

Southampton to London Pipeline Project

Deadline 4

DCO Application Errata

Application Document: 8.64

Planning Inspectorate Reference Number: EN070005

Revision No. 1.0

January 2020



Contents

| | | |
|----------|------------------------------------|----------|
| 1 | DCO Application Errata..... | 1 |
| 1.1 | Introduction..... | 1 |

1 DCO Application Errata

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This document is to present any errata that have been identified within the documents that were submitted as part of the application for Development Consent. The errors are minor in nature and do not change the meaning of documents, analysis or any assessment.
- 1.1.2 The errata are presented in Table 1.1 with the correction provided for clarification. The list of documents does not include the Code of Construction Practice, which has been updated at Deadline 4 (**Document Reference 6.4 Appendix 16.1(3)**) and includes the amendments where applicable.

Table 1.1: Errata Identified Within Original Submission Documents

| Section and Paragraph Reference | Nature of Erratum and Explanation |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Habitats Regulation Assessment – HRA Report (Application Document APP-130 and APP-131) | |
| Table 2.1 | There are two references to Annex B in Table 2.1 on pages 11 and 12. This reference should state Appendix B instead of Annex B. This was communicated to the Examining Authority at Deadline 2 in response to question BIO.1.61 (REP2-040) |
| Section 8 | There are two references missing from the reference list in Section 8. The reference list should include: Highways Agency (2007). Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 11 Environmental Assessment Section 3 Environmental Assessment Techniques. Part 1 Air Quality - HA 207/07. Highways Agency (2009). Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 11 Environmental Assessment Section 4 Assessment of Implications on European Sites - HD 44/09. This was communicated to the Examining Authority at Deadline 2 in response to question BIO.1.61 (REP2-040) |
| Appendix D | The original application of the HRA Report (Application Document APP-130) uploaded on the Planning Inspectorate website in May 2019 had the last page missing of Appendix D, which contains the footnotes from e-i. The Applicant resubmitted Appendix D of the HRA Report to the Examining Authority on 13 August (Additional Submission AS-026), as part of the S51 submission, and this was uploaded as a pdf to the project website. This contains the missing page on page 18. |
| Appendix B | The brown hatched areas shown on the figures in Appendix B to the HRA Report are missing from the legend. The areas are indicative locations for site compounds. They should be shown on the legend and labelled as 'Indicative locations of site compounds'. This was communicated to the Examining Authority at Deadline 2 in response to question BIO.1.61 (REP2-040) |
| Table 4.1 and Appendix D | Table 4.1 and screening matrix D.1 of the HRA Report (Application Document APP-130) states that the waterfowl assemblage number is 53,948. However, Natural England provided the waterfowl assemblage number to be 51,361 in the citation, Natura 2000 data form, and in the Supplementary Advice on Conservation Objectives published in September 2019 for Solent and Southampton Water Special Protection Area. The number 53,948 given in the HRA Report (Application Document APP-130) is an error. Instances of 53,948 should instead read 51,361. This was communicated to the Examining Authority at Deadline 2 in response to question BIO.1.61 (REP2-040) |

| Section and Paragraph Reference | Nature of Erratum and Explanation |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Flood Risk Assessment - FRA (Application Document APP-134) | |
| Paragraph 7.4.3, Table 7.3, Appendix B and Appendix C | <p>In the FRA WCX 066 is labelled as the Hale Bourne, which is consistent with the OS Rivers Mapping. This is also referred to as Windle Brook on the OS Mapping at the 1:25,000 scale. This is the same watercourse.</p> <p>WCX 066 is identified as a trenchless crossing. However, a haul road may still be required at this location. Therefore, WCX 066 (Hale Bourne / Windle Brook) should be listed in Table 7.3, Appendix B and Appendix C as a medium risk crossing. In addition, Paragraph 7.4.3 should state that there are 18 crossings of medium or high risk instead of 17.</p> |
| Paragraph 13.2.3 and Table 13.1 | <p>A small part of Compound 55 and the M3 Junction 3 Logistics Hub are located in Flood Zone 3. These should be added to Table 13.1 on page 85. Paragraph 13.2.3 introduces the table and currently says '<i>There are three proposed compounds located within Flood Zone 3 as summarised in Table 13.1</i>' should instead say '<i>There are four proposed construction compounds and one logistics hub which are wholly or partly located within Flood Zone 3 as summarised in Table 13.1</i>.' This was communicated to the Examining Authority at Deadline 2 in response to question FR.1.20 (REP2-043)</p> |
| Appendix B and Appendix C | <p>WCX 058d is incorrectly identified as an Ordinary Watercourse when it should be labelled as a Main River.</p> |
| Appendix D | <p>A small part of Compound 55 and the M3 Junction 3 Logistics Hub are located in Flood Zone 3. Therefore, these should both be listed as having a likelihood of flooding from fluvial sources is medium in Appendix D. This has been referenced within Technical Note: Environment Agency – Works within Flood Zone 3, as part of the Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency (REP2-012).</p> |
| Appendix D | <p>Appendix D includes a construction compound at Hardwick Lane (KT16 0AA). This is not included as part of the application and should not be included within the list of compounds in Appendix D.</p> |
| Appendix D | <p>Compound 4S was omitted from the FRA. This should have been noted as Compound 19 and located adjacent to Ryebriidge Lane in East Hampshire GU34 4JH at E: 475596 N: 142407. The compound is at Low risk of flooding for Flood Zone 1. This would result in a low overall risk and no mitigation requirements.</p> |
| Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135) | |
| Table A2.2 | <p>Balmoral Drive column 4 should read 375 and not 37. This was addressed in the Applicant's response to Written Question TT1.7 at Deadline 2 (REP2-052).</p> |
| Appendix 3 | <p>Appendix 3 was missing from the original application submission. This was provided to the Examining Authority at Deadline 2 (REP2-057). The Transport Assessment Scoping Report was previously provided to Hampshire County Council, Surrey County Council and Highways England, as the relevant highways authorities (see details in REP2-052).</p> |
| Environmental Statement (Application document references provided below) | |
| <p>Figures Chapter 3 Project Description (Application Document APP-059) Figure 3.1</p> | <p>The label for the 'new pigging station at Boorley Green' in Figure 3.1 is in the wrong place, it should be shown at grid reference SU51774 15371.</p> |
| <p>Appendix 4.1 Pipeline Route Corridor Options (Application Document APP-077) Table 1.2, page 6.</p> | <p>Grid reference SU7703044164 is given for 'D45 – Use existing gaps in hedge to avoid mature trees'. The grid reference is incorrect and should be 'Grid reference SU 7606342997'</p> <p>The grid reference SU7796145439 is given for 'D46 – Move Order Limits west to avoid woodland block which is a Priority Habitat'. This grid reference is incorrect and should be SU7697644160.</p> |
| <p>Chapter 16 Table 16.1 page 10 (Application</p> | |

