



Southampton to London Pipeline Project

Reference EN07000

Surrey County Council Local Impact Report

Final Version

Submission Deadline 24 October 2019

Submitted by Surrey County Council

Emailed to: southamptontolondonpipeline@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

23 October 2019

Contents

Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction and Terms of Reference	7
2. Scheme Description	9
3. Minerals and Waste	11
4. Local Transport Issues	14
5. Social, Environmental and Economic Issues	17
6. The DCO	23
Appendix 1 – Surrey County Council’s Consultation Response April 2018	30
Appendix 2 – Local Archaeological Policies	39
Appendix 3 - Review of the submitted Environmental Statement & Habitat Regulations Assessment in respect of impacts on Chobham Common SSSI and NNR, Thames Basin Heaths SPA and Thursley, Ash, Pirbright & Chobham SAC	41

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This Executive Summary sets out the key areas of concern for Surrey County Council (SCC) by theme. The LIR assesses the impact of these issues on the local area and sets out mitigation or amendments to the DCO that SCC considers necessary.
2. SCC is a host authority and has range of responsibilities in relation to the proposals, including, Highway Authority, County Planning Authority, Public Rights of Way and lead local flood authority. SCC is also a landowner affected by the scheme.
3. SCC has actively engaged with Esso during the pre-application period. Discussions have been proactive and the extent of agreement is set out in the Statement of Common Ground. SCC supports the principle of the scheme. However, there are a number of substantive issues that still need to be resolved to ensure that the scheme and associated powers are acceptable.
4. The County Council has reviewed the likely impact of the proposed scheme on land within the county of Surrey in respect of the following matters:
 - Impacts on those components of the highway network for which the County Council is responsible in its capacity as Highway Authority.
 - Impacts on surface water and ground water flood risk, and on ordinary watercourses, for which the County Council is responsible in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority.
 - Impacts on minerals and waste safeguarding areas, existing minerals or waste sites covered by safeguarding policies in the adopted minerals plan or adopted waste plan, and on land allocated or otherwise identified as suitable for waste or minerals related development in the adopted minerals plan or adopted waste plan. Of particular interest to the County Council is the implications of the scheme for the following established mineral workings:
 - The ongoing minerals and waste operations, including restoration, at the Brett Aggregates site at Littleton Lane in Shepperton;
 - The permitted mineral working at Manor Farm, Ashford Road, Laleham;
 - The ongoing minerals and waste operations, including restoration, at the Brett Aggregates site at Queen Mary Quarry, Ashford Road, Laleham;
 - The permitted mineral working at Homers Farm, Short Lane, West Bedfont.
 - Impacts on land owned by the County Council, for example, highways land and Chobham Common. The impact of the proposed development on Chobham Common is a matter of particular interest given its status as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), a National Nature Reserve (NNR), and as part of a Special Protection Area (SPA) designation (the Thames Basin Heaths SPA) and part of a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) designation (the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC).

Minerals and Waste

5. In the context of the adopted Surrey Minerals Plan (2011) (comprising the Core Strategy and Primary Aggregates Development Plan Documents (DPD) and the Joint Aggregates Recycling

DPD) and the adopted Surrey Waste Plan (2008/09), there are no anticipated major issues with regard to the proposed development.

6. Surrey County Council is the minerals and waste planning authority (the County Planning Authority or CPA), and in that capacity is satisfied with the general route of the proposed pipeline, which would have limited impact on mineral resources and existing waste capacity within the county. Further work with the CPA and site operators will be essential if the potential impacts of the scheme on operational sites are to be minimised and the sterilisation of aggregate resources is to be avoided. It is considered that any potential conflicts between minerals and waste resources or facilities and the preferred route can be overcome through discussions between the relevant site operators and Esso.
7. With respect to waste sites existing, allocated or proposed for allocation, all would be unaffected by the proposed scheme.
8. The CPA notes that the applicant will develop a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). It is recommended that the CEMP has regard to the principles of sustainable construction and waste management and takes account of the approach set out in Policy CW1 – ‘Waste Minimisation’ of the adopted Surrey Waste Plan (2008 /09) and in proposed Policy 4 – ‘Sustainable Construction and Waste Management in New Development’ of the emerging Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019-2033.

Local Transport Issues

9. Surrey County Council requires the DCO to make reference to, and be subject to, the South East Permit Scheme (“SEPS”). It comprises a permit scheme prepared in accordance with the Traffic Management Act 2004 which provides for highway authorities to co-ordinate works affecting the highway, discharging the duty to maintain the highway network under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. Those wishing to undertake works affecting the highway are required to obtain a permit before carrying them out.
10. Surrey County Council (SCC) as Highway Authority for approximately half of the length of the pipeline is a Statutory Consultee on the Development Consent Order (DCO) for the Southampton to London Oil Pipeline project.
11. The content and extent of the TA Scoping Report as submitted was acceptable as it scoped in all the usual issues that would be expected to be covered within a Transport Assessment for a project of this nature.
12. The Council agrees with the conclusions of the Transport Assessment that the transport impacts are almost entirely based around the project’s construction rather than permanent operation, and for this reason the focus on work with Esso has been on the protection of the County’s interests as Permitting Authority during construction. Subject to:
 1. The agreement of including SEPS within the DCO ;
 2. The provision of additional information/minor amendments to the logistics hubs and maintenance accesses;

3. The acceptance of those conditions recommended in Surrey County Council’s submission on the Proposed Logistics Hubs and Permanent maintenance access points; and
 4. Clarification of the processes to be followed in the alteration of Traffic Regulation Orders.
13. It is acknowledged that the County’s interests as highway authority can be protected through the “business as usual” function of authorising “statutory Authority” type activities on the highway, and the application of conditions on the accesses required under 3) above.
 14. The Council is satisfied that the impacts on Public Rights of Way will be negligible and kept to a minimum.

Heritage

15. A programme of Archaeological Assessment and Evaluation will be required to fully understand the archaeological impact. Using appropriate baseline data, a moderate – high potential has been identified for encountering previously unknown remains dating to all periods. Discussions with Esso are ongoing to develop proposals for trial trench evaluation and further archaeological investigation where appropriate. Subject to these works, it is considered that the proposal will be compliant with the archaeological policies listed above, and the likely impacts will be able to be mitigated to an acceptable level.

Property

16. Surrey County Council owns land that will be affected by the proposals. The significant holdings are:
 - Abbeymore Golf Club
 - Chobham Common (see section on biodiversity and landscape for comments)
 - Abbey Rangers Football Club
 - Phillip Southcote School
 - Clarendon School
 - Chertsey Independent School
17. Discussions with Esso are ongoing to ensure that the impacts on these land interests are acceptable. There are varying degrees of agreement between the parties, for example, there are still considerable issues to resolve with Abbey Rangers Football Club.

Chobham Common

18. Chobham Common is owned by the County Council, as part of its countryside estate, and is managed on the Council’s behalf by the Surrey Wildlife Trust. The Common is subject to a number of European and national level nature conservation designations (Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and National Nature Reserve (NNR)), and the County Council has a responsibility to ensure that the ecological integrity of the Common is protected in line with the reasons for the granting of those designations. In total approximately 2% of the 665 hectares would be affected by

the proposed scheme, the installation of which would involve the use of trenchless and open cut trench construction methods.

19. Conclusion for Chobham Common in respect of Biodiversity Impacts: Overall the County Council is content that the potential for significant adverse impacts on Chobham Common has been addressed robustly through the EIA and HRA processes and that appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures have been embedded into the design of the proposed development and approach outlined in respect of construction and aftercare.
20. Conclusion for Chobham Common in respect of Landscape Impacts: In summary the County Council notes that no permanent surface infrastructure would be installed along the section of the pipeline route that passes through Chobham Common, and that consequently the impacts of the scheme's implementation would be temporary and associated solely with the construction phase. It is also noted that the proposed route of the pipeline across the Common coincides, for the majority of its length with an existing trackway, which would limit the scope for significant changes in landscape character and visual amenity over the duration of the proposed works.
21. The County Council has considered the potential impacts on Flood risk, and is generally satisfied with the approach taken by Esso. It has highlighted the potential for disruption due to protest activity.
22. The County Council also provides detailed comments on the DCO itself.

1. INTRODUCTION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

- 1.1 This Local Impact Report (LIR) has been prepared by one of the host local authorities, Surrey County Council (SCC). This submission forms part of the authority's response to the Southampton to London Pipeline Project. Unless otherwise stated, the comments in this report reflect the view of SCC. A Relevant Representation has been separately prepared and submitted by the authority, and where necessary has been referenced in this Local Impact Report.
- 1.2 Under the Planning Act 2008, the host authorities in Surrey are Surrey County Council (SCC), Spelthorne Borough Council (SBC), Runnymede Borough Council (RBC) and Surrey Heath Borough Council (SHBC). SCC is the relevant Highway Authority and the County Planning Authority (covering minerals, waste and county development), and SBC, RBC and SHBC are the relevant Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) for the areas affected by the scheme. Additionally, the County Council and the Borough Councils have a number of other statutory responsibilities relating to the scheme, including public rights of way (SCC), the lead local flood authority role (SCC) and environmental health (SHBC, SBC and RBC). SCC is also a land owner in relation to the scheme.
- 1.3 SCC has taken into account the purpose of LIRs as set out in s60(3) of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended), DCLG's "Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent" and the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note One "Local Impact Reports", in preparing this LIR.
- 1.4 SCC has actively engaged with Esso during the pre-application period, and has responded to previous consultations with comments. Esso has addressed a number of concerns through the process to date and the extent of agreement reached with Esso is set out in the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG). Inevitably a number of points in this LIR are repeated from the Relevant Representation. However given the importance afforded to the LIR in the Planning Act, the Council is keen to restate key issues within this submission.
- 1.5 SCC supports the principle of the scheme, however a number of substantive issues still need to be resolved to ensure that the scheme and associated powers are acceptable. The primary purpose of this LIR is therefore to evidence the key issues for the Council and its respective communities and to constructively identify where further information and proposals are needed, both to ensure proposals are consistent with policy and to ensure that the adverse local impacts of the DCO scheme are adequately mitigated. The County Council will continue to engage positively with Esso during the examination process.
- 1.6 The County Council has reviewed the likely impact of the proposed scheme on land within the county of Surrey in respect of the following matters:
- Impacts on those components of the highway network for which the County Council is responsible in its capacity as Highway Authority.
 - Impacts on surface water and ground water flood risk, and on ordinary watercourses, for which the County Council is responsible in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority.
 - Impacts on minerals and waste safeguarding areas, existing minerals or waste sites covered by safeguarding policies in the adopted minerals plan or adopted waste plan, and on land allocated or otherwise identified as suitable for waste or minerals

related development in the adopted minerals plan or adopted waste plan. Of particular interest to the County Council are the implications of the scheme for the following established mineral workings:

- The ongoing minerals and waste operations, including restoration, at the Brett Aggregates site at Littleton Lane in Shepperton;
 - The permitted mineral working at Manor Farm, Ashford Road, Laleham;
 - The ongoing minerals and waste operations, including restoration, at the Brett Aggregates site at Queen Mary Quarry, Ashford Road, Laleham;
 - The permitted mineral working at Homers Farm, Short Lane, West Bedfont.
- Impacts on land owned by the County Council, which comprises of highways land and of Chobham Common. The impact of the proposed development on Chobham Common is a matter of particular interest given its status as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), a National Nature Reserve (NNR), and as part of a Special Protection Area (SPA) designation (the Thames Basin Heaths SPA) and part of a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) designation (the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright & Chobham SAC). The County Council has a duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 'to further the conservation and enhancement of the special features of a SSSI'.

2. SCHEME DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The Southampton to London Pipeline Project aims to replace 90km of Esso Petroleum Company Limited's 105km aviation fuel pipeline that runs from Fawley Refinery near Southampton to Esso's West London Terminal Storage Facility in Hounslow.
- 2.2 The pipeline would largely be installed in open cut trenches at least 1.2m deep. In some locations, the pipeline would be installed using trenchless methods. 'Trenchless crossings' would be used to avoid impacting important features such as major roads or rivers and may be considerably deeper than open cut sections.
- 2.3 Temporary infrastructure would be required to install the pipeline. This includes:
- up to six logistics hubs which would be placed at strategic locations and used for pipe storage and distribution as well as providing site offices for workers;
 - construction compounds close to the route and used for storing equipment, providing staff facilities, and laying down pieces of the pipeline and equipment; and
 - haul roads and access tracks to link the pipeline installation areas with the local road network.
- 2.4 The route starts in the north-west of the County, crossing the North Downs railway line, A331, River Blackwater, Frimley Hatches and the Ascot to Guildford railway line. It then runs along the southeastern boundary of SC Johnson Ltd land before crossing Frimley Green Road (B3411) near the roundabout with Balmoral Drive. From the B3411 the route follows Balmoral Drive to Frith Hill, where it follows the existing pipeline across Pine Ridge Golf Course. The route follows the B3015 at the junction of Old Bisley Road, The Maultway and Deepcut Bridge Road.
- 2.5 Here it enters Ministry of Defence (MoD) land associated with the Bisley and Pirbright Ranges, Colony Bog and Bagshot Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The application route continues north running adjacent to The Maultway (B3015) before turning east to follow Red Road (B311) and across open ground before running alongside Guildford Road for a short distance. The section then crosses Guildford Road, followed by a crossing of the A322 Lightwater Bypass, continuing through Windlemere Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). The application route then crosses the Halebourne and then Halebourne Lane.
- 2.6 The Section then continues generally northeast, crossing Windlesham Road, before passing through Chobham Common SSSI, which is owned by Surrey County Council.
- 2.7 The route then continues generally northeast, passing through Foxhills Country Club and Resort to the B386 Longcross Road. The section then crosses the B386 and continues north of St Peter's Hospital. It passes under the A320 Guildford Road, through the grounds of Salesian School and under the M25. It then continues through Abbey Moor golf course. There is then a crossing of the Chertsey Branch railway line between Chertsey and Addlestone Stations. The route then follows Canford Drive before crossing the A317 Chertsey Road and subsequently passing through the playing fields at Addlestone Moor. The section then crosses the Chertsey Bourne and passes through Chertsey Meads.
- 2.8 The route then passes under the River Thames and the M3 and heads north, before crossing the B376 Shepperton Road. The section then heads north to cross under the Queen Mary

Intake Canal before following Ashford Road (B377) west of the Queen Mary Reservoir. This is followed by a crossing under the Staines Reservoir Aqueduct and Ashford Road just south of the A308.

