

# Southampton to London Pipeline Project

## Deadline 5

Draft SoCG with Surrey Heath Borough  
Council

Application Document: 8.4.31

Planning Inspectorate Reference Number: EN070005

Revision No. 2.0

February 2020





## **Southampton to London Pipeline Project**

### **Statement of Common Ground**

**Between:**

**Esso Petroleum Company, Limited**

**and**

**Surrey Heath Borough Council**

Date: February 2020

Application Document Reference:



Signed	
Printed Name	Tim Sunderland
Position	SLP Project Executive
On behalf of	Esso Petroleum Company, Limited
Date	

Signed	
Printed Name	Jenny Rickard
Position	Executive Head of Regulatory Services
On behalf of	Surrey Heath Borough Council
Date	



**Contents**

**1. Introduction ..... 1**

1.1. Purpose of Document ..... 1

1.2. Description of the Project ..... 1

1.3. This Statement of Common Ground ..... 1

1.4. Structure of the Statement of Common Ground ..... 2

**2. Record of Engagement Undertaken to Date ..... 3**

2.1. Pre and Post-DCO Application Engagement and Consultation..... 3

**3. Matters Agreed ..... 4**

**4. Matters Not Agreed ..... 8**

**5. Matters Subject to On-going Discussion ..... 9**

**6. Relevant documents and drawings ..... 11**

6.1. List of relevant documents and drawings ..... 11

**7. Appendix A ..... 12**

7.1 Schedule of pre-application meetings and correspondence ..... 12

**8. Appendix B ..... 20**

8.1 Response to Corridor Consultation ..... 20

**9. Appendix C ..... 22**

9.1. Response to Preferred Route Consultation ..... 22

**10. Appendix D ..... 26**

10.1 Response to Design Refinements Consultation ..... 26

**11. Appendix E ..... 28**

11.1 Considerations in the Cumulative Effects Assessment ..... 28



## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Purpose of Document

- 1.1.1. A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is a written statement produced as part of the Application process for a Development Consent Order (DCO) and is prepared jointly between the applicant for a DCO and another party. It sets out matters of agreement between both parties, as well as matters where there is not an agreement. It also details matters that are under discussion.
- 1.1.2. The aim of a SoCG is to help the Examining Authority manage the Examination Phase of a DCO application. Understanding the status of the matters at hand will allow the Examining Authority to focus their questioning and provide greater predictability for all participants in examination. A SoCG may be submitted prior to the start of or during Examination, and then updated as necessary or as requested during the Examination Phase.

### 1.2. Description of the Project

- 1.2.1. Esso Petroleum Company, Limited (Esso) launched its Southampton to London Pipeline Project in December 2017. Esso proposes to replace 90km of its 105km aviation fuel pipeline that runs from the Fawley Refinery near Southampton, to the West London Terminal storage facility in Hounslow. In spring 2018, Esso held a non-statutory consultation which helped it to select the preferred corridor for the replacement pipeline. In autumn 2018, it held a statutory consultation on the preferred route for the replacement pipeline. In early 2019, it held a second phase of statutory consultation on design refinements.

### 1.3. This Statement of Common Ground

- 1.3.1. This SoCG has been prepared jointly by Esso as the applicant and Surrey Heath Borough Council as a prescribed consultee and Local Authority as defined within the Local Government Act 2000. Surrey Heath Borough Council has interests in the SLP Project, as a Local Planning Authority, as a service provider to its businesses and residents and as a landowner affected by the project.
- 1.3.2. For the purpose of this SoCG, Esso and Surrey Heath BC (SHBC) will jointly be referred to as "the Parties". When referencing Surrey Heath BC alone, they will be referred to as "SHBC".
- 1.3.3. Throughout this SoCG:
  - Where a section begins 'matters agreed', this sets out matters that have been agreed between the Parties.
  - Where a section begins 'matters not agreed', this sets out matters that are not agreed between the Parties.



- Where a section begins 'matters subject to ongoing discussion', this sets out matters that are subject to further negotiation between the Parties.

#### **1.4. Structure of the Statement of Common Ground**

1.4.1. This SoCG has been structured to reflect matters and topics of relevance to SHBC in respect of Esso's Southampton to London Pipeline Project.

- Section 2 provides an overview of the engagement to date between the Parties.
- Section 3 provides a summary of areas that have been agreed.
- Section 4 provides a record of areas that have not yet been agreed.
- Section 5 provides a list of ongoing matters (if any) that will be agreed or not agreed by the Parties during examination.
- Section 6 provides a record of relevant documents and drawings



## **2. Record of Engagement Undertaken to Date**

### **2.1. Pre and Post-DCO Application Engagement and Consultation**

- 2.1.1. Appendix A contains tables that set out the consultation and engagement that has been undertaken between the Parties. Engagement and consultation included pre-application and since the submission of the DCO application. Engagement between the Parties has been meaningful and constructive throughout.

### 3. Matters Agreed

3.1.1. The table below sets out the matters agreed in relation to different topics.

Table 3.1 Schedule of matters agreed

Examining Authority's suggested theme	Topic	Matter agreed
	General	<p>The project and SHBC have met at appropriate times since the Project launch in December 2017.</p> <p>In general, SHBC is satisfied that the consultation and engagement with its officers and members has been robust and meaningful. SHBC confirms that it considers the applicant has complied with the duty to consult (section 42 of the Planning Act 2008), the duty to consult the local community (Section 47 of the Planning Act 2008) and the duty to publicise (Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008).</p>
<b>The Need and Principle of the Proposed Development and Examination of Alternative Routes</b>	General	SHBC is satisfied with the approach of consulting on corridors and then a route. The project acknowledges SHBC's consultation response.
	General	<p>In general, SHBC is satisfied with the statutory consultation on the pipeline route – both during the Preferred Route Consultation and the Design Refinements Consultation. The project acknowledges SHBC's consultation responses.</p> <p>SHBC gave its initial opinion and comments regarding the pipeline route, based on the information available at the time, in its statutory consultation responses.</p>
	General	SHBC acknowledges that the SLP Project has listened to its consultation response, in particular through deselecting a corridor which would have adversely affected access to Frimley Park Hospital.
	General	<p>SHBC does not object to the majority of the proposed Order Limits and Limits of Deviation that define the proposed pipeline route (described below), as proposed in the SLP Project's application for Development Consent.</p> <p>The route starts in the west of the Borough, crossing the North Downs railway line, A331, River Blackwater, Frimley Hatches and the Ascot to Guildford railway line. It then runs along the south-eastern boundary of SC Johnson Ltd land before crossing Frimley Green Road (B3411) near the roundabout with Balmoral Drive. From the B3411 the route</p>





