

# Southampton to London Pipeline Project

## Deadline 6

Signed SoCG with Winchester City Council

Application Document: 8.4.32

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**

**Winchester City Council**

Date: March 2020

Application Document Reference: B2325300-JAC-000-COE-REP-000280



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

Signed	[Redacted]
Printed Name	Steve Cornwell
Position	Principal Planning Officer
On behalf of	Winchester City Council
Date	

## Contents

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>2</b>
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
<b>2.</b>	<b>Record of engagement undertaken to date</b> .....	<b>4</b>
2.1	Pre-application Engagement and Consultation.....	4
2.2	Engagement Following Submission of Application.....	7
<b>3.</b>	<b>Matters agreed</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Matters not agreed</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Matters subject to on-going discussion</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Relevant documents and drawings</b> .....	<b>15</b>
6.1	List of relevant documents and drawings.....	15
<b>7.</b>	<b>Appendix A</b> .....	<b>16</b>
7.1	Response to Preferred Route Consultation.....	16
<b>8.</b>	<b>Appendix B</b> .....	<b>20</b>
8.1	Response to Design Refinements Consultation.....	20
<b>9.</b>	<b>Appendix C</b> .....	<b>23</b>
9.1	Long list of DCO/Other Developments considered in the Cumulative Effects Assessment.....	23

## 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 14 May 2019.

### 1.3 This Statement of Common Ground

1.3.1 This SoCG has been prepared jointly by Esso as the applicant and Winchester City Council as a prescribed consultee and Local Authority as defined within the Local Government Act 2000. Winchester City Council has interests in the SLP Project, as a Local Planning Authority, and as a service provider to its businesses and residents.

1.3.2 For the purpose of this SoCG, Esso and Winchester City Council will jointly be referred to as the “Parties”. When referencing Winchester City Council 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 and correspondence.

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
04/12/2017	Correspondence	Project introduction	The project sent a letter to planning team at the Authority regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map of current route</li> <li>• Project timeline</li> <li>• Project introduction</li> </ul>
Dec 2017	Correspondence	Enquiry	The Authority's Head of Development Management contacted to confirm who had been consulted at the Council and whether SLP project had engaged with SDNPA.
19/01/2018	Hampshire Officers Forum	Project introduction	The Authority's Planning Officer was not able to attend
19/01/2018	Hampshire Members Forum	Project introduction	One of the Authority's elected representatives attended and was briefed on the project.
07/02/2018	Workshop	Environmental Forum	Invitation to environmental forum issued but the Authority's officer was not able to attend.
23/02/2018	Hampshire Officers Forum	Project update	One of the Authority's Officers attended the forum meeting and was briefed on the project and proposed engagement processes.
23/02/2018	Hampshire Members Forum	Project update	The Authority's elected representative was not able to attend.
01/03/2018	Briefing note	Non-statutory consultation	Briefing note sent to all Local Authorities and councillors of wards/elected members within each corridor option.
02/03/2018	Correspondence	Follow-up	Further correspondence with the Authority Officers on availability of information and communication with elected Members.
02/03/2018	Correspondence	Data request	Liaison with the Authority over GIS and other data requested for the project.
15/03/2018	Correspondence	Commitment to Community Consultation – early view	Email sent to the Authority containing Commitment to Community Consultation (CtCC), and details of councillors that will be notified ahead of launch