- 2.9 The section then passes through Fordbridge Park before crossing under the Staines Bypass (A308) and River Ash. After crossing the A308, it continues north, through the open space adjacent to Woodthorpe Road and then east along Woodthorpe Road itself, crossing the Waterloo to Reading railway line just east of Ashford Station. This will be accomplished by heading east from Station Approach to cross under Church Road (B378) into the grounds of Clarendon Primary School and then crossing under the railway line heading north.
- 2.10 The section passes on the east side of the grounds of St James Senior Boys' School and through the eastern part of the Thomas Knyvett College playing fields before crossing under the A30.
- 2.11 In Surrey the pipeline would cross a variety of land uses from built up residential areas, open countryside, Common land, military land and farmland.

3. MINERALS AND WASTE

Policy Context

- 3.1 In the context of the adopted Surrey Minerals Plan (2011) (comprised of the Core Strategy and Primary Aggregates Development Plan Documents (DPD) and the Joint Aggregates Recycling DPD) and the adopted Surrey Waste Plan (2008/09), there are no anticipated major issues with regard to the proposed development. The adopted Surrey Waste Plan (2008/09) is currently being reviewed, and the emerging Surrey Waste Local Plan for the period 2019-2033 is at the public examination stage.
- 3.2 Surrey County Council is the minerals and waste planning authority (the County Planning Authority or CPA), and in that capacity is satisfied with the general route of the proposed pipeline, which would have limited impact on mineral resources and existing waste capacity within the county. Further work with the CPA and site operators will be essential if the potential impacts of the scheme on operational sites are to be minimised and the sterilisation of aggregate resources is to be avoided.
- 3.3 Appendix 1 gives Surrey County Council's consultation response dated April 2018, which included the views of the CPA. That consultation response highlighted potential conflicts between minerals and waste resources or facilities and the preferred route which it is considered can be overcome through discussions between the relevant site operators and Esso.
- 3.4 The CPA has reviewed the information provided in Chapter 11 (Soils & Geology) of the submitted Environmental Statement (ES) to ascertain the extent to which the proposed pipeline route and Order Limits for Sections E (Farnborough (A327 crossing) to Bisley & Pirbright Ranges), F (Bisley & Pirbright Ranges to M25), G (M25 to M3) and H (M3 to West London Terminal storage facility) interface with sites or areas allocated for development in the adopted Surrey Minerals Plan, the adopted Surrey Waste Plan and the emerging Surrey Waste Local Plan, or with permitted minerals or waste development.

Minerals Development

The CPA notes that section 11.3 (Baseline Conditions) (pp.12-17) of Chapter 11 of the ES includes reference at paragraphs 11.3.12 and 11.3.13 (p.14) to the relationship of the proposed pipeline to a number of permitted minerals sites in Surrey. Assessment of the likely implications of the proposed development for those mineral workings is provided in paragraphs 11.5.10 to 11.5.13 (p.21) of section 11.5 (Potential Impacts (without Mitigation) (pp.19-22) of Chapter 11 of the ES.

- 3.4.1 Queen Mary Reservoir, Ashford Road, Laleham – Reference is made in paragraph 11.3.13 (p.14) to the quarry as a 'Preferred Area' and an allocated site for mineral extraction, where in fact it is an operational mineral site rather than an area identified in the Plan for future mineral working. The extraction of mineral (sharp sand and gravel) from the reservoir is ongoing under Planning Permission SP13/01236/SCC (granted on 6 January 2015). Mineral from the reservoir is processed at the adjoining Queen Mary Quarry under Planning Permission SP13/01239/SCC (granted on 6 January 2015). Applications (ref. SP16/01164/SCRVC) seeking extensions of time for the completion of extraction from the reservoir baffle and for the retention and

continued use of the processing plant (ref. SP16/01196/SCRVC) were submitted in April 2016 and are currently awaiting determination.

- 3.4.2 Paragraph 11.5.12 (p.21) in the ES reports that the proposed pipeline would only intersect with the western extremities of the Queen Mary Quarry site, and would therefore not interfere with the continued extraction of mineral from the reservoir baffle, or with the continued processing of that mineral at the established plant site within the quarry. The CPA does not disagree with that conclusion, and has no specific concerns in relation to the implementation of the proposed pipeline and the continued operation of the mineral working and associated processing facility.
- 3.4.3 Homers Farm, London Road, Staines-upon-Thames – Also referred to in paragraph 11.3.12 (p.14) as a ‘Preferred Area’, this is a permitted mineral working (planning permission ref: SP/13/00141/SCC granted on 12 January 2015), from which the extraction of sand and gravel has recently commenced (2018).
- 3.4.4 Paragraph 11.5.12 (p.21) in the ES reports that it is anticipated, for the purposes of the assessment of the pipeline, that mineral working at the Homers Farm quarry would have largely ceased before installation of the pipeline reaches that part of Surrey. The CPA is concerned that this assessment has been based on the end date for the quarry as set out in the extant planning permission (ref: SP/13/00141/SCC granted on 12 January 2015), which is given as 21 February 2020. The CPA can confirm that it has recently received an application for an extension of time to 30 September 2024 for the Homers Farm quarry, to enable extraction of the mineral resource to be completed, and it is therefore likely that mineral working at Homers Farm may be ongoing when installation of the pipeline reaches that part of Surrey. The CPA is therefore not able, at this point in time, to concur with the conclusion set out in paragraph 11.5.12 (p.21) of the ES that there would be no impact on the operation of the permitted quarry from the implementation of the proposed pipeline. Further consideration needs to be given to the potential for the export of raw mineral from to the Hengrove Farm processing facility (located to the south west and accessed via the A30) and the import of in-fill material to the quarry to be affected by the installation of the proposed pipeline on the northern side of the A30 and on the western side of Short Lane.
- 3.4.5 Manor Farm, Ashford Road, Laleham and Queen Mary Quarry, Ashford Road, Laleham – Referenced in paragraph 11.3.14 (p.14) Manor Farm is a permitted mineral working (Planning permission ref: SP/2012/01132 granted on 23 October 2015) from which the extraction of sand and gravel has yet to commence.) Mineral from the site will be processed at the existing Queen Mary Quarry (QMQ) processing plant to which it would be transported by means of a field conveyor to be installed in a tunnel beneath Ashford Road.
- 3.4.6 Paragraph 11.5.12 (p.21) in the ES reports that, for the purposes of the assessment, it has been assumed that the conveyor that would pass under the Ashford Road linking the Manor Farm quarry to the processing facility at Queen Mary Quarry would be unaffected by the implementation of the proposed pipeline. The CPA is not able, at this point in time, to concur with the conclusion set out in paragraph 11.5.12 (p.21) of the ES that there would be no impact on the operation of the permitted quarry from the implementation of the proposed pipeline. Further consideration needs to be given to the potential for the conveyor to be affected, at the Ashford Road crossing point, by the installation of the proposed pipeline on the western side of the Queen Mary Quarry site. Any impact on the conveyor could impact on the accessibility of the mineral resources contained within the permitted Manor Farm site, and could have implications for the CPA’s landbank for aggregate minerals.

- 3.5 The former Shepperton Quarry at Littleton Lane is identified in Table 3.2 (p.17) in Chapter 3 (Project Description) of the ES as the site of a proposed logistics hub, which would be required for the duration of the proposed 2 year construction period. Table 3.2 (p.17) in Chapter 3 of the ES indicates that the hub would be situated on an area of land within the former quarry that is to be restored to agricultural land. The potential implications of the proposed use of that land as a temporary construction compound for the restoration of the quarry, and the creation of the proposed agricultural land, does not appear to have been addressed in the ES. The CPA notes that the proposed duration of the construction period for the DCO project is relatively short, and that any impacts on the implementation of the approved restoration scheme for the former Shepperton Quarry are therefore likely to be of limited significance, but is concerned that the matter has not been addressed even briefly in the ES.
- 3.6 Paragraph 11.3.12 (p.14) of the ES describes the relationship of the proposed pipeline route to the mineral safeguarding areas (MSAs) identified in the Surrey Minerals Plan, with parts of the pipeline in sections F, G and H intersecting with MSAs. The assessment set out in section 11.5.13 (p.21) of the ES notes that access to mineral resources within MSAs could be restricted as a consequence of the presence of the proposed pipeline and associated easements and safe working zones. The assessment goes on to note that some 3,800 hectares of MSAs or mineral consultation areas (MCAs) (there are none of the latter in north west Surrey) fall within the 1 kilometre buffer zone defined along the route of the proposed pipeline (which covers Hampshire and Surrey), but only 96 hectares distributed across the two counties would be covered by the proposed Order limits, representing a small proportion of the total area of covered by MSA or MCA designations in Surrey or Hampshire. The assessment therefore concludes that the impact of the scheme on mineral resources, in terms of sterilisation, would be of minor significance, a conclusion with which the CPA concurs in respect of the county of Surrey.

Waste Development

- 3.7 With respect to sites allocated for development in the adopted Surrey Waste Plan or proposed for allocation in the emerging Surrey Waste Local Plan the CPA can confirm that none would fall within the DCO boundary or the 250 metre buffer zone applied with respect to contaminated or potentially contaminated land. The Queen Mary Quarry site at Ashford Road in Laleham is engaged in the recycling of construction, demolition and excavation wastes, in addition to the processing of minerals. The impacts of the proposed development on that site have been considered in paragraph 11.5.12 (p.21) in section 11.5 (Potential Impacts (without Mitigation) (pp.19-22) of the ES which concludes that the mineral and associated processing operations would be unaffected by the implementation of the proposed pipeline, and conclusion with which the CPA does not disagree.
- 3.8 The CPA notes that the applicant will develop a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and that no stage of the authorised development would commence until a CEMP relating to that stage has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority (which it is assumed would be the local planning authority for the area affected). It is recommended that the CEMP has regard to the principles of sustainable construction and waste management and takes account of the approach set out in Policy CW1 – ‘Waste Minimisation’ of the adopted Surrey Waste Plan (2008 /09) and in proposed Policy 4 – ‘Sustainable Construction and Waste Management in New Development’ of the emerging Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019-2033.

4. LOCAL TRANSPORT ISSUES

Network Management

- 4.1 Surrey County Council requires the DCO to make reference to the South East Permit Scheme (“SEPS”). Specified works would therefore be subject to the SEPS as applied by the County Council as Highway Authority. Since the introduction of SEPS in November 2013, it is required to be used by those wishing to undertake works on Surrey highways. It is administered by Surrey County Council as the local highway authority. It comprises a permit scheme prepared in accordance with the Traffic Management Act 2004 which provides for highway authorities to co-ordinate works affecting the highway, discharging the duty to maintain the highway network under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991.
- 4.2 Those wishing to undertake works affecting the highway are required to obtain a permit before carrying them out. The permit application is considered by the highway authority and if the authority is satisfied that the SEPS objectives are met and that the works proposed would not compromise their statutory duties to co-ordinate and manage the local highway network, a permit is issued. Regular consultation with and dialogue between the highway authority and those wishing to undertake road and street works before a permit is applied for and issued, ensures that the works are co-ordinated in a way that minimises disruption.
- 4.3 The permit scheme has the benefit of being familiar and widely understood. It works well and is respected by those that use it in the County. SEPS will ensure that the County Council retains the ability to comply with its statutory duties to co-ordinate works affecting the local road network. This approach was agreed by the Secretaries of State in their Decision Letter relating to the Thames Tideway Tunnel DCO. Further consultation with TFL, the highway authority running the permit scheme within the area of the Thames Tideway Tunnel has confirmed that the permit scheme is running well and that the bespoke scheme which was negotiated but not agreed prior to the decision on that scheme has not been required.

Local transport patterns and issues

- 4.4 Surrey County Council (SCC) as Highway Authority for approximately half of the length of the pipeline is a Statutory Consultee on the Development Consent Order (DCO) for the Southampton to London Oil Pipeline project. SCC has been included from the outset in all appropriate discussions, meetings, and correspondence on the project as it has evolved and in general terms accept that the supporting documentation is fit for purpose in terms of assessing the potential traffic and transport impacts on the highway network in Surrey.

Non-Statutory Corridor Consultation: April 2018

- 4.5 On 30th April 2018, SCC provided a commentary on the initial consultation which included a high level commentary on the route options available at that time, as well as an initial commentary on the network management implications of administering the installation of the pipeline along the route as it ran under the highway network. This response is given in Appendix 1. Comments have generally been taken on board, and where there were questions raised, these are in the course of being addressed as the DCO process has continued. The only exception being the progression of a PPA (Planning Performance Agreement) associated with this application.

Transport Assessment Scoping Report 20/12/2018

- 4.6 The content and extent of the scoping as submitted was acceptable as it scoped in all the usual issues that would be expected to be covered within a Transport Assessment for a project of this nature.