		<p>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.</p> <p>Here it enters Ministry of Defence (MoD) land associated with the Bisley and Pirbright Ranges, Colony Bog and Bagshot Heath SSSI. The application route continues north running adjacent to The Maultway (B3015) before turning east to follow Red Road (B311) and through the wooded area 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 Green Space (SANG). The application route then crosses the Halebourne and then Halebourne Lane.</p> <p>The Section then continues generally northeast, crossing Windlesham Road, before passing through Chobham Common Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</p>
<p><b>Highways and transport</b></p>	<p>Highways</p>	<p>The parties have agreed that the Applicant will keep local residents informed of traffic management in the Borough.</p>
<p><b>Planning policy</b></p>	<p>National Policy Statements (NPSs)</p> <p>Development Plan</p>	<p>The relevant NPSs are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)</li> <li>• National Policy Statement for Gas Supply Infrastructure and Gas and Oil Pipelines (EN-4)</li> </ul> <p>While the assessment of the application for development consent should be made against the NPSs.</p> <p>Esso and SHBC agree the Development Plan comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2012)</li> <li>• Surrey Heath Local Plan 2000 – saved policies</li> <li>• Camberley Town Centre AAP (2011-2028)</li> <li>• Surrey Minerals Local Plan 2011 – Core Strategy, Primary Aggregates DPD, Mineral Sites Restoration SPD</li> <li>• Surrey Waste Plan 2008</li> <li>• Windlesham Neighbourhood Plan, ‘Made’ 2019</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD 2019</li> <li>Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area Delivery Framework (2009)</li> </ul> <p>Esso and Surrey Heath BC agree the following documents are emerging policy documents, but not yet part of the Development Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emerging Surrey Heath Draft Local Plan – Issues and Options 2018</li> </ul>
<b>Planning policy</b>	Development Land	SHBC is satisfied that the route of the proposed pipeline does not impact adversely on any strategic housing site allocation identified in emerging or adopted local plans in the borough.
<b>Methodology for Environmental Impact Assessment including the assessment of cumulative effects</b>	Environmental Impact Assessment	SHBC has provided its initial comments, via the scoping consultation and statutory consultation, on the Environmental Impact Assessment process based on the information available at the time.
<b>Biodiversity</b>	Environmental Impact Assessment	When considering Chobham Common, SHBC is satisfied that, when considering all factors, the selection of the final pipeline route is appropriate in its response to biodiversity receptors within and in the vicinity of the Order Limits.
<b>Biodiversity</b>	Environmental Impact Assessment	SHBC is satisfied that there are no significant residual effects on biodiversity receptors at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Frimley Hatches;</li> <li>Frith Hill.</li> </ul>
<b>Methodology for Environmental Impact Assessment including the assessment of cumulative effects</b>	Environmental Impact Assessment	SHBC agrees that the list of housing developments and housing allocations within its borough considered in the cumulative effects assessment and reported in Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement is satisfactory. The list of developments is found in Appendix E of this document.
<b>Construction Environmental Management Plan / Code of</b>	Open Space	SHBC is satisfied that the Applicant's Code of Construction Practice and the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) establish reasonable generic

<b>Construction Practice / Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments</b>		<p>principals for managing post construction impacts, on Open Spaces crossed by the Order Limits at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The informal open spaces along Balmoral Drive;</li> <li>• Windlemere SANG</li> </ul>
<b>Historic Environment</b>		<p>SHBC has raised no concerns regarding this theme. The Authority considers that the impact of the project on the historic environment will be negligible on the basis of good practice measures identified in Environmental Statement Chapter 9: Historic Environment.</p>
<b>Landscape and visual impacts</b>		<p>SHBC has raised no comments regarding this theme.</p>
<b>People and Communities</b>  <b>Biodiversity</b>		<p>SHBC notes that objections have been raised by residents in the Lightwater area as to the location of the pipeline in Turf Hill.</p> <p>SHBC is satisfied that the Applicant has investigated the location of the Affinity Water main along the footpath on the northern edge of Turf Hill.</p> <p>The Parties agree to continue discussions through the development of the Community Engagement Plan and CEMP/LEMP/CoCP to reduce disruption to residents and to the trees within Turf Hill.</p>
<b>Highways and Transport</b>	General	<p>The Applicant has agreed to manage the construction activity within Streets using the Surrey County Permit Scheme and construction traffic impacts will be managed through the CTMP following approval by Surrey County Council in consultation with SHBC.</p>
<b>Flooding and Water</b>	General	<p>SHBC understands that the Applicant is working with the EA and Local Lead Flood Authorities to resolve any outstanding issues.</p>
<b>Construction Effects on People and Communities</b>	SPA and St Catherine's SANG	<p><b>The Parties consider that an agreement can be reached regarding the specific terms of the occupation of the SANG and are continuing negotiations. Consequently, the Authority does not object in principle to the Order Limits within St Catherines Road SANG.</b></p>



## 4. Matters Not Agreed

4.1.1. The table below sets out the matters **not** agreed in relation to different topics.

Table 4.1 Schedule of matters not agreed

Examining Authority's suggested theme	Topic	Matter not agreed

## 5. Matters Subject to On-going Discussion

5.1.1. The table below sets out the matters subject to ongoing discussion.

Table 5.1 Schedule of topics under discussion

Examining Authority's suggested theme	Topic	Matter subject to ongoing discussion
<b>Biodiversity</b>	Trees	<p>The Applicant and SHBC will continue to discuss the concerns raised by the council regarding potential impact on trees within the Borough.</p> <p><b>The Applicant submitted outline CEMP and LEMP documents and Site Specific Plans for St Catherine's SANG and Turf Hill at Deadline 4, which will inform this discussion.</b></p>
<b>Construction Effects on People and Communities</b>	Residential properties and community facilities	<p>The Applicant and SHBC will continue to discuss the management of construction impacts on local residents in particular those living and working on Balmoral Drive and at community locations such as the Baptist Church and church hall.</p> <p><b>The Applicant submitted outline CEMP and CEP documents at Deadline 4, which will inform this discussion.</b></p>
<b>The Draft Development Consent Order</b>	General	<p>As outlined in SHBC's Local Impact Report, the local authorities of Surrey Heath, Runnymede and Spelthorne have suggested new draft requirements and amended requirements for the draft DCO to address impacts relating to tree protection, transport and highways and residential amenity (see Chapter 2 of the LIR). SHBC considers that such amendments to the DCO would help to address SHBC's concerns in relation to these matters.</p> <p><b>The Applicant submitted outline CEMP and LEMP documents at Deadline 4, which will inform this discussion.</b></p>
<b>Safety and Security</b>	General	<p>As noted in SHBC's Local Impact Report in the Security and Safety section (see paragraph 6.43 – 6.44), SHBC understands that the applicant has committed to the removal of unstable trees near the pipeline that might pose a risk to residential properties,</p>