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
19/03/2018	Correspondence	Non-statutory (Corridor) consultation launch	The project sent the Authority two letters: 1) Notification of launch letter (as a potential future statutory consultee) 2) Draft CtCC with a separate cover letter The Authority did not respond to the consultation.
18/04/2018	Meeting	Archaeology	Meeting with Authority's Archaeologist on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corridor consultation;</li> <li>• heritage assessment;</li> <li>• survey strategy; and</li> <li>• mitigation approaches.</li> </ul>
02/05/2018	Correspondence	Pre-preferred corridor announcement	The project called the Authority to explain how the preferred corridor would be selected and how it would be announced to stakeholders. The Parties also discussed next steps following the preferred corridor announcement re: route development and environmental scoping. The Authority made suggestions for engagement with members.
03/05/2018	Workshop	Meeting to explain the project's ecology survey strategy, with the council ecologists	Meeting attended by the Authority's Ecology Officer and other Council ecologists to discuss approach to project, including surveys and assessments.
25/05/2018	Hampshire Officers Forum	Update	A planning officer from the Authority attended the forum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presented the findings of the non-statutory Corridor Consultation and explained how the preferred corridor had been selected</li> <li>• Details of the preferred corridor announcement were shared</li> </ul>
25/05/2018	Hampshire Members Forum	Update	The Authority's elected representative was not able to attend.
30/05/2018	Correspondence	Preferred corridor announcement	The Authority was sent a letter as a key stakeholder regarding the preferred corridor that was selected
27/06/2018	Correspondence	Initial Working Route	Project update regarding Initial Working Route release
09/07/2018	Consultation	Draft Statement of Community Consultation	The draft Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) was issued for statutory consultation to the Authority.



Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
Various dates In August 2018	Workshop	EIA Scoping	Invitation was issued on the 17 July 2018 to the main point of contact at the Authority. Several dates were offered. The Authority's Officer was not able to attend. The workshops supported the Planning Inspectorate's scoping consultation.
24/08/2018	Hampshire Officers Forum	Update	The Authority's Planning Officer was not able to attend.
24/08/2018	Hampshire Members Forum	Update	The Authority's elected representative was not able to attend.
06/09/2018	Correspondence	Launch of statutory consultation (Preferred Route)	The project sent the Authority a notification of launch letter (as a statutory consultee), in line with the Planning Act 2008.
19/10/2018	Correspondence	Statutory consultation (Preferred Route) response	The Authority responded to the Statutory consultation. A copy is enclosed at Appendix A. The Council commented on the measures undertaken in route selection to avoid potential ecological and archaeological impacts, and requested further information and discussion of mitigation measures, including best practice construction techniques.
03/12/2018	Meeting	Update	Briefing meeting with a Planning Officer from the Authority, jointly with Officers from Hampshire County and Eastleigh Borough Councils. Briefing provided on progress with the application, feedback from the Preferred Route Consultation and potential for a targeted consultation.
03/01/2019	Briefing Note	Next steps – second statutory (Design Refinements) consultation	Sent to planning officers and councillors/ members. Provided an overview of the targeted 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.
17/01/2019	Meeting	Workshop	Historic Environment workshop with council officers and Historic England, attended by the Authority's historic environment officer. Meeting discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• project update;</li> <li>• baseline data;</li> <li>• archaeological potential;</li> <li>• assessment methodology;</li> <li>• mitigation.</li> </ul>

Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
18/01/2019	Correspondence	Launch of second statutory (Design Refinements) consultation	The project sent the Authority a notification of launch letter (as a statutory consultee), complying with the approach set out the in SoCC).
18/02/2019	Correspondence	Response to second statutory (Design Refinements) consultation	The Authority responded to the consultation, with comments on the proposed logistics hub at Ropley Dean, including suggestions on how any impacts could be mitigated. A copy of the Council's response is included at Appendix B.
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.
07/05/2019	Correspondence	General correspondence	The Authority's Planning Officer emailed to raise a number of questions on the DCO proposals, ahead of a planned meeting. Responses were provided.
14/05/2019	Meeting	Progress meeting	Project update meeting with a Planning Officer from the Authority, and Officers from Hampshire County Council.

## 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.

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.
21/05/2019	Correspondence	General Correspondence	Enquiry from the Authority's Planning Officer with questions ahead of a Committee meeting. Information provided.
06/06/2019	Correspondence	Consulting the project on planning applications	The project requested that the Authority consult it on planning applications where relevant.