Commentary on Transport Assessment

- 4.7 The Transport Assessment recognises that the majority of the impact will be temporary during the 27 months of construction. It assesses links and considers the impacts on public transport of the proposed road closures. It concludes that as the project only results in changes in Annual Average Daily Traffic on any link assessed of no greater than 3% arising from Construction Traffic, there is not a significant or severe impact. SCC agrees with this conclusion.
- 4.8 It also assess the impacts on bus routes during construction in the vicinity of the Logistics Hubs, and in respect of road closures on specific routes. In Surrey, as the only road which is to be closed both ways during construction is St Catherine's Road, Frimley Green, and as this has no bus routes running along it, there will be no need to operate diversions. If bus routes have single line traffic signals, it will be similar to all other road works that buses encounter on a regular basis. Individual bus stops might have to be temporarily closed/ moved during these works, but these will be managed through the permitting process.
- 4.9 Once these are all identified with firm dates in an actual construction period, the Council will advise the operators as a courtesy that they may experience some delays, especially in peak hours. The Council will manage the actualities when the construction programme is initiated and the Road Closure Orders are published. The latter are received through internal channels and each one is scrutinised to assess the impact on any bus route(s).
- 4.10 An assessment has also been undertaken on the impact on Collisions and Safety, with the conclusion that there would be negligible change, and that these would occur over a temporary basis on a diversion route.
- 4.11 An assessment of the potential severe cumulative impacts of the Heathrow Expansion has also been undertaken. Whilst TEMPRO accounts for growth from committed development in North Surrey, it does not include Heathrow Expansion. However, the timings of the Heathrow Expansion construction activities which are expected to be between 2023 and 2035 do not overlap with the Southampton to London Esso Pipeline replacement project. Whilst there is the potential for some of the Heathrow enabling works to coincide with the project, it is not expected that Heathrow Expansion enabling works traffic would use the network subject to short term disruption by the pipeline project construction.
- 4.12 Assessments have also been undertaken of the other DCO and other significant developments along the route, none of which are deemed to contribute towards a severe cumulative impact.

Conclusions

- 4.13 It is agreed that the transport impacts are almost entirely based around the project's construction rather than permanent operation, and for this reason the focus on work with Esso has been on the protection of the County's interests as Permitting Authority during construction. Subject to:

- 1) The inclusion of SEPS within the DCO ;
- 2) The provision of additional information/minor amendments to the logistics hubs and maintenance accesses;
- 3) The acceptance of those conditions recommended in Surrey County Council's submission on the Proposed Logistics Hubs and Permanent maintenance access points; and
- 4) Clarification of the processes to be followed in the alteration of Traffic Regulation Orders.

4.14 It is acknowledged that the County's interests as highway authority can be protected through the "business as usual" function of authorising "statutory Authority" type activities on the highway, and the application of conditions on the accesses required under 3) above.

Public Rights of Way (PROW)

- 4.15 The proposed pipeline crosses numerous PROWs across the County, therefore there will be some disruption caused to the public. From discussions with Esso it is understood that these will be kept to a reasonable minimum.
- 4.16 There do not appear to be any negative implications to the PROW network from the proposed works access routes/hubs.
- 4.17 It is noted that the DCO gives Esso the power to temporarily stop up, divert or restrict public access. This should be kept to a minimum at all times, with any temporary changes to PROWs only being in place when work is actively being carried out or there are obvious public safety issues created by the pipeline works.
- 4.18 It should be noted that all appropriate classes of public user must be taken into account with regards to alternative routes and signing for different status of PROWs. These are:
- Public Footpath – pedestrians.
 - Public Bridleways – pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians.
- 4.19 Appropriate reinstatement must be carried out for all PROWs under the council's permit/opening scheme. This includes PROWs with natural, aggregate or semi-sealed surfaces. The council has provided Esso with guidance for this type of work.
- 4.20 There has been a significant level of comment from local residents about the proposed route through Turf Hill, Lightwater. The route runs along a section of Public Bridleway 66 West End. Although the council does not have specific data on the levels of public use of this bridleway, it would appear from the comments that it is a very popular route and to minimize public disruption any temporary alterations to the path should be for as short a time as possible.

5. SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC ISSUES

Climate Change

- 5.1 The County Council has declared a climate emergency in recognition of the issues facing our planet. The Government requires that all greenhouse gas emissions are reduced to net zero by 2050. The County Council is currently reviewing how it can contribute to help ensure that this low carbon future is achieved. Our reliance on fossil fuels and hydrocarbons will rightly reduce with a much greater emphasis on renewable and sustainable energy sources. This will however take time and there will still be a role for hydrocarbons during the transition. Aviation emissions will be taken into account in the Government's net zero by 2050 target along with all other sources. If the pipeline is not replaced, there will still be a demand for fuel. This would be most likely to be met by HGVs, the use of which is likely to result in an increase in greenhouse emissions.

Heritage

- 5.2 Surrey's archaeological policies, which are set out in Appendix 2, are defined by the relevant borough administrative areas. All three sets of policies are comparable in their expectations and requirements. As the proposed pipeline route is over the 0.4ha size threshold as specified in all three policies, Archaeological Assessment and a programme of Evaluation will be required in order to fully understand the archaeological impact. The policies also set out measures to minimise or mitigate the archaeological impact once this has been determined.

Key Local Issues

- 5.3 The key issue considered here is the long term negative archaeological impact arising from the destruction of archaeological assets as a result of the groundworks involved in pipe laying or associated access, compounds or enabling works.
- 5.4 However the potential impact of any change in setting to Designated Heritage Assets such as Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas or Parks and Gardens should also be considered, particularly as a result of tree or vegetation loss.
- 5.5 A search of the Surrey HER was undertaken for Designated Heritage Assets within 300m of the proposed route:
- Scheduled Monuments: 4
 - Listed Buildings: 33
 - Conservation Areas: 2
 - Registered Parks or Gardens: 1
- 5.6 In addition to designated Heritage Assets, Surrey County Council has some locally identified archaeological classifications:
- A 'County Site of Archaeological Importance' is a known archaeological heritage asset within Surrey that is important in either a National or Regional context and should be preserved. 4 sites are identified within 300m of the proposed route.

- An 'Area of High Archaeological Potential' is a defined area where it is strongly suspected that there is an increased likelihood of archaeological remains (finds or features) being revealed should ground disturbance take place. There are 19 of these sites identified within 300m of the proposed route.

5.7 Due to the size of the proposed groundworks, the impact on hitherto unidentified or currently not understood archaeological sites must also be considered and further explored. The County has an archaeologically rich resource and the proposed route traverses through areas known to contain an archaeologically rich resource (such as across the Thames gravels), and also through areas where very little previous archaeological investigation has been carried out (such as the Surrey Heath MoD land), meaning the archaeological potential is largely unknown.

Adequacy of application/DCO

5.8 A Desk Based Archaeological Assessment of the potential impact of the proposals has been completed, (Jacobs, 2018). It demonstrates that the proposed route has been designed to minimise direct impact to designated Heritage Assets. Using appropriate baseline data, a moderate – high potential has been identified for encountering previously unknown remains dating to all periods, although this potential may vary across the route.

5.9 Trial Trench evaluation is proposed where possible in order to better understand unknown impacts and provide an opportunity to decide on measures to enable remains to be preserved in situ, or enable suitable mitigation measures to be developed. Discussions between SCC and the applicant regarding a design for a detailed Method Statement/Written Scheme of Investigation for this phase of work are in progress, and this is expected to be submitted in support of the application.

5.10 Following trial trench evaluation it is proposed that further archaeological investigation in the form of a 'Strip Map and Sample' excavation or 'Watching Brief' will be undertaken. This will provide an opportunity to fully investigate archaeological remains revealed through the evaluation phase, and also to investigate areas which were not identified as suitable for evaluation (e.g. due to heavy vegetation cover). A Method Statement/Written Scheme of Investigation for this will need to be finalised based on the results of trial trench evaluation, when available.

5.11 Any submitted method statements will also need to consider promoting and encouraging community involvement and publicising the results for both an expert and non-expert audience.

5.12 Subject to these works, it is considered that the proposal will be compliant with the policies listed above, and the likely impacts will be able to be mitigated to an acceptable level.

Property

5.13 Surrey County Council owns land that will be affected by the proposals. The significant holdings are:

- Abbeymore Golf Club
- Chobham Common (see section on biodiversity and landscape for comments)

- Abbey Rangers Football Club
- Phillip Southcote School
- Clarendon School
- Chertsey Independent School

Abbeymore Golf Club

- 5.14 The Golf Club has been in detailed discussions with Esso and is working with Esso constructively and positively. The Club has planning permission for an adventure golf facility which involves the construction of a track. Esso has asked for an easement across the track. A delay to the construction of the track has been agreed.
- 5.15 There will be an impact on the Club, but it can be overcome. Therefore, there are no major issues arising. Both parties are working to agree a schedule of works, for before, during and after construction. The financial implications are being worked through and discussions about who is responsible for undertaking the making good works is in progress.

Abbey Rangers Football Club

- 5.16 Abbey Rangers Football Club (ARFC) was formed in 1976, and has used these grounds since 1986. The clubhouse was recently valued at £900,000 and the Club is a Surrey Football Association 'centre for excellence'. The building was opened by Sir Trevor Brooking in 2008 and in the next month or so, construction of a full-size synthetic pitch with floodlights will be started. This new synthetic pitch will not be affected by the proposals.
- 5.17 The Club has over 30, regularly competing, football teams. The site comprises 7 football pitches of varying size to cater for the intake age group of Under 7s, up to men and women's senior football. Its football season generally begins early in August and finishes in the middle of May.
- 5.18 The Club operates a safe and organised platform to deliver football to a large number of people in the local community. Currently, it has over 450 people as playing members and significant numbers of people associated with the players that give up valuable time to support the Club.
- 5.19 The annual charge for membership is £115 per head. The actual cost of each member is approximately £200. The deficit is made up by selling food and drink, putting on events in the clubhouse building, sponsorship and grants etc.
- 5.20 The Club is extremely concerned that the proposals will have a catastrophic effect on its day to day business.
- 5.21 Immediately after the football stops in May, remedial works to the pitches and grounds are carried out. This costs approximately £13,000. Once that work has been completed, the grounds are shut to allow the remedial works to settle and the grass to grow.
- 5.22 The next major event is always the first week of July, when the annual Summer tournament is held. This is the largest single fundraiser the Club holds. In 2019, 187 teams competed over 2 days and the event made c. £16,000 profit.
- 5.23 If the pipeline was replaced in the closed season, then the following impacts would arise:

- Excavation damage to 5 out of the 7 pitches.
- The annual remedial works would not be undertaken, resulting in a severe and detrimental effect on the playing condition of the pitches for the following season.
- The Summer tournament could not take place, resulting in financial loss to the Club for one, and possibly more, years.

5.24 The Clubs preferred route would be to follow the perimeter of our grass areas. If this route was taken, the pitches would not be affected, the remedial works could progress and the annual Summer Tournament could take place.

Phillip Southcote School

5.25 Currently there are no significant issues identified.

Clarendon School

5.26 The works proposed here will have some impact, which needs to be clarified. Further discussion with Esso and the school is required to review potential mitigation. In particular the comments relate to works being conducted outside of term time (The Summer window offering the only period of length – 6 weeks). However, the programme duration for these works for this location is currently unclear. It incorporates a change in direction and a drill under the railway. Access is required through the entire site from the main gates, through to the rear playing field.

Chertsey High School

5.27 The key concern for the school is that the proposed work (in parcel 9700, title number SY836354,) uses the school's main vehicle entrance for construction traffic access which could be disruptive to the school's activities. Depending on when access is required this will need careful management and the impact will need to be satisfactorily resolved. Ideally the works should be carried out during the school holidays.

Other Land Interests

5.28 SCC maintain other interest in land affected by the scheme, primarily maintainable highway (owned or adopted) and associated verges within the curtilage of the recognised highway extent. All works planned within these areas would be anticipated under the usual permits provided by SCC highways team.

5.29 Subsequent road crossings and pipelaying works within the roads/verges will have implications which are generally captured in the Local Transport Issues (Section 4).

Biodiversity and Landscape: Chobham Common

5.30 Chobham Common is owned by the County Council, as part of its countryside estate, and is managed on the Council's behalf by the Surrey Wildlife Trust. The Common is subject to a number of European and national level nature conservation designations (Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and National Nature Reserve (NNR)), and the County Council has a responsibility to ensure that the ecological integrity of the Common is protected in line with the reasons for the granting of those designations. The proposed development would dissect the Common to the south

of the M3 motorway, following an existing trackway for the majority of its length. In total approximately 2% of the 665 hectares would be affected by the proposed scheme, the installation of which would involve the use of trenchless and open cut trench construction methods. Trenchless techniques are proposed at three separate locations across the Common to avoid adverse impacts on the wet heathland habitats that are one of the features for which the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright & Chobham SAC is designated, of which the Common is a constituent part. Installation works would be restricted to the period between 1 October and 31 January, in order to minimise the risks of adverse impacts on the Common's breeding populations of the Dartford warbler, the nightjar and the woodlark, the three bird species for which the Thames Basin Heaths SPA is designated, of which the Common is a constituent part.

- 5.31 The County Council, in its capacity as the custodian of Chobham Common, has reviewed the information provided in Chapter 7 (Biodiversity) and Chapter 10 (Landscape) of the submitted Environmental Statement (ES) to ascertain the extent to which the implementation of Section F (Bisley & Pirbright Ranges to M25) of the proposed pipeline route would impact on the ecological integrity and landscape character and visual amenity of the Common. The review also involved examination of the information set out in the Habitat Regulations Assessment for the proposed scheme, due to Chobham Common's status as part of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and as part of the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright & Chobham Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The conclusions of that review are summarised below, and can be found in full in Appendix 3 to this report.
- 5.32 Conclusion for Chobham Common in respect of Biodiversity Impacts: Overall the County Council is content that the potential for significant adverse impacts on Chobham Common has been addressed robustly through the EIA and HRA processes and that appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures have been embedded into the design of the proposed development and approach outlined in respect of construction and aftercare. The County Council is satisfied that adequate consideration has been given to the European designations (Thames Basin Heaths SPA and Thursley, Ash, Pirbright & Chobham SAC) and the national designations (SSSI and NNR) that cover the Common, and that the integrity of those designations would not be compromised by the proposed scheme.
- 5.33 Conclusion for Chobham Common in respect of Landscape Impacts: In summary the County Council notes that no permanent surface infrastructure would be installed along the section of the pipeline route that passes through Chobham Common, and that consequently the impacts of the scheme's implementation would be temporary and associated solely with the construction phase. It is also noted that the proposed route of the pipeline across the Common coincides, for the majority of its length with an existing trackway, which would limit the scope for significant changes in landscape character and visual amenity over the duration of the proposed works.