		<p>especially in the Lightwater area. SHBC is of the view that the proposed DCO Requirement for tree protection included in Chapter 2 of the LIR would assist in this respect.</p> <p><b>The Applicant submitted a Site Specific Plan for Turf Hill at Deadline 4, which will inform this discussion. SHBC will also review Article 41 in the dDCO.</b></p>
<p><b>Biodiversity</b></p>	<p>Great Crested Newts</p>	<p><b>The Parties continue to discuss good practice measures related to Great Crested Newts within Windlemere SANG.</b></p>

## 6. Relevant documents and drawings

### 6.1. List of relevant documents and drawings

6.1.1. The following is a list of documents and drawings upon which this SoCG is based.

Table 6.1 Schedule of relevant documents

Examination Library Reference	Application Reference	Title	Content	Date
APP-039	EN070005 Document 6.1	Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary	Overview of the Environmental Statement	14 <sup>th</sup> May 2019
APP-040 to APP-057	EN070005 Document 6.2	Environmental Statement	Report of the Environmental Impact Assessment	14 <sup>th</sup> May 2019
APP-058 to APP-068	EN070005 Document 6.3	Environmental Statement Figures	Illustrative material to support the Environmental Statement	14 <sup>th</sup> May 2019
APP-069 to APP-129	EN070005 Document 6.4	Environmental Statement Appendices	Additional data and evidence to support the Environmental Statement	14 <sup>th</sup> May 2019
APP130-APP-131	EN070005 Document 6.5	Habitats Regulations Assessment	Assessment of the impact of the project on the Thames Basin Heaths	14 <sup>th</sup> May 2019
	EN070005 Document 7.1	Planning Statement	Assessment of the application against National Policy Statements EN-1 Energy and EN-4 Oil and Gas Pipelines	14 <sup>th</sup> May 2019
RR-093		Surrey Heath BC Relevant Representation	SHBC representations relating to the project	19 <sup>th</sup> July 2019
REP1-024		Surrey Heath Local Impact Report	Assessment of the Local Impacts of the project in Surrey Heath borough	28 <sup>th</sup> October 2019
REP1-003	Deadline 1 submission 8.3	Responses to Relevant Representations	The Applicant's response to the concerns raised by SHBC in their Relevant Representation	28 <sup>th</sup> October 2019

## 7. Appendix A

### 7.1 Schedule of pre-application meetings and correspondence

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
04/12/2017	Correspondence	Project introduction	<p>The project sent a letter to planning team at SHBC regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map of current route</li> <li>• Project timeline</li> <li>• Project introduction</li> </ul>
19/01/2018	Surrey Officers Forum	Update	<p>The invitation was issued to elected members and officers. A planning officer from SHBC attended the meeting.</p> <p>A presentation was provided with Q&amp;A session at the end. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary of project, including existing pipeline and the need for replacement.</li> <li>• Explanation of project plan, including the intention to consult on corridor options before the statutory consultation.</li> </ul>
23/02/2018	Surrey Officers Forum	Update	<p>The invitation was issued to elected members and officers. A planning officer from SHBC attended.</p> <p>A presentation was provided with a Q&amp;A session at the end. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary of the project, including existing pipeline and the need for replacement.</li> <li>• Explanation of project plan, including the intention to consult on corridor options before the statutory consultation.</li> <li>• Gave specific details on event locations and promotional activity targeted at local communities.</li> <li>• Invited feedback on the planned delivery of the consultation related activity.</li> <li>• SHBC asked the project to be aware of using social media, as SHBC had a successful and well used Twitter feed.</li> </ul>



Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
07/02/2018	Environmental workshop	Environmental assessments	<p>SHBC's planning officer attended the environmental workshop.</p> <p>The workshop was to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide an overview of the project</li> <li>• explain approach to assessing route options</li> <li>• give the opportunity to provide feedback and ask questions</li> </ul>
26/02/2018	Correspondence	TPOs and Common Land	<p>As a result of discussions at the forum on 23 February, SHBC's planning officer followed up by providing a shapefile for TPOs and Common Land.</p> <p>The officer also suggested Frimley Community Centre and Heatherside Community Centre as consultation event venues.</p>
1/03/2019	Briefing note	Non-statutory (Corridor) consultation	Briefing note sent to all local authorities and councillors of wards within each corridor option.
14/03/2018	Correspondence	Commitment to Community Consultation (CtCC) – early view	<p>Email containing draft CtCC.</p> <p>Details of councillors that will be notified ahead of launch.</p>
19/03/2018	Correspondence	Launch of non-statutory (Corridor) consultation	<p>The project sent SHBC three letters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Notification of launch letter (as a potential future statutory consultee)</li> <li>2) A notification letter as a landowner, with a Person with an Interest in Land questionnaire and land plans</li> <li>3) Draft CtCC with a separate cover letter</li> </ol> <p>No feedback was provided on the CtCC.</p>
03/04/2018	Correspondence	Data request	The project's planning lead spoke to SHBC's planning officer regarding a data request. The planning officer confirmed councillors would be attending the public consultation event and also that the council executive would be considering a report on the project.
08/04/2018	Correspondence	Corridor J impact on properties	A ward councillor contacted the project to ask for more clarity on Corridor J, after residents had raised concerns with her.
10/04/2018	Correspondence	Corridor J impact on properties	A member of the project's stakeholder engagement team called the ward councillor who had written in (see record above). The project team member

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
			explained why residents in Corridor J had received letters and gave details of the land team for any further enquiries.
10/04/2018	Correspondence	Non-statutory (Corridor) consultation response	A copy is enclosed as Appendix B.
25/05/2018	Surrey Officers Forum	Update	One of SHBC's officers attended: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presented the findings of the Pipeline Corridor Consultation</li> <li>Explained how the preferred corridor would be selected and then when it would be announced to stakeholders</li> </ul>
30/05/2018	Correspondence	Preferred corridor announcement	SHBC was sent two letters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter as a key stakeholder regarding the preferred corridor that was selected</li> <li>A landowner letter</li> </ul>
27/06/2018	Meeting	Initial Working Route	A meeting was held between the project and SHBC. Those present included representatives on both sides from planning, land environment and engineering teams.  The meeting introduced the project to those at SHBC who had not been involved up to this point and allowed the participants to discuss relevant local issues, for example where a pond would affect the pipeline project, and how the project would work with landowners. A wide range of topics were covered.
27/06/2018	Correspondence	Initial Working Route	Project update regarding Initial Working Route release
09/07/2018	Consultation	Draft Statement of Community Consultation	The draft SoCC was issued for statutory consultation to SHBC. SHBC made two points, all of which were adopted or confirmed.
16/07/2018	Councillor correspondence	Chobham sub-options	The project responded to an email from a ward councillor requiring more detail of the two sub-options in Chobham. An explanation of the options was provided, and it was outlined more information would be available during the autumn consultation.

