

## St James School

### Comments on Esso response to points raised in Alan Baxter report

Esso have only responded to 3 specific paragraphs in our report:

#### Para 4.1 – Consideration of high ground water level

- Whilst Esso acknowledge that high water levels are a concern for the project (although there was no reference to this in SLT's technical note), it is not correct for them to conclude that this has little bearing on route selection.
- Esso have not addressed our comments in paragraphs 4.3.4 and 5.0 that as ground levels along the western boundary of the school are around 1 metre higher than along Esso's preferred route along the eastern playing fields, construction along this western boundary would be above the recorded water table as illustrated on our sketches SK 06 and 07 whilst construction would be below the recorded water table along Esso's route as illustrated on our sketch SK 03. This will add significant cost and complexity to their preferred option compared to Option 1B.

#### Para 4.3.2 – Alignment of option 1B relative to proposed sports hall

- Esso state there are a number of inaccuracies within this paragraph without identifying what they think these are.
- I do not understand why Esso have felt the need to reiterate that it is not possible to construct a fixed structure over the new or existing pipelines as that is not a consequence of Option 1B.
- Esso then state that it is incorrect to assume the new pipeline could be constructed within the easement of the existing pipeline with no explanation. This statement is then contradicted by their final note 1.2 in response to para 4.3.3 which simply notes that laying the replacement pipe in the existing easement increases the risks and construction duration. As noted in section 2.1 of our report, the safe working guidance set out in the Linewatch document 'Special Requirements for Safe Working in Close Proximity to High Pressure Pipelines' simply requires that any excavations within 3m either side of an existing pipeline need to be supervised by a representative of the Pipeline Organisation and undertaken using manual digging unless another method is specifically authorised. Esso have not disputed this.
- Esso make further comments about the potential impact of the proposed sports hall foundations on the available space for the new pipeline, whilst acknowledging that the building has yet to be designed, and could be adjusted in its position to mitigate this.

#### Para 4.3.3 – Alignment of Option 1B relative to existing Building B

- Esso have simply restated their view that the overall impacts of the alternative routes would be greater than their preferred route without responding to any of the points we raised in paragraphs 4.3.3 to 4.3.6 for Option 1B.