Flood risk

- 5.34 The Council is generally satisfied with the approach taken and the mitigation measures presented in the Flood Risk Report. However, there are a few specific locations and mitigations that the Council require to ensure that there is an agreeable mitigation strategy. Draft Protective Provisions for the drainage authority to be included in the DCO were provided in September. No response to those has yet been received.

Emergency Planning

- 5.35 Surrey has experienced protests at some of the oil exploration/production sites within the County. It is known that more protests are planned for these and the Heathrow expansion. For the construction phase Esso may already be liaising directly with the Police. However, SCC is currently not aware of the arrangements for on-site construction phase security. This may already be in place, and plans may be regarded as sensitive.
- 5.36 SCC would like to discuss with Esso how they plan to protect the site from or respond to protests. If the protests are on private land a lot of the actions would need to be addressed by Esso.

6. THE DCO

- 6.1 Throughout the DCO, deemed consent is conferred if a consultee has not responded within a certain amount of time – often 28 days. Any such application for consent should contain a clear reference to this deemed consent provision and this should be expressly required within all such provisions.

Part 1

Interpretation

- 6.2 “maintain” is defined in very broad terms. An explanation and examples of “any derivative of ‘maintain’” should be provided so that the County Council can properly understand what is meant. Are the derivatives likely to be different from ‘maintain’ activities? ‘Maintain’ includes removal/decommissioning and the principal powers of the DCO provide that the undertaker may at any time maintain the authorised development. Is consent therefore granted for the lifetime of the pipeline?

Part 2

Article 5 – Maintenance of drainage works

- 6.3 If the undertaker is not to be allocated any maintenance responsibility, the Local Lead Flood Authority should have a mechanism for approving works. Who has responsibility for maintenance if the undertaker is in temporary possession?

Article 6 – Limits of Deviation

- 6.4 divert is already included in the definition of maintain and so why is diverting dealt with as a separate term in this article?
- 6.5 6 (1) (c) (ii), (d) (i) and (ii) Are these also subject to not giving rise to any new or materially different environmental effects to those assessed in the environmental statement?

Part 3

- 6.6 Surrey County Council requires the DCO to make reference to the South East Permit Scheme (“SEPS”). Specified works would therefore be subject to the SEPS as applied by the County Council as Highway Authority. Since the introduction of SEPS in November 2013, it is required to be used by those wishing to undertake works on Surrey highways. It is administered by Surrey County Council as the local highway authority. It comprises a permit scheme prepared in accordance with the Traffic Management Act 2004 which provides for highway authorities to co-ordinate works affecting the highway, discharging the duty to maintain the highway network under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991.
- 6.7 Those wishing to undertake works affecting the highway are required to obtain a permit before carrying them out. The permit application is considered by the highway authority and if the authority is satisfied that the SEPS objectives are met and that the works proposed would not compromise their statutory duties to co-ordinate and manage the local highway network, a permit is issued. Regular consultation with and dialogue between the highway authority and those wishing to undertake road and street works before a permit is applied for and issued, ensures that the works are co-ordinated in a way that minimises disruption.

- 6.8 The permit scheme has the benefit of being familiar and widely understood. It works well and is respected by those that use it in the County. SEPS will ensure that the County Council retains the ability to comply with its statutory duties to co-ordinate works affecting the local road network. This approach was agreed by the Secretaries of State in their Decision Letter relating to the Thames Tideway Tunnel DCO. Further consultation with TFL, the highway authority running the permit scheme within the area of the Thames Tideway Tunnel has confirmed that the permit scheme is running well and that the bespoke scheme which was negotiated but not agreed prior to the decision on that scheme has not been required.

Article 9 – Power to alter layout, etc. of streets

- 6.9 Please see previous comments above on Part 3 and the application of the South East Permit Scheme.
- 6.10 9 (3) ‘reasonable satisfaction’ – how will this be measured and will be the mechanism for the resolution of any dispute on this point be Article 47 (Arbitration)?

Article 10 – Street Works

- 6.11 Please see previous comments above on Part 3 and the application of the South East Permit Scheme.

Article 11 – Application of the 1991 Act

- 6.12 The Explanatory Memorandum at 6.57 states that the modifications within this Article replace those in Article 8 of the General Model Provisions (“GMP”) however Article 8 of the GMP contains the street works provisions which are contained within Article 10 of the draft DCO. This Article 11 is additional and provides for the undertaker to carry out the works contained in section 86(3) (a), (c) to (e), (g) and (h) works under sections 64 or 184 of the Highways Act 1980. Surrey County Council as highway authority require further information on what works are envisaged by the undertaker under Article 11 and what consultation and approval mechanism are proposed as works under these provisions include continuing maintenance liability for the highway authority in addition to its statutory duties. Also there are policy considerations to be taken into account in the granting of requests for the construction of vehicle crossings over footways.
- 6.13 11 (3) Please refer to the previous comments under Part 3 above. The disapplications within Article 11 (3) are not explained within the Explanatory Memorandum. Why are each of these necessary? It is a departure from the GMP which states that the provisions of sections 54 to 106 of the 1991 Act apply to any street works carried out under paragraph 1. Use of SEPS would be acceptable in place of the suggested disapplication of sections of the 1991 Act.
- 6.14 11 (5) Should the reference to paragraph (2) be to paragraph (4)?

Article 12 – Temporary stopping up of streets and public rights of way

- 6.15 The County Council’s Countryside Access Team Manager has noted the power within this Article to temporarily stop up, divert or restrict public access with the conditioned consent of the street authority. He has requested that this be kept to a minimum at all times, with any temporary changes to PROWs only being in place when work is actively being carried out or there are obvious public safety issues created by the pipeline works. Perhaps the applicant could include this within Article 12.

- 6.16 12(1) In the absence of a definition of reasonable here and throughout, it is assumed that the arbitration provision at Article 47 will be invoked.
- 6.17 12 (5) Part 1 of the 1961 Act relates to compensation for Compulsory Acquisition. Would it apply here?
- 6.18 12(6) Is there a reason for this departure from Article 11 of the GMP?

Article 13 – Use of private roads

- 6.19 13(3) Is Part 1 of the 1961 Act applicable here?

Article 14 – Access to works

- 6.20 There may be wording missing from this Article. The Explanatory Memorandum refers to Article 14 (2). As drafted, the undertaker may form and layout means of access or improve existing means of access without seeking consent/approval/agreement of the relevant highway authority or street authority. Clearly such consent/approval/agreement must be sought from the relevant authority. If required, the County Council can provide a form of words but it may be that the missing Article 14(2) covers it.

Article 15 – Traffic regulation

- 6.21 These provisions are currently being considered by the County Council’s Traffic team and further comments will be provided at the draft DCO hearing. Specific consideration is being given to the deemed consent time provisions within this article and whether these are realistic and achievable.

Article 16 – Agreements with street authorities

- 6.22 It is understood that as section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 does not apply to development consent orders, this section provides for agreements if deemed necessary. The County Council would want further information on the mechanism for agreeing to enter into agreements or whether arbitration clause 47 would be relied on if necessary.

Part 4

Article 17 – Discharge of water

- 6.23 17(8)(a) should this reference be to Homes England?

Article 19 – Authority to survey and investigate land

- 6.24 It is noted that this Article contains significant departures from the GMP. A requirement should be included to ensure that the undertaker restores the land to the condition and level it was in on the date on which the survey or investigation began or other such condition as may be agreed with the owner of the land.
- 6.25 19(1) This article authorises the entering on to of any land within the Order limits or which may be affected by the authorised development. What is envisaged by ‘may be affected by the authorised development’? This appears to be a very broad power to enter land. The

Explanatory Memorandum states that surveys are authorised by the provision where reasonably necessary on land outside the Order limits provided that the land in question is affected by the proposed development. Neither affected nor reasonably necessary are defined. Reasonably necessary does not appear in 19(1) and the power sought is wider than the authorisation of surveys mentioned in the Explanatory Memorandum and includes the 19(1) activities and the 19(2) taking of samples.

- 6.26 19(8) It is unclear how section 13 of the 1965 Act can be made to apply to an authority to survey and investigate land in this way using section 125 of the Planning Act 2008 and perhaps the undertaker can clarify this. It should be borne in mind that section 13 provides a mechanism for obtaining a warrant to deliver possession with costs to be paid by the person refusing to give possession to be offset against any compensation payable by the acquiring authority and if none, recovery can be effected using the procedure in Schedule 12 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007 (taking control of goods).

Part 5

Powers of Acquisition and Possession of Land

- 6.27 Further comment on this part of the draft DCO will be made during the draft DCO hearing and relevant issue specific hearings.

6.28

Article 29 – Temporary use of land for carrying out the authorised development

- 6.29 29 (1) (c) The provision of means of access should be subject to highway authority approval.

Article 30 – Temporary use of land for maintaining the authorised development

- 6.30 30 (1) Maintenance period should be clarified or defined.

- 6.31 30 (1) (a) As previously stated, maintain (and any derivative of maintain) is broadly defined. Does this temporary use extend up to decommissioning?

- 6.32 30 (1) (b) The provision of means of access should be subject to the approval of the highway authority.

Article 32 – Special Category Land

- 6.33 32 (1) This article is a departure from the GMP and seeks to discharge land from all rights, trusts and incidents to which it was previously subject in so far as their continuance would be inconsistent with the exercise of the Order rights either permanently or temporarily. The Explanatory Memorandum does not explain why such discharge is required. Article 32 (2) refers to the discharge for, inter alia, Article 30 'maintaining'. The reason for the discharge and the likely length of time for the discharge should be clarified.

- 6.34 Article 33 – Statutory Undertakers.

- 6.35 33(e) It is unclear from this provision what is meant by 'any necessary track or roadway (whether temporary or permanent)' These terms should be defined.

Part 6

Article 35 – Disapplication and Modification of legislative provisions

- 6.36 Each disapplication should be fully justified rather than providing comfort/certainty for the undertaker. Article 35 (c) has not been agreed as no comments have been received from the undertaker on the draft protective provisions for drainage authorities provided by Surrey County Council.

Article 36 – Removal of human remains

- 6.37 Could the undertaker explain why the requirement to give notice before the removal of remains which the undertaker is satisfied were interred more than 100 years ago and that no relative or personal representative of the deceased is likely to object to their removal other than the approach having precedent.

Articles 41 and 42 – Felling or lopping and Trees Subject to Tree Preservation Orders

- 6.38 41 (1) Please define ‘near any part’
- 6.39 41 (5) and 42 (4) Do the compensation provisions of the 1961 Act apply here without modification?
- 6.40 Consent from the relevant Local Authority should be required prior to the removal of any hedgerow or part not specifically identified on the Schedule and plan.

Article 43 – Protection of Interests

- 6.41 As previously mentioned, the County Council requires a response to its draft protective provisions for the drainage authority.

Schedule 2

Requirements

Part 1

Requirements

Requirement 3 – Stages of authorised development

- 6.42 This requirement does not provide for the agreement of the relevant planning authority to the staging plan. Could the undertaker explain why this has been excluded. Should the Explanatory Memorandum refer to requirement 3 at 8.3 (c)?

Requirement 9. Surface and foul water drainage

- 6.43 The County Council requires the following provisions to be included in the requirements relating to surface water:

(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence until written details of the surface water drainage system, reflecting the mitigation measures in the environmental statement and including means of pollution control, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State following consultation with the relevant planning authority, the Lead Local Flood Authority, the local highway authority and the Environment Agency.

(2) Prior to consultation with the relevant planning authority, the Lead Local Flood Authority, the local highway authority and the Environment Agency as required by sub-paragraph (1), the undertaker will carry out:

(a) a CCTV survey of the location and condition of all drainage assets where drainage is connecting into the proposed drainage network; and

(b) A topographical and condition survey (i.e. visual inspection and dimensions of the channels) of the vicinity of any work done to ordinary watercourses (ie outfalls into watercourses or culverting work); and

(c) An assessment of the sustainability of the drainage proposals and of the opportunities to increase sustainable drainage provision.

The undertaker will make the results of the surveys and assessments undertaken in accordance with this requirement available to the relevant planning authority, the Lead Local Flood Authority, the local highway authority and the Environment Agency when undertaking any consultation required by sub-paragraph (1).

(3) The drainage system must be constructed in accordance with the approved details referred to in sub-paragraph (1) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Secretary of State following consultation with the relevant planning authority, the local highway authority and the Environment Agency.

Requirement 14 – Construction Hours

- 6.44 14 (3) Is there any control over the time for the taking place of operations outside working hours? Is there justification for each of those operations being able to take place outside working hours? The Explanatory Memorandum does not make this clear. What are ‘start up’ and ‘shut down’ activities mentioned in 14 (4) (b)? Are core working hours the same as working hours?

Requirement 16 – Amendments to approved details

- 6.45 16 (4) How does the 28 day deemed consent clause at 4 sit with any statutory time period for the determination of an application?

Requirement 17 – Anticipatory steps towards compliance with any requirement

- 6.46 What steps are contemplated within this provision as steps taken before the coming into force of the Order which may be taken into account for determining compliance? Are they steps that would have been agreed with the relevant planning authority?

Part 2

Procedure For Discharge of Requirements

- 6.47 It is noted that this Part 2 of Schedule 2 will be the subject of further discussion with relevant discharging bodies according to the Explanatory Memorandum.

Requirement 18 – Applications made under Requirements

- 6.48 Previous comments relating to deemed consent apply here.

Requirement 19 – Applications involving multiple relevant authorities under Requirements.

- 6.49 19 Has agreement been sought from the relevant authorities on the 20 day deadline within which comments in writing must be provided?

Requirement 20 – Further Information

- 6.50 20 (2) to (4) The time limits set down in this Article will need to be agreed with the relevant authorities.