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
06/08/2018 and 21/08/2018	Workshops	EIA Scoping	<p>Invitation were issued on the 17 July 2018 to the main point of contact at SHBC.</p> <p>Several dates were offered. One of SHBC's officers attended the workshop on the 6 August and another officer attended the workshop on the 21 August.</p> <p>The workshop supported the Planning Inspectorate's scoping consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was broad agreement by three borough councils, including SHBC regarding the approach to scoping contaminated land.</li> <li>• There was a recognition from councils in the northern section of the route that historic landfills could pose a significant challenge.</li> </ul>
24/08/2018	Surrey Officers Forum	Update	<p>One of SHBC's officers attended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of activity to date</li> <li>• SoCC consultation feedback</li> <li>• Overview of engagement in support of scoping report</li> <li>• Summary of content and purpose of the statutory consultation on the preferred route</li> </ul>
28/08/2018	Councillor correspondence	Public meetings in Frimley Green	<p>A councillor requested a meeting about the project to be held for their residents. The project responded letting them know public consultation events would be held in the autumn and offering a one to one meeting with the councillor to discuss the project in their area on 15 September.</p>
30/08/2018	Correspondence	Response to Scoping	<p>SHBC sent an email response to Planning Inspectorate re: scoping opinion, sharing it with the project.</p>
06/09/2018	Correspondence	Launch of first statutory (Preferred Route) consultation	<p>The project sent SHBC two letters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Notification of launch letter (as a statutory consultee)</li> <li>2) A notification letter as a landowner, with a Person with an Interest in Land questionnaire and land plans</li> </ol> <p>(Both letters were in line the Planning Act 2008.)</p>

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
15/09/2018	Meeting	The project in Frimley area	The project met with a councillor from SHBC to discuss the consultation process and the project proposals within the ward.
26/09/2018	Site Meeting	Colony Bog and Bagshot Heath SSSI	An officer of SHBC attended a site meeting with the project at the Turf Hill unit of the Colony Bog and Bagshot Heath SSSI, as SHBC owns and manages this site. The meeting discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walkover of proposed route and sub-options</li> <li>• Construction management</li> <li>• Impacts on heathland habitats, reptiles and trees</li> <li>• Reinstatement</li> <li>• Potential environmental investment</li> </ul>
12/10/2018	Correspondence	First statutory (Preferred Route) consultation response	A copy is enclosed in Appendix C.
31/10/2018	Meeting	Project update meeting	A meeting was held between SHBC and project to update on the statutory consultation feedback and discuss key elements of the project relating to the borough. This was a very detailed meeting covering a lot of topics; including potential developments, possible routing through Chobham Common, engineering challenges and flood zones and green space.
02/11/2018	Correspondence	Information sharing	SHBC provided the contact details of an Environmental Advisor to the project in respect of a cycle path in the Frith Hill area.
20/11/2018	Correspondence	Update	The Project emailed SHBC's planning officer to let them know a letter had gone out to new landowners potentially affected by refinements to the replacement pipeline route. The letter also outlined the steps leading up to the submission of the Development Consent Order.
03/01/2019	Briefing Note	Next steps – Design Refinements Consultation	Sent to planning officers and elected members. Provided an overview of the Design Refinements Consultation and its contents ahead of the launch on 21 January 2019. The briefing note was accompanied

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
			by the offer of a meeting, although no meetings were arranged.
18/01/2019	Correspondence	Launch of second statutory (Design Refinements) consultation	The project sent SHBC two letters: 1) Notification of launch letter (as a statutory consultee) 2) A notification letter as a landowner (Both letters complied with the approach set out the in SoCC).
19/02/2019	Correspondence	Second statutory (Design Refinements) consultation response	A copy is enclosed as Appendix D.
25/03/19	Briefing note	Next steps	The project issued a briefing note to planning officers and elected members following the close of the Design Refinements Consultation re: next steps.
27/03/2019	Correspondence	Final route release	The project issued a letter to planning officers announcing the final route and offering a meeting if required.
01/04/2019	Meeting	Project update	The project met with representatives from SHBC from the Planning, Business and Leisure, Scientific and Environmental Health teams. The route release was discussed, as well as consultation responses. Talks were also had around the Local Impact Report process and the expected date for the development consent order submission.
02/04/2019	Correspondence	Draft DCO	Project supplied SHBC with a draft of the DCO and it was noted that the project would 'be happy to discuss this or anything else about the application' within the limited time available. SHBC did not provide comments on this draft.
05/04/2019	Meeting	Site visit	A meeting took place at Turf Hill to update environment team on project and discuss the potential environmental investment programme.
12/04/2019	Correspondence	Update	Email from the project to SHBC officer following up on points from the meeting on 01/04/2019 associated with survey results

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
			from Windlemere and project contact's details.
25/04/2019	Correspondence	Next steps	The project contacted SHBC to provide early warning of its submission for development consent.

## 7.2 Schedule of engagement post DCO submission

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
16/05/2019	Correspondence	Application submitted	The project confirmed that the application for Development Consent was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate and a USB containing the application was being sent in the post to SHBC's planning team.
06/06/2019	Correspondence	Consulting the project on planning applications	The Project requested that SHBC consult it on planning applications where relevant, SHBC actioned this request.
06/06/2019	Correspondence	Safeguarding	The Project emailed SHBC's planning officer to confirm safeguarding procedures and request the Project be consulted on planning applications made on the application site for the Project.
28/06/2019	Correspondence	Statement of Common Ground	SHBC emailed the Project to seek confirmation of when a draft Statement of Common Ground would be provided, it was noted that it would be helpful to arrange a meeting to discuss the SoCG as soon as is practical.
09/07/2019	Correspondence	Statement of Common Ground	Esso emailed SHBC, providing a draft SoCG to SHBC.
18/07/2019	Meeting	Statement of Common Ground	Meeting to progress Statement of Common Ground. SHBC raised concerns with regard to the impacts on St Catherines Road SANG.
06/09/2019	Meeting	Statement of Common Ground and Relevant Representations	Meeting to progress Statement of Common Ground and to discuss the issues raised by SHBC in its Relevant Representation. SHBC reiterated concerns with regard to the impacts on St Catherines Road SANG. It was noted in the meeting that Esso would update the SoCG to take into account guidance provided in the Rule 6 letter.
14/10/2019	Site visit	St Catherines SANG	The Parties met at St Catherines SANG to discuss the impacts during construction. SHBC and Esso discussed potential mitigation options for the impacts on St Catherines Road SANG.
25/10/2019	Correspondence	Statement of Common Ground	Esso emailed SHBC, providing an updated draft SoCG to SHBC.

