

Southampton to London Pipeline Project

Deadline 6

Signed SoCG with Surrey County Council

Application Document: 8.4.30

Planning Inspectorate Reference Number: EN070005

Revision No. 2.0
March 2020





Southampton to London Pipeline Project

Statement of Common Ground

Between:

Esso Petroleum Company, Limited

and


Surrey County Council

Date: March 2020

Application Document Reference: B2325300-JAC-000-COE-REP-000393



Signed	
Printed Name	Tim Sunderland
Position	SLP Project Executive
On behalf of	Esso Petroleum Company, Limited
Date	04/03/2020

Signed	
Printed Name	Caroline Smith
Position	Planning Group Manager
On behalf of	Surrey County Council
Date	04.03.2020



Contents

1.	Introduction	2
1.1	Purpose of Document	2
1.2	Description of the Project	2
1.3	This Statement of Common Ground	2
1.4	Structure of the Statement of Common Ground	3
2.	Record of Engagement Undertaken to Date	4
2.1	Pre-application Engagement and Consultation	4
2.2	Engagement Following Submission of Application	14
3.	Matters Agreed	17
4.	Matters Not Agreed	24
5.	Matters Subject to On-going Discussion	25
6.	Relevant documents and drawings	26
6.1	List of relevant documents and drawings	26
7.	Appendix A	27
7.1	Response to Corridor Consultation	27
8.	Appendix B	36
8.1	Response to Preferred Route Consultation	36
9.	Appendix C	42
9.1	Response to Design Refinements Consultation (1)	42
9.2	Response to Design Refinements Consultation (2)	44
10.	Appendix D	46



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. The project 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. The application for Development Consent was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 14th May 2019.

1.3 This Statement of Common Ground

- 1.3.1 This SoCG has been prepared jointly by Esso as the applicant and Surrey County Council (SCC) as a prescribed consultee and Local Authority as defined in the Local Government Act 2000. SCC has interests in the SLP Project, as a County Planning Authority, as a Local Highway 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 CC will jointly be referred to as “the Parties”. When referencing Surrey CC alone, they will be referred to as “the Authority”.
- 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 the Authority 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-application Engagement and Consultation

2.1.1 The table below sets out the consultation and engagement that has been undertaken between the Parties prior to the submission of the DCO application.

Table 2.1 Schedule of pre-application meetings

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
04/12/2017	Correspondence	Project introduction	<p>The project sent a letter to planning team at the Authority regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map of current route • Project timeline • Project introduction
06/12/2017	Correspondence	Meeting request	<p>Request for a meeting with the project in January and mentioned that the Authority did not receive a map. The project responded with a map on 19 December 2017 and explained there will be a forum in the new year.</p>
15/12/2017	Correspondence	Launch	<p>The Authority highlighted that the Heritage Conservation team is responsible for providing planning and development control input. Suggested the project get in touch if needed.</p>
19/01/2018	Surrey Members Forum	Update	<p>The invitation was issued to portfolio holders at county and district councils. Councillor Mike Goodman was invited as the Environment Cabinet Member for the Authority. He attended the meeting.</p> <p>A presentation was provided with Q&A session at the end. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of project, including existing pipeline and the need for replacement. • Explanation of project plan, including the intention to consult on corridor options before the first statutory (Preferred Route) consultation.
19/01/2018	Surrey Officers Forum	Update	<p>The invitation was issued to planning officers at relevant county and district councils. Trevor Pugh, Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure was invited for the Authority and Dominic Forbes, Head of Planning, attended the meeting.</p> <p>A presentation was provided with Q&A session at the end. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of project, including existing pipeline and the need for replacement. • Explanation of project plan, including the intention to consult on corridor options

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
			before the first statutory (Preferred Route) consultation.
23/01/2018	Correspondence	Meetings	Follow up from forum to set up additional meetings with councillors from the Authority.
24/01/2018	Correspondence	Stakeholder mailing list	Request from a contact at the Authority to be added to stakeholder list.
25/01/2018	Correspondence	Invite to environmental workshop	Invite to attend environmental workshop. No one attended from the Authority.
29/01/2018	Correspondence	Meeting with local MP	Lead Member stated he met with local MP and he was unaware of project. Agreed MPs would be briefed.
07/02/2018	Correspondence	MP briefing and consultation	The Authority asked when project would come to Surrey for consultation. Project explained that Local MP had been contacted and consultation would launch in March
08/02/2018	Correspondence	Councillor meeting	Requested if meeting with local councillors can be organised as soon as possible.
09/02/2018	Correspondence	Invitation	Requested that project should add council officers to meeting on 23 February 2018.
13/02/2018	Correspondence	List of those affected	Lead Member requested confirmation on parishes and MPs affected.
13/03/2018	Meeting	Surrey Local Councils Spring Conference / Parish drop-in	Following discussions with the Authority, it was initially proposed that the project would attend the Surrey Local Councils Spring Conference to present to all Surrey parishes. Due to poor weather in February 2018, the Surrey Local Councils Spring Conference was cancelled. The project team instead organised a meeting for parishes in Surrey. An invitation to this event was issued on 9 March 2018. The event was held on 13 March 2018. Chobham and Windlesham Parish Councils attended.
22/02/2018	Correspondence	Meeting with members	Request to arrange meeting with SLP team to brief members on possibility of proposed route running through Woking, Guildford and Waverley before consultation launch.
23/02/2018	Surrey Members Forum	Update	<p>The invitation was issued to portfolio holders at county and district councils. Councillor Mike Goodman was invited as the Environment Cabinet Member for the Authority. He attended the meeting.</p> <p>A presentation was provided with a Q&A session at the end. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of the project, including existing pipeline and the need for replacement.

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation of project plan, including the intention to consult on corridor options before the first statutory (Preferred Route) consultation. • Gave specific details on event locations and promotional activity targeted at local communities. • Invited feedback on the planned delivery of the consultation related activity. • The Authority expressed its interest that the project would engage with relevant residents' associations. The project agreed to include those within its Commitment to Community Consultation (CtCC), which it shared in draft form at the forum.
23/02/2018	Surrey Officers Forum	Update	<p>The invitation was issued to planning officers at relevant county and district councils. Six officers were invited. Stephen Jenkins, Deputy Planning Development Manager, attended the meeting. A presentation was provided with a Q&A session at the end. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of the project, including existing pipeline and the need for replacement. • Explanation of project plan, including the intention to consult on corridor options before the first statutory (Preferred Route) consultation. • Gave specific details on event locations and promotional activity targeted at local communities. • Invited feedback on the planned delivery of the consultation related activity. • The Authority expressed its interest that the project would engage with relevant residents' associations. The project agreed to include those within its Commitment to Community Consultation (CtCC), which it shared in draft form at the forum.
March 2018	Correspondence	Archaeology	Initial data request from Surrey Historic Environment Record.
01/03/2018	Briefing note	Non-statutory (Corridor) consultation	Briefing note sent to all Local Authorities and councillors of wards within each corridor option.
09/03/2018	Correspondence	Data request	Officer emailed with link to data. Project responded stating website only provides data on planning applications and asked for further information.

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
09/03/2018	Phone call	Project update	Discussed parish meetings in Surrey. Both Parties happy with approach and happy with progression at this stage.
11/03/2018	Correspondence	Information sharing by parish councils	Concern raised to the project that information sent to parish councils is being circulated with wider public.
13/03/2018	Correspondence	Meeting request	Request for meeting with Councillors on 10 May 2018.
15/03/2018	Correspondence	Document download and landscape character areas	Project Team requested information about 2015 Landscape Character areas.
18/03/2018	Correspondence	Data request	Project emailed seeking clarification on mineral data, allocations and designations we received and what the files relate to. The Authority clarified files cover request for shapefiles on adopted Minerals Local Plan allocations and designations.
19/03/2018	Correspondence	Launch of non-statutory (Corridor) consultation	The project sent the Authority three letters: 1) Notification of launch letter (as a potential future statutory consultee) 2) A notification letter as a landowner, with a Person with an Interest in Land questionnaire and land plans 3) Draft CtCC with a separate cover letter <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No feedback was provided on the CtCC.
03/04/2018	Correspondence	Local information	Email received stating route north of Guildford down Goose Rye Road may not be practical due to 900mm medium pressure gas main feeding seven animal research station at Pirbright put through the road 2/3 years ago. Advised who holds more information.
26/04/2018	Meeting	Archaeology	Meeting with Authority's Archaeologist to present and discuss: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An introduction to the project Broad approach to developing the baseline
30/04/2018	Correspondence	Meeting	Email received notifying project of change of date of coordination meeting. Responded confirming new date.
30/04/2018	Correspondence	Non-statutory (Corridor) consultation response	A copy is enclosed as Appendix A. The Authority requested a PPA at this stage.