Date	Format	Topic	Discussion Points
10/06/2019	Correspondence	Safe-guarding	The project confirmed with the Authority that it had been granted safeguarding and that it would be required to consult the project.
11/06/2019	Correspondence	Adequacy of Consultation	The Authority responded to PINS on the adequacy of consultation.
24/09/2019	Meeting	Discussion of submitted DCO application	The project met with the Authority's Planning Officer to discuss comments on the submitted DCO application, including on the proposals for hedgerow removal and reinstatement and the potential impacts arising from the operation of the proposed Logistics Hub at Ropley Dean. It was agreed that the Applicant would issue a draft SoCG taking account of these comments for the Authority to review.
05/11/2019	Correspondence	Launch of consultation on reducing temporary logistics hubs	Correspondence issued to Authority on the consultation.
07/01/2020	Meeting	Archaeological trial trench programme	Meeting with the Authority's Archaeologist to discuss and agree trial trenching plans and programme, and the related Written Scheme of Investigation.
23/01/2020	Meeting	Project Update Meeting	Meeting with the Authority's Planning Officer to discuss Esso's Outline plans to be submitted at Deadline 4, and updating the SoCG.

### 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
Planning Policy	National Policy Statements (NPSs)  Development Plan	<p>The relevant NPSs are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)</li> <li>• National Policy Statement for Gas Supply Infrastructure and Gas and Oil Pipelines (EN-4)</li> </ul> <p>While the assessment of the application for development consent should be made against the NPSs, it is agreed that the Development Plan for Winchester District comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy (adopted jointly by Winchester and the SDNPA)</li> <li>• Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations (adopted by Winchester only)</li> <li>• Hampshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan</li> </ul>
The Need and Principle of Proposed Development and Examination of Alternative Routes	General	The Authority has no objection to proposed Order Limits and Limits of Deviation that define the proposed pipeline route, as proposed in the SLP Project's application for development consent.
	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 during the Preferred Route Consultation and the Design Refinements Consultation.</p> <p>The Authority gave its full opinion and comments regarding the pipeline route in its statutory consultation responses.</p>
	General	<p>The project and the Authority have met at appropriate times since the project launch in December 2017.</p> <p>The Authority is satisfied that the consultation and engagement with its officers, members and residents has been robust and meaningful and in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.</p>
Biodiversity	Environmental Impact Assessment	The Authority is satisfied that there are no residual effects on biodiversity receptors provided that the ecological mitigation measures and commitments identified in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement ( <b>Application document App-056</b> ) are implemented.

Construction Effects on People and Communities	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 in the District.
	Development Land	The Authority is satisfied that the Applicant has and continues to take account of development sites within the District, and is working with the respective landowners and developers to avoid or mitigate potential impacts.
The Draft Development Consent Order	Discharge of Requirements	The Authority is satisfied that Schedule 2 of the draft DCO ( <b>Additional Submission AS-059</b> ) provides a suitable framework for its approval of those further plans requiring discharge prior to the commencement of development, including the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP).
	Property	There is no Authority owned property within the Order Limits affected by the DCO proposals.
Flooding and Water		The Authority has no comments on this topic, provided that the relevant commitments set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments are secured by draft DCO Requirements.
Security and Safety		The Authority has no comments on this topic, provided that the relevant commitments set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments are secured through draft DCO Requirements.
Highways and transport	Highways	The Authority is satisfied with the project's approach to highway crossings and street works in its district.
Noise, air quality and disturbance during construction		The Authority is satisfied that the relevant commitments set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments and the Code of Construction Practice are secured through draft DCO Requirements. The Authority is satisfied that Schedule 2 of the draft DCO ( <b>Additional Submission AS-059</b> ) provides a suitable framework for its approval of those further plans requiring discharge prior to the commencement of development.
Logistics Hubs	Logistics hub at Ropley Dean	The Authority raised concerns regarding the potential temporary impacts on local residents arising from the operation of the originally proposed temporary Ropley Dean logistics hub. However, Esso submitted a change to the Planning Inspectorate to remove this, and the change was accepted by the Examining Authority on 6 Feb 2020 ( <b>Examination Document PD-014</b> ). The Authority confirms that the removal of the Ropley Dean hub overcomes any concerns it previously had.
Biodiversity Landscape and visual impacts	Removal and reinstatement of hedgerows	The Authority wishes to ensure that the removal and reinstatement of hedgerows within the District is carefully controlled and managed so as to avoid or reduce potential biodiversity and landscape/visual impacts. The Authority is concerned that temporary impacts may occur before reinstatement planting matures. Esso has made detailed commitments relating to tree and hedgerow removal and reinstatement and considers that the implementation of