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
28/10/2019	Correspondence	Statement of Common Ground	Esso emailed SHBC requesting a signed copy of the SoCG by the 7 <sup>th</sup> November.
30/10/2019	Email Correspondence	St Catherines Road SANG	Email setting out the mitigation compensation SHBC requires from the Applicant to address SHBC's concerns regarding the impact of the project on St Catherines Road SANG. Reply from Applicant sent 11/11.
28/10/2019	Correspondence	Statement of Common Ground	The Applicant emailed SHBC requesting a signed copy of the SoCG by the 7 November.
07/11/2019	Correspondence	Statement of Common Ground	SHBC emailed the Applicant with an amended draft SoCG, signed by the Council.
14/11/2019	Correspondence	Statement of Common Ground	<b>The Parties discussed what would be submitted. The Deadline 4 submissions from both Parties referenced the reasons for the discrepancies between the two versions.</b>
09/12/2019	Meeting	Statement of Common Ground	The Parties met to progress discussions on outstanding matters and the Applicant agreed to produce a Site Specific Plan for St Catherines SANG.
16/12/2019	Correspondence	Site Specific Plans	A consultant for SHBC shared an outline for the Site Specific Plan.
23/01/2019	Meeting	Statement of Common Ground	The Parties met to progress discussions on outstanding matters and the Applicant shared details as to the plans it would be submitting at Deadline 4.
31/01/2020	Correspondence	Outline Plans and Site Specific Plans	The Applicant shared the outline plans with SHBC that it submitted at Deadline 4.
07/02/2020	Meeting	Statement of Common Ground	The Parties met at the SHBC to co-edit the next iteration of the SoCG.



## 8. Appendix B

### 8.1 Response to Corridor Consultation



**Surrey Heath Borough Council**  
Surrey Heath House  
Knoll Road  
Camberley  
Surrey GU15 3HD  
[REDACTED]  
DX: 32722 Camberley  
www.surreyheath.gov.uk

**Service** Regulatory  
**Our Ref:** N/A  
**Your Ref:** N/A

**Email:** keiran.bartlett@surreyheath.gov.uk

Southampton to London Pipeline Project  
1180 Eskdale Road,  
Winnersh,  
Wokingham,  
RG41 5TU

BY EMAIL

10<sup>th</sup> April 2018

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Surrey Heath Borough Council's response to the Southampton to London (SLP) project's replacement pipeline corridor consultation.**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the route options included in the Southampton to London Pipeline (SLP) project's replacement pipeline corridor consultation. This letter is the Council's formal response.

**Corridor J**

The Council notes that Corridor J is the preferred route for the northern section of the final pipeline route. The Council objects to sub option two of Corridor J, which passes through Frimley, for the following reasons.

The route is likely to lead to significant disruption in the vicinity of Frimley Park Hospital, Frimley District Centre and surrounding highways infrastructure, including the Frimley Park Hospital and Toshiba roundabouts. These areas are already prone to significant congestion, particularly during rush hour and hospital visiting hours. Therefore, installing the replacement pipeline in this location could have significant implications. Indeed, the Council notes that in 2010, visiting times at Frimley Park Hospital were permanently altered due to afternoon traffic congestion. The Council would resist any proposal which would exacerbate the current situation or inhibit the capacity of emergency vehicles to access the hospital.

The Council would also express concerns that, between the Frimley Park Hospital roundabout and the intersection of Chobham Road and Tomlinscote Way, the proposed route travels along Chobham Road (B311) for almost 1km. Either side of this section of the road is populated with residential properties and therefore routing the pipeline along or underneath the B311 is considered the only viable option without routing the pipeline through multiple residential gardens or under properties. Indeed, in chapter 11 of the consultation brochure, it is stated that 'we will not install any pipeline under existing homes'. This could cause significant disruption to





residents by impacting the local road network in this area, especially for small residential roads that can only be accessed by the B311.

Moreover, the Council would also express concern that, unless the replacement pipeline is routed directly under the A325 near the Grove, the pipeline would pass through an area of High Archaeological Potential. The Council also raises concerns regarding the small sub corridor that passes west of Frimley Green's Local Centre, which would route the pipeline through residential areas in Frimley Green. Without routing the pipeline along small local roads, the pipeline would have to be routed through an extensive number of residential gardens, which would not be welcomed by the Council.

The Council notes that the potential for short term disruption is raised in the consultation brochure, and that such disruption could be reduced through careful design and engineering techniques. However, due to the points raised above the short term installation of the pipeline in this area could still generate significant disruption for the Frimley area, especially given that installation in any given location will typically take around one to two months.

The Council does not object to the corridor that follows a similar route to the location of the existing pipeline, and considers that if the pipeline is to be routed through the Borough, that this would be the most appropriate location.

The Council welcomes the recognition that adverse impacts on sensitive ecological sites will be minimised through careful route design and appropriate installation techniques. Moreover, the Council recognises that Corridor J is likely to have the shortest installation time. However, the Council notes that any works that take place will have to have regard to Special Areas of Conservation and the Thames Basin Heath SPA if within or adjacent to such designations to ensure that harm to these habitats is avoided during construction.

**Other corridors included in the consultation**


The Council has no specific concerns for other corridor options included in the replacement pipeline corridor consultation.

**General comments**

The Council welcomes the six guiding principles used to refine corridor options, but would welcome more detail on how these principles were used in determining potential corridors. For example, it would be beneficial to provide information on how each principle was measured and what weightings were applied to each principle to determine if it 'performed' well against the guiding principles.

We look forward to hearing from you and welcome opportunities to continue to engage as the project progresses.