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
25/05/2018	Surrey Members Forum	Update	Lead Councillor for Environment was invited and attended: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented the findings of the Pipeline Corridor Consultation • Explained how the preferred corridor would be selected and then when it would be announced to stakeholders
25/05/2018	Surrey Officers Forum	Update	Seven of the Authority's officers were invited. Dominic Forbes, Head of Planning, and Stephen Jenkins, Deputy Planning Development Manager attended: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented the findings of the Pipeline Corridor Consultation • Explained how the preferred corridor would be selected and then when it would be announced to stakeholders
30/05/2018	Correspondence	Preferred corridor announcement	The Authority was sent two letters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter as a key stakeholder regarding the preferred corridor that was selected • A landowner letter
01/06/2018	Correspondence	Maps and corridors	Ward councillor stated maps are too small. Would like to know if corridors will go near Ockham, East Horsley, West Horsley, East Clandon, Ripley, Wisley or Effingham. Project responded.
06/06/2018	Phone call	Corridor deselected - no longer affecting ward	Project phone call to explain corridor affecting ward had been deselected.
21/06/2018	Meeting	Project update	A Surrey Highways officer from the Authority attended a meeting and discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corridor selection • Non-statutory (Corridor) consultation feedback • Frimley fisheries • Trenchless crossings through Farnborough North • Design parameters for drawings • The Authority mentioned it is building a new roundabout on corner of Red Road and the Maultway. Raised concerns over timing of work, potential closure of Public Rights of Way • Proposed compounds and potential preference for winter work • Raised concern over potential planned works • Traffic management

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlighted redevelopment of Chertsey High School • Informed project that A30 is a strategic route, which would need to remain open. Planning/traffic/engineering impacts • Stated strong desire to complete works before third Heathrow runway project commences. Relative to Heathrow third runway SLP scope has minimal impact for the Authority • Considering introducing lane rental scheme • If implemented, impact could be expensive. Project could avoid paying costs if agreed to work at certain times • Authority would like project to identify areas of constraint along the route linked to areas in programme and they will do the same
27/06/2018	Correspondence	Initial Working Route	Project update regarding Initial Working Route release.
27/06/2018	Phone call	Project update following Initial Working Route release	<p>The Authority expressed satisfaction with Initial Working Route release. Believes project is going above and beyond with community engagement. Asked for more details on Friday event in Windlesham. Pleased the project was meeting local MP.</p> <p>The Authority also asked for details on maintenance payments.</p>
09/07/2018	Consultation	Draft Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC)	<p>The draft SoCC was issued for statutory consultation to the Authority.</p> <p>The Authority did not respond.</p>
21/08/2018 and 30/08/2018	Workshops	Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping	<p>Invitations were issued on the 17 July 2018 to the main point of contact at the Authority.</p> <p>Several dates were offered.</p> <p>One officer from the Authority attended on the 21 August.</p> <p>Four officers from the Authority attended on the 30 August.</p> <p>The workshop supported the Planning Inspectorate's scoping consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was broad agreement by three borough councils, including the Authority regarding the approach to scoping contaminated land.

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was a recognition from councils in the northern section of the route that historic landfills could pose a significant challenge.
24/08/2018	Surrey Officers Forum	Update	<p>Esso invited officers from the local authorities consulted at the non-statutory (Corridor) consultation to the forum.</p> <p>Two officers from the Authority attended.</p>
24/08/2018	Surrey Members Forum	Update	<p>Esso invited members from the local authorities consulted at the non-statutory (Corridor) consultation to the forum.</p> <p>One member from the Authority attended.</p> <p>Provided an overview of the proposed corridors and discussed next steps in the project.</p>
06/09/2018	Correspondence	Launch of first statutory (Preferred Route) consultation	<p>The project sent the Authority two letters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Notification of launch letter (as a statutory consultee) 2) A notification letter as a landowner, with a Person with an Interest in Land questionnaire and land plans <p>(Both letters were in line the Planning Act 2008.)</p>
22/10/2018	Correspondence	First statutory (Preferred Route) consultation response	<p>The Authority's highways and transport team responded.</p> <p>A copy is enclosed as Appendix B.</p>
05/10/2018	Correspondence	Protective provisions	<p>Email to enquire if highways team has standard text for protective provisions. The Authority stated it does not have standard text, but draft should be sent to highways' lead officer.</p>
16/10/2018	Correspondence	Celia Crescent petition	<p>Call from the Authority as it received correspondence from Celia Crescent residents asking it to support a petition against the project. Asked for clarity on pipeline alignments presented at the first statutory (Preferred Route) consultation. Agreed it would respond with high level information but stated that the Authority cannot comment on the details of the petition.</p>
13/11/2018	Meeting	Progress meeting with Surrey Highways team and local highways officers	<p>The project offered a meeting in October/November. The meeting took place and included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on project and outcome of the first statutory (Preferred Route) consultation Provided flyover of route Deepcut Bridge Road if affected will require kerb to kerb reinstatement under Section 58 agreement

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stated in places they will prefer their contractors to be used for reinstatement • All were happy with proposed logistics compounds • Explanation of DCO process and summarised powers DCO gives project • Discussion regarding the disapplication of existing highways related powers in the draft DCO; in particular disapplication of existing SRSWA '91 and TMA '04 powers. • Mentioned DfT's Street Manager will be replacing existing ETON system by April 2020. System will be used by Hampshire County Council as well • Stated Forward Planning Information Notices (FPINs) can be submitted now so will flag up to traffic officers • Order Limits will be submitted for FPINS after feedback from the first statutory (Preferred Route) consultation correspondence was fully considered • Stated Fisher German currently submit permit applications for Esso for existing pipelines. The Authority to send guide • Discussions held on using Streetworks Master for public rights of way. Authority stated it will need to ensure all PRow along the route are in the Streetworks Master system • Traffic officers to reviewed traffic management and PRow drawings issued beginning of November • The Authority stated it had not seen file transfer notification • During meeting drawings were downloaded and agreed traffic officers will review and provide comments by end of November 2018 • Discussion on reinstatement of non streetworks PRow. Authority to produce reinstatement document • Mentioned the Authority's leader has resigned, and Acting leader is Councillor for Addlestone)
16/11/2018	Direct Mail	Commons map	The Authority does not have commons that are subject to be enclosed under Inclosure Acts 1845 to 1882. Registers are in paper format, which are open and available for general public to view at County Hall or copy can be provided for £25 per

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
			unit. Overlay on maps and data showing registered common land and town/village greens. However as this is not the definitive record, it is for indicative purposes only.
27/11/2018	Workshop	Feedback on the Scoping Report	Archaeologists from the Authority were invited but did not attend. A separate meeting was arranged for 12/02/2019.
29/11/2018	Meeting	Project update	Meeting with Lead Councillor for Environment and Director of Environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on route refinement • Consultation responses
02/01/2019	Email/FTP link	Transport Assessment Scoping Report	Transport Assessment Scoping Report issued via file transfer to the Authority.
03/01/2019	Briefing Note	Next steps – Second statutory (Design Refinements) consultation	Sent to planning officers and provided an overview of the second statutory (Design Refinements) consultation and its contents ahead of the launch on 21 January 2019. The briefing note was accompanied by the offer of a meeting.
09/01/2019	Meeting	Progress update	Progress meeting with highways team and local highways officers. Transport Assessment Scoping Note discussed, Authority happy with Transport Assessment methodology
18/01/2019	Correspondence	Launch of second statutory (Design Refinements) consultation	The project sent the Authority two letters: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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).
12/02/2019	Meeting	Archaeology	Meeting with Authority's Archaeologist to present and discuss: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project overview; • historical and archaeological baseline along the route; • archaeological potential; • historic environment assessment; • potential mitigation strategy.
19/02/2019 and 22/02/2019	Correspondence	Second statutory (Design Refinements) consultation response	A copy is enclosed as Appendix C.
14/03/2019	Meeting	DCO Part 3 discussion	Meeting with highways team to:



Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss the text of the DCO Part 3 and the powers to be applied and dis-applied • Discuss visibility splays and access to the working area and commitment to minimise impact of hedgerows
21/03/2019	Meeting	Progress meeting with highways team and local highways officers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Run through the route of the pipeline in Surrey • Discussion around method of working, street works, PRow • Discussion about the role of DCO text, CoCP and Project Commitments
25/03/2019	Briefing note	Next steps	The project issued a briefing note to planning officers following the close of the second statutory (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.
02/04/2019	Correspondence	Draft DCO	Project supplied the Authority with a draft of the DCO and asked for comments.
25/04/2019	Correspondence	Next steps	The project contacted the Authority to provide early warning of its submission for development consent.

2.2 Engagement Following Submission of Application

2.2.1 The table below sets out the consultation and engagement that has been undertaken between the Parties since the submission of the DCO application.

Table 2.2 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 the Authority's planning team.
06/06/2019	Meeting	Post DCO submission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guiding Transport Development Planning Manager and Traffic Manager through DCO application. Explained the SoCG contents Described the Local Impact Report Process Traffic impact assessment questions Highway ownership at Mead Lane, Chertsey.
06/06/2019	Correspondence	Consulting the project on planning applications	The project requested that the Authority consult it on planning applications where relevant.
10/06/2019	Correspondence	Safe-guarding	The project emailed the Authority's planning officer to confirm safeguarding procedures and request the project be consulted on planning applications made on the application site for the project.
16/07/2019	Correspondence (Email)	Archaeology	Clarification about the format to send details of proposed trial trenching and requesting a meeting to discuss the proposals. Trial trenching spreadsheets and shapefiles sent.
12/08/2019	Correspondence (Email)	Archaeology	Confirmation of meeting to be held on 11/09/2019.
02/09/2019	Meeting	Highways & Planning	<p>Discussion took place on the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of SoCG and timescales Local Impact Report DCO Part 3 and the powers to be applied and dis-applied Construction Traffic Management Plan – action to prepare heads of terms The Authority's requirements – cutting back vegetation, vehicle tracking and gates Heritage – mitigation strategy and trial trenching Public Transport – Bus routes Confirmation of Surrey Wildlife Trust discussions within the Surrey CC SoCG – day to day delivery measures and timings

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sterilisation of minerals • Areas of concern for residents – Ashford Road, Turf Hill and Celia Crescent • Officers delegated powers • Keep councillors updated • Invitation to Tender issued to contractors.
11/09/2019	Meeting	Archaeology	Discussion took place regarding the number of trial trenches within Surrey and the reasoning behind selecting/deselecting locations. Agreed to share documentation for county archaeologists to conduct a formal review and to engage when dealing with potential contractors.
31/10/2019	Phone Call	Highways	Telephone call to discuss mechanisms for the management of street works, in order to resolve the concern regarding the powers sought in the draft DCO compared to the South East Permitting Scheme
11/12/2019	Meeting	Flood Risk	Meeting with Local Lead Flood Authority flood risk advisor (Hampshire County Council's flood risk advisor also in attendance), covering watercourse crossings, protective provisions, soil storage, compounds, drainage, and flood warnings.
09/01/2020	Phone call	Archaeology	To confirm archaeology trial trenching programme.
14/01/2020	Meeting	Environment, Archaeology, Highways and Planning	<p>Discussion took place on the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Lead Flood Authority – Flood Risks Technical Note • Protective Provisions relating to flood risk • Archaeology – Trial Trench Programme and WSI • Minerals • Highways Permitting Scheme • Hours of working – on a weekend and 24-hour basis • Outline CTMP • Woodthorpe Road access into Fordbridge Park.
18/02/2020	Conference call	Statement of Common Ground	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Authority explained that it is finding it difficult to respond to the Examination deadlines as set out in the Rule 8 letter The Authority will forward responses to the project as they are available to enable progress on outstanding issues as quickly as possible • The Authority has not had responses to the proposed construction working hours from districts • The Authority requests greater cross referencing of the permit scheme within the dDCO



Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Authority also requested that the project tighten up wording regarding working hours in SoCG to match dDCO text • Progress is being made to resolve wording of the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy • Emergency planning are unable to respond before Deadline 6 because of flooding and Coronavirus events.
25/02/2020	Meeting	Draft DCO	Discussion relating to the wording of the draft DCO focusing on Articles 9, 10, 11, 14 and 35.
03/03/2020	Correspondence	Statement of Common Ground	The Parties liaised over the course of the week regarding the final, signed SoCG.