		<p>these measures is secured through the requirements set out in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted an Outline LEMP at Deadline 4.</p> <p>In so far as this relates to actions associated with the removal and replanting of the gaps, the Authority has reviewed the Outline LEMP and the example vegetation removal and reinstatement plans. The Authority confirms it is satisfied that Requirement 8 and the submission of the final LEMP for its approval, secured by DCO Requirement 12, will adequately and appropriately control reinstatement proposals.</p> <p>However, the above does not address the Authority's concerns over loss of landscape features or biodiversity value whilst the new planting re-established itself back to the condition of the original vegetation. This remains a not agreed matter, as detailed below.</p>
<p>Methodology for EIA including assessment of cumulative effects</p>	<p>Environmental Impact Assessment</p>	<p>The Authority is satisfied that the Environmental Impact Assessment is proportionate to the scale and likely impacts of the project in the District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scope and methods of the ecological surveys are appropriate</li> <li>• The mitigation is appropriate</li> <li>• The identification and assessment of effects on biodiversity assets is appropriate</li> </ul>
	<p>Environmental Impact Assessment</p>	<p>The Authority agrees that the list of developments and allocations within its District, considered in the cumulative effects assessment and reported in Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement (and enclosed at Appendix C), is satisfactory.</p>

## 4. Matters not agreed

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

Table 4.1: Matters not agreed

Examining Authority's suggested themes	Topic	Matter not agreed
Historic Environment	Archaeology	<p>Esso, through discussions with the Authority, considers that it has reached agreement with the Authority on the following matters. The Authority's Archaeological Officer has not yet confirmed this position:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the methods used for the historic environment assessment in the Environmental Statement is appropriate</li> <li>• the baseline used for the historic environment assessment is appropriate</li> <li>• the scope and methods of the geophysical survey is appropriate</li> <li>• none of the predicted residual effects are equivalent to substantial harm or less than substantial harm</li> <li>• the proposed embedded mitigation strategy is appropriate</li> <li>• the approach to the pre-construction mitigation proposed in the Archeological Mitigation Strategy [ES Appendix 9.5 - 5(2)(a)] and the Code of Construction Practice [ES Appendix 16.2 - 5(2)(a)] is appropriate</li> <li>• the approach to the construction mitigation proposed in the Archeological Mitigation Strategy [ES Appendix 9.5 - 5(2)(a)] and the Code of Construction Practice [ES Appendix 16.2 - 5(2)(a)] is appropriate.</li> <li>• the approach to the post-construction mitigation proposed in the Archeological Mitigation Strategy [ES Appendix 9.5 - 5(2)(a)] and the Code of Construction Practice [ES Appendix 16.2 - 5(2)(a)] is appropriate.</li> </ul>
Biodiversity Landscape and Visual Impacts	Removal and reinstatement of hedgerows	<p>The Authority is seeking some mitigation for the loss of landscape features and biodiversity value that it considers will occur as the existing mature hedgerows are removed. Whilst the replanting will fill the gaps the Authority considers it will take years for the new planting to recover to the same level of landscape presence or biodiversity value that formerly existed. The Authority is concerned that if trees cannot be planted due to technical reasons, then the landscape/biodiversity value will never recover. The Authority has estimated the level of hedgerow loss to be 210m of hedgerow from 11 crossings. The Authority is aware of an intention to undertake some hedgerow enhancement but the first site offering this enhancement is to the north in the National</p>