Yours faithfully,

  
Jane Ireland  
Planning Policy Manager  
Surrey Heath Borough Council



## 9. Appendix C

### 9.1. Response to Preferred Route Consultation

From: Keiran Bartlett [Keiran.Bartlett@surreyheath.gov.uk]  
Sent: 17 October 2018 11:49:49  
To: info@slpproject.co.uk  
Subject: SHBC response to the replacement pipeline route consultation

Attachments: SHBC response to Statutory Consultation.pdf

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please see attached Surrey Heath Borough Council's formal response to the Southampton to London Pipeline Project's Replacement Pipeline Route Consultation.

Regards,

Keiran Bartlett

Keiran Bartlett Bsc (Hons) MSc

Planning Officer

Policy and Conservation


Surrey Heath Borough Council

Knoll Road

Camberley

GU15 3HD

Planning Policy - 01276 707100

  
www.surreyheath.gov.uk <<http://www.surreyheath.gov.uk/>>

<<http://www.facebook.com/surreyheath>>

<<https://twitter.com/Surreyheath>>

<<http://www.linkedin.com/company/surrey-heath-borough-council>>

<<https://www.youtube.com/user/SurreyHeathBC>>

Great Place \* Great Community \* Great Future



Surrey Heath Borough Council  
Surrey Heath House  
Knoll Road  
Camberley  
Surrey GU15 3HD  
DX: 32722 Camberley  
www.surreyheath.gov.uk

Service Regulatory  
Our Ref: N/A  
Your Ref: N/A



Email: keiran.bartlett@surreyheath.gov.uk

Southampton to London Pipeline Project  
1180 Eskdale Road,  
Winnersh,  
Wokingham,  
RG41 5TU

BY EMAIL

12<sup>th</sup> October 2018

Dear Sir/Madam

**Surrey Heath Borough Council's response to the Southampton to London Pipeline (SLP) Project's Preferred Route Statutory Consultation.**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the route options included in the Southampton to London Pipeline (SLP) Project's replacement pipeline corridor consultation. This letter is the Council's formal response.

**Section E: Farnborough to Bisley and Pirbright Ranges**

The Council generally welcomes the pipeline route for Section E, including the use of trenchless techniques under the A331, which follows a similar routing to the existing pipeline. The Council has the following comments to make on Section E.

For the Farnborough North sub-options (E4), the Council raises concerns regarding the routing of sub-option E4b. As noted in the consultation brochure, route E4b has the potential to disrupt Henry Tyndale School and access to Farnborough North Station, a key commuter station. This could cause significant disruption to residents in Frimley Green and the wider area, and would likely result in the temporary closure of the footpath and bridleway that is a designated public right of way between The Hatches and Farnborough North Station during the pipelines construction. Moreover, it has the potential to cause disruption to the Fisheries in the area. Consequently, the Council considers that the location of sub-option E4a would be the most appropriate location for the replacement pipeline, which avoids Henry Tyndale School and reduces the impact on Farnborough North Station.

For the Pine Ridge Golf Course sub-options (E5), the Council notes that if sub-option E5b is taken forward, efforts should be made to ensure that there is minimal disruption to Deepcut Bridge Road and cycle lanes in the vicinity, as well as ensuring that protected trees in the area are not adversely impacted. The Council has no comments to make on section E5a which closely follows the existing pipeline route.



Great Place • Great Community • Great Future



### **Section F: Bisley and Pirbright Ranges to M25**

The Council generally welcomes the pipeline route for Section F, including the use of trenchless techniques under the A322, which follows a similar routing to the existing pipeline. The Council has the following comments to make on Section F.

For the Red Road sub-options (F1), the Council notes that there is potential for significant disruption to Red Road during construction. Disruption to Red Road could lead to significant congestion in the area. The Council would therefore seek for the pipeline to be routed along the sub-option that would result in the least disruption to Red Road.

For the Chobham Common sub options (F2), the Council notes that any works that take place will have to have regard to the Chobham Common Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) if within or adjacent to such designations, to ensure that harm to these habitats is avoided during construction. The Council welcomes the wider area provided for the pipeline routing through Chobham Common to ensure that the best possible alignment is selected in this area. The Council notes that if sub-option F2b is taken forward, efforts should be made to ensure that there is minimal disruption to the Broom Lane and Red Lion Road allotments.

### **Statement of Community Involvement**

The Council welcomes the approach that has been taken in the Statement of Community Involvement and has no further comments to make on the document.

### **General comments**

The Council welcomes the removal of the corridor sub-option that passed Frimley Park Hospital following feedback on traffic management and obstruction to emergency services from the consultation in spring 2018.


The Council would seek for the inclusion in the Biodiversity section of Chapter 9 Consultation Brochure for the recognition of potential air quality impacts associated with the potential for traffic congestion, as noted in para 12.3.14 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report. There are a number of roads which may be directly or indirectly impacted by traffic management during construction that are in close proximity to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. The Thames Basin Heaths heathland habitat is known to be susceptible to adverse effects of nitrogen deposition and road-generated pollutants deposited within 200m of the road. Prolonged works on Red Road, for example, could lead to changes in traffic flows on the Maultway (B3015) and A322 which both adjoin the Thames Basin Heath SPA. Moreover, within the People and Communities Section of Chapter 9 of the Consultation Brochure, the Council would seek for the inclusion of appropriate traffic management in the mitigation measures for people and communities.

The Council welcomes The Code of Construction Practice set out in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Brochure, along with the commitment on page 15 to 'not install the pipeline under any existing homes'.



We look forward to receiving future updates from the Southampton to London Pipeline Project regarding the progress of the Project and welcome opportunities to continue to engage as the project progresses.

Yours sincerely



**Cllr Moira Gibson  
Leader of the Council  
Surrey Heath Borough Council**



**Karen Whelan  
Chief Executive  
Surrey Heath Borough Council**



## 10. Appendix D

### 10.1 Response to Design Refinements Consultation



**Surrey Heath Borough Council**      **Service**    **Regulatory**  
Surrey Heath House      **Our Ref:**    **N/A**  
Knoll Road  
Camberley      **Your Ref:**    **N/A**  
Surrey GU15 3HD  
[REDACTED]  
DX: 32722 Camberley      **Email:**    **keiran.bartlett@surreyheath.gov.uk**  
www.surreyheath.gov.uk

Southampton to London Pipeline Project  
1180 Eskdale Road,  
Winnersh,  
Wokingham,  
RG41 5TU

BY EMAIL

14<sup>th</sup> February 2019

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Surrey Heath Borough Council's response to the Southampton to London Pipeline (SLP) Project's Design Refinements Consultation.**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the details included in the Southampton to London Pipeline (SLP) Project's Design Refinements consultation. This letter is the Council's formal response.