Requirements 21 and 22 – Fees and Appeals

- 6.51 These articles will need to be further discussed with the relevant authorities.

Schedule 9 (Protective Provisions)

- 6.52 As previously noted, the County Council has provided the undertaker with a draft set of protective provisions for the drainage authority. These will need to be agreed prior to agreement with the disapplication of s23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991.

Appendix 1

Surrey County Council's Consultation Response April 2018

Emailed to: info@slpproject.co.uk 30 April 2018

Esso Southampton to London Pipeline Project - Replacement Pipeline Corridor Non-Statutory Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity for Surrey County Council (SCC) to comment on the Southampton to London Replacement Pipeline Corridor Consultation. Presented below is a collective response from Minerals and Waste Policy, Heritage and Conservation, Transport Development Planning, Highways and the Strategic Network Resilience Team.

Minerals and Waste

Options J, M & Q

Routes J, M and Q all converge north east of Addlestone. Below are comments on minerals and waste sites that should be considered when identifying a preferred corridor.

Shepperton Quarry, Littleton Lane – The site is located to the north of the M3 and west of Littleton Lane. The site currently has an extant planning permission to extract remaining aggregate from an area to the east of the lake on site. There is also an active aggregates recycling facility on the site, processing around 150,000 tonnes of CD&E waste per annum. This recycling operation is located to the north of an established industrial area, planning permission for the recycling operation is due to expire in 2019. The site will be a wet restoration to a series of open water lakes. The MWPA consider that a corridor following the existing pipeline, as close to Littleton Lane as possible, will have the least effect on current operations at the site.

Land West of Queen Mary Reservoir – The corridor forks just south of a site known as Land West of Queen Mary Reservoir. The site located on the area of land between Queen Mary reservoir and Ashford Road. The site would be impacted where the corridor option forks to the east. An area in the north east of the site is currently used for processing aggregate extracted from the reservoir and also for recycling around 200,000 tonnes of CD&E waste per annum. The site has permission till 2033 and will be a wet restoration. The site will also be used to process aggregate extracted from the adjacent Manor Farm Quarry via a conveyor. The wet restoration, conveyor from Manor Farm and the pipeline itself make this route very tightly constrained, SCC suggest working closely with the operator Brett Aggregates to identify possible operational impacts to the site if this corridor was to be selected. A corridor following the existing pipeline looks to be the MWPA's preferred option or a corridor immediately east of the current pipeline, provided that it can be delivered without prejudicing current operations.

Manor Farm Quarry – The site located on the area of land between Ashford Road and Staines Road. The site would be impacted where the corridor forks to the west of the Queen Mary Reservoir site. The site has planning permission to extract aggregates for a 5 year period and will be restored to landscaped lakes. Extraction at the site hasn't yet commenced. The extracted aggregates will be transported by conveyor to the Queen Mary site to be processed, the route of the conveyor could conflict with this corridor option. This corridor option has the potential to sterilise a significant reserve of primary aggregate which the MWPA would strongly object to this. SCC suggest discussions with the operator Brett Aggregates to identify timescales for the site being worked, this corridor option would be

acceptable subject to the site being worked prior to pipeline development.

Homers Farm – The site is adjacent to the West London Oil Terminal. The site has planning permission for aggregate extraction, this is yet to commence. The MWPA would prefer the corridor be located to the west of Short Lane and to the north of the site. A corridor running to the east of Short Lane has the potential to sterilise a significant reserve of primary aggregate which would not be supported by the MWPA.

Option J

Route option J broadly follows the existing pipeline route with a number of possible deviations. Below are comments on minerals and waste sites that should be considered when identifying a preferred corridor.

Chobham car spares – Where the proposed corridor forks to the north of Chobham, the northern fork of the corridor appears to be adjacent to or encroaching on a Metal / End of Life Vehicle (ELV) recycling site known as Chobham car spares. This site is safeguarded under policy DC1 of the 2008 SWP. SCC as MWPA would want to see northern fork run to the south of this site or equally preferable is the southern fork.

Option M

Alton Road Sandpit – The site is located to the south of the A31 and the MWPA don't believe it is likely to be affected by the proposed corridor.

Bourne Mill Community Recycling Centre (CRC) – The site is located to the west of the Shepherd and Flock Roundabout. Corridor option M runs directly through the site. The site is safeguarded under policy DC1 of the 2008 SWP and SCC as MWPA would want to see the corridor avoid this site.

Options M & Q

Corridor options M and Q converge at the east of Farnham. Below are comments on minerals and waste sites that should be considered when identifying a preferred corridor.

Runfold South – The corridor option runs through the northern edge of the site. All areas of the site are scheduled to be restored by 2021 and aggregate recycling operations on the site have now ceased. The area of the site that the corridor runs through has been infilled with inert waste only. The corridor if developed would be unlikely to have a major impact on the site but SCC as MWPA would want to see any impact on the restoration minimised were this corridor option to be selected.

Runfold North – The site is located on land between Guildford Road and the A31. The corridor option runs through the whole site. The site is a fully restored sandpit in aftercare as an agricultural use. The MWPA would want to see any impact on the restoration minimised were this corridor option to be selected.

Farnham Quarry – The site is located to the North of the A31. The corridor option currently runs to the south of the A31 and the MWPA don't believe the site is likely to be affected by the proposed corridor.

Homefield Sandpit – The site is located south of Seale Lane and east of Blighton Lane. The corridor option runs along the northern boundary of the site. There is an aggregate recycling facility on the site that is due to cease in 2020 with the site due to be restored by 2042. The MWPA don't believe this corridor option is likely to impact on any operations or restoration of the site.

Land at Strawberry Farm – The site is located to the north of Wanborough station and east of Glaziers Lane. This site is used for processing soil and has a capacity of 13,000 tonnes per annum. The corridor option runs along the southern boundary of the site. The MWPA would prefer this corridor option to run south of the site, minimising not to have any operational impact.

Clasford Bridge – The site is located north of the junction between Aldershot Road and Frog Grove Lane. The corridor option runs directly through the site. There is an aggregate recycling facility on the site that processes around 62,500 tonnes of CD&E waste per annum. The site is safeguarded under policy DC1 of the 2008 SWP and the MWPA would want to see the corridor avoid this site, this could be achieved by the corridor running south of Aldershot Road.

Addlestone Quarry – The site is located to the north of the railway line and Brooklands industrial estate. The site has been worked for aggregates and is to be restored by December 2020 at which point aggregate recycling on the site will also cease. The corridor option runs through part of the site and the MWPA would want to see any impact on the restoration minimised were this corridor option to be selected.

Comments on Minerals Safeguarding

All routes – All 3 corridor options converge north of Addlestone and run through Preferred Minerals Zones 19 Dumsey Meadow and 20 Chertsey Meads. These sites were identified as areas containing significant reserves of aggregates. Further investigation into the sites however led the MWPA being of the view that these sites are unlikely to be worked due to a number of constraints.

M & Q – Corridor options M & Q run adjacent to 2 preferred areas of aggregate extraction as identified in the Adopted Primary Aggregates DPD. These are:

- Preferred area A - Addlestone Quarry Extension. An area to the east of the current operation at Addlestone Quarry has been identified as having reserves of around 0.4 million tonnes of concreting aggregate. The MWPA will seek to safeguard this area from development that could sterilise these reserves. The corridor option currently runs to the west of this area. The MWPA would prefer the corridor to remain as far west of the site as possible.
- Preferred area C - Hamm Court Farm. This is an area to the north of Weybridge Road and west of Woburn Park. The site has been identified as having reserves of around 0.78 million tonnes of concreting aggregate. Currently the pipeline option runs directly through the site, the site is unlikely to be worked in advance of the potential pipeline construction. The MWPA would strongly object to this corridor option being selected as it would likely sterilise a larger quantity of the reserves at the site.

Other issues

Composition of historic landfill – It has been identified that the former landfill site to the south of Shepperton Road and north of the current quarry may have been infilled with some household waste.

Impact on minerals site restorations – SCC works hard with operators to ensure the best ecological and landscape benefits from minerals site restorations are achieved. SCC prefers a corridor option that encroaches as little as possible on restored sites. Where these sites

cannot be avoided SCC expects sites to be restored back to a pre-construction standard and seek enhancement opportunities where possible.

Mineral & Waste Conclusions

All 3 corridor options converge north of Addlestone. The corridor beyond this point raises concerns for the MWPA. Further work with SCC and operators at the next stage of consultation will be essential for minimising the impacts to sites beyond this point. The importance of both the Land West of Queen Mary and Manor Farm Quarry sites makes identifying a preferred route difficult. Ultimately the MWPA would not want any aggregate resources to be sterilised from either site and for any operational disruptiveness to be minimised when installing a pipeline.

Before the corridor options merge the routes are vastly different. SCC as MWPA regards corridor option J as having the lowest impact on mineral and waste resources in the Surrey. Corridor options M and Q have the potential to impact a number of mineral and waste sites were they to be selected. These impacts could be overcome by ensuring sites are restored and operational disruption is kept to a minimum. However corridor options M & Q's proximity to preferred areas of mineral extraction, as identified in the Adopted Primary Aggregates DPD makes them the least preferred option for the MWPA.

Heritage & Conservation Team

Esso plans to replace 90km of its 105km aviation fuel pipeline between Southampton and London, crossing the local authorities of Hampshire, Winchester, Surrey and into Greater London. The pipeline will most commonly be constructed through open cut trenches and should take between one and two months in any area. The project is classed as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project under the 2008 Planning Act, with the permission if granted referred to as a 'Development Consent Order'. The final decision will be taken by the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy.

Three 200m wide corridor options are being taken forward, with one of these to be identified as the preferred option. In terms of the route through Surrey, the three options are J, M and Q. Option J is aligned closely to the existing pipeline and has less potential to impact on either designated or currently unrecorded heritage assets. Options M and Q do not follow the existing pipeline route and both options carry a high potential for encountering previously undiscovered archaeology and/or effecting designated heritage assets. The 'Cultural Heritage' implications of the three options as identified in the first consultation document (Esso 2018) are reproduced below:

Option J - This corridor includes or is close to heritage assets, including one Grade I listed building (Farnborough Hill Convent), two scheduled monuments at West End Common and Chobham, and Frimley Park Registered Park and Garden. However, the design of a route within this corridor may be able to avoid impacts on all of these assets. The majority of the corridor follows the existing pipeline and in these locations, buried archaeological remains are likely to have already been disturbed. The corridor, therefore, has fewer heritage constraints than Option M and Option Q.

Option M - This corridor is close to a large number of designated heritage assets including Grade I and II* listed buildings and scheduled monuments (Waverley Abbey, a Romano-Celtic temple complex west of Long Common, and Woking Palace). This corridor does not follow the existing pipeline and thus there may be a greater risk of disturbing buried archaeological remains. This corridor includes three conservation areas (Pierrepont, the Wey Navigation and the Wey and Godalming Conservation Areas) that could be difficult to avoid. The Option M corridor also runs close to Farnham Park Registered Park and Garden

and Farnham Castle scheduled monument, both of which can be avoided, and Farnham Conservation Area that cannot be avoided.

Option Q - This corridor is close to a large number of designated heritage assets including Grade I and II* listed buildings and scheduled monuments (Waverley Abbey, a Romano-Celtic temple complex west of Long Common, and Woking Palace). This corridor does not follow the existing pipeline and thus there may be a greater risk of disturbing buried archaeological remains. This corridor includes three conservation areas (Pierrepont, the Wey Navigation and the Wey and Godalming Conservation Areas) that could be difficult to avoid.

The Heritage Conservation Team at Surrey County Council support the choice of Option J as being less harmful to the historic environment.

Looking forward towards the consultation on the preferred route (Autumn 2018) and eventual application submission (during 2019), it will be necessary for full consideration of the implications of the chosen option with regards to heritage assets to be made. As part of this, it is anticipated that an Environmental Impact Assessment assessing the likely impact of the project above and below ground will be produced, with area specific archaeological Desk Based Assessments produced as supporting documentation as necessary. The compilation of the project wide Environmental Impact Assessment and area specific archaeological Desk Based Assessments will then inform the scope of any further investigations that may be required, leading to the identification of appropriate mitigation measures should significant archaeology be identified.

Transport Development Planning

The following comments are made on behalf of Surrey County Council as a Statutory Consultee on highway and transport matters arising from the DCO development proposals:

High Level Commentary on Corridor/Route choice:

- As first choice wherever possible, to follow the existing route of the pipeline through Surrey.
- Avoid if at all possible, or at the very least, minimise any conflict with access to the major Health Care facilities, such as Frimley Park Hospital, Royal Surrey County Hospital at Guildford, St Peter's Hospital, Chertsey and Ashford Hospital.
- Avoid if at all possible, or at the very least, minimise any conflict with emergency ambulance and fire station sites.
- Minimise impact on educational facilities, although it is appreciated that these sites do provide open spaces/ less developed locations through which the pipeline could pass.
- Please prioritise in general terms, the crossing/use of the lesser status / hierarchy of road first. Clearly in terms of traffic management, road safety, and disruption, it is generally preferable to impact the lesser roads rather than Trunk/Mways/A and B class roads.

Initial Commentary on J Corridor: (South West to North East direction)

- Generally this corridor is preferred as it follows more of the existing Pipeline's route through Surrey.
- The general southern of these two corridors south of Frimley is preferred because it has the opportunity to follow more open space, and to avoid Frimley Park Hospital. The northern route is much more challenging to provide in terms of urban areas,

although it is understood that it avoids the narrow strip of the present southern route where it passes between the two bodies of water between the A331 and the railway line.