2.2.2 Esso will brief Surrey County Council on its voluntary Environmental Investment Programme and the scope of work that will be conducted in the Authority's area.

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 the Authority have met at appropriate times since the project launched in December 2017.</p> <p>The Authority is satisfied that the consultation and engagement with its officers and members has been robust and meaningful and in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.</p>
The Need and Principle of the Proposed Development and Examination of Alternative Routes	General	The Authority is satisfied with the approach of consulting on corridors and then a route.
	General	<p>The Authority is satisfied with the statutory consultation on the pipeline route – both on the Preferred Route Consultation and the Design Refinements Consultation. The project acknowledges the Authority's statutory consultation responses.</p> <p>The Authority gave its full opinion and comments regarding the pipeline route in its statutory consultation response. The Statutory Consultation response provided comment and opinion for the route at that time.</p>
	General	The Authority acknowledges that the project has listened to its consultation responses, in particular in the area of Chertsey Meads. It acknowledges that the project consulted on and selected the Authority's preferred route alignment in this area.
	General	Following consultation with the Authority on sub-options as part of the Preferred Route Consultation, there were two design refinements proposed. The Authority is satisfied with the reasoning as to why the project needed to refine its preferred route and consult further.
	General	<p>The Authority has no objection to proposed Order Limits, 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 north-west of the County, 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 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 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>The route then continues generally northeast, passing through Foxhills Country Club and Resort to the B386 Longcross Road. The section then crosses the B386 and continues north of St Peter's Hospital. It passes under the A320 Guildford Road, through the grounds of Salesian School and under the M25. It then continues through Abbey Moor golf course. There is then a crossing of the Chertsey Branch railway line between Chertsey and Addlestone Stations. The route then follows Canford Drive before crossing the A317 Chertsey Road and subsequently passing through the playing fields at Addlestone Moor. The section then crosses the Chertsey Bourne and passes through Chertsey Meads.</p> <p>The route then passes under the River Thames and the M3 and heads north, before crossing the B376 Shepperton Road. The section then heads north to cross under the Queen Mary Intake Channel before following Ashford Road (B377) west of the Queen Mary Reservoir. This is followed by a crossing under the Staines Reservoir Aqueduct and Ashford Road just south of the A308.</p> <p>The section then passes through Fordbridge Park before crossing under the Staines Bypass (A308) and River Ash. After crossing the A308, it continues north, through the open space adjacent to Woodthorpe Road and then east along Woodthorpe Road itself, crossing the Waterloo to Reading railway line just east of Ashford Station. This will be accomplished by heading east from Station Approach to cross under Church Road (B378) into the grounds of Clarendon Primary School and then crossing under the railway line heading north.</p> <p>The section passes on the east side of the grounds of St James Senior Boys' School and through the eastern part of the Thomas Knyvett College playing fields before crossing under the A30.</p>
	General	The Authority wishes to maintain its overall support to the proposed route of the Southampton to London pipeline.
Planning policy	Development Land	The Authority is satisfied that the route of the proposed pipeline does not impact adversely on any strategic allocation identified in emerging or adopted local plans within the county.

Planning policy	National Policy Statements (NPSs) Development Plan	<p>The relevant NPSs are:</p> <p>Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)</p> <p>National Policy Statement for Gas Supply Infrastructure and Gas and Oil Pipelines (EN-4)</p> <p>While the assessment of the application for development consent should be made against the NPSs, it is agreed that the Development Plan for Surrey comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surrey Minerals Local Plan 2011 – Core Strategy, Primary Aggregates DPD, Mineral Sites Restoration SPD • Surrey Waste Plan 2008. <p>The following document is emerging planning policy for Surrey: Surrey Draft Waste Local Plan 2019.</p>
Highways and transport	General (Highway Authority)	The Authority agree all major road (A roads, trunk roads and motorway) crossings will be trenchless crossings.
Highways and transport	General (Highway Authority)	The Authority agree that the only road in its area which will be closed entirely during the installation of the replacement pipeline is St Catherine's Road in Frimley. All other roads in which the pipeline may be installed will be subject to traffic management but will not be closed entirely.
Highways and transport	General (Highway Authority)	The Authority agrees with the proposed methodology detailed in the Transport Assessment Scoping Report.
Highways and transport	Construction (Highway Authority)	<p>The Authority and Applicant will discuss appropriate traffic management measures and take into account the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4-way traffic lights should be avoided where practicable. • The project does not intend to close any roads with the sole exception of St Catherine's Road in Frimley as detailed in the DCO application.
Highways and transport	Construction (Highway Authority)	The Authority agrees that road reinstatement will be undertaken to SRoH. (Specification for the Reinstatement of Openings in the Highways – Code of Practice 3 rd edition – April 2010.) (Section 71 of New Roads and Streetworks Act 1991. - NRSWA)
Highways and transport	Construction (Highway Authority)	The Authority agrees that should vehicles accessing the proposed construction compound from Deepcut Bridge Road affect the surface, damage caused by the Applicant would be reinstated at the expense of the Applicant. A condition survey would be undertaken prior to the logistics hub being brought into use.

Highways and transport	Permanent Access Locations	<p>That the permanent access locations are acceptable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11A SC Johnson, off Frimley Green Road, Frimley, on the basis of approximately 2-3 additional vehicles per month for maintenance/inspection purposes. • 11D Access road to Pannels Farm, The Knoll, Chertsey, on the basis of approximately 2-3 additional vehicles per month for maintenance/inspection purposes. • Detailed design of the accesses will be shared and discussed with the local highway authority.
Biodiversity	Environmental Impact Assessment	<p>The Authority is satisfied that the Environmental Impact Assessment is proportionate to the scale and likely impacts of the project within the County.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scope and methods of the ecological surveys are appropriate. • The mitigation is appropriate. • The identification and assessment of effects on biodiversity assets is appropriate.
	Environmental Impact Assessment	<p>The Authority has provided comments, via the scoping consultation and statutory consultation, on the Environmental Impact Assessment process and is satisfied that these consultations have led to appropriate changes and that these are reflected in the design, outcomes and mitigation as reported in the Environmental Statement.</p>
Methodology for Environmental Impact Assessment including assessment of cumulative effects	Environmental Impact Assessment	<p>The Authority agrees that the list of developments and allocations within the county, 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 D of this document.</p>
Biodiversity	Environmental Impact Assessment	<p>The Authority agrees that, when considering all factors, the selection of the final pipeline route in the county is appropriate in its response to biodiversity receptors within and in the vicinity of the Order Limits.</p>
Historic Environment	Archaeology (Environmental Statement methodology)	<p>The Authority agrees that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The methods used for the historic environment assessment in the Environmental Statement is appropriate. • The baseline used for the historic environment assessment is appropriate.
Historic Environment	Archaeology (geophysical survey)	<p>The Authority agrees that the scope and methods of the geophysical survey is appropriate.</p>

