

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Jones, Hefin](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** ISH Meeting 26th February 2020 Turfhill Site Specific Plan  
**Date:** 02 March 2020 09:20:21  
**Attachments:** [The SLP - Response to SSP for Turfhill Site Plan 010320 AB,CT,KS.docx](#)  
**Importance:** High

---

Dear Hefin,

We will be submitting our Deadline 6 submission within the next few days but as we mentioned in our note to Mr Allen on 4<sup>th</sup> February, responses to various matters affecting Turfhill Park continue to be of concern to affected and interested residents following work by the Resident Associations and various experts we continue to consult with.

Additionally, we are conscious that although we were given the opportunity by the ExA at the Issue specific Hearing at Farnborough last week, to respond briefly to some of the Applicant's claims about aspects of the Turfhill Park Site Specific Plan, additional factors continue to emerge, and our more comprehensive response to their published proposals are attached. We trust they are of concern to the ExA.

We appreciate that the Inspectorate may defer the content of the attached note and publish at Deadline 6, but with the approaching end of the Examination, we felt it appropriate to ensure that the latest news and developments should be submitted as a separate document. We continue to share our thoughts and strong objections with local residents, Surrey Heath Borough Council and Mr Michael Gove, our MP.

As indicated above our Deadline 6 presentation will be sent to Mr Allen within the next few days in accordance with the Examination timetable.

HCRA  
CGRA

**The SLP – The Heronscourt & Colville Gardens (the RAs) response to the Applicants Site Specific Plan for Turfhill Park APP 8.58 REP4-050**

**Section 3 Description of Works**

**3.2 Vegetation Removal**

**Para 3.2.1**

As has been covered in other submissions, the 17 trees referred to are those in only two sections of F1a+ and in excess of 250mm diameter.

An update on that is that the Applicant has come to realise the inadequacy of its Arboricultural Survey report and is presently surveying all three sections of the total route and all trees in excess of 75mm.

It is evident that the resulting survey report will confirm the RAs' previous estimates of hundreds of trees that will be affected.

It is not known at this stage if the trees affected by the Compound will be included.

**3.5 Open Cut**

**Para 3.5.3**

The Applicant had stated that the trees being retained will be protected from installation activity, in line with the NJUG Guidelines.

It subsequently announced that it would not now be going to use these guidelines but instead is committed to strictly applying BS5837; 2012 throughout the project.

As Open Cut can be extremely damaging to root systems, no matter what methods of protection are employed, the commitment to the BS Standard has been very welcomed, particularly as Under Para 7.4 and 7.7, it clearly states that 'if installation is to occur within the RPA of any tree then a "trenchless" system should be used with entry and exit points outside of the RPA'.

It is recognised that the Standard is a set of recommendations and by following those recommendations, the Planning Authorities generally accept that the Applicant is using good practice and reasonable care. Therefore using this information should be a part of the Applicant's considerations and failure to follow them, would be contrary to their own commitment.

As the Applicant has committed to using this Standard, it is difficult to see how Open Cut methods can now be employed along F1a+, particularly with the RPA and root patterns present on this route as described in the following paragraph.

#### **Para 3.5.10**

In the RAs current submission for Deadline 5 concerning its criticism of the Arboricultural Report and the RPAs, it states, under Ref 1.1 (f) that 'Ground radar studies have clearly shown that mature trees in open ground can have roots extending out to 120% of the canopy area. The RPA is therefore not a 'no damage likely to be done' limit but is more a 'tree is unlikely to die immediately and may eventually recover' one.

Additionally, as the pipe alignment has been designed to run along the southern edge of the Order Limits to avoid the roots of the Residents' trees on the northern boundary, the RPAs of the many significant trees bordering the southern edge of the Order Limits will be in play.

As a result, throughout most of F1a+, there will be complex root patterns which spread right across the width of the Order Limits. Add to that the factor of the water main discussed further below, and it presents an extremely difficult challenge for any contractor to meet without causing considerable permanent collateral damage to all bordering trees and probably also to the water main.

#### **Para 3.5.13**

The water main's actual route along F1a has still to be identified so at this stage it is impossible for the Applicant to agree how and where it can lay its line.

As the water main has to cross from its entry point in Guildford Road on the southern side of F1a to somewhere near to its estimated 3 metre easement from the Residents' boundaries on the northern side and take account of a significant bend halfway along the route, it is inevitable, that one or two of the following will occur at various points;

- the Applicant will have to exceed its Order Limits
- the fuel line will be laid in very close proximity to the water main
- the fuel line will encroach on the easement of the water main
- the fuel line will need to cross the water main
- the fuel line will damage the roots of trees in Residents gardens

and there will be a major risk of damage to the water main during the construction process.

The Applicant announced at the ISH on the 26<sup>th</sup> February, that it was in discussion with Affinity Water to reach agreement to overlap its easement with theirs. Easements are

universally sacrosanct and if this were to be the case, many of the concerns expressed above will become a reality.

In addition, immediate access to either pipeline in the event of an emergency, could become a major hurdle to overcome. If in the process it was the fuel line with the problem, because of the urgency of that repair, the risk of damage to the adjacent water line would be severe.

### **3.6 Reinstatement**

#### **Para 3.6.6**

Given the narrowness of the Order Limits remaining after respecting the easements of both pipelines and the expected results of the new tree survey, there remains very little room, a strip of 1.5 to 2 metres to accommodate all of the replacement plantings.

#### **Summary**

**It is appreciated that this SSP was developed before the rethink on the tree survey, before the commitment to BS5837 and without knowledge of the actual route of the water main.**

**However, whilst this original SSP raised many concerns and presented many challenges to the contractor, those concerns are now massively heightened.**

**These concerns must be fully addressed now, they cannot be left to the Contractor.**

**HCRA**

**CGRA**

**March 2020**

-