| Section and Paragraph Reference | Nature of Erratum and Explanation |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Document APP-056). | |
| Chapter 7 Biodiversity (Application Document APP-047) Section 7.5, Paragraph 7.5.197 | Paragraph 7.5.197 indicates that narrow width working within the SSSI would reduce the area of habitats impacted within the Order Limits from 15.24ha to 7.73ha. The value of 15.24ha is erroneous. The value given in paragraph 7.5.197 should be 14.50ha rather than 15.24ha and hence the value 7.73 should be 6.72. The text should read: <i>'This would reduce the area of habitats impacted within the order limits from 14.50ha to 6.72ha.'</i> |
| Chapter 7 Biodiversity (Application Document APP-047) Section 7.5, Paragraph 7.5.218 | The text states, <i>'the Colony Bog & Bagshot Heath SSSI citation does not list any specific invertebrate species as notified features of the site...'</i> . Paragraph 7.5.218 should be altered to read <i>'The Colony Bog and Bagshot Heath SSSI citation makes note of several species of invertebrate. Of particular note to the project is the large raft spider Dolomedes fimbriatus which is associated with bog pools.'</i> The alteration will not make a difference to the report's assessment or conclusions. |
| Chapter 7 Biodiversity (Application Document APP-047) Section 7.5, Paragraph 7.5.460 Chapter 16 Environmental Management and Mitigation Table 16.1 (Application Document APP-056) | The text states <i>'working width would be reduced to 15m positioned towards the western half of the Order Limits (to reduce impacts to Lowland Meadows Priority Habitat) and ground protection matting would be used over an approximate distance of 720m (grid ref: TQ05626 66084 to TQ05972 66563). Turf would be stripped, stored and reinstated above the trench for an approximate distance of 125m between approximate grid references TQ 05958 66596 to TQ 05997 66480 (NW29).</i> The text has been amended to improve the clarity of the meaning. The text should read: <i>'Working width reduced to 15m and use of ground protection to reduce impacts to Chertsey Meads Local Nature Reserve. The approximate distance would be 720m to be positioned away from mature trees. (Grid ref: TQ0562666084 to TQ0597266563). Turf would be stripped, stored and reinstated above the trench for an approximate distance of 125m between approximate grid references TQ 05958 66596 to TQ 05997 66480. This section would be positioned towards the western half of the Order Limits to protect lowland meadows priority habitat'</i> |
| Appendix 7.10 Great Crested Newt EPS Licence Application (1 of 2) (Application Document APP-097) B1.2 Page 43 | The text currently says <i>'The Order Limits at Upper Froyle, Hants (SU 7574 4260), pass close to a development that was subject to a GCN licence. According to MAGIC the licence reference is 2016-20026-EPS-MIT. Pond 57a, and possibly Pond 55, is believed to be a mitigation pond created in 2016 as part of the licence'</i> . This is incorrect, Pond 57a was not created as a mitigation pond as part of licence 2016-20026-EPS-MIT. Only Pond 55 was created as a mitigation pond in 2015. Pond 57a is currently managed by a local wildlife group. The text should read: <i>'Pond 55 is believed to be a mitigation pond created in 2016 as part of the licence. Pond 57a is currently managed by a local wildlife group'</i> . |
| Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document APP-050) Section 10.5, Paragraph 10.5.104 | Chapter 10 states that <i>'The effects on the landscape caused by vegetation loss during construction would remain evident post construction, but the overall landscape character of the common land would not be adversely affected.'</i> Post construction (for both year 1 and year 15), The reference to 'common land' should actually be 'open access land'. The adverse effect should relate to both year 1 and year 15. The text should read: <i>'The effects on the landscape caused by vegetation loss during construction would remain evident post construction, but the overall landscape character of the open access land would not be adversely affected in year 1 or year 15.'</i> |