Historic Environment	Archaeology (mitigation methodology)	The Authority agrees that the mitigation proposed in the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [Environmental Statement Appendix 9.5 - 5(2)(a)] and the Code of Construction Practice [Environmental Statement Appendix 16.2 - 5(2)(a)] is appropriate for pre- construction, during construction and post construction.
Planning policy	Sterilisation of Mineral Resources	The Authority does not consider there to be any material impacts on any safeguarded mineral reserves affected by the proposed pipeline alignment.
Biodiversity	Chobham Common	The Authority agrees that on balance the alignment across Chobham Common is the most appropriate alignment. The environmental mitigation proposed in the CEMP, LEMP, CoCP, as signposted in the REAC, provides suitable safeguards during construction.
Construction Effects on People and Communities	Open Space	The Authority is satisfied that the project is working closely with occupiers of open spaces to manage the impacts, including the temporary installation and post construction reinstatement. The Open Spaces crossed by the Order Limits are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School playing fields; • SANG land (St Catherines, Windlemere and Chertsey Meads) • Roadside verges • Golf courses • Public access land such as Chobham Common.
Highways and transport	Construction/ Highway Authority	The Project submitted forward planning information notices (FPINs) (Electronic Transfer of notices) to the Authority as per the route of the replacement pipeline included with the application.
Flooding and Water	Flood Risk Assessment	The Authority is generally satisfied with the approach taken and the mitigation measures presented in the Flood Risk Report. Both Parties agree to engage early in the locations set out in Annex B of the outline CEMP regarding the detailed mitigation measures.
Landscape and visual impacts		No issues raised by the Authority.
Noise, air quality and disturbance during construction		No issues raised by the Authority.
Highways and transport	Highways	The Authority considers the following documents are satisfactory for the purposes of assessment of the transport impacts:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport Assessment and the Environmental Statement Appendix 13.1 Traffic (Application Document APP-135; and • Transport Technical Note (Application Document APP-119).
Highways and transport	Mead Lane	Mead Lane is both a public and private highway. The Authority and Esso agree in principle this is the most appropriate access and are engaged in discussion to confirm access rights.
Highways and transport	Bus Services	Esso agrees to engage with the Authority at an early stage regarding the impact of the project on Bus Services, this will be detailed in the Construction Traffic Management Plan to be submitted to the Authority for approval under requirement 7 of the draft DCO.
Historic Environment	Archaeology - Trial trenching	Both parties have agreed the scope and approach for the programme for trial trenching. The approach and extent of trial trenching is set out in the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy. A Written Scheme of Investigation was agreed with the Authority prior to this work being carried out.
Draft Development Consent Order	Disapplication of Land Drainage Consents under the DCO	<p>Protective provisions to be agreed will address disapplication of consents for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permanent crossings of Ordinary Watercourses • Construction of drainage outfall headwalls within Ordinary Watercourses <p>The LLFA notes the content within Esso's submitted Flood Risk Technical Note and agrees to work with Esso to develop mitigation measures within individual Flood Risk Action Plans set out in G127.</p>
Highways and transport	General (Highway Authority)	The Authority, as Highway Authority, will work with the project to review all permits in a timely manner, as prescribed in the Surrey County Permit Scheme Council Order, to prevent delays to the construction programme. To aid this process all permits to be submitted by the Esso's Project Team with project reference in their title for easy recognition.
Highways and transport	General (Highway Authority)	<p>Esso agrees to use the booking system for street works afforded by the Surrey County Permit Scheme in order to notify the Authority of its intention to carry out works in the area this is added to the DCO at Article 35.</p> <p>The Authority agrees that it will consider any activity requests made under Surrey County Permit Scheme promptly and recognises the interlinked and cumulative nature of the project's street works.</p> <p>.</p>
Highways and transport	General (Highway Authority)	The Authority agrees that it is content to discharge the CTMP in consultation with the District Councils within the county.
Highways and transport	Woodthorpe Road	The Authority accepts, subject to the approval of a permit, the proposal to access Fordbridge Park from Woodthorpe Road, in order to provide an alternative vehicle access to the park rather than using Celia Crescent. The Authority has no issue



		with either suspension of car parking on Woodthorpe Road or relocation of a bus stop to accommodate the access.
Historic Environment	Archaeological evaluation	The Parties agreed the evaluation strategy and detailed methods will be set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation.
	Land ownership	Details relating to Clarendon School, Abbey Moor Golf Club, Chobham Common and Abbey Rangers will be contained within the voluntary land agreements.
Security and Safety		The Parties are in agreement regarding site safety and security during construction.
The Draft Development Consent Order	Working hours	The Parties agree to amended DCO text to allow for a variation in working hours for works on a traffic sensitive street where so directed by the relevant highway authority pursuant to a permit granted under the Surrey County Council Permit Scheme and following consultation by the relevant highway authority with the relevant planning authority.



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
	General (Highway Authority) – Highway Trees removal	<p>As first raised at the Issue Specific Hearing on 26 February 2020, where any Highway Tree must be removed, the Authority wants Esso to follow the Authority's process of charging 20% of a Highway Tree's 'CAVAT' value, in order to fund sufficient planting of adequate volume of replacement trees by the Authority itself.</p> <p>Esso has proposed to treat all trees equally regardless of the land on which they sit. Esso has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agreed to utilise BS5837:2012 • made commitments G92, G97 and G200 • included DCO Requirement 8 that relates to replacement planting and a five-year management period, which is longer than the CAVAT management period of one year.

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
Flooding and Water	Flood Risk Assessment	The Parties are working hard to agree the Draft Protective Provisions and are under discussion with the Drainage Authority. The Parties are confident that agreement will be reached before the end of Examination.
Draft Development Consent Order	General (Highway Authority) – Use of Permit Scheme	Whilst the overarching principle of adopting use of the permit scheme has been agreed, the Parties are still working hard to reach agreement on the required specific wording for Article 35 to the DCO.

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 Statement of Common Ground is based.

Table 6.1 Schedule of relevant documents

Examination Reference	Application Reference	Title	Content	Date
APP-135	ENV-REP-000075	Transport Assessment Scoping Report	Proposed scope of Transport Assessment	2 January 2019
APP-039	EN070005 Document 6.1	Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary	Overview of the Environmental Statement	14 May 2019
APP-040 to APP-057	EN070005 Document 6.2	Environmental Statement	Report of the Environmental Impact Assessment	14 May 2019
APP-058 to APP-068	EN070005 Document 6.3	Environmental Statement Figures	Illustrative material to support the Environmental Statement	14 May 2019
APP-069 to APP-129	EN070005 Document 6.4	Environmental Statement Appendices	Additional data and evidence to support the Environmental Statement	14 May 2019
APP-132	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 May 2019
RR-281		Relevant Representation	Surrey County Council's relevant representation	26 th July 2019
REP1-023		Deadline 1 Submission - Local Impact Report	Details of the County Council's assessment of the local impacts from the project	28 th October 2019
REP2-089 REP2-090		Deadline 2 Submission - Response to ExA's first Written Questions and Request for information	The Authority's response to the Examining Authority's first written questions and requests for information	14 November 2019
REP4-074		Deadline 4 Submission - Response to ExA's further written questions and request for information	The Authority's response to the Examining Authority's further written questions and requests for information	30 January 2020
REP4-055	EN070005 Document 8.63	Site Specific Plan for Ashford Road	Site Specific Plan	30 January 2020
REP5-038	EN070005 Document 8.78	Site Specific Plan Ashford Town Centre and Clarendon School	Site Specific Plan	13 February 2020



7. Appendix A

7.1 Response to Corridor Consultation

Esso Southampton to London Pipeline Project - Replacement Pipeline Corridor Non-Statutory Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity for Surrey County Council (SCC) to comment on the Southampton to London Replacement Pipeline Corridor Consultation. Presented below is a collective response from Minerals and Waste Policy, Heritage and Conservation, Transport Development Planning, Highways and the Strategic Network Resilience Team.

Minerals and Waste

Options J, M & Q

Routes J, M and Q all converge north east of Addlestone. Below are comments on minerals and waste sites that should be considered when identifying a preferred corridor.

Shepperton Quarry, Littleton Lane – The site is located to the north of the M3 and west of Littleton Lane. The site currently has an extant planning permission to extract remaining aggregate from an area to the east of the lake on site. There is also an active aggregates recycling facility on the site, processing around 150,000 tonnes of CD&E waste per annum. This recycling operation is located to the north of an established industrial area, planning permission for the recycling operation is due to expire in 2019. The site will be a wet restoration to a series of open water lakes. The MWPA consider that a corridor following the existing pipeline, as close to Littleton Lane as possible, will have the least effect on current operations at the site.

Land West of Queen Mary Reservoir – The corridor forks just south of a site known as Land West of Queen Mary Reservoir. The site located on the area of land between Queen Mary reservoir and Ashford Road. The site would be impacted where the corridor option forks to the east. An area in the north east of the site is currently used for processing aggregate extracted from the reservoir and also for recycling around 200,000 tonnes of CD&E waste per annum. The site has permission till 2033 and will be a wet restoration. The site will also be used to process aggregate extracted from the adjacent Manor Farm Quarry via a conveyor. The wet restoration, conveyor from Manor Farm and the pipeline itself make this route very tightly constrained, SCC suggest working closely with the operator Brett Aggregates to identify possible operational impacts to the site if this corridor was to be selected. A corridor following the existing pipeline looks to be the MWPA's preferred option or a corridor immediately east of the current pipeline, provided that it can be delivered without prejudicing current operations.

Manor Farm Quarry – The site located on the area of land between Ashford Road and Staines Road. The site would be impacted where the corridor forks to the west of the Queen Mary Reservoir site. The site has planning permission to extract aggregates for a 5 year period and will be restored to landscaped lakes. Extraction at the site hasn't yet commenced.

The extracted aggregates will be transported by conveyor to the Queen Mary site to be processed, the route of the conveyor could conflict with this corridor option. This corridor option has the potential to sterilise a significant reserve of primary aggregate which the MWPA would strongly object to this. SCC suggest discussions with the operator Brett Aggregates to identify timescales for the site being worked, this corridor option would be acceptable subject to the site being worked prior to pipeline development.

Homers Farm – The site is adjacent to the West London Oil Terminal. The site has planning permission for aggregate extraction, this is yet to commence. The MWPA would prefer the corridor be located to the west of Short Lane and to the north of the site. A corridor running to the east of Short Lane has the potential to sterilise a significant reserve of primary aggregate which would not be supported by the MWPA.

Option J

Route option J broadly follows the existing pipeline route with a number of possible deviations. Below are comments on minerals and waste sites that should be considered when identifying a preferred corridor.

Chobham car spares – Where the proposed corridor forks to the north of Chobham, the northern fork of the corridor appears to be adjacent to or encroaching on a Metal / End of Life Vehicle (ELV) recycling site known as Chobham car spares. This site is safeguarded under policy DC1 of the 2008 SWP. SCC as MWPA would want to see northern fork run to the south of this site or equally preferable is the southern fork.

Option M

Alton Road Sandpit – The site is located to the south of the A31 and the MWPA don't believe it is likely to be affected by the proposed corridor.

Bourne Mill Community Recycling Centre (CRC) – The site is located to the west of the Shepherd and Flock Roundabout. Corridor option M runs directly through the site. The site is safeguarded under policy DC1 of the 2008 SWP and SCC as MWPA would want to see the corridor avoid this site.

Options M & Q

Corridor options M and Q converge at the east of Farnham. Below are comments on minerals and waste sites that should be considered when identifying a preferred corridor.