	<p>Park. The Authority feels one or two areas should be identified in its section of the pipeline for enhancement work.</p> <p>Esso does not accept that additional mitigation for the removal and reinstatement of hedgerows in Winchester district is required, based on its assessment of the landscape and biodiversity effects as set out in the submitted Environmental Statement. Esso has committed to a maximum of 10m width of hedgerow removal, which would equate to a maximum of 210m for the 21 crossings within Winchester District. Esso has committed to full reinstatement of hedgerows.</p> <p>In addition, and as clarified at the Issue Specific Hearing on 26 February, it is Esso’s intention to reinstate any trees removed at or in the vicinity of the location of the removed tree. Where a tree cannot be replaced within the pipeline easement, shrub planting would be implemented within the easement, in addition to the replacement of the removed tree in the vicinity (for example, shrubs can be planted within the full 10m width, and trees can be within the 10m but located either side of the 6.3m easement). This clarification will be included within the documents to be submitted at Deadline 6. The Applicant considers that additional mitigation such as is being sought by the Authority is not justified or required as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, Esso is however willing to engage with the Authority to discuss measures such as hedgerow planting that could potentially be included within its Environmental Investment Programme (EIP). As has been explained to the Authority and Examination, the EIP is a voluntary programme being undertaken by Esso, that is not required by or related to the DCO.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------





## 5. Matters subject to on-going discussion

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

Table 5.1: Matters subject to on-going discussion

Examining Authority's suggested themes	Topic	Matter subject to ongoing discussion

## 6. Relevant documents and drawings

### 6.1 List of relevant documents and drawings

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

Table 6.1: Schedule of relevant documents

Application Reference	Title	Content	Date
EN070005 Document 6.1	Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary	Overview of the Environmental Statement	14 May 2019
EN070005 Document 6.2	Environmental Statement	Report of the Environmental Impact Assessment	14 May 2019
EN070005 Document 6.3	Environmental Statement Figures	Illustrative material to support the Environmental Statement	14 May 2019
EN070005 Document 6.4	Environmental Statement Appendices	Additional data and evidence to support the Environmental Statement	14 May 2019
EN070005 Document 7.1	Planning Statement	Assessment of the application against National Policy Statements EN-1 Energy and EN-4 Oil and Gas Pipelines	14 May 2019

## 7. Appendix A

### 7.1 Response to Preferred Route Consultation

This response is made on behalf of Winchester City Council (WCC). and as such it is only appropriate to comment on that section of the route which would run through the administrative area of the local authority. Furthermore, these comments do not relate to that section of the route which runs through the South Downs National Park (SDNP) where it falls within the boundary of the WCC area. The SDNP authority have been informed of this approach. I understand that they hold a copy of the consultation documents and will respond as appropriate. As a consequence; the relevant area of the route on which these comments will focus is that section which enters the district after crossing the River Hamble up to the point where the route crosses the Winchester Road at Bishops Waltham and then enters the national park.

The consultation documents consist of following two documents. The first entitled Replacement Pipeline Route Consultation: Pipeline Corridor Map Book and the second entitled Replacement Pipeline Route Consultation: Securing aviation fuel supplies in South East England.

Whilst the details of the route have been refined since the first consultation at stage 2 of the project, the level of detail is still very general and this response reflects that lack of detail. Comments have been made on matters that you may already have in hand but it is felt better to raise them now than have to reply at the next stage.

I have approached the following officers within the authority to seek to co- ordinate a combined response.

- Archaeological Officer
- Conservation Officer
- Ecology Officer
- Environmental Health Officer
- Head of Drainage
- Highway Officer
- Landscape Officer
- Strategic Planning Policy Officer
- Tree Officer

Comments have been received from some of these officers and I have set them out below for you to view and take note of. The Archaeological officer s views are perhaps those which require most attention.