- The route across Frith Hill will potentially cross / follow a proposed all weather cycle facility which is being installed as part of the Deepcut development.
- Where Corridor J heads north up The Maultway, it will need to avoid junction improvements associated with the redevelopment of Deepcut Barracks. The roundabout of Red Road with the Maultway is being improved, although if the new alignment is south east of the existing, it should be clear of the highway works.
- The junction of Red Road with Guildford Road (B311/A322) is also being improved, and this junction is shown as the southern extent of the proposed corridor. Crossing the A322 dual carriageway will need careful traffic management.
- It is understood that the southern alternative route south of Longcross (along Stonehill Road) is to avoid the SPA, but the southern route follows more highway, so will cause more disruption than would be the case if were retained on the existing alignment.
- At the eastern end of B386 (junction of Holloway Hill with Guildford Road A320), a significant junction improvement is possible, as a result of a recently completed study on the A320. This land holding we understand is being acquired by the Salesian School as playing fields. The proposed Longcross South Garden Village (on the Longcross Studios site) has not had a Transport Assessment undertaken, but it is likely that there will be junction / highway improvements on B386 at various points between the M3 and including the A320.
- Where the existing pipeline and proposed corridor passes beneath the A317 outside the proposed new Chertsey High School, there will be junction / access alterations associated with that school. Also, the school re-development is clearly designed around the existing alignment, but does not necessarily take into account a potentially wider corridor as shown across virtually all of its playing fields/ campus.
- It seems sensible following the existing route where it crosses the River Thames, M3, and where it follows Littleton Lane.
- The alternative (western) route to the west of Ashford Road appears to take a more challenging route in that it uses residential roads rather than the existing open land immediately adjacent to Queen Mary Reservoir. The crossing of the Aqueduct / Kingston Road/ Staines Bypass will be a challenge. On the existing route corridor there will be a new fire station on the Kingston Road, immediately east of the Fordbridge Roundabout, with a right turn out of the site across the central reservation.
- My Mineral Planning colleagues will comment in more detail, but there is proposed mineral extraction between Worple Road and Ashford Road (Manor Farm), involving the construction of a conveyor belt tunnel under Ashford Road and footpath 30, to run northwards following roughly the existing alignment.
- Following the existing route north to the destination seems to be make sense. Crossing the A30 Trunk will need to involve Highways England (as is the case with the M25 and M3 further to the south west).

Initial Commentary on Corridor M (South West to North East direction)

- Just east of the Surrey/Hampshire Border, if the A31 dual carriageway could be avoided that would be good. There are very long term intentions to potentially create a Wrecclesham Bypass, which would involve a roundabout junction on the A31 Alton Road roughly where the southern boundary of your corridor runs along the A31. That is, if this corridor has to be chosen, a route as far away (north) as possible from the A31 would be safest.
- There is at least one potential housing site off Crondall Lane within the corridor route (between Crondall Lane and A287).
- The route along the tight suburban streets of Farnham north of the A325, and then along the Guildford Road will be a challenge in terms of traffic/parking management during installation.
- Part of the corridor east of the A31 crossing of the Farnham/Aldershot railway line includes the A31 dual carriageway. For obvious reasons it would be good to avoid that. The majority of the corridor at this point also includes mineral working sites.
- There's a potential junction improvement scheme at the junction of Poyle Road with White Lane in Ash, if a development to the north goes ahead. Your corridor only just touches this point.
- Within the community of Wanborough there are several small scale developments, so it would be good to pass to the south of the village if at all possible (ie south of Flexford Road.)
- The remainder of the route within Guildford Borough utilises open space and seems to avoid communities and main roads so looks sensible from the highways point of view.
- Within Woking Borough, the route between Pyrford and the M25 would clearly impact on the residential roads around Pyrford Road, so it might be better to follow the pylon route if that's possible technically.
- The route up the M25 between the A245 and the main railway line is a bit of a "no man's land" with respect to security issues, especially given that the M25 is up on stilts on a viaduct through this point, with the canal on the west side and not much overlooking to the east.
- The route north of the railway line should if at all possible avoid the Byfleet Road.
- The route until it joins the existing route corridor (J) seems to make sense in that it follows open land and the route of the pylons.

Initial Commentary on Corridor Q (Southwest to north east – as far as it then duplicates with Corridor M)

- Generally, Corridor Q is preferable than the part of Corridor M that it bypasses, because it misses out the urban area of Farnham. It also involves no crossing of the A31/ railway line (in Surrey at least).

These are the preliminary comments that the County have from the Transport Development Planning point of view, but they should be read in conjunction with the other commentaries from colleagues representing other interests.

Highways Team

The SCC Highways team agree with comments from Transport Development Planning that option J is the preferred route. Highways regard Q as second preference over M. Highways have the following comments to supplement Transport Development Planning comments:

- Options M & Q impact on the A245 in West Byfleet. The A245 at this location is part of the Highways England Tactical Diversion Route for M25 J10-J11 (bi-directional) and as such if the pipeline were to cross the A245 we would wish to see all opportunities to directionally drill beneath the road as opposed open cut across it, fully explored.
- Options M&Q include the A245 West Byfleet and the A367 at Pyrford. Both roads form part of the RideLondon-Surrey Cycling events route. The event is either the last weekend in July or the first weekend in August each year and is subject to a works moratorium in advance of the event each year. Enhanced reinstatement of any highway surfaces disturbed may be required on this section of these roads.
- At Surrey's initial meeting with Esso (and partners) it was indicated that whenever it was necessary for the pipeline route to cross A roads, that the feasibility of directional drilling would be explored in each instance to avoid traffic disruption. Surrey Highways support this initiative, and request that similar consideration is also given to crossing busy B roads across the County; B383, B386, B375 & B376 for option J, B376 & B367 for option M and B376, B367 & B3001 for Option Q.
- Surrey CC's Traffic Manager wishes to highlight that when considering route options, it will be Surrey Highway's expectation that when the pipeline crosses any A or B category roads on the network, - whichever route option is taken forward as a preference, whenever feasible, that the pipeline crosses the road via the shortest possible route and does not travel along the road.

Strategic Network Resilience Team Comments

The Strategic Network Resilience Team within Highways have a number of comments to make on known flooding locations, proposed flooding schemes and the River Thames Scheme.

The attached PDF shows the flood issues SCC have along the different ESSO pipeline corridors. The shaded areas are potential schemes that may go ahead in the future.

The blue wetspot lines are areas of reported flooding. The severity of flooding at the locations varies. Some flood and restrict access. Some have had remedial work carried out and are now at a reduced risk but continue to be monitored. Each location has been recorded on a database and at many of the locations, additional information will be available if requested.

River Thames Scheme

The proposed northern routes and corridors pass through the area being considered for the construction of flood channels as part of the River Thames Flood Alleviation Scheme (RTS), particularly in the Runnymede and Spelthorne areas. More information can be found via the following link (<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/river-thames-scheme>) but I would strongly suggest a meeting with the project team to discuss further.

Construction for the RTS is due to begin in 2020/2021 and we would wish to ensure that any works associated with the replacement pipeline does not conflict with this. There may however be opportunities and efficiencies if the two projects could work together.

Further Information and Future Consultations

SCC has welcomed the inclusive approach taken by Esso during this non-statutory consultation and would expect to see this continue as a preferred corridor option is developed.

In accordance with the PINS Advice Note Feb 2015 (The Role of Local Authorities in the development consent process), Section 10 Planning Performance Agreement resources, the County Council requests that a Planning Performance Agreement be established between the applicant and Surrey County Council covering the following:

- 1) The funding of 60% fte of a Surrey PS9 TDP Officer to undertake all detailed consideration of corridor and then route choice submissions made by the developer in terms of impacts on the highway and bus networks in Surrey County (through six Surrey Districts and Boroughs). The resources to be provided throughout the consideration of the DCO pre-application and application process (including the 6 months for the Inquiry) from the present to DCO grant.
- 2) The funding of 60% fte of Surrey PS9 (Matt Jezzard position) to undertake all pre-commencement, site evaluation, traffic management implementation, site inspection, and post reinstatement to all Surrey Highways (including Rights of Ways).
- 3) All normal fees relating to Section 278 Agreements, Licences, and Working Permits.

Appendix 2

Local Archaeological Policies

Spelthorne – Local Plan saved policies:

BE26: Outside the defined areas of high archaeological potential, the Borough Council will require an agreed scheme of archaeological assessment or evaluation appropriate for the site concerned to be submitted with any new development proposal for a site larger than 0.4 ha, and for smaller sites if deemed necessary. Where evidence of significant archaeological remains is found then the requirements set out in policy BE25 will apply.

BE25: In considering proposals for development within areas of high archaeological potential, the Borough Council will:-

(a) require an initial assessment of the archaeological value of the site to be submitted as part of any planning application

(b) expect the applicant to arrange an archaeological field evaluation to be carried out prior to the determination of the planning application, where, as a result of the initial assessment, important archaeological remains are considered to exist

(c) have a preference for preservation in situ, and in such circumstances will impose conditions or seek a legal agreement, where appropriate, to ensure that damage to the remains is minimal or will be avoided

(d) require by planning condition or seek a legal agreement to secure a full archaeological investigation and recording of the site and subsequent publication of results in accordance with a scheme of work to be agreed in writing with the Council prior to the commencement of the proposed development, where important archaeological remains are known or considered likely to exist but their preservation in situ is not justified.

Runnymede Draft Local Plan Policy EE7: Scheduled Monuments, County Sites of Archaeological Importance (CSAIs) and Areas of High Archaeological Potential (AHAPs)

Proposals for development will be required to conserve, and where appropriate, enhance the significance, historic features and importance of Scheduled Monuments and County Sites of Archaeological Importance and their settings. Proposals which improve public access to, or the understanding of, a Scheduled Monument or County Sites of Archaeological Importance in a manner consistent with its conservation, will be supported.

Development that adversely affects the physical survival, setting or overall heritage significance of any element of a Scheduled Monument or County Sites of Archaeological Importance or their settings will be resisted.

An archaeological assessment, and where appropriate, the results of a site evaluation (and, should remains have been identified, an accompanying archaeological mitigation strategy) will be required to accompany a planning application for:

- Proposals for development on sites which affect, or have the potential to affect, Scheduled Monuments*
- Proposals for development on sites which affect, or have the potential to affect, County Sites of Archaeological Importance or Areas of High Archaeological Potential*
- Proposals for development on all other sites which exceed 0.4ha in size.*

Where archaeological finds are identified the first consideration will be in situ preservation. Where it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Council that this is not feasible, the Council will require adequate excavation and an accurate record to be made of any archaeological remains which will be destroyed and the results to be made publicly accessible via the publication and archiving of any material recovered.

Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policy DM17

Development which affects any Heritage Asset should first establish and take into account its individual significance, and seek to promote the conservation and enhancement of the Asset and its setting. In determining proposals for development affecting Heritage Assets or their setting, regard will be had as to whether the Asset is a Designated Heritage Asset or a Local Heritage Asset in determining whether the impact of any proposed development is acceptable.

Within Areas of High Archaeological Potential, as identified on the Proposals Map, or outside of these areas on any major development site of 0.4ha or greater, applicants are required to undertake prior assessment of the possible archaeological significance of the site and the implications of their proposals, and may be required to submit, as a minimum, a desk-based assessment to accompany any application. Where desk-based assessment suggests the likelihood of archaeological remains, the Planning Authority will require the results of an archaeological evaluation in order to inform the determination of the application.

The Borough Council will from time to time review the Heritage Assets included on the Local Lists, with regard to the Historic Environment Record, in consultation with Surrey County Council.

Appendix 3: Review of the submitted Environmental Statement & Habitat Regulations Assessment in respect of impacts on Chobham Common SSSI and NNR, Thames Basin Heaths SPA and Thursley, Ash, Pirbright & Chobham SAC

- A3.1 The County Council, in its capacity as the custodian of Chobham Common, has reviewed the information provided in Chapter 7 (Biodiversity) and Chapter 10 (Landscape) of the submitted Environmental Statement (ES) to ascertain the extent to which the implementation of Section F (Bisley & Pirbright Ranges to M25) of the proposed pipeline route would impact on the ecological integrity and landscape character and visual amenity of the Common. The review also involved examination of the information set out in the Habitat Regulations Assessment for the proposed scheme, due to Chobham Common's status as part of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and as part of the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright & Chobham Special Area of Conservation (SAC).
- A3.2 The impact of the proposed pipeline on recreational access to the Common, in terms of likely effects on the public rights of way network, is reviewed elsewhere (section 4) in the main body of the Local Impact Report.

Landscape

- A3.3 Chobham Common sits within section E of the proposed pipeline route, which according to Table 10.6 (pp.17-18) of Chapter 10 of the ES, is located within National Character Area (NCA) 129 (Thames Basin Heaths), a statement with which the County Council does not disagree. Paragraphs 10.2.7 to 10.2.9 (p.3) of Chapter 10 state that the assessment of impacts on landscape character is based on the published NCAs, except within the South Downs National Park, where account is also taken of the relevant Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (ILCA), or where elements of above ground infrastructure are to be installed where account is taken of the details of the pertinent local landscape character areas (LCAs) as described in the published landscape character assessments for Hampshire or Surrey. It is unclear why assessment of the impacts of the construction phase of the proposed pipeline, which will have temporary impacts on character as well as visual amenity, has focussed solely on the NCAs and does not take account of relevant county landscape character assessments.
- A3.4 The Thames Basin Heaths NCA extends across an area of some 120,000 hectares, encompassing land that exhibits variety in its local landscape character that is not captured in the NCA description. Chobham Common is defined, in the Surrey Landscape Character Assessment (2015), as having a specific local landscape character ('SH2 – Chobham Sandy Heath & Common', pp.36-37 in the *Surrey Landscape Character Assessment* report for the borough of Surrey Heath). The County Council would recommend that the assessment baseline be updated to include information about LCA 'SH2 – Chobham Sandy Heath & Common' with reference to section E of the proposed pipeline, as the development crosses that character area and would, based on the assessment set out in Table 10.14 (p.57) for the Thames Basin Heaths NCA, give rise to impacts of 'moderate significance' during construction and during the year following construction. Given that impacts of greater than 'minor significance' are anticipated across the Thames Basin Heaths NCA, the County Council would recommend that the assessment of construction phase impacts on landscape

character should include consideration of locally defined LCAs in addition to the broader NCAs.