Runfold South – The corridor option runs through the northern edge of the site. All areas of the site are scheduled to be restored by 2021 and aggregate recycling operations on the site have now ceased. The area of the site that the corridor runs through has been infilled with inert waste only. The corridor if developed would be unlikely to have a major impact on the site but SCC as MWPA would want to see any impact on the restoration minimised were this corridor option to be selected.

Runfold North – The site is located on land between Guildford Road and the A31. The corridor option runs through the whole site. The site is a fully restored sandpit in aftercare as an agricultural use. The MWPA would want to see any impact on the restoration minimised were this corridor option to be selected.

Farnham Quarry – The site is located to the North of the A31. The corridor option currently runs to the south of the A31 and the MWPA don't believe the site is likely to be affected by the proposed corridor.

Homefield Sandpit – The site is located south of Seale Lane and east of Brighton Lane. The corridor option runs along the northern boundary of the site. There is an aggregate recycling

facility on the site that is due to cease in 2020 with the site due to be restored by 2042. The MWPA don't believe this corridor option is likely to impact on any operations or restoration of the site.

Land at Strawberry Farm – The site is located to the north of Wanborough station and east of Glaziers Lane. The site is used for processing soil and has a capacity of 13,000 tonnes per annum. The corridor option runs along the southern boundary of the site. The MWPA would prefer this corridor option to run south of the site, minimising not to have any operational impact.

Clasford Bridge – The site is located north of the junction between Aldershot Road and Frog Grove Lane. The corridor option runs directly through the site. There is an aggregate recycling facility on the site that processes around 62,500 tonnes of CD&E waste per annum. The site is safeguarded under policy DC1 of the 2008 SWP and the MWPA would want to see the corridor avoid this site, this could be achieved by the corridor running south of Aldershot Road.

Addlestone Quarry – The site is located to the north of the railway line and Brooklands industrial estate. The site has been worked for aggregates and is to be restored by December 2020 at which point aggregate recycling on the site will also cease. The corridor option runs through part of the site and the MWPA would want to see any impact on the restoration minimised were this corridor option to be selected.

Comments on Minerals Safeguarding

All routes – All 3 corridor options converge north of Addlestone and run through Preferred Minerals Zones 19 Dumsey Meadow and 20 Chertsey Meads. These sites were identified as areas containing significant reserves of aggregates. Further investigation into the sites however led the MWPA being of the view that these sites are unlikely to be worked due to a number of constraints.

M & Q – Corridor options M & Q run adjacent to 2 preferred areas of aggregate extraction as identified in the Adopted Primary Aggregates DPD. These are:

- Preferred area A - Addlestone Quarry Extension. An area to the east of the current operation at Addlestone Quarry has been identified as having reserves of around 0.4 million tonnes of concreting aggregate. The MWPA will seek to safeguard this area from development that could sterilise these reserves. The corridor option currently runs to the west of this area. The MWPA would prefer the corridor to remain as far west of the site as possible.
- Preferred area C - Hamm Court Farm. This is an area to the north of Weybridge Road and west of Woburn Park. The site has been identified as having reserves of around 0.78 million tonnes of concreting aggregate. Currently the pipeline option runs directly through the site, the site is unlikely to be worked in advance of the potential pipeline construction. The MWPA would strongly object to this corridor option being selected as it would likely sterilise a larger quantity of the reserves at the site.



Other issues

Composition of historic landfill – It has been identified that the former landfill site to the south of Shepperton Road and north of the current quarry may have been infilled with some household waste.

Impact on minerals site restorations – SCC works hard with operators to ensure the best ecological and landscape benefits from minerals site restorations are achieved. SCC prefers a corridor option that encroaches as little as possible on restored sites. Where these sites cannot be avoided SCC expects sites to be restored back to a pre-construction standard and seek enhancement opportunities where possible.

Mineral & Waste Conclusions

All 3 corridor options converge north of Addlestone. The corridor beyond this point raises concerns for the MWPA. Further work with SCC and operators at the next stage of consultation will be essential for minimising the impacts to sites beyond this point. The importance of both the Land West of Queen Mary and Manor Farm Quarry sites makes identifying a preferred route difficult. Ultimately the MWPA would not want any aggregate resources to be sterilised from either site and for any operational disruptiveness to be minimised when installing a pipeline.

Before the corridor options merge the routes are vastly different. SCC as MWPA regards corridor option J as having the lowest impact on mineral and waste resources in the Surrey. Corridor options M and Q have the potential to impact a number of mineral and waste sites were they to be selected. These impacts could be overcome by ensuring sites are restored and operational disruption is kept to a minimum. However corridor options M & Q's proximity to preferred areas of mineral extraction, as identified in the Adopted Primary Aggregates DPD makes them the least preferred option for the MWPA.

Heritage & Conservation Team

Esso plans to replace 90km of its 105km aviation fuel pipeline between Southampton and London, crossing the local authorities of Hampshire, Winchester, Surrey and into Greater London. The pipeline will most commonly be constructed through open cut trenches and should take between one and two months in any area. The project is classed as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project under the 2008 Planning Act, with the permission if granted referred to as a 'Development Consent Order'. The final decision will be taken by the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy.

Three 200m wide corridor options are being taken forward, with one of these to be identified as the preferred option. In terms of the route through Surrey, the three options are J, M and Q. Option J is aligned closely to the existing pipeline and has less potential to impact on either designated or currently unrecorded heritage assets. Options M and Q do not follow the existing pipeline route and both options carry a high potential for encountering previously undiscovered archaeology and/or affecting designated heritage assets. The 'Cultural Heritage' implications of the three options as identified in the first consultation document (Esso 2018) are reproduced below:

Option J - This corridor includes or is close to heritage assets, including one Grade I listed building (Farnborough Hill Convent), two scheduled monuments at West End Common and Chobham, and Frimley Park Registered Park and Garden. However, the design of a route within this corridor may be able to avoid impacts on all of these assets. The majority of the corridor follows the existing pipeline and in these locations, buried archaeological remains

are likely to have already been disturbed. The corridor, therefore, has fewer heritage constraints than Option M and Option Q.

Option M - This corridor is close to a large number of designated heritage assets including Grade I and II* listed buildings and scheduled monuments (Waverley Abbey, a Romano-Celtic temple complex west of Long Common, and Woking Palace). This corridor does not follow the existing pipeline and thus there may be a greater risk of disturbing buried archaeological remains. This corridor includes three conservation areas (Pierrepoint, the Wey Navigation and the Wey and Godalming Conservation Areas) that could be difficult to avoid. The Option M corridor also runs close to Farnham Park Registered Park and Garden and Farnham Castle scheduled monument, both of which can be avoided, and Farnham Conservation Area that cannot be avoided.

Option Q - This corridor is close to a large number of designated heritage assets including Grade I and II* listed buildings and scheduled monuments (Waverley Abbey, a Romano-Celtic temple complex west of Long Common, and Woking Palace). This corridor does not follow the existing pipeline and thus there may be a greater risk of disturbing buried archaeological remains. This corridor includes three conservation areas (Pierrepoint, the Wey Navigation and the Wey and Godalming Conservation Areas) that could be difficult to avoid.

The Heritage Conservation Team at Surrey County Council support the choice of Option J as being less harmful to the historic environment.

Looking forward towards the consultation on the preferred route (Autumn 2018) and eventual application submission (during 2019), it will be necessary for full consideration of the implications of the chosen option with regards to heritage assets to be made. As part of this, it is anticipated that an Environmental Impact Assessment assessing the likely impact of the project above and below ground will be produced, with area specific archaeological Desk Based Assessments produced as supporting documentation as necessary. The compilation of the project wide Environmental Impact Assessment and area specific archaeological Desk Based Assessments will then inform the scope of any further investigations that may be required, leading to the identification of appropriate mitigation measures should significant archaeology be identified.

Transport Development Planning

The following comments are made on behalf of Surrey County Council as a Statutory Consultee on highway and transport matters arising from the DCO development proposals:

High Level Commentary on Corridor/Route choice:

- As first choice wherever possible, to follow the existing route of the pipeline through Surrey.
 - Avoid if at all possible, or at the very least, minimise any conflict with access to the major Health Care facilities, such as Frimley Park Hospital, Royal Surrey County Hospital at Guildford, St Peter's Hospital, Chertsey and Ashford Hospital.
 - Avoid if at all possible, or at the very least, minimise any conflict with emergency ambulance and fire station sites.
 - Minimise impact on educational facilities, although it is appreciated that these sites do provide open spaces/ less developed locations through which the pipeline could pass.
 - Please prioritise in general terms, the crossing/use of the lesser status / hierarchy of road first. Clearly in terms of traffic management, road safety, and disruption, it is generally preferable to impact the lesser roads rather than Trunk/Mways/A and B class roads.