**Section E: Farnborough to Bisley and Pirbright Ranges**

The Council generally welcomes the selected pipeline route options for Section E, including the selection of E4a which reduces the direct impacts associated with the disruption to Henry Tyndale School and access to Farnborough North Station, a key commuter station. The Council has no comments to make on the selection of E5a which closely follows the existing pipeline route.

**Section F: Bisley and Pirbright Ranges to M25**

The Council generally welcomes the pipeline route for Section F, including the proposed reduction in time taken to install the pipeline along Red Road (relative to the time taken for other proposed route options). However, the Council notes that the potential remains for significant disruption to Red Road during construction. Disruption to Red Road could lead to significant congestion in the area.

The Council notes that the route option which goes through Chobham Common has been selected. Any works that take place will have to have regard to the Chobham Common Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) if within or adjacent to such designations, to ensure that harm to these habitats is avoided during construction. The Council welcomes the wider area provided for the pipeline routing through Chobham Common to ensure that the best possible alignment in this area.



Great Place • Great Community • Great Future





**Location of temporary logistic hubs**

In respect of the use of the Green Belt site in Windlesham (M3 Junction 3: New Road) as a temporary logistic hub, it is noted that the site should be reinstated to open status, that was present prior to the site for use as part of works for the M3 Smart Motorway, following the completion of the project. The Council has no comments on the proposed temporary logistics hub off Deepcut Bridge Road (MOD Land: Deepcut Bridge Road).

We look forward to receiving future updates from the Southampton to London Pipeline Project regarding the progress of the Project and welcome opportunities to continue to engage as the project progresses.

Yours sincerely,



Jane Reeves  
Planning Policy Manager  
Surrey Heath Borough Council



## 11. Appendix E

### 11.1 Considerations in the Cumulative Effects Assessment

**Table 8.1 Long list of DCO/Other Developments considered in the Cumulative Effects Assessment**

ID_1	Name of Development	Description	Status	Long List	Tier	Distance from the Project	Temporal Scope / Overlap with Project Timescales	Scale and Nature of Development	Reason for Scoping In / Out	Short listed?
A1	Heathrow Expansion	Adding a northwest runway at Heathrow to increase air-traffic movement, in addition to supporting airfield, terminal and transport infrastructure, works to the M25, local roads and rivers.	Scoping Opinion received in June 2018	Yes	2	<1km to the north	Yes (Application for development consent due in 2019/2020; Construction starts from 2021).	Schedule 1 EIA development	Potential to have cumulative effects. Scoped into shortlist.	Yes
A2	Western Rail Link to Heathrow	Rail link from Reading Station to Heathrow Terminal 5 by building a new rail tunnel to link the Great Western Mainline to Heathrow Airport.	Scoping Opinion received in June 2015. Application to be submitted in Summer 2019.	Yes	2	3km	Possible (Planned construction 2020–2027)	Schedule 1 EIA development	Potential to have cumulative effects not anticipated due to the intervening distance between this scheme and the project	No
A3	Southern Rail Link to Heathrow	Southern rail connection between Chertsey, Virginia Water and Staines with Heathrow Terminal 5.	UK Government is expected to announce the next stage of the process for securing a private sector developer in	Yes	3	>500m	No published timetable. However, if operation is due to commence in 2025, construction could overlap	Schedule 1 EIA development	Potential to have cumulative effects. Scoped into shortlist.	Yes





Statement of Common Ground

ID_1	Name of Development	Description	Status	Long List	Tier	Distance from the Project	Temporal Scope / Overlap with Project Timescales	Scale and Nature of Development	Reason for Scoping In / Out	Short listed?
			early 2019. Expected to become operational between 2025-2027.				with the project construction timescale.			
A4	Windsor Rail Link	Phase 1 connects the Great Western Rail Line from Slough and Windsor with the Windsor Waterloo line. Phase 2 connects Heathrow to western and southern parts.	Proposals for both phases of the project were submitted to the government on 31 July 2018. It was rejected by the government in December 2018.	Yes	3	This is 1.9 km at its closest point to the project.	No (Proposal rejected December 2018)	Schedule 1 EIA development	Rejected. Scoped out of shortlist	No
A5	Water infrastructure projects in Hampshire	This consists of a number of sewer improvements, flood protection schemes, upgrades to treatment works and projects to improve the quality of treated wastewater to meet European legislation.	<p>Otterbourne Water Supply Works: To submit planning application in March 2019. Expected to start construction in winter 2019 and end in spring 2020.</p> <p>Portsmouth Flood Alleviation: Complete.</p> <p>Woolston Wastewater Treatment Works: In</p>	Yes	1	Nearest is Portswood WTW at 7km	Yes, Otterbourne WSW and South Hampshire and Portsmouth WTW could have overlapping construction timescales with the project.	Schedule 1 EIA development	No direct receptor source pathway identified due to distance from the project. Scoped out of shortlist	No



ID_1	Name of Development	Description	Status	Long List	Tier	Distance from the Project	Temporal Scope / Overlap with Project Timescales	Scale and Nature of Development	Reason for Scoping In / Out	Short listed?
			<p>construction and due for completion in summer 2019.</p> <p>South Hampshire (The Itchen, Candover and Testwood Water Abstraction): Public Inquiry has now concluded and further plans are being drawn up.</p> <p>Portswode Wastewater Treatment Works: Construction activities are currently underway and due for completion in March 2025.</p>							
A6	River Thames Scheme	Flood relief channel from Datchet to Teddington Lock	A pre-planning application process was completed in August 2018. Subject to funding, a full planning	Yes	2	The scheme intersects the project near Chertsey	Yes (Planned construction 2020–2021)	Schedule 2 development	Potential to have cumulative effects. Scoped into shortlist.	Yes



ID_1	Name of Development	Description	Status	Long List	Tier	Distance from the Project	Temporal Scope / Overlap with Project Timescales	Scale and Nature of Development	Reason for Scoping In / Out	Short listed?
			application may be submitted October 2019.							
A7	Heathrow Western Hub	Expansion of Heathrow Airport including new and reconfigured hub terminal facilities; supporting airfield and transport infrastructure; works to roads and rivers; temporary construction works; mitigation works and other associated and ancillary development.	A Scoping Report has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on February 2019	Yes	2	The scheme is located 2.6 km to the northwest from the northern extent of SLP project	Yes (Assuming that grant of DCO is obtained in late 2021, the scheme is expected to be fully completed by 2030)	Schedule 1 development	No direct receptor source pathway identified due to distance from the project. Scoped out of shortlist.	No

