



Southampton to London Pipeline Project

2 March 2020

Final

Deadline 6 Submission 5 March 2020

Responses to Action Points arising from the Hearings week commencing 24 February 2020

Dear Sir /Madam,

This document sets out Surrey County Council's (SCC) comments on the Action Points arising from the Hearings week beginning 24 February 2020. From the list of Actions SCC considers that it should respond to the following:

9	Provide a list of the traffic sensitive streets that would be affected by the proposed development	Relevant Highways Authorities	Deadline 6
10	Requirement 14, 4(c) to be reviewed to see whether a reference to Highways England requirements needs to be included	Applicant, Relevant Highways Authorities, Highways England	Deadline 6
30	Update the outline LEMP with a specific commitment to confirm that tree replacement would be on a one for one basis and, where possible would be on the site of, or within close proximity to the existing lost tree.	Applicant in consultation with Highways Authorities	Deadline 6

9 Traffic Sensitive Streets

Please see table below.

List of Surrey CC Streets Esso SLP Project pipeline proposes to excavate in, by Traffic Sensitivity.

(With reference to potential extended working hours, to mitigate traffic disruption if deemed necessary)

Road Name	Traffic Sensitive?
Frimley Green Road	Y
Balmoral Drive	N
St Catherines Road	N
B3015 The Maultway	Y
B311 Red Road	Y
Guildford Road	Y
Blackstroud Lane East	N
Halebourne Lane	N
Steep Hill	N
B383 – Windsor Road	Y
Canford Drive	N
Roakes Avenue	N
Mead Lane	N
Ashford Road	Y
Buxton Road	N
Prison entrance from Woodthorpe Road	N
Woodthorpe Road	N
Station Approach	N
Ashford Station Road	N
Short Lane	N

10 Requirements 14, 4 (c)

SCC is satisfied with the current wording of Requirement 14-4-C, (only to be used in circumstances where the Highway Authority feel that severe disruption to traffic flows can be best mitigated by working hours being extended in order to complete activities at an earlier date/time, having consulted the relevant planning authority).

A minor amendment is however required, as the correct term to differentiate which streets such considerations may be applied to is 'Traffic Sensitive Street' as opposed 'Traffic Sensitive Highway'.

SCC is happy for wording to be adapted to include provision for the same consideration to be applicable to works on Highways England's road network, provided that this content is additional wording to reflect how Highways England might wish to confirm 'road space bookings', as SCC is not aware that Highways England currently specifically operates a Permit Scheme for such activities. Our preference would be for any additional content, as opposed any deletion of current reference to the Surrey County Council Permit Scheme, or any attempt at re-drafting with a single generic term used to cover all means of various Highway Authorities' granting of works.

30 Tree Replacement

SCC considers that the proposal to replace each highway tree lost with one replacement as inadequate for the following reasons:

- The capital asset value of a mature tree, as calculated by the London Tree Officers' Association's CAVAT method, can be several tens-of-thousands; it generally costs £200 to £300 to plant a new sapling. Like for like replacement is not adequate compensation from a financial point of view.
- Approximately 70% of new trees planted in urban contexts die. It is genuinely challenging to nurture a new street tree to maturity. In a like for like compensation package, we may well end up with a selection of dead street trees after 2-3 years. A good example of this is Tolworth Broadway.
- The environmental, ecological and amenity contribution of a sapling is a tiny fraction of what a mature tree would provide. This means that several hundred new saplings might be needed to compensate for the loss of a single mature tree from an environmental, ecological and amenity point of view.
- SCC requires all 3rd party works promoters – developers, utility companies, etc – to provide compensation according to 20% of the CAVAT valuation. We do not see that there is a difference in this case.
- SCC applies the same principal to anyone who damages or removes a Highway tree. A 20% adjustment is applied on the basis that when cases of unauthorised tree damage or removal have been brought to court, the courts have generally awarded 20% of the CAVAT valuation of the tree in question.
- Compensation according to the CAVAT value would enable meaningful compensation to be delivered by way of new tree planting, and would enable us to provide the aftercare needed to nurture new trees to maturity.
- Esso has the option of finding engineering solutions to avoid any excavation within the root protection zone of Highway trees. This could avoid the need to remove any Highway trees in the first place, which would be our preferred option.

Please see this link for further information:

<https://www.ltoa.org.uk/documents-1/capital-asset-value-for-amenity-trees-cavat>

I trust that this answers all your questions, please let me know if you require any further information.

Yours Faithfully,

Caroline Smith,
Surrey County Council