Initial Commentary on J Corridor: (South West to North East direction)

- Generally this corridor is preferred as it follows more of the existing pipeline's route through Surrey.
- The general southern of these two corridors south of Frimley is preferred because it has the opportunity to follow more open space, and to avoid Frimley Park Hospital. The northern route is much more challenging to provide in terms of urban areas, although it is understood that it avoids the narrow strip of the present southern route where it passes between the two bodies of water between the A331 and the railway line.
- The route across Frith Hill will potentially cross / follow a proposed all weather cycle facility which is being installed as part of the Deepcut development.
- Where Corridor J heads north up The Maultway, it will need to avoid junction improvements associated with the redevelopment of Deepcut Barracks. The roundabout of Red Road with the Maultway is being improved, although if the new alignment is south east of the existing, it should be clear of the highway works.
- The junction of Red Road with Guildford Road (B311/A322) is also being improved, and this junction is shown as the southern extent of the proposed corridor. Crossing the A322 dual carriageway will need careful traffic management.
- It is understood that the southern alternative route south of Longcross (along Stonehill Road) is to avoid the SPA, but the southern route follows more highway, so will cause more disruption than would be the case if were retained on the existing alignment.
- At the eastern end of B386 (junction of Holloway Hill with Guildford Road A320), a significant junction improvement is possible, as a result of a recently completed study on the A320. This land holding we understand is being acquired by the Salesian School as playing fields. The proposed Longcross South Garden Village (on the Longcross Studios site) has not had a Transport Assessment undertaken, but it is likely that there will be junction / highway improvements on B386 at various points between the M3 and including the A320.
- Where the existing pipeline and proposed corridor passes beneath the A317 outside the proposed new Chertsey High School, there will be junction / access alterations associated with that school. Also, the school re-development is clearly designed around the existing alignment, but does not necessarily take into account a potentially wider corridor as shown across virtually all of its playing fields/ campus.
 - It seems sensible following the existing route where it crosses the River Thames, M3, and where it follows Littleton Lane.
 - The alternative (western) route to the west of Ashford Road appears to take a more challenging route in that it uses residential roads rather than the existing open land immediately adjacent to Queen Mary Reservoir. The crossing of the Aqueduct / Kingston Road/ Staines Bypass will be a challenge. On the existing route corridor there will be a new fire station on the Kingston Road, immediately east of the Fordbridge Roundabout, with a right turn out of the site across the central reservation.
 - My Mineral Planning colleagues will comment in more detail, but there is proposed mineral extraction between Worple Road and Ashford Road (Manor Farm), involving the construction of a conveyor belt tunnel under Ashford Road and footpath 30, to run northwards following roughly the existing alignment.



- Following the existing route north to the destination seems to be make sense. Crossing the A30 Trunk will need to involve Highways England (as is the case with the M25 and M3 further to the south west).

Initial Commentary on Corridor M (South West to North East direction)

- Just east of the Surrey/Hampshire Border, if the A31 dual carriageway could be avoided that would be good. There are very long term intentions to potentially create a Wrecclesham Bypass, which would involve a roundabout junction on the A31 Alton Road roughly where the southern boundary of your corridor runs along the A31. That is, if this corridor has to be chosen, a route as far away (north) as possible from the A31 would be safest.
- There is at least one potential housing site off Crondall Lane within the corridor route (between Crondall Lane and A287).
 - The route along the tight suburban streets of Farnham north of the A325, and then along the Guildford Road will be a challenge in terms of traffic/parking management during installation.
 - Part of the corridor east of the A31 crossing of the Farnham/Aldershot railway line includes the A31 dual carriageway. For obvious reasons it would be good to avoid that. The majority of the corridor at this point also includes mineral working sites.
 - There's a potential junction improvement scheme at the junction of Poyle Road with White Lane in Ash, if a development to the north goes ahead. Your corridor only just touches this point.
 - Within the community of Wanborough there are several small scale developments, so it would be good to pass to the south of the village if at all possible (ie south of Flexford Road.)
 - The remainder of the route within Guildford Borough utilises open space and seems to avoid communities and main roads so looks sensible from the highways point of view.
- Within Woking Borough, the route between Pyrford and the M25 would clearly impact on the residential roads around Pyrford Road, so it might be better to follow the pylon route if that's possible technically.
 - The route up the M25 between the A245 and the main railway line is a bit of a "no man's land" with respect to security issues, especially given that the M25 is up on stilts on a viaduct through this point, with the canal on the west side and not much overlooking to the east.
- The route north of the railway line should if at all possible avoid the Byfleet Road.
 - The route until it joins the existing route corridor (J) seems to make sense in that it follows open land and the route of the pylons.

Initial Commentary on Corridor Q (Southwest to north east – as far as it then duplicates with Corridor M)

- Generally, Corridor Q is preferable than the part of Corridor M that it bypasses, because it misses out the urban area of Farnham. It also involves no crossing of the A31/ railway line (in Surrey at least).

These are the preliminary comments that the County have from the Transport Development Planning point of view, but they should be read in conjunction with the other commentaries from colleagues representing other interests.



Highways Team

The SCC Highways team agree with comments from Transport Development Planning that option J is the preferred route. Highways regard Q as second preference over M. Highways have the following comments to supplement Transport Development Planning comments:

- Options M & Q impact on the A245 in West Byfleet. The A245 at this location is part of the Highways England Tactical Diversion Route for M25 J10-J11 (bi-directional) and as such if the pipeline were to cross the A245 we would wish to see all opportunities to directionally drill beneath the road as opposed open cut across it, fully explored.
- Options M&Q include the A245 West Byfleet and the A367 at Pyrford. Both roads form part of the RideLondon-Surrey Cycling events route. The event is either the last weekend in July or the first weekend in August each year and is subject to a works moratorium in advance of the event each year. Enhanced reinstatement of any highway surfaces disturbed may be required on this section of these roads.
- At Surrey's initial meeting with Esso (and partners) it was indicated that whenever it was necessary for the pipeline route to cross A roads, that the feasibility of directional drilling would be explored in each instance to avoid traffic disruption. Surrey Highways support this initiative, and request that similar consideration is also given to crossing busy B roads across the County; B383, B386, B375 & B376 for option J, B376 & B367 for option M and B376, B367 & B3001 for Option Q.
- Surrey CC's Traffic Manager wishes to highlight that when considering route options, it will be Surrey Highway's expectation that when the pipeline crosses any A or B category roads on the network, - whichever route option is taken forward as a preference, whenever feasible, that the pipeline crosses the road via the shortest possible route and does not travel along the road.

Strategic Network Resilience Team Comments

The Strategic Network Resilience Team within Highways have a number of comments to make on known flooding locations, proposed flooding schemes and the River Thames Scheme.

The attached PDF shows the flood issues SCC have along the different ESSO pipeline corridors. The shaded areas are potential schemes that may go ahead in the future. The blue wetspot lines are areas of reported flooding. The severity of flooding at the locations varies. Some flood and restrict access. Some have had remedial work carried out and are now at a reduced risk but continue to be monitored. Each location has been recorded on a database and at many of the locations, additional information will be available if requested.

River Thames Scheme

The proposed northern routes and corridors pass through the area being considered for the construction of flood channels as part of the River Thames Flood Alleviation Scheme (RTS), particularly in the Runnymede and Spelthorne areas. More information can be found via the following link (<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/river-thames-scheme>) but I would strongly suggest a meeting with the project team to discuss further.



Construction for the RTS is due to begin in 2020/2021 and we would wish to ensure that any works associated with the replacement pipeline does not conflict with this. There may however be opportunities and efficiencies if the two projects could work together.

Further Information and Future Consultations

SCC has welcomed the inclusive approach taken by Esso during this non-statutory (Corridor) consultation and would expect to see this continue as a preferred corridor option is developed.

In accordance with the PINS Advice Note Feb 2015 (The Role of Local Authorities in the development consent process), Section 10 Planning Performance Agreement resources, the County Council requests that a Planning Performance Agreement be established between the applicant and Surrey County Council covering the following:

- 1) The funding of 60% fte of a Surrey PS9 TDP Officer to undertake all detailed consideration of corridor and then route choice submissions made by the developer in terms of impacts on the highway and bus networks in Surrey County (through six Surrey Districts and Boroughs). The resources to be provided throughout the consideration of the DCO pre- application and application process (including the 6 months for the Inquiry) from the present to DCO grant.
- 2) The funding of 60% fte of Surrey PS9 (Matt Jezzard position) to undertake all pre-commencement, site evaluation, traffic management implementation, site inspection, and post reinstatement to all Surrey Highways (including Rights of Ways).
- 3) All normal fees relating to Section 278 Agreements, Licences, and Working Permits.



8. Appendix B

8.1 Response to Preferred Route Consultation

Stage 1
Stage 2
Sturgess48

[Stage 2](#) > [List of organisations](#) > View comments by participant

View responses by participant: 22/10/18, Surrey CC Highways & Transport Dept.; Jezzard, Matthew (UserID 1092) - 332764

Click on a code to see all of the responses for which that code was used.

Section: Section A: Boorley Green to Bramdean

Question: 1.1.1 Do you favour the sub-option A1a or A1b?

Not applicable

Question: 1.2.1 Do you favour sub-option A2a or A2b?

Not applicable

Section: Section E: Farnborough to Bisley and Pirbright Ranges

Question: 5.1.1 Do you favour sub-option E1a or E1b?

Not applicable

Question: 5.2.1 Do you favour sub-option E2a or E2b?

Not applicable

Question: 5.3.1 Do you favour sub-option E3a, E3b or E3c?

Not applicable

Question: 5.4.1 Do you favour sub-option E4a or E4b?

Not applicable



Question: 5.5.1 Do you favour sub-option E5a or E5b?

E5b

Question: 5.5.2 On which of the following main issues are your views based? (Please pick as many as apply)

Question: 5.5.2

Community (including local businesses, Rights of Way and local amenities)

Question: 5.5.3 Please give any further details about your response on sub-option E5, in particular information about specific locations.

The following groups have been applied to this response:

[L - Roads - Deepcut Bridge Road](#),

[SE5b - Oppose - Installation - roads impact](#)

Collation status: Collation complete

Response:

Preference to avoid road network (Busy B3015 Deepcut Bridge Road) where possible to minimise disruption and delays to traffic.

Question: 5.6 Please give your comments about section E as a whole or outside the sub-options, in particular information about specific locations

The following groups have been applied to this response:

[L - Roads - A331](#),

[L - Roads - Balmoral Drive](#),

[L - Roads - Deepcut Bridge Road](#),

[L - Roads - Frimley Road](#),

[L - Roads - Newfoundland Road](#),

[L - Roads - Red Road](#),

[L - Roads - Swordsman Road](#),

[L - Roads - The Maultway](#),

[SE - Concern - Installation - terrain constraints](#),

[SE - Suggestion - Installation - mitigation](#),

[SE4 - Concern - Installation - terrain constraints](#),

[SE4 - Concern - Installation - utilities impact](#),

[SE4 - Suggestion - Community - mitigation](#),

[SE5b - Concern - Installation - terrain constraints](#),

[SE5b - Oppose - Installation - roads impact](#)

Collation status: Collation complete

Response:

From West to East: A331 : assumption of no network impact due to directional drilling however we believe soil is very sandy in this area which may affect proposed operations.