- A3.5 The County Council notes that the assessment of impacts on landscape designations, in respect of common land and open access land, set out in paragraphs 10.5.99 to 10.5.104 (pp.65-66), draws a number of conclusions for Chobham Common. Paragraph 10.5.99 (pp.65-66) states that the removal of trees along the route of the pipeline across the common would not adversely impact the overall landscape character of the common. Paragraph 10.5.100 (p.66) reports that the construction phase works would give rise to landscape impacts of minor significance across the common. The County Council is concerned that these conclusions are not wholly consistent with those drawn in respect of landscape character, with reference to the Thames Basin Heaths NCA.

Conclusion for Chobham Common in respect of Landscape Impacts

- A3.6 In summary the County Council notes that no permanent surface infrastructure would be installed along the section of the pipeline route that passes through Chobham Common, and that consequently the impacts of the scheme's implementation would be temporary and associated solely with the construction phase. It is also noted that the proposed route of the pipeline across the Common coincides, for the majority of its length with an existing trackway, which would limit the scope for significant changes in landscape character and visual amenity over the duration of the proposed works.

Biodiversity

- A3.7 Chobham Common is covered by multiple designations for its nature conservation interest and value, which fact is reflected in the baseline description provided for section F of the proposed pipeline (paragraphs 7.3.43 to 7.3.47, pp.52-53) of Chapter 7 of the ES. The Common is noted as being covered by national level Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and National Nature Reserve (NNR) designations, and as forming part of two European sites, the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright & Chobham Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Detailed assessment of the likely impacts of the proposed development on those designations is set out in section 7.5 (pp.72-217) of Chapter 7 of the ES.
- A3.8 In addition to the assessment set out in the ES, the two European designations, the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright & Chobham SAC, have also been subject to assessment under the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). The conclusions of those assessments are set out in the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) report for the proposed scheme. Impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA are covered in Chapter 5 (pp.42-58) of the HRA report, and impacts on the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright & Chobham SAC are covered in Chapter 6 (pp.59-79) of the HRA report.
- A3.9 **Thames Basin Heaths SPA:** The SPA is designated for the presence of breeding populations of three species of lowland heathland birds, nightjar and woodlark which nest on the ground and Dartford warbler which nests in gorse. Chobham Common is one of thirteen areas of heathland and woodland habitat distributed across western Surrey, north east Hampshire

and south east Berkshire, that support communities of those three bird species and are covered by the SPA designation. Paragraphs 7.5.10 to 7.5.13 (pp.81-82) in Chapter 7 of the ES provide an account of the impact pathways (changes in audio-visual baseline; displacement of recreational activities to the SPA due to work being carried out within Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANGs)) considered for the SPA as part of the HRA process, and summarise the conclusions of the HRA.

A3.10 Noise & Visual Disturbance: Paragraph 7.5.11 (p.82) in Chapter 7 of the ES reports that the potential for adverse impacts on the SPA bird species as a consequence of changes in the incidence of noise and visual disturbance would be mitigated by restricting construction works with the ability to create disturbance to the period between 1 October and 31 January, which is typically outside the three bird species breeding seasons. Paragraph 5.8.7 (p.52) of Chapter 5 of the HRA report concludes that the integrity of the SPA would not be adversely impacted by noise and visual disturbance arising from the proposed construction works.

A3.11 The County Council does not disagree with the conclusion set out in the ES and the HRA report with reference to the effects of noise and visual disturbance on the integrity of the Chobham Common component of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, subject to construction works being limited to a time period outside the typical breeding seasons of the three SPA bird species, and to the implementation of relevant embedded mitigation measures (see below) set out in Table 16.1 (p.30 and p.32) in Chapter 16 (Environmental Management & Mitigation) of the ES.

- Measure G34 – Where restrictions to working are required due to ecological seasonality, e.g. for hibernation or breeding of protected species, standard timings have been indicated. However, due to alterations in weather patterns and temperatures from year to year, the restricted season may alter. It would be at the discretion of the ECoW in consultation with Natural England, where applicable, to decide the actual dates for restriction of works.
- Measure G35 – Bird Breeding Season: The assumption would be that vegetation with the potential to support bird nests would not be removed during the breeding bird season (March to August inclusive). If any works become necessary during the breeding bird season, works would be supervised by an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW). Appropriate protection measures would be put in place should active nests be found. These would include exclusion zones around active nests until chicks fledge or nests become inactive as determined by monitoring by the ECoW.
- Measure G38 – Thames Basin Heaths (SPA): Potentially disturbing construction works within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA would be undertaken between 1 October and 31 January unless otherwise agreed with Natural England. The HRA report (paragraphs 5.8.8 to 5.8.29, pp.52-56) does not identify any risk of additional visitors to the Chobham Common component of the SPA arising as a consequence of pipeline installation works being undertaken within nearby SANGs.

A3.12 Recreational displacement from SANGs: Paragraphs 7.5.12 and 7.5.13 (p.82) of Chapter 7 of the ES report that the installation of sections of the pipeline within land that has been designated as SANG, the purpose of which is to mitigate against the recreational impacts of

new residential development on the SPA, would not be expected to give rise to significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the SPA. The County Council does not disagree with the conclusion set out in the ES and the HRA report with reference to the effects of visitor displacement from nearby SANGs on the integrity of the Chobham Common component of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA.

- A3.13 **Thursley, Ash, Pirbright & Chobham SAC:** The SAC is designated for its heathland habitats, specifically North Atlantic wet heaths with *Erica tetralix* (H4010), European dry heaths (H4030) and depressions on peat substrates of the *Rhynchosporion* (H7150). Chobham Common is one area of four areas of heathland distributed across Surrey that include examples of those three categories of habitat, and are covered by the SAC designation. Paragraph 7.5.14 (p.82) in Chapter 7 of the ES provides an account of the impact pathways (direct loss of dry heathland habitat; indirect loss of wet qualifying habitats due to changes in hydrological processes and habitat supporting substrates (e.g. peat)) considered for the SAC as part of the HRA process, and summarises the conclusions of the HRA.
- A3.14 Direct loss of SAC habitats: Paragraph 7.5.14 (p.82) of Chapter 7 of the ES reports that the area of dry heathland that would be small and that therefore significant adverse impacts would be unlikely to arise. Table 4.2 (pp.37-39) in Chapter 4 (Stage 1 Screening) of the HRA report concludes that the impact of the pipelines installation on the European dry heaths habitat of the SAC would be *de minimis*, and required no further assessment. The County Council does not disagree with the conclusions of that assessment.
- A3.15 For the water dependent habitats of the SAC, the wet heath and the depressions on peat substrates of the *Rhynchosporion*, Table 4.2 (pp.37-39) in Chapter 4 (Stage 1 Screening) of the HRA report concluded that further assessment was required, which is set out in paragraphs 6.8.1 to 6.8.8 (pp.69-70). The impact of the installation of the proposed pipeline on the water dependent habitats of the Chobham Common component of the SAC is discussed in paragraph 6.8.5 (p.69) of Chapter 6 of the HRA report, which reports that trenchless construction methods would be used to install the pipeline beneath the three valleys within Chobham Common that support the sensitive habitats. The use of trenchless construction techniques would reduce the extent and type of above-ground construction activities carried out in these locations, and a range of other embedded mitigation measures (see below) would also be deployed to further limit the potential for significant harm to the habitats.
- Measure G48 – Working within ecologically designated sites would be controlled using a variety of methods. These would take account of the reasons for designation to identify the appropriate techniques to reduce impacts. This could include to limit the number of compounds, reduce corridor widths and use lighter vehicles within the sites.
 - Measure G51 – Where works in wet heath would be unavoidable, effects on soils and surface vegetation would be reduced through the use of ground protection matting and use of appropriate machinery where practicable.
- A3.16 The County Council does not disagree with the conclusion set out in the ES and the HRA report with reference to the direct effects of construction on the integrity of the Chobham Common component of the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright & Chobham SAC, subject to

implementation of relevant embedded mitigation measures (see above) set out in Table 16.1 (p.31 and p.32) in Chapter 16 (Environmental Management & Mitigation) of the ES.

- A3.17 Indirect loss of wet qualifying habitats due to changes in hydrological processes: Paragraph 7.5.15 (p.82) of Chapter 7 of the ES reports that detailed work undertaken as part of the HRA process has demonstrated that the wet heathland and bog habitats of the SAC would not be subject to adverse impacts as a consequence of changes in hydrology arising from the installation of the proposed pipeline. Paragraphs 6.8.13 to 6.8.20 (pp.72-73) of the HRA report provide a more detailed account of the matters considered in determining whether the proposed development would lead to significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the Chobham Common component of the SAC as a consequence of changes in hydrology.
- A3.18 For the construction phase, dewatering during pipeline installation was identified as the principal mechanism of effect (paragraphs 6.8.13 to 6.8.16, p.72 of the HRA report). The use of trenchless crossings is identified in paragraph 6.8.13 (p.72) as the primary means of avoiding dewatering impacts on those parts of the pipeline route that intersect with wet heathland and bog habitats. For those areas where open cut trenching would be employed, paragraph 6.8.14 (p.72), dewatering is likely to be required as construction would be taking place between 1 October and 31 January to avoid the SPA bird nesting seasons. Paragraphs 6.8.14 and 6.8.15 (p.72) note that embedded mitigation measures (measures G132 and G134, Table 16.1, p.36 of Chapter 16 of the ES) would ensure that trenches situated close to sensitive features would be open for the minimum time necessary, that dewatering would only be carried out where essential for safe working during pipe installation and preparation, and that measures (stanks) would be installed within open trenches to prevent the within trench migration of water. Paragraph 6.8.16 (p.72) of the HRA report concludes that there would be negligible effects on the wet habitats of the SAC as a consequence of the installation of the proposed pipeline.
- A3.19 For the operational phase, groundwater interception and groundwater contamination are the principal mechanisms of effect (paragraphs 6.8.17 to 6.8.20, pp.72-73 of the HRA report). With reference to groundwater flows, paragraph 6.8.18 (p.72) reports that the conceptual site model developed to examine groundwater flows across Chobham Common indicate that the presence of the pipeline and the use of temporary water stops (stanks) in open cut areas would have a negligible effect on shallow groundwater flows within the sensitive habitats. With reference to groundwater quality, paragraph 6.8.20 (p.73) reports that negligible impacts are anticipated as a consequence leaks from the pipeline, due to pipeline integrity measures that have been embedded into the design of the scheme.
- A3.20 The County Council does not disagree with the conclusion set out in the ES and the HRA report with reference to the indirect effects of construction and operation on the hydrology of the Chobham Common component of the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright & Chobham SAC, subject to implementation of the relevant embedded design measures and the embedded mitigation measures (G132 and G134) set out in Table 16.1 (p.36) in Chapter 16 (Environmental Management & Mitigation) of the ES.
- A3.21 Indirect loss of wet qualifying habitats due to changes in habitat supporting substrates (e.g. peat): Paragraph 7.5.16 (p.82) of Chapter 7 of the ES reports that the detailed work undertaken as part of the HRA process has demonstrated that the wet heathland habitats of

the SAC would not be subject to adverse impacts as a consequence of chemical or physical changes in substrate properties arising from the installation of the pipeline. Paragraphs 6.8.32 to 6.8.39 (pp.75-76) of the HRA report provide a more detailed account of the matters considered in determining whether the proposed development would lead to significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the Chobham Common component of the SAC as a consequence of changes in the substrate of the wet heathland habitats.

A3.22 Paragraph 6.8.33 (p.75) of the HRA report identifies three mechanisms by which the installation of the pipeline could give rise to changes in the underlying substrate of the wet heathland habitats: through trench excavation; through topsoil stripping; and, through the use of non-native fill material. Paragraph 6.8.36 (pp.75-76) identifies a range of embedded mitigation measures (see below) that would be deployed to manage the risks that installation of the pipeline may present to the substrates of the wet heathland habitats. Paragraph 6.8.39 (p.76) concludes that, subject to the implementation of the identified embedded mitigation measures, in combination with the proposed reinstatement of heathland post-construction by means of natural regeneration (measure HRA1, Table 16.1, p.34 of Chapter 16 of the ES), that there would be no significant adverse effects on the SAC as a consequence of changes in substrate properties.