**Table 8.2 Long list of Major Applications considered in the Cumulative Effects Assessment**

ID	Name of Development	Description (based on information from the planning portal)	Status	Long List	Tier	Distance from the Project	Temporal Scope / Overlap with Project Timescales	Scale and Nature of Development	Reason for Scoping In / Out	Shortlisted?
Surrey County Council										
B65	12/01132/ SCC	Extraction of sand and gravel and restoration to landscaped lakes for nature conservation after use at Manor Farm, Laleham, and provision of a dedicated area on land at Manor Farm	Approved	Yes	1	Intersects with SLP	Likely	Schedule 2 EIA development.	Potential to have cumulative effects. Scoped into shortlist	Yes



ID	Name of Development	Description (based on information from the planning portal)	Status	Long List	Tier	Distance from the Project	Temporal Scope / Overlap with Project Timescales	Scale and Nature of Development	Reason for Scoping In / Out	Shortlisted?
		adjacent to Buckland School for nature conservation study; processing of the sand and gravel in the existing Queen Mary Quarry (QMQ) processing plant and retention of the processing plant for the duration of operations; erection of a concrete batching plant and an aggregate bagging plant within the existing QMQ aggregate processing and stockpiling areas; installation of a field conveyor for the transportation of mineral and use for the transportation of mineral from Manor Farm to the QMQ processing plant; and construction of a tunnel beneath the Ashford Road to accommodate a conveyor link between Manor Farm and QMQ for the transportation of mineral.								



ID	Name of Development	Description (based on information from the planning portal)	Status	Long List	Tier	Distance from the Project	Temporal Scope / Overlap with Project Timescales	Scale and Nature of Development	Reason for Scoping In / Out	Shortlisted?
Surrey Heath Borough Council										
B69	12/0546	Hybrid planning application for major residential-led development totalling 1,200 new dwellings	Approved	Yes	1	1km	Likely	Schedule 2 EIA development.	Potential to have cumulative effects. Scoped into shortlist	Yes
B70	16/0803	Prior notification for change of use of the ground, first, second and third floors from B1a (Office) to C3 (Residential) to create 91 apartments comprising of 31 studio units, 41 one-bedroom units, 11 two-bedroom units and 8 two-bedroom duplex units. (Additional Plan Rec'd 07/09/2016) (Amended Plans Rec'd 29/09/2016)	Approved	Yes	1	1km	Likely	Not Schedule 1 or 2 development.	Change of use, no major construction work. Not expected to generate cumulative effects due to the scale of the proposed scheme. Scoped out.	No
B71	16/0836	Demolition of the Quartermaster's block and adjacent outbuildings. Conversion of part of the Admin block to re-house the Quartermaster department. New build block to provide	Approved	Yes	1	880m	Likely	Schedule 2 EIA development	Potential to have cumulative effects. Scoped into shortlist	Yes



ID	Name of Development	Description (based on information from the planning portal)	Status	Long List	Tier	Distance from the Project	Temporal Scope / Overlap with Project Timescales	Scale and Nature of Development	Reason for Scoping In / Out	Shortlisted?
		kitchen/dining hall, multifunctional space and 6 bedrooms. Remedial work to the external facade of the Grade II listed mansion and conversion of redundant kitchen area to other uses.								
B72	16/1207	Three detached two-storey dwellings with detached double garages, entrance gates and associated accesses and landscaping following demolition of golf club and driving range buildings and use of remainder of land as SANG.	Approved	Yes	1	300m	Likely	Not Schedule 1 or 2 development.	Not expected to generate cumulative effects due to the scale of the proposed scheme. Scoped out.	No
B73	17/0469	Erection of 4 x two-bed terraced houses, 4 x three-bed terraced houses, and 2 x four-bed semi-detached houses with associated parking, landscaping and gardens, and creation of new access road onto Evergreen Road, on former builders' yard following	Approved	Yes	1	780m	Likely	Schedule 2 not EIA development	Not expected to generate cumulative effects due to the scale and nature of the proposed scheme. Scoped out.	No



ID	Name of Development	Description (based on information from the planning portal)	Status	Long List	Tier	Distance from the Project	Temporal Scope / Overlap with Project Timescales	Scale and Nature of Development	Reason for Scoping In / Out	Shortlisted?
		demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings.								
B74	17/1151	Erection of a two-storey building comprising six classrooms and associated landscaping following demolition of existing single-storey modular block.	Approved	Yes	1	0 - 500m	No, already constructed.	N/A	Scoped out of cumulative assessment as it is already constructed.	No



Table 8.3 Local Development Plan allocations considered in the Cumulative Effects Assessment

ID	Name of the Local Plan	Development Description	Long List	Tier	Reason for Scoping In / Out	Shortlisted ?
Surrey County Council						
C62	MC6, MC7 - Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011	Minerals and Waste Safeguarded Area: various areas along the proposed route, as shown on Surrey County Council Minerals Safeguarded Areas map	N			No
C63	Primary Aggregates DPD (Development Plan Document) Policy Ma2, Area G	Minerals and Waste Allocation: Homers Farm, Bedfont	Y	Associated Planning Application SP/13/00141/SCC and Spelthorne 13/00141/S CA1	This site as already been taken as a baseline in Chapter 11 Soils and Geology.	No
C64	Primary Aggregates DPD (Development Plan Document) Policy Ma2, Area J	Minerals and Waste Allocation: Manor Farm, Laleham	Y	Associated Planning Application SP/2012/01132 and Spelthorne 10/00738/S CC	Cumulative effect is not considered relevant to the assessment of soil resources and agriculture as these are by their nature site specific. There are therefore no cumulative impacts anticipated on land use or soil resources either during or following the proposed development.	No
C65	Primary Aggregates DPD (Development Plan Document) Policy Ma2, Area F	Minerals and Waste Allocation: Home Farm Quarry Extension, Shepperton	Y	Associated Planning Application SP09/0720 and Spelthorne	As per Planning Application 18/01011/SCC (Spelthorne BC), mineral extraction has ceased in this site. Therefore, there are no potential to have cumulative impacts with	No





ID	Name of the Local Plan	Development Description	Lon g List	Tier	Reason for Scoping In / Out	Shortlisted ?
				11/01086/S CC (	the project. This site as already been taken as a baseline in Chapter 11 Soils and Geology.	
C66	Primary Aggregates DPD (Development Plan Document) Policy Ma2, Area K	Minerals and Waste Allocation: Queen Mary Reservoir, Ashford	Y	Associated Planning Application SP16/01164/SCRVC Considered as 12/01132/S CC	This site as already been taken as a baseline in Chapter 11 Soils and Geology.	No