There is an SGN Governor at B3411 Frimley Road j/o Balmoral Drive meaning that medium pressure gas lines will be in the vicinity here. At this location TM measures need to allow for HGV deliveries to SC Johnson building. Note that the Carnival closes B3411 Frimley Road each year. Other events to consider for this road: 'Palace to Palace' and Farnborough Air Show.

Preference that route is off highway along Balmoral drive. Discussion required around TM provision.
 Preference to avoid B3015 Deepcut Bridge Road and utilise golf club option to avoid traffic congestion.
 Deepcut Bridge Road has been resurfaced and is protected under 'Section 58' until June 2023. (Full width reinstatement required if excavated between Newfoundland Road to Swordsman Road including RA)
 Preference to avoid c/w excavations along B3015 The Maltway to reduce network congestion. Current Section 278 works at Heatherside Corner (B3015/Red Road) will re-align RA closer to your preferred route.
 B3015 The Maltway affected by 'Palace to Palace' event.

Question: 5.6.1 On which of the following main issues are your views based? (Please pick as many as apply)

Question: 5.6.1

Installation (including engineering and maintenance)

Other

Section: Section F: Bisley and Pirbright Ranges to M25

Question: 6.1.1 Do you favour sub-option F1a, F1b or F1c?

F1a

Question: 6.1.2 On which of the following main issues are your views based? (Please pick as many as apply)

Question: 6.1.2

Installation (including engineering and maintenance)

Question: 6.1.3 Please give any further details about your response on sub-option F1, in particular information about specific locations.

The following groups have been applied to this response:

[L - Roads - A322](#)

[L - Roads - M3](#)

[L - Roads - Red Road](#)

[SF1a - Support - Installation - roads impact](#)

Collation status: Collation complete

Response:

Preference to leave Red Road at earliest opportunity as very busy road (linking A322 and M3). Particularly busy when any issues on M3.

Question: 6.2.1 Do you favour sub-option F2a or F2b?

F2a



Question: 6.2.2 On which of the following main issues are your views based? (Please pick as many as apply)

Question: 6.2.2

Installation (including engineering and maintenance)

Question: 6.2.3 Please give any further details about your response on sub-option F2, in particular information about specific locations.

The following groups have been applied to this response:

[L - Roads - A319](#)

[L - Roads - Stonehill Road](#)

[L - Villages - Chertsey](#)

[L - Villages - Chobham](#)

[SF2b - Oppose - Installation - roads impact](#)

Collation status: Collation complete

Response:

Avoid Stonehill Road route if possible. Key link between Chobham/Chertsey. (A319 'over flow')

Question: 6.3.1 Do you favour sub-option F3a or F3b?

No preference between sub-options

Question: 6.3.2 On which of the following main issues are your views based? (Please pick as many as apply)

Question: 6.3.2

Installation (including engineering and maintenance)

Question: 6.3.3 Please give any further details about your response on sub-option F3, in particular information about specific locations.

The following code was applied to this response:

[SF3 - Benefit - Installation - reduced roads impact](#)

Collation status: Collation complete

Response:

No preference at neither route has road network impact

Question: 6.4.1 Do you favour sub-option F4a or F4b?

F4a

Question: 6.4.2 On which of the following main issues are your views based? (Please pick as many as apply)

Question: 6.4.2

Installation (including engineering and maintenance)

Question: 6.4.3 Please give any further details about your response on sub-option F4, in particular information about specific locations.

The following groups have been applied to this response:

[L - Roads - A320](#)
[L - Roads - M25](#)
[SF4 - Concern - Safety - emergency services](#)
[SF4 - Suggestion - Installation - mitigation](#)
[SF4 - Suggestion - Safety - mitigation](#)
[SF4b - Support with caveats](#)

Collation status: Collation complete

Response:

Note A320 here is H.E. emergency diversion route for M25 J11-J13. Must be directional drilling. Preference for works footprint as far away from school entrance as possible. (But Poss implications with H.E. Structure further north ?).

Would not object to option F4b if chosen.

Question: 6.5 Please give your comments about section F as a whole or outside the sub-options, in particular information about specific locations.

The following groups have been applied to this response:

[L - Roads - A30](#)
[L - Roads - A320](#)
[L - Roads - A322](#)
[L - Roads - Guildford Road](#)
[L - Roads - Hardwick Lane](#)
[L - Roads - Longcross Road](#)
[L - Roads - M25](#)
[L - Roads - M3](#)
[L - Roads - Stonehill Road](#)
[L - Roads - Windsor Road](#)
[L - Villages - Chertsey](#)
[L - Villages - Lightwater](#)
[L - Villages - Ottershaw](#)
[L - Villages - Virginia Water](#)
[SF - Concern - Installation - roads impact](#)
[SF - Suggestion - Installation - mitigation](#)
[SF1 - Concern - Other - cumulative impact](#)
[SF2 - Concern - Installation - roads impact](#)
[SF2 - Concern - Other - cumulative impact](#)
[SF2 - Suggestion - Installation - mitigation](#)
[SF4 - Concern - Safety - emergency services](#)
[SF4 - Suggestion - Safety - mitigation](#)

Collation status: Collation complete

Response:

A320 is H.E. Emergency diversion route for M25 J11-J13. Assumption this will be directionally drilled. Assumption that A322 will be directionally drilled.



B383 Windsor Road - preference for directional drilling to minimise disruption. Very busy route when Sunningdale A30 level crossing is down. May need to coordinate with any network rail planned maintenance activities at A30 level crossing.
Guildford Road, Lightwater and A322 Lightwater By Pass - need to consider Wentworth Golf tournament (each Sept)
Stonehill Road, Ottershaw - Palace to Palace event
Longcross Road - Wentworth Golf event each Sept.
Preference for directional drilling under B386 Longcross Road - very busy M3/M25 link.
Hardwick Lane: Not an A or B road but extremely busy 'rat run' linking Chertsey to Virginia Water. Especially busy if A30 busy. (Directional drilling an option here?)

Question: 6.5.1 On which of the following main issues are your views based? (Please pick as many as apply)

Question: 6.5.1

Installation (including engineering and maintenance)



9. Appendix C

9.1 Response to Design Refinements Consultation (1)

From: info@slpproject.co.uk
Sent: 15 February 2019 16:18:36
To: SLP
Subject: Fwd: Southampton to London Pipeline Project - Design Refinements Consultation

Attachments: Forwarded Message

----- Forwarded message from Paul Sanderson EI
<paul.sanderson@surreycc.gov.uk> -----
- Date: Fri, 15 Feb 2019 15:52:41
+0000
From: Paul Sanderson EI <paul.sanderson@surreycc.gov.uk>
Subject: Southampton to London Pipeline Project - Design Refinements Consultation
To: info@slpproject.co.uk
Cc: Planning Consultations/EAI/SCC
<planning.consultations@surreycc.gov.uk>, Simon Elson EI
<simon.elson@surreycc.gov.uk>, Susan Waters EI
<susan.waters@surreycc.gov.uk>, Simon Elson EI
<simon.elson@surreycc.gov.uk>

SLP Engagement Team

In response to your consultation on design refinements Surrey County Council as the minerals planning authority has the following comments:

Littleton Lane West Quarry (Section H): Gravel extraction at this site has now ceased and the site is required to be restored. The company (Bretts) is now looking to complete restoration of the site. The revised proposed pipeline route north of the M3, together with temporary logistics hub, is therefore impacting land that will either be in the process of being restored to farmland or will have been restored to farmland. If restoration (including aftercare) has yet to be completed when pipeline operations are commenced then the county council will need to be notified so that amendments to the restoration scheme can be agreed with the landowner.

Regards

Paul Sanderson
Minerals & Waste Policy Team Manager
Surrey County Council



We are welcoming views on our Submission Surrey Waste Local Plan until 10 March. www.surreycc.gov.uk/newwasteplan

* * * * *



This email and any attachments with it are intended for the addressee only. It may be confidential and may be the subject of legal and/or professional privilege.
If you have received this email in error please notify the sender or postmaster@surreycc.gov.uk
The content may be personal or contain personal opinions and cannot be taken as an expression of the County Council's position. Surrey County Council reserves the right to monitor all incoming and outgoing mail. Whilst every care has been taken to check this e-mail for viruses, it is your responsibility to carry out any checks upon receipt.

Visit the Surrey County Council website -
<http://www.surreycc.gov.uk>

* * * * *



9.2 Response to Design Refinements Consultation (2)

From: info@slpproject.co.uk

Sent: 20 February 2019 09:22:55

To: SLP

Subject: Fwd: Ashford Rd / Woodthorpe Rd Spelthorne further design consultation response

Attachments: Forwarded Message

----- Forwarded message from Denise Turner Stewart CLR

<Denise.TurnerStewart@surreycc.gov.uk> ----- Date: Tue, 19 Feb 2019 19:51:26 +0000

From: Denise Turner Stewart CLR

<Denise.TurnerStewart@surreycc.gov.uk>

Subject: Ashford Rd / Woodthorpe Rd Spelthorne further design consultation response

To: info@slpproject.co.uk

For the attention of the SLP Consultation Team

As County Councillor for Staines South and Ashford West in Spelthorne, representing the residents of Ashford Rd, Woodthorpe Rd and surrounding areas, I wish to raise the following concerns regarding the proposed routing of the Esso pipeline along Ashford Rd and Woodthorpe Rd in Laleham and Ashford:

Preservation of Ashford Rd trees and woodland- high amenity value-impact must be avoided

Access to Laleham C of E Primary School

Congestion on surrounding roads in Ashford, Staines and Laleham Access to Shaftesbury Crescent, Bingham Drive, Charles Rd and Gloucester Crescent

Access to Ferndale Rd, Chesterfield Rd, Brookside Ave, Celia Crescent and Stanwell Rd

Build up of HGVs accessing Brett's site

Disturbance for pedestrians as residents of Ashford and Woodthorpe Rd and surrounding areas

Disruption - traffic modelling not available for public scrutiny

Impact of logistics sites required definition

Noise disturbance to local residents

Please could you acknowledge receipt of this representation.

