of the A3 access road to the west side of Painshill Park. There are concerns that this closure will delay emergency services and would like Highways England to re-evaluate their plans. | This access will no longer be available due to the widening of the A3 at this point. The project team has confirmed with Surrey Fire and Rescue that the access road did not form part of its contingency plans they were not concerned that it has been removed. | |
| ATC-15 | Has spoken about the proposal on the phone previously with Highways England and would like a meeting to discuss the additional consultation scheme changes. Concerns about removal of right turn from seven hills road to A245 and the widening of the A3 WB to 3 lanes. | Highways England met with landowner to discuss road layout at Seven Hills junction and operational arrangements explained. No further action required. | |
| ATC-16 | Has concerns about the proposals for Seven Hills Junction. Welcomes provision of footpath between Seven Hills junction and Painshill | The proposed changes at Seven Hills junction are being incorporated into the scheme at the request of Surrey County Council. The traffic signals currently have four phases and by incorporating the proposed changes the | |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Scheme change? |
|-----------|--|--|----------------|
| | Junction. | number of phases is reduced to three. Overall, this allows the junction to perform better and is therefore a key design feature of this enhancement. | |
| ATC-17 | Does not agree with the removal of the right turn from Seven Hills Road to A245. This will cause inconvenience to residents travelling to Byfleet, who will have to travel to Painshill and back again. This will add to the heavy traffic and the benefit of this proposal is not clear. The proposal seems to be an after-thought with little relevance to the M25 and A3 improvements. | The removal of the right-turn from Seven Hills Road (north) allows for the overall capacity improvement to the junction, and tests have shown that the junction will perform better as a result of this change, with journey times for all traffic and movements being improved, although some drivers will be deterred from making the movement that they presently make. | |
| ATC-18 | Concerned about removal of the right turn from Seven Hills Road (North). Painshill roundabout will become more congested with the additional traffic from Walton and Hersham having to use it. It will add considerable journey time to people wishing to travel towards Byfleet. Would like this change to be removed. | The proposed changes at Seven Hills junction are being incorporated into the scheme at the request of Surrey County Council. The traffic signals currently have four phases and by incorporating the proposed changes the number of phases is reduced to three. Overall, this allows the junction to perform better and is therefore a key design feature of this enhancement. | |
| ATC-19 | Concerned about the proposal to remove the right turn from Seven Hills Road (north) towards Byfleet. Believes this will cause more congestion towards and around Painshill Roundabout, which will also worsen air pollution. Is also concerned that these proposals will push people to use already over congested local roads rather than using Seven Hills junction and the A245. | The proposed changes at Seven Hills junction are being incorporated into the scheme at the request of Surrey County Council. The traffic signals currently have four phases and by incorporating the proposed changes the number of phases is reduced to three. Overall, this allows the junction to perform better and is therefore a key design feature of this enhancement. | |
| ATC-20 | Removal of the previously proposed flood compensation area for the new bridge over Stratford Brook. The EA have been verbally notified that review of the Stratford Brook model demonstrated that the flood compensation is no longer required there has not been any written evidence of this. The EA are therefore not in a position to confirm if flood compensation is required until such evidence has been seen. | Highways England has been in detailed discussion with the stakeholder about the relevant Environmental Statement and this issue will be detailed in the stakeholder's Statement of Common Ground. | |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Scheme change? |
|-----------|--|--|----------------|
| ATC-21 | Concerned with the removal of the right turn from Seven Hills Road (N) toward Byfleet via the A245. Believes the additional 0.8 mile and 5 additional traffic signals of the new route will cause congestion between Seven Hills junction and Painshill Roundabout, alongside worsening noise and pollution. Would like to see the traffic surveys in the area to ascertain the likely congestion. | The proposed changes at Seven Hills junction are being incorporated into the scheme at the request of Surrey County Council. The traffic signals currently have four phases and by incorporating the proposed changes the number of phases is reduced to three. Overall, this allows the junction to perform better and is therefore a key design feature of this enhancement. A response has been made in writing to the stakeholder. | |
