Dear Madam Inspector,

Following your request for submissions below:

Update from the Inspector 21 October 2019:

An addendum to The Strategic Highway Assessment 2019 is published today.

If representors wish to address the following question in writing: ‘Do the findings of the Strategic Highway Assessment 2019: Addendum include any new information that might significantly alter conclusions drawn from the previously published evidence, and if so, in what way?’, they may do so by submitting a written response of no more than 1000 words to the Programme Officer by no later than 17:30 hours on Tuesday 29 October.

I would like to make the following additional representations:

1. It seems extraordinary that the very substantial omission disclosed in the Addendum could happen and must give cause for concern as to the error free nature and validity of all RBC and its agents and contractors’ submissions and documents. At the very least I submit that in the absence of having the resource to check and verify all documentation this requires that you should treat all RBC submissions with suspicion and with the presumption that they are likely to understate the true extent of adverse impacts from the proposals in its plan.

2. I would respectfully refer you to my previous written and oral submissions, in which I point out the likely impacts on village character, air quality and infrastructure including traffic circulation, safety and parking in the village of Virginia Water. The new document demonstrates factually and conclusively what has always been intuitively clear. i.e. that it is not possible to fit a quart into a pint pot.
3. In its Plan RBC states that VW is a separate settlement to the proposed Garden Village yet the new conclusions disclosed in RBCLP 59 show conclusively that the knock on effect on the infrastructure of Virginia Water is so severe and directly impactive that the Village must actually be considered an expansion of Virginia Water and not a separate free standing and sustainable settlement as submitted by the Council. On that basis it is submitted that the Plan must be rejected.

4. In the alternative it is submitted that even if what is said in para 3 above does not find favour with you, the effect of the Plan on the character and environment of the village of Virginia Water Plan has now been demonstrated by RBC’s own evidence as follows below, to be so adverse that it is respectfully submitted that the Plan must be rejected.

5. The severe and increased congestion (leading to flow breaking down) displayed in the new document clearly shows the substantially worsening conditions in the main thoroughfares of the village of Virginia Water and likely underestimates the holistic effect and cumulative effects on roads conjoined to these through routes and the environs. Additional essential safety features, which the Council must attend to in Christ Church Road, Wellington Ave, Trumps Green Road and Callow Hill such as strategic traffic lights, speed and weight restrictions and traffic calming will necessarily further decelerate the flow rate and therefore increase congestion of traffic. These have not been modelled and it is submitted that this is another reason why the Plan must be rejected.

6. The breakdown of traffic flow explicitly forecast has not prompted any analysis whatsoever of the inevitable increase in the adverse effect on health of queuing traffic from the resulting increased CO2, Nox and PM emissions, which are very currently being reviewed and acted on by Central and local government as a proven, direct cause of increased morbidity. Both schools and retirement homes are situated in or near Christ Church Road, which means that sections of the population most affected by morbidity from toxic air will be substantially affected. This, it is submitted, is a further reason why the Plan must be rejected.

7. The clearly inadequate infrastructure, which would be unacceptably severely stressed by the expansion of Virginia Water by the addition of the Garden Village or equally by treating it notionally as a separate settlement cannot be remedied as I have previously submitted. This means that any attempt by RBC or the developers to phase or in some way mitigate these extremely adverse effects is cannot ever be successful or effective and is likely to be part of a strategy of stealth creep to deliver the original Plan over time by avoiding addressing urgent issues in a timely fashion. In my respectful submission any such attempt should be treated by you with extreme caution and suspicion and a presumption of failure.

John Tenconi