Many thanks,

Denise.



Denise Turner-Stewart

Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Fire and Resilience

Surrey County Councillor for Staines South and Ashford West

07970 350473 denise.turnerstewart@surreycc.gov.uk

This email and any attachments with it are intended for the addressee only. It may be confidential and may be the subject of legal and/or professional privilege.

If you have received this email in error please notify the sender or postmaster@surreycc.gov.uk The content may be personal or contain personal opinions and cannot be taken as an expression of the County Council's position. Surrey County Council reserves the right to monitor all incoming and outgoing mail. Whilst every care has been taken to check this e-mail for viruses, it is your responsibility to carry out any checks upon receipt.

Visit the Surrey County Council website - <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk>

10. Appendix D

Table 10.1 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	Yes	3	>500m	No published timetable. However, if operation is due to	Schedule 1 EIA development	Potential to have cumulative effects. Scoped	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?
			securing a private sector developer in early 2019. Expected to become operational between 2025-2027.				commence in 2025, construction could overlap with the project construction timescale.		into shortlist.	
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.	Otterbourne Water Supply Works: To submit planning application in March 2019. Expected to start construction in winter 2019 and end in spring 2020. Portsmouth Flood	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>Alleviation: Complete.</p> <p>Woolston Wastewater Treatment Works: In 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>Portswood Wastewater Treatment Works: Construction activities are currently underway and due for completion in March 2025.</p>							

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?
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 application may be submitted October 2019.	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
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?
Runnymede Borough Council										
B34	RU.12/1277	Demolition of existing buildings and structures and development of 4 x two-storey dwellings each with attached / integrated garage and basement together with associated landscaping and other works	Approved	Yes	1		Likely	Not Schedule 1 or 2 development.	Scoped out due to scale and nature of the development.	No
B35	RU.13/0857	Hybrid planning application for the change of use from agriculture to publicly accessible open space (Sui Generis use), together with associated development, car park, footpaths and landscaping, including a detailed first phase of development comprising road access to an onsite car park with 12 spaces, an 800m hoggin path, dog proof fencing, gates, benches, signs and landscape planting, including trees and scrub and a wildflower grassland within a 5.1ha area	Approved	Yes	1	875m	Likely	Schedule 2 not EIA development	Potential to have cumulative effects. Scoped into shortlist	Yes
B36	RU.15/0855	Outline application for the erection of up to 130 residential dwellings (including affordable housing), vehicular access from Pretoria Road, open space, landscaping including sustainable drainage systems and all necessary ground works.	Approved	Yes	1	Intersecting with SLP	Likely	Not Schedule 1 or 2 development.	Potential to have cumulative effects. Scoped into shortlist	Yes
B37	RU.16/1053	Redevelopment of land to rear of existing office buildings to provide 174 residential units and associated access, car parking and landscape works (known as Phase 2)	Approved	Yes	1	1km	Likely	Schedule 2 not 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?
B38	RU.16/1748	Proposed works comprising the following: 1) Multi-faith prayer room with offices above 2) Offices and ancillary accommodation for the Intensive Therapy Unit and Coronary Care Unit 3) Enclosure of a courtyard with the Outpatients Block to create extensions to the Endoscopy and Neurophysiology Departments.	Approved	Yes	1	<500m	Likely	Schedule 2 not EIA development	Potential to have cumulative effects. Scoped into shortlist.	Yes
B39	RU.16/1765	Rear and roof extension to existing office building to provide 22 new residential units, with associated landscaping, car parking and other infrastructure.	Approved	Yes	1	625m	Likely	Not Schedule 1 or 2 development.	Scoped out due to scale and nature of the development.	No
B40	RU.17/0766	Application for a temporary change of use of two wings of the ground floor for two years to a school (Class D1), use of the Abbey Rangers Car Park for pupil drop-off and collection, the provision of a pedestrian access route from the Abbey Rangers Car Park to a school access gate and use of The Hub Car Park for staff parking to facilitate the proposed change of use.	Approved	Yes	1	Intersecting with SLP	Likely	Not Schedule 1 or 2 development.	Scoped out due to scale and nature of the development.	No
B41	RU.17/1136	Proposed demolition of existing Runnymede Centre (former The Meads School); construction of new secondary school and sports hall; improved vehicle access, pedestrian access, parking and on-site drop-off/pick-up areas; formal and informal playing area	Approved	Yes	1	50m	Likely	Schedule 2 not 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?
B42	RU.17/2014	Demolition of existing sales building and removal of existing canopy link. Construct new single-storey sales building, gated timber fenced compound area with bins and plant units, relocation of LPG (Liquefied petroleum gas) dispenser and construct new boundary brick wall.	Approved	Yes	1	400m	Likely	Not Schedule 1 or 2 development.	Not expected to generate cumulative effects due to the scale of the proposed scheme	No
B43	RU.18/0206	EIA Screening Opinion Request for proposed development for approximately 250 dwellings incorporating open space.	Screening Opinion Received	Yes	3	0-500m	Not known	Schedule 2 EIA development.	Insufficient information.	No
B44	RU.18/1280	Construction of 158 residential dwellings, new access road to the south of Hanworth Lane, open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage systems).	Approved	Yes	1	<100m	Likely	Schedule 2 not EIA development.	Potential to have cumulative effects. Scoped into shortlist.	Yes
B45	RU.17/1815	Hybrid application comprising: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redevelopment of west site (including demolition of all existing buildings) to provide 212 x one-, two-, three-, four- and five-bedroom houses and flats and 116 x one- and two-bedroom retirement apartments in two-, three- and four-storey buildings served by new access onto Stoneleigh Road (outline planning application, all matters reserved) Construction of three-storey acute care wing connected to existing hospital; 	Approved	Yes	1	350m	Likely	Schedule 2 not 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?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 72 x one-, two- and four-bedroom key worker dwellings in 6 x three-storey buildings served by new access onto Holloway Hill; ▪ Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 72 x one-, two- and four-bedroom key worker dwellings in 8 x three-storey buildings ▪ Erection of single-storey building and infilling at basement level to provide new staff restaurant and 1,500m² of retail floorspace; ▪ Redevelopment of car park to provide three-storey/six-deck multi-storey car park together with alterations to internal road layout; and ▪ Erection of detached two-storey workshop building together with alterations to car park 								
B46	RU.18/0796	Development of 155 dwellings, new access road to the south of Hanworth Lane, open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage systems (Site A) and for the formation of sports pitches, associated earthworks and pavilion with associated access, car parking and landscaping (Site B).	Screening Opinion Received	Yes	3	Intersecting with SLP	Not known	Schedule 2 not EIA development.	Insufficient information.	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?
B47	RU.17/0793	Development for up to 1,400 dwellings, a primary school, 3,210m ² of commercial space (restaurants, retail, public house), 930m ² of community space, publicly accessible open space, landscaping, ecological habitats, and access. SANG will be provided on site, which will link to Trumps Farm.	Scoping Opinion received	Yes	2	0.4km	Likely	Schedule 2 EIA development.	Potential to have cumulative effects. Scoped into shortlist	Yes
B48	RU.18/0443	Outline planning application for the erection of up to 52 dwellings (including affordable housing), vehicular access from Pretoria Road, emergency access from Hanworth Lane, open space, landscaping including Sustainable Drainage System and all necessary ground works. All matters reserved except for means of access, layout and scale.'	Application Registered	Yes	1	0.2km	Likely	Schedule 2 not EIA development.	Not expected to generate cumulative effects due to the scale of the proposed scheme	No
B49	RU.17/1749	Erection of up to 200 residential dwellings (class C3) with vehicular access onto Bittams Lane, associated landscaping and public open space	Application Registered	Yes	1	0.7km	Likely	Schedule 2 EIA development.	Potential to have cumulative effects. Scoped into shortlist	Yes
Surrey County Council										
B65	12/01132/SC C	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 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	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?
		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.								
Spelthorne Borough Council										
B66	15/00140/FUL	Provision of educational facilities for Brooklands College and joint use sports facilities for Brooklands College and Thomas Knyvett College including the erection of a two-storey building and relocation and upgrading of existing multi-use games area together with associated access, parking and landscaping works.	Approved	Yes	1	320m	Likely	Schedule 2 not EIA development.	Potential to have cumulative effects. Scoped into shortlist	Yes
B67	16/00196/FUL	Demolition of existing commercial building and erection of a part three-storey, part four-storey residential development comprising 26 flats (7 no. one-bed, 17 no. two-bed and 2 no. three-bed) together with associated parking and amenity space. Reconfiguration of existing office car park and installation of car stackers.	Approved	Yes	1	0 - 500m	No, already constructed.	N/A	Scoped out of cumulative assessment as it is already constructed.	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?
B68	17/00358/PDO	Prior approval for change of use from office (Use Class B1a) to provide 50 residential units (Use Class C3) comprising one-bed flats.	Approve	Yes	1	0 - 500m	No, already constructed.	N/A	Scoped out of cumulative assessment as it is already constructed.	No
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 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.	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?
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 demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings.	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
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	N			No

ID	Name of the Local Plan	Development Description	Long List	Tier	Reason for Scoping In / Out	Shortlisted ?
		Surrey County Council Minerals Safeguarded Areas map				
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/SCA1	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/SCC	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 11/01086/SCC (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 the project. This site as already been taken as a	No



ID	Name of the Local Plan	Development Description	Long List	Tier	Reason for Scoping In / Out	Shortlisted ?
					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	Associate d Planning Applicatio n SP16/011 64/SCRV C Considere d as 12/01132/ SCC	This site as already been taken as a baseline in Chapter 11 Soils and Geology.	No