| ATC-22 | Concerns over the changes at Seven Hills Road. The removal of the right turn from Seven Hills north and the extent of the road widening on the A245 EB. | The proposed changes at Seven Hills junction are being incorporated into the scheme at the request of Surrey County Council. The traffic signals currently have four phases and by incorporating the proposed changes the number of phases is reduced to three. Overall, this allows the junction to perform better and is therefore a key design feature for this enhancement. | |
| ATC-23 | Does not feel the SCC's proposal to improve Seven Hills Junction takes into account the three concerns landowner previously expressed. Would like to contact someone at SCC to discuss these changes and their impact on the wider area. | The proposed changes at Seven Hills junction are being incorporated into the scheme at the request of Surrey County Council. The traffic signals currently have four phases and by incorporating the proposed changes the number of phases is reduced to three. Overall, this allows the junction to perform better and is therefore a key design feature for this enhancement. Landowner was provided with the details to reach Surrey County Council's Customer Contact Centre so she is able to raise these changes directly with SCC's team. | |
| ATC-24 | Resident states she has never been contacted by Highways England about the acquisition of her land, and no offer has been made to her. Request a meeting with Jonathan Wade to discuss the scheme. | As above, the Highways England response to Pains Hill Residents Association will cover issue. | |
| ATC-25 | The land parcel boundary information is not correct and omits the MAFF triangle land previously detailed to HE. The area of permanent land take from DEFRA will increase and the DEFRA gateway access to the B2039 will be lost. The change will not make a significant operational impact on the APHA | Noted. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Scheme change? |
|-----------|---|---|----------------|
| | farms. | | |
| ATC-26 | Part of Pains Hill Residents Association and no other home owner than one had been informed of the ongoing changes. Objecting to the proposals due to a lack of information. Concerned about the changes to the access road from the A3 and the changes for it. Would like meeting and would like Highways England to walk the area to show the residents the extent of the scheme plans. | As above, residents will be written to via the Resident's Association and an offer to meet is proposed. | |
| ATC-27 | Appreciates the changes to the NMU route that will no longer pass through Heyswood Campsite. Would like a gate at the Court Close Farm side of the campsite for security. Will the road be tarmacked? Will HE be responsible for future repairs to the road? Will HE maintain responsibility for the fencing along the A3 at the front of the site? Would like confirmation of sound barrier installation. Would appreciate special screening during the construction phase to maintain safeguarding of the children on site. Asking for 24hr CCTV at both gates to maintain security and would like to be involved in the signage at the start of the slip road. Would like to work with the contractors for the installation of the gas pipe to avoid times when the campsite will be in use. | These features will be considered in detailed design. | |
| ATC-28 | Regarding the gas pipeline diversion - WPIL request that details of the easement to assess the impact of this proposal the implemented IVC consent and on the masterplan for the new settlement as allocated in Policy A35. | No change required, to be considered a part of detailed design. | |
| ATC-29 | WPIL strong object the area in Map 2C previously shown as 'proposed replacement | Accepted, map revised and reissued. | |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Scheme change? |
|-----------|--|---|----------------|
| | land', for the loss of common land or public open space, being included in the DCO Scheme as SPA Compensation Land. WPIL don't consider this land to be of appropriate quality to be used as SPA compensation land and including it would alter to 400m buffer affecting Former Wisley Airfield, reducing the area available for development and undermining GLP Allocation A35. WPIL proposed design change of the removal of additional land showing in Map 2C as SPA Compensation Land. This land should remain in the scheme as proposed replacement land. | | |
| ATC-30 | WPIL support the amendment to the Flood Compensation area at Stratford Brook. WPIL requests that detailed drawings of the proposed works with associated method statement be provided which include details of the plant used in the works, access and egress, mitigation to avoid spread of invasive species. WPIL reserve the right to make further comments. | No change required, to be considered a part of detailed design. | |
| ATC-31 | WPIL outlined number of additional amendments to the DCO scheme not included within this targeted consultation: - Topsoil Area - area of WPIL land used for temporary storage of topsoil during DCO works. WPIL seeks clarity on the intentions, land area and timing of the use of this land for topsoil storage and construction compound use. The preference is for this land to be removed from the DCO, or as a second preference it be made very clear that this land is to only be used temporarily. | We estimate that the topsoil storage will be required for the duration of the works, this being approximately two and half years (enabling and main works). | No |
| ATC-32 | WPIL request design change to the fence line along proposed Wisley Lane, area shown to | To be considered as part of detailed design. | No |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Scheme change? |
|-----------|--|--|----------------|
| | allow for fence lines appears to be excessive - request that this is minimised in this area in order to avoid loss of developable land. | | |
| ATC-33 | WPIL request justification for the DCO scheme not including access to the proposed spine road within Wisley New Settlement pursuant to Allocation A35 and further information required in respect of future adoption and management of the proposed road in order to ensure the DCO scheme and New Settlement masterplan are aligned. It is also sought to secure gas main protection works between the new A3/Wisley Lane overbridge and Ancient Woodland as part of the DCO works to permit a potential access road into Allocation A35 via the Wisley Lane diversion. | <p>The scheme does not provide a junction to the proposed spine road, however the alignment of the new Wisley Lane could accommodate this junction at a later date.</p> <p>With regard to the gas main, any temporary protection will be addressed at the next stage of the project.</p> | No |
| ATC-34 | WPIL once more requests that the available information on traffic modelling and the effects of the DCO scheme on the strategic and local highway networks are released so that these discussions can take place. | Modelling for Seven Hills junction is provided and discussed in the Transport Assessment, once available this can be shared. | |
| ATC-35 | WPIL support the proposed tie in of the Wisely lane Diversion to Ockham Interchange. WPIL object to proposed scheme as drawn as no access provided to facilitate the proposed main spine road through the Wisley new settlement. They request an amendment to facilitate a junction into the Wisley new settlement site with an appropriate level of capacity for the projected traffic flows is required. | No change required, to be considered a part of detailed design. | |
| ATC-35 | Be helpful if more detailed design could be provided to assess the need for additional land take near the A245 and southern part of the school site along the A3. They do not want to | Noted and this will be considered during detailed design, but Highways England continues to seek to minimise tree loss across the scheme. | |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Scheme change? |
|-----------|--|---|----------------|
| | see a substantial amount of trees being removed from the site/near the site. | | |
| ATC-36 | Believe that soakaway could be located elsewhere to reduce land-take. | To be considered as part of detailed design. | |
| ATC-38 | Modelling analysis for Seven Hills Junction is requested to be provided. Welcome the proposal for Old Byfleet Road to become private for Feltonfleet use only. Welcome dialogue with HE but request further detail on the precise details of the scheme. | Modelling for Seven Hills junction is provided and discussed in the Transport Assessment, once available this can be shared. In summary, the removal of the ahead/right turn lane allows the signals to run in a more efficient manner, reducing the amount of lost green time, thereby providing overall benefits to users of the junction. Those vehicles previously making the right/ahead movement (approx. 17% of the total Seven Hills Rd North flow) will reroute either by performing a u-turn at Painshill or taking an alternative route. | |
| ATC-39 | EBC encourage new area of tree planting provided next to Buxton Wood. | Planting will form a key part of the compensation and enhancement measures for the scheme and will result in an overall increased area of woodland. This will include the planting of woodland, including woodland creation at Park Barn Farm that will provide linkages between the ancient woods at Queen Anne's Hills and Buxton Woods. | |
| ATC-40 | Regarding the new pond proposed for pollution control at Manor Pond - EBC raise no objection provided it can be accessed from the A245 without hindering the flow of traffic and can be suitably landscaped. EBC request clarity as to why the footpath (shown orange/ yellow on sheet 4) is truncated at the pond? | The footpath extends to the relocated bus stop only, hence showing as a truncated line on the drawings. Pedestrian access will be via Seven Hills Road Junction and then the A245 to Painshill. Design Fix 3.1 details the access arrangements to the pond. | No |
| ATC-41 | EBC question why siting the shared footway/cycle way adjacent to the multi lane A245 serves? Design change suggested: for scope to be given to routing it along the Old Byfleet Road: requiring permissive rights from Feltonfleet School. Benefits would be cuts out a corner, redundant piece of roadway and provide safer and secure route for users that currently proposed. | Old Byfleet Road will be declassified (as agreed with Surrey County Council) and provide private access to Feltonfleet School and therefore no public access can be made via this route. | |
| ATC-42 | EBC remain unconvinced of the need for the | The removal of the right turn from Seven Hills Road (North) improves | |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Scheme change? |
|-----------|--|---|----------------|
| | change of traffic exiting Seven Hills Road (north) being unable to make a right turn onto the A245 or pass straight over onto Seven Hills Road (south), and traffic exiting A245 (from Byfleet) no longer being able to make a right turn into Seven Hills Road (south). Ask for evidence to justify the removal of the ability to turn right as benefits unclear. | overall performance of this junction and is therefore a key design feature of this enhancement. | |
| ATC-43 | Whilst the relocation of the NMU from the south east to the north west side of the A3 would help reduce the impact of the scheme on the GII* listed Gothic Tower and GI listed Painshill Park, vehicular access to Court Close Farm and Heyswood Camp must be maintained. In addition, the Council as landowner would wish to see some form of access for motorised vehicles (fire appliances etc.) retained to the Gothic Tower. | The scheme provides for a private means of vehicular access to Court Close Farm and Heyswood Camp. The Gothic Tower access will no longer be available due to the widening of the A3 at this point. The Surrey Fire and Rescue Service has tested and confirmed the suitability of the access route within the Park to the Gothic Tower for standard response vehicles. The access from the A3 does not form part of Surrey Fire and Rescue Services emergency contingency plans. | |
| ATC-44 | The Council is concerned that the consultation material, specifically Sheet 2C 'Old lane environmental changes' incorrectly labels a parcel of land within a bubble with "reduction in SPA compensation land adjacent to Old Lane". In doing so, it identifies the land as SPA replacement land. In the previous consultation document (November/December 2018), the map on page 10/11 showed the land in question as "replacement land" and it had been understood that this was proposed as replacement common land and not SPA land. By identifying a new land parcel as SPA compensation land, the impact on the Former Wisley Airfield is increased and would lead to a significant effect on housing delivery. GBC believe this is a labelling error and | Accepted. The map has been amended and re-issued. | |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Scheme change? |
|-----------|--|---|----------------|
| | request confirmation that land has been labelled as SPA compensation land in error and will in fact not be taken forward as SPA compensation land. | | |
| ATC-45 | The DCO application should ensure it is in conformity with the adopted Local Plan. | Noted. | |
| ATC-46 | The Council notes that the latest engineering drawings supplied do not show how access is provided to facilitate the proposed main spine road through the Former Wisley Airfield site. They have requested that the plan is amended to show how access would be facilitated via the new Wisley Lane. | The scheme does not provide a junction to the proposed spine road, however the alignment of the new Wisley Lane could accommodate this junction at a later date. Highways England will share the appropriate drawings once they are ready for external publication. | |
| ATC-47 | With the adoption of the Local Plan we request that Highways England revise its previous position (as stated in its letter dated 3 October 2018) and include north-facing slip roads at Burnt Common as part of the DCO scheme. | The Burnt Common slips are out of scope of this scheme. | |
| ATC-48 | The Council notes that Highways England will share the Environmental Information when it is available and therefore the Council reserves its position until this is available and has been reviewed by officers. | Noted. | |
| ATC-49 | GBC is aware that activity related to ground works investigations is planned in the near future. We would expect a Construction Management Plan to be made available to the Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council for consideration and in order to plan communications effectively. | This will be part of the detailed design phase. | |
| ATC-50 | SCC ask to see a copy of the correspondence / agreements reached with the EA to provide confirmation that SCC's concerns set out in their response to the Stat Consultation (23rd March | All measures required to mitigate the impacts of the scheme, that relate to the remit of the Environment Agency are in the process of being agreed with the Environment Agency and the key aspects be set out in the Statements of Common Ground between Highways England the | |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Scheme change? |
|-----------|--|--|----------------|
| | 2018) have been addressed. | <p>Environment Agency. The details of the agreed mitigation will be set out in the Environmental Statement, relevant chapters of which are also being reviewed by the Environment Agency. These will be published as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Detailed hydraulic modelling of the Stratford Brook as part of a Flood Risk Assessment has confirmed that the new crossing (bridge) will not alter the flood risk at Stratford Brook. Therefore, floodplain compensation is not required for this element of the scheme. This remains true for present day conditions and over the lifetime of the scheme taking climate change into account. The modelling has been reviewed and accepted by the Environment Agency.</p> | |
| ATC-51 | SCC would like to see and approve any enhancements to any watercourses. | Any impacts to the watercourses as a result of this scheme, have been assessed and mitigation proposed in consultation with the Environment Agency, and this is set out in the Water Framework Directive Assessment and in the Environmental Statement, this includes enhancements where possible. | |
| ATC-52 | As stated in para 1.1.2 of SCC letter dated 13th December 2018 can clarification be provided as to the proposed future ownership and maintenance responsibility for these new routes and assets e.g. pollution pond at Manor Pond? | Land ownership agreements will be subject to further discussion after DCO submission. | |
| ATC-53 | In relation to where the bridleway on the side of the Wisley Lane realignment is retained and is proposed to be extended to Ockham Road North junction - Consideration needs to be given to the different requirements of equestrians to that of cyclists. A sealed surface is needed for cyclists whilst equestrians need an unsealed surface such as rough stone. Adequate width will be needed to accommodate the two parts of this NMU route. This comment applies for all other bridleways where cycle use is also proposed; for example this relates to the section of NMU route | Noted. The intention is for the route to be a sealed surface. The design accommodates both cyclists and equestrians to the appropriate standard. | |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Scheme change? |
|-----------|--|---|----------------|
| | running parallel to the A3 where this proposed route is being shown as a Restricted Byway. | | |
| ATC-54 | SCC asks if the proposed gas pipeline diversion affects SCC owned land, what it means in terms of easements, future access and impact on any special category land? | Where the gas pipeline diversion affects land owners, these have been notified of the impacts in accordance with the required processes. | No |
| ATC-55 | SCC request a copy of a RSA (Road Safety Audit) for various areas including the exit for cyclists from A3 northbound towards Portsmouth road, and access road to pollution pond at Manor Pond. | HE and SCC are currently engaged in discussion over RSA. Final comments from HE to be sent before end of May. | |
| ATC-56 | Request brief rationale for why the SPA compensation land off Elm Lane is removed and reduced off Old Lane. | This was an error that has since been rectified and the correct drawing was circulated to GBC 01/05/19. This was also addressed and clarified at the last LA liaison meeting on 23/04/19. | |
| ATC-57 | SCC agree in principle to habitat enhancement at Bolder Mere but request more details as landowner for the area. | Noted this will be considered during detailed design. | |
| ATC-58 | Ask how will the proposed cycle / footway route adjacent to A245 westbound between Seven Hills and Painshill Junction link to the associated DF scheme? | There is no physical link between the NMU routes, but they are close enough to provide continuity. | |
| ATC-59 | Regarding access to Feltonfleet School, SCC have requested further details including junction / traffic modelling results. | Modelling for Seven Hills junction is provided and discussed in the Transport Assessment, once available this can be shared. In summary, the removal of the ahead/right turn lane allows the signals to run in a more efficient manner, reducing the amount of lost green time, thereby providing overall benefits to users of the junction. Those vehicles previously making the right/ahead movement (approx. 17% of the total Seven Hills Rd North flow) will reroute either by performing a u-turn at Painshill or taking an alternative route. | |
| ATC-60 | SCC requests explanation for 1. The removal of replacement land from open fields in the additional scheme drawing of Chatley Wood area, and boundary adjusted to follow the fence line. 2. The replacement land removed from the | The land requirements have been agreed with the individual land owner. | |

| Unique ID | Consultation response summary/topic area | Highways England summary response | Scheme change? |
|-----------|---|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| | open fields in the additional scheme drawing of "The Bogs" area, and boundary adjusted to follow tree line. | | |
| ATC-61 | Ask if meeting with HE/Atkins/SCC Traffic Signals team is still planned? | This meeting was held on 9 May 2019. | |
| ATC-62 | Historic England have no further comments to make in addition to those in the previous response dated 14/12/2018. | Noted with thanks. | |

© Crown copyright (2017).

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/ write to the Information Policy Team, **The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU**, or email 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

