

From: [REDACTED]
To: [M25 Junction 10](#)
Subject: Negative response to the M25 J10 planning
Date: 03 March 2022 10:54:03

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to you as my partner and I are strongly against the plans for the expansion of junction 10 of the M25 as well as the expansion and explicit deforestation of the A3 perimeter.

I have a plethora of concerns with this project which would comprise an exhaustive list, however I will focus on two of the areas that are of highest concern:

Climate change

- The applicant's response to the SoS with regards to measuring the climate impact of the project is abysmal. The continued reference to old documentation standards and the obvious deflection of responsibility back to the government is a clear sign that a lack of care for the environment is at the forefront of the developers mind.
- In the 'supportive' modeling that the developer has provided, there is no clear wider impact climate modelling. Specifically, how will deforestation affect the CO2 absorption rate within the local area, especially in reflection to an increased rate of road adoption.
- The removal of several acres of woodland will not only have an effect on CO2 absorption rates but have a large effect on sound pollution dispersal as well as particulate pollution.
- The reliance on an increase in electric vehicles as an offset for the pollutants of the project is a misconception. Yes, studies find that over a period of 10 years electric cars produce less CO2 than Diesel or Petrol cars (this is due to the high early on carbon output required to make an electric car). What isn't recognised is the tire and breaking particulates that are generated from electric cars. Due to the increased weight of an electric car there is an increased rate of friction on the road and it takes more braking power to stop the car. This results in an increased rate of micro particles from brake discs/pads and tire particles. Whilst this won't have an effect on the global heat levels, these particles are toxic to humans and can be directly linked to an increased rate of respiratory related diseases. Tree lines provide a barrier to these particles. Granted, this isn't great for the trees either. If we reduce the mature tree barrier to community areas like Okham Common and Wisley then these particles are more likely to affect the public.

Road adoption

- The road adoption strategy of the project is entirely flawed. Increasing lanes at junctions either means more traffic or more chaos because people don't know how to use the lanes. Dr Steve Melia has written an article highlighting this exact problem
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- The whole premise of this expansion is to decrease traffic. However, upon investigation it appears the Wisley airfield housing development is dependent on the J10 expansion going forward. This seems like a huge contradiction as building 2000 homes would definitely increase the traffic within the area regardless of an extra lane.

The list of things wrong with this plan is exhaustive. One thing is clear though. In order to rally support around such plans there is a need for qualitative and unbiased regulated data. At the moment there is very little of this and I can only air my discontent at this. As you have probably gathered, I am sternly against this proposal as it stands.

Best,

Joseph Smith

[REDACTED]

Hersham
Walton On Thames
Surrey,

[REDACTED]

--

Joseph DF Smith MA, BMus (Hons)

[REDACTED]