- NW23 – Working width reduced along and adjacent to the existing track to reduce impacts on Chobham Common SSSI/NNR. This heathland is protected for several species of reptile including the rare sand lizard. Working specifications as detailed within Annex B of the HRA. This would consist of two areas over a combined distance of 1.6km. (Grid ref: SU9691663545 to SU9776664071 and SU9826064307 to SU9878164515). (Table 16.1, p.19, Chapter 16 of the ES)
- G51 – Where works in wet heath would be unavoidable, effects on soils and surface vegetation would be reduced through the use of ground protection matting and use of appropriate machinery where practicable. (Table 16.1, p.32, Chapter 16 of the ES)
- HRA4 – Topsoil stripping would be reduced to a minimum extent within European sites and SSSIs except where identified within the HRA. (Some unavoidable stripping would take place as part of the trenching for the pipeline and in construction compounds where matting is not a workable alternative). (Table 16.1, p.34, Chapter 16 of the ES)
- G151 – A method statement would be produced for stripping, handling, storage and replacement of all soils to reduce risks associated with soil degradation. This would include: identification of appropriate plant to strip, reinstate and otherwise handle soils; methods for compaction and grading of stockpiles; methods for working in naturally wet soils; and, specification of appropriate decompaction measures to be used during reinstatement. (Table 16.1, p.42, Chapter 16 of the ES)
- G155 – Topsoils and subsoils intended for reinstatement would be temporarily stockpiled as close to where they were stripped from as practicable. (Table 16.1, p.42, Chapter 16 of the ES)
- G159 – Different soil types and made ground would be stripped and stored separately where applicable. (Table 16.1, p.42, Chapter 16 of the ES)

- A3.23 The County Council does not disagree with the conclusion set out in the ES and the HRA report with reference to the indirect effects of construction and operation on the properties of the substrates that underlie the Chobham Common component of the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright & Chobham SAC, subject to implementation of relevant embedded design measure and embedded mitigation measures identified above.
- A3.24 **Chobham Common SSSI & NNR:** The impacts of the proposed development on the SSSI and NNR designations that apply to Chobham Common are discussed in paragraphs 7.5.265 to 7.5.337 (pp.123-134) and summarised in Table 7.21 (pp.134-135) of Chapter 7 of the ES. Further assessment of the impacts of hydrological changes on the groundwater dependent ecosystems of the Chobham Common SSSI is set out in paragraphs 7.5.834 to 7.5.839 (p.211) and Table 7.43 (p.212) of Chapter 7 of the ES.
- A3.25 The assessment set out in the paragraphs 7.5.265 to 7.5.337 (pp.123-134) of Chapter 7 of the ES covers eight distinct impact pathways by which features of interest of the SSSI and NNR could be affected by the installation of the proposed pipeline.
- A3.25.1 Habitat loss/gain, fragmentation or modification with reference to:
- A3.25.1.1 Notified habitat features and other habitats – Paragraphs 7.5.271 to 7.5.281 (pp.124-126) report on the anticipated direct impacts of the proposed scheme in terms of the loss or fragmentation of notified habitat features and other habitats. Paragraph 7.5.276 (p.125) reports that the use of trenchless crossings would protect some 8 hectares of sensitive habitats from direct impacts, with the total area of land within the SSSI and the DCO limits amounting to some 14.05 hectares. Paragraph 7.5.277 (pp.125-126) reports that some 2.28 hectares composed of five broad habitat types would be directly affected by open cut trenching. Paragraph 7.5.278 (p.126) reports on the embedded mitigation measures that would be employed to limit adverse impacts (measures HRA4, G51 and G62 as listed in Table 16.1 of Chapter 16 of the ES). Paragraph 7.5.279 (p.126) reports on the heathland regeneration regime (measure HRA1 in in Table 16.1 of Chapter 16 of the ES) that would be employed post-construction. Paragraph 7.5.280 (p.126) reports that taking into account the proposed embedded mitigation measures and good practice approaches that would be employed, direct impacts on the notable habitat features and other habitats of the SSSI and NNR would be small in magnitude and of minor adverse significance;
- A3.25.1.2 Notable plants and vascular plant assemblages – Paragraphs 7.5.282 to 7.5.287 (p.127) report on the anticipated direct impacts of the proposed scheme in terms of the loss of individuals of four notable plant species – dodder (rare), common wintergreen (rare), white-beaked sedge (locally frequent), and oblong-leaved sundew (locally frequent). Paragraph 7.5.283 (p.127) reports that no impacts are anticipated for white-beaked sedge and oblong-leaved sundew, as both species occur within those areas of the DCO area

where the pipeline would be installed by means of trenchless crossings. Paragraph 7.5.284 (p.127) reports that where works are necessary in wet heath areas the use of ground protection matting (measure G51 in Table 16.1 of Chapter 16 of the ES) and the timing of works for the plant dormant period (measure G38 in Table 16.1 of Chapter 16 of the ES) would provide for the protection of plant communities. Paragraph 7.5.285 (p.127) reports that dodder is an annual seed bearing parasitic plant that is expected to re-establish following the completion of the construction works. Paragraph 7.2.86 (p.127) reports that there is uncertainty as to the regeneration capabilities of common wintergreen, which would be addressed through the translocation of individual plants to an appropriate receptor site within the DCO limits, under the guidance of the Ecological Clerk of Works (ECOW) and in accordance with embedded mitigation measure G55 (Table 16.1 of Chapter 16 of the ES). Paragraph 7.5.287 (p.127) reports that taking into account the proposed embedded mitigation measures and good practice approaches that would be employed, direct impacts on the notable plant and vascular plant assemblages of the SSSI and NNR would be negligible in magnitude and of minor adverse significance.

A3.25.2 Habitat loss/gain, fragmentation or modification with reference to:

A3.25.2.1 Notified species of breeding birds – Paragraphs 7.5.289 to 7.5.293 (p.128) report on the anticipated impacts that habitat change could have on the three SPA bird species (Dartford warbler, woodlark and nightjar). Paragraph 7.5.291 (p.128) reports that the worst case scenario for temporary loss of habitat suitable for the SPA bird species would be an area equivalent to 2% of the 655 hectare Chobham Common, or 0.17% of the area covered by the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. Paragraph 7.5.293 (p.128) reports that given the temporary nature of the works and the limited extent of the affected land, that the loss of SPA bird habitat would be of negligible magnitude and minor adverse significance;

A3.25.2.2 Notified species of terrestrial invertebrates – Paragraphs 7.5.294 to 7.5.299 (pp.128-129) report on the anticipated impacts that habitat change could have on a range of invertebrate species, including ants, bees, wasps, aquatic beetles, flies, butterflies, moths and spiders. Paragraph 7.5.295 (p.128) reports that an ant species of particular interest (*Formica rufibarbis*) is well recorded and is not found within the DCO limits. Paragraph 7.5.296 (pp.128-129) reports that the worst case scenario for temporary loss of habitat suitable for invertebrates would be an area equivalent to 2% of the 655 hectare Chobham Common, which is unlikely to have significant impacts on the invertebrates of interest. Paragraph 7.5.297 (p.129) reports that impacts on earth banks within the SSSI should be avoided, and if removal is necessary then reinstatement

would be required (measure G57 in Table 16.1 of Chapter 16 of the ES). Paragraph 7.5.298 (p.129) reports that the reinstatement of heathland habitat post-construction is expected to offer improved habitat for terrestrial invertebrates. Paragraph 7.5.299 (p.129) reports that given the temporary nature of the works and the limited extent of the affected land, the loss of habitat suitable for terrestrial invertebrates would be of negligible magnitude and minor adverse significance.

A3.25.3 Introduction or spread of invasive non-native species – Paragraphs 7.5.300 to 7.5.303 (p.129) report on the presence and management of invasive non-native species (INNS). Paragraph 7.5.300 (p.129) reports that the invasive plant species montbretia has been identified as being present within the DCO limits, with areas of potential risk mapped in Appendix 7.4 to the ES. Paragraph 7.5.302 (p.129) reports that measures to control the spread of INNS have been embedded into the proposed construction management approach, as detailed by measures HRA4, G155 and G42 in Table 16.1 of Chapter 16 of the ES. Paragraph 7.5.303 (p.129) reports that taking into account the proposed mitigation and management measures that the risk of the project spreading INNS across the SSSI and NNR would be of negligible magnitude and negligible significance.

A3.25.4 Species mortality or injury with reference to:

A3.25.4.1 Notified species of breeding birds – Paragraphs 7.5.305 to 7.5.308 (p.130) report on the potential risks to breeding birds, noting that works would be restricted to the period between 1 October and 31 January to avoid the SPA species breeding season. Paragraphs 7.5.306 and 7.5.307 (p.130) report on the measures that would be deployed to avoid adverse impacts on breeding birds, including supervision by an ECoW and the deployment of nest protection measures (measure G35 in Table 16.1 of Chapter 16 of the ES). Paragraph 7.5.308 (p.130) reports that taking into account the proposed mitigation and management measures that the risk of the project resulting in the death or injury of breeding birds across the SSSI and NNR would be of negligible magnitude and negligible significance;

A3.25.4.2 Notified species of terrestrial invertebrates (heathland specialists) – Paragraphs 7.5.309 to 7.5.312 (pp.130-131) report on the potential risks to terrestrial invertebrates, noting that most invertebrate species would be dormant during the construction period, with paragraph 7.5.310 (p.130) noting that dormant individuals and juveniles could be killed during site preparation works. Paragraph 7.5.310 (p.130) reports that impacts on earth banks within the SSSI should be avoided, and if removal is necessary then reinstatement would be required (measure G57 in Table 16.1 of Chapter 16 of the ES). Paragraph 7.5.311 (p.130) reports that amount of heathland habitat that would be subject to

temporary loss would be small (c. 2% of the whole SSSI), and that therefore the number of individuals killed or injured would be unlikely to have a significant impact on the status of the population. Paragraph 7.5.312 (p.130) reports that the impacts of the project on the terrestrial invertebrate population as a consequence of the death or injury of individuals would be of negligible magnitude and minor adverse significance.

A3.25.5 Species disturbance with reference to notified species of breeding birds – Paragraphs 7.5.314 to 7.5.319 (pp.131-132) report on the potential for the scheme to give rise to adverse impacts on breeding birds as a consequence of disturbance, noting that works would be restricted to the period between 1 October and 31 January to avoid the SPA species breeding season. Paragraphs 7.5.316 and 7.5.31 (p.13) report on the measures that would be deployed to avoid adverse impacts on breeding birds, including supervision by an ECoW and the deployment of nest protection measures (measure G35 in Table 16.1 of Chapter 16 of the ES). Paragraph 7.5.318 (p.131) reports that taking into account the proposed mitigation and management measures that the risk of the project resulting in the disturbance of breeding birds across the SSSI and NNR would be of negligible magnitude and negligible significance.

A3.25.6 Hydrological changes to groundwater dependent ecosystems, with reference to:

A3.25.6.1 Changes in groundwater flows or levels – Paragraphs 7.5.322 to 7.5.325 (pp.132-133) report on the potential impacts of the scheme on groundwater flows and levels within the SSSI and NNR, and in particular within wet heathlands and bogs. Paragraph 7.5.322 (p.132) reports that trenchless crossings would be used to install the pipeline through the most groundwater sensitive habitats, and that there would be no dewatering effects as a consequence of those works. For sections of the pipeline where open cut trenches would be used a number of mitigation measures would be deployed (measures G132 and G134 in Table 16.1 in Chapter 16 of the ES) to address potential dewatering impacts (paragraphs 7.5.323 and 7.5.324, p.132). Paragraph 7.5.325 (pp.132-133) reports that taking into account the proposed mitigation and management measures that the risk of the project resulting in changes in groundwater levels or flows would be of negligible magnitude and negligible significance;

A3.25.6.2 Changes in groundwater quality – Paragraphs 7.5.326 to 7.5.329 (p.133) report on the potential impacts of the scheme on groundwater quality within the SSSI and NNR. Paragraph 7.5.327 (p.132) reports on the mitigation measures that would be deployed (measures G8, G119, G121, G142, and G117 in Table 16.1 in Chapter 16 of the ES) to address potential groundwater quality impacts. Paragraph 7.5.329 (p.133) reports that taking into account the proposed mitigation and management measures that

the risk of the project resulting in changes in groundwater quality would be of negligible magnitude and negligible significance.

- A3.25.7 Hydrological changes with reference to surface water contamination – Paragraphs 7.5.330 to 7.5.333 (pp.133-134) report on the potential impacts of the scheme on surface water quality within the SSSI and NNR. Paragraph 7.5.331 (p.134) reports that trenchless techniques would be employed for the two surface watercourses that would be crossed by the pipeline. Paragraph 7.5.332 (p.132) reports on the mitigation measures that would be deployed (measures G8, G11, G12, G39, G119, G121, and G142 in Table 16.1 in Chapter 16 of the ES) to address potential surface water quality impacts. Paragraph 7.5.333 (p.134) reports that taking into account the proposed mitigation and management measures that the risk of the project resulting in changes in surface water quality would be of negligible magnitude and negligible significance.
- A3.25.8 Changes in air quality with reference to dust deposition – Paragraphs 7.5.334 to 7.5.337 (p.134) report on the potential impacts of the scheme on air quality as a consequence of fugitive dust emissions within the SSSI and NNR. Paragraph 7.5.335 (p.134) reports on the mitigation measures that would be deployed (measures G30 (dust management plan) in Table 16.1 in Chapter 16 of the ES) to address potential dust emissions and impacts. Paragraph 7.5.337 (p.134) reports that taking into account the proposed mitigation and management measures that the risk of the project resulting in changes in air quality due to dust emissions would be of small magnitude and minor adverse significance.
- A3.26 Hydrological changes to groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystems: The assessment of hydrological changes set out in the paragraphs 7.5.834 to 7.5.839 (p.211) and summarised in table 7.43 (p.212) of Chapter 7 of the ES concludes that the installation of the proposed pipeline would give rise to minor significance impacts with respect to the interception of groundwater flows, and to negligible impacts on groundwater quality.
- A3.27 The County Council does not disagree with the conclusion set out in the ES with reference to the indirect effects of pipeline installation on the hydrology of the Chobham Common SSSI, subject to implementation of the relevant embedded design measures and the embedded mitigation measures (G132 and G134) set out in Table 16.1 (p.36) in Chapter 16 (Environmental Management & Mitigation) of the ES.

Conclusion for Chobham Common in respect of Biodiversity Impacts

- A3.28 Overall the County Council is content that the potential for significant adverse impacts on Chobham Common has been addressed robustly through the EIA and HRA processes and that appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures have been embedded into the design of the proposed development and approach outlined in respect of construction and aftercare. The County Council is satisfied that adequate consideration has been given to the European designations (Thames Basin Heaths SPA and Thursley, Ash, Pirbright & Chobham SAC) and the national designations (SSSI and NNR) that cover the Common, and that the integrity of those designated would not be compromised by the proposed scheme.

CONTROL SHEET

V1	24 September	First draft. Heritage, PROW and Buses
V2	2 October	Second draft. Transport Assessment, Property.
V3	15 October	Third draft. Minerals and Waste.
V4	16 October	Fourth Draft. Minerals and Waste, Chobham Common
V5	19 October	Fifth Draft. The DCO etc, Emergency Planning
V6	20 October	Sixth Draft. Summary.
V7	21 October	Seventh Draft. Network Management
V8	23 October	Final Version.

Input from/Comments by

Mike Green
Stephen Jenkins
Steve Mitchell
Laurie James
Alex Egginton
David Moody
Jessica Salder (with input from John Edwards and Caroline Smith)
Helen Forbes
Ian Good
Matthew Jezzard
Clare Springett

Approval

Caroline Smith