In addition to the points raised by individual officers below, I do have a number of general comments.

If I understand the Development Consent Order procedure correctly, then in the event permission is granted and the inspector imposed any conditions that require the submission and agreement of further details, that role falls to the local planning authority. With a project that involves multiple authorities, it seems sensible to avoid (as much as possible) any requirement to make further submissions. Accordingly, can I suggest that the application submission and any code of practice and other best practice documents are as detailed as possible. This would then result in conditions stating " Undertake development in accordance with approved details....." rather than " Before any development commences....."

Where trenchless crossings are proposed to rivers, any details should include noise levels from drilling equipment and the operating times. If the drilling cannot be completed within normal working hours then full details of any night time operations need to be set out and any mitigation measures proposed to the site and for any nearby sensitive property.

I do not know what depth you would take the pipe below the river bed but consideration should be given to the possibility of any drilling fluids escaping from the bore and emerging through the river bed as well as the general measures to be adopted to ensure fluids are captured and safely disposed of in the launch pit and reception pit. Whilst fluids such as bentonite may be inert if they escape into a water course in a concentrated fashion they can have an adverse impact on its ecology.

The Code of Practice or a separate document needs to set out the methodology on how the construction workforce will be informed and "signed up" to the low impact approach that the project is proposing to adopt.

Engagement with the local community needs to be set out the full, detailing of all the measures to be adopted during the phase leading up to work commencing and then during the working phase itself. The nomination of named contacts should be considered.

The intention to reduce the disturbance to any field boundary by narrowing the area of disruption to a gap of 10m is noted. However, whilst it could be argued that each gap has a "low impact" there is a cumulative impact to consider if those spaces are all added together. This needs to be considered in the ecological and landscape impacts with proposals for additional mitigation beyond just replanting each gap where a valued section of hedge is removed. Measures to increase biodiversity and landscape character beyond simply replanting up the gaps.

**Ecology Officer response:**

I met with Jacobs, with ecologists representing East Hans and Hart & Rushmoor back in May to discuss the ecological impact assessment and the scope of survey, the potential for significant effects (and the relevant features potentially susceptible to such effects), mitigation, and enhancement opportunities.

I understand the project will be subject to a Development Consent Order (DCO), and the application will be accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) under the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process, and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) which we will review when it is submitted.

The pipeline will be constructed following good industry practice, following the existing route along much of the route, with the use of open cut trenches, and directional drilling being used to avoid particularly sensitive features. All areas subject to construction activity will be reinstated on a like-for-like basis unless agreed otherwise.

I assume Natural England and the relevant ecological officers elsewhere in Hampshire, as well as in Surrey and London will be consulted in the same manner.

**Archaeological Officer response:**

WCC section (Land NE of Boorley Green to Winchester Road, Bishops Waltham)

Unlikely to have any objections in principle to the preferred route for this nationally significant infrastructure project, however detailed information on the impact of the project on buried archaeological remains has yet to be submitted for review.

The pipeline requires a maximum 30m easement, with trenchless construction techniques used for crossing major roads and watercourses. The proposed pipeline will result in a permanent adverse effect on buried archaeological remains along the proposed route; as such archaeological mitigation work will be required. Where the route runs along existing roads there are unlikely to be archaeological issues.

The proposed route avoids designated archaeological sites, and following the construction stage there would be no permanent effects upon the setting of any nearby Scheduled Monument.

To date, discussions with the archaeological consultant (Jacobs) have focused on a broad archaeological strategy. An archaeological desk-based assessment (DBA) has been carried out; however this has not yet been supplied for review. Discussions have taken place in relation to archaeological surveys (e.g. geophysical survey) and intrusive site investigations, both at a pre-decision stage and post consent.

However, without sight of the DBA and the results of geophysical survey, it is difficult to understand the full impacts of the proposal and identify areas where further archaeological mitigation work may be required (whether pre- or post-consent).

During previous discussions with Jacobs, the need to plan for sufficient time and resources to undertake required archaeological mitigation work along the pipeline route has been stressed.

#### **Environmental Health Officer response**

Comments sent directly to Jacobs. This was purely to provide information and was not offering a consultation response.

I think we would be particularly interested in an assessment of the noise implications for residents, particularly around construction. For example, considering hours of operation, methods of excavation, duration of noise exposure and communication with residents

#### **Highway Officer Response:**

Anticipate that Hampshire County Council Highway officers will respond.

#### **Landscape Officer response**

There are no landscape concerns with this project. The pipeline will enter the south of the District near Hill Farm in Durley before entering the SDNP just to the west of Bishops Waltham. In many places the route will follow the existing pipeline which is being replaced. Every effort has been made to avoid priority habitat, areas of ancient woodland and other important environmental assets.

The works will involve a temporary working zone of, in places, up to 30m wide to allow for the movement of diggers and lorries etc. Some roads will be burrowed under but other minor roads will have an open trench dug which will necessitate some small road closures. Rivers will be burrowed beneath. The only features which will remain after the works are complete will be small inconspicuous transformer cabinets, small fenced compounds containing valve enclosures and marker posts in the verges and hedges.

**Landscape and visual impact are considered to be negligible.**

#### **Strategic Planning Policy Response:**

The proposed route of the pipeline could affect some of the sites which have been put forward in the SHELAA (strategic housing and economic land availability assessment) but it will be for the owners of the land to make their own representations on this as the council has no commitment to supporting the development of any of these sites at the present time.



**Section A – Boorley Green to Bramdean (Replacement Pipeline Route Consultation).**

The route of the proposed pipeline runs close to the western edge of BW5 which is a site allocated for employment in LPP2. This site is known as the Tollgate Sawmill Employment Allocation is allocated for employment and also a limited amount of market housing to enable a viable employment development and the restoration of Tollgate House which is not listed but is a locally valued building. The Council would have concerns/objections if the routing of the pipeline or any easement prejudiced the ability to develop BW5.

End.

## 8. Appendix B

### 8.1 Response to Design Refinements Consultation

This is the response of Winchester City Council relating to the design refinements consultation. There do not appear to be any proposed refinements to the routing detail as previously considered by the authority. Accordingly, the focus of these comments will be on the proposal to create a Temporary Logistical Hub off the A31 at Ropley Dean. This site lies just inside the Winchester City Council boundary with East Hampshire DC. The details of the proposed hub are set out in the consultation document. A red lined plan is provided on page 23 that shows an access leading north from the A31 and then broadening out into an irregular shaped area.

The eastern edge of this area represents the boundary of the district. The level of detail presented at this stage is very general in terms of how the hub would operate. An indicative diagram is provided on page 21 that shows a typical layout with reference to storage, office, welfare facilities with space for plant/equipment to be stored and maintained. On the basis there is no reference to any form of residential or sleeping accommodation being provided, or space being allocated to allow caravans to be brought onto the site, it is assumed these are not intended to be part of the proposal. Reference is made for the need to provide security to the site in the form of a secure fenced off boundary with the provision of a security service and the use of floodlights. A need for the facility for a period of two years is quoted with additional time for establishment and de-commissioning.

#### **Proposed Hub Site**

The proposed hub site lies on the northern side of the road some 260m east of the roundabout of the A31 & B3047. The site access would utilise a set of double gates that currently serve an agricultural building located in an excavated area. The double gates sit back from the road separated from it by a verge, split by a path. A hedge lies at the back of the highway limit to both sides of the access. The depth of the verge seems greater to the east than the west. Ground levels appear to be falling from north to south and this is reflected in the current excavated area that is referred to above. The main site for the compound appears to be sloping ground.

An existing track runs up the western side of the excavation from the gates under the overhanging branched of a mature tree to another set of double gates. This access track climbs the slope. The gates providing access into a field. This field has hedge boundaries with some trees.

#### **Consultee Responses**

The following officers within the council have responded within the available timeframe. Please note that the Archaeological officer has a brief to advise the SDNP authority hence that comments makes reference to the pipeline route.

#### **Archaeology officer:**

No objection in principle to the minor route change (addition / connection at Wolfhanger Farm) in WCC (SDNP) area; also no objection in principle to the proposed temporary hub at A31, Ropley Dean. The projected route of a Roman road lies in this area, however the impact of the proposed temporary hub could be mitigated through a programme of archaeological investigation and recording.

I (and other archaeological advisors along the proposed route) have now received copies of a draft Desk-Top Study and a Geophysical survey (covering sections of the proposed route) which we are currently considering.



I would recommend undertaking further geophysical survey of the proposed temporary hub sites (subject to access agreements) at this stage.

**Ecology Officer**

There are some mature trees on the perimeter of the (hub) site. There are no other identified environmental sensitivities. At this stage we do not consider there to be any likely significant ecological effects associated with this logistics hub

**Environmental Protection Officer**

No adverse comments from Environmental Protection.

**Landscape Officer**

The landscape has some value for its unspoilt rural character and natural beauty, particularly as one approaches the small settlement of Ropley Dean from the west. This rural character diminishes however as one gets closer to Ropley Dean. The proposed site for the hub is just outside the urbanised area beyond the street lights, the 40 mph zone, the petrol filling station and the Ropley Business Park and is considered to have medium sensitivity to development. Landscape impact would be moderate and development of a temporary 'hub' could be accommodated without changing landscape character.

The site slopes up from the road but is not excessively prominent in views being set behind a wide roadside verge and a mature roadside hedgerow. Views from the west are influenced by the presence of the farm buildings at Sunnybank Farm. There is scope to reinforce the boundary hedgerows with native species and evergreen species (Yew ?) which would help minimise visual impacts particularly night time impacts.

**Local Planning Authority Response**

The planning policy framework is provided by the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 adopted March 2013 and LPP2 adopted April 2017.

The following policies are found in these plans:

- Policy MTRA4 Development in the Countryside
- Policy CP16 Biodiversity
- Policy CP17 Flooding, Flood Risk and the Water Environment
- Policy CP20 Heritage and Landscape Character

**LPP2**

- DM15 Local Distinctiveness
- DM16 Site Design Criteria
- DM17 Site Development Principles
- DM18 Access and Parking
- DM19 Development and Pollution
- DM20 Development and Noise
- DM23 Rural Character
- DM26 Archaeology

I have considered the proposed temporary logistical hub in the context of the policies listed above. The site does not carry any landscape or ecological designations. When considering the temporary nature of the facility, there is no in principle objection to the proposal. However, the choice of the site as proposed is not





without its difficulties specifically those associated with coping with the change in ground levels that climb from the junction with the A31 up the access track into the main site itself. The following matters are considered to require further attention and might, if not satisfactorily resolved, raise questions over the choice of this location. The use of the site does need further investigation to ensure that its use is acceptable in principle in terms of environmental, landscape, amenity and highway considerations. It cannot be assumed they can be left to be resolved by requirements post decision. The following matters need consideration to establish the principle:

- Access and egress needs to be reviewed so that the necessary visibility can be achieved. If adequate visibility is not achievable, then consideration should be given to traffic light controlled access.
- The ability of one vehicle to pass another on the section of track just off the main road needs to be reviewed. Is there adequate room?
- How the site will be established in the context of the existing ground levels and proposed ground levels; how they will affect access by heavy vehicles and plant and where the resultant soil will be placed.
- If the proposal is to have the hub open 24 x 7 then it needs to be shown that it can operate without causing adverse amenity to nearby residents.

The following matters also need consideration

- Any work to the access track should consider the potential impact on the adjoining mature tree in terms of soil compaction.
- The surface of the first part of any access needs to be of bonded so no material is dragged out onto the main road.
- Any secured compound perimeter fencing should be positioned away from the perimeter hedges and trees offering an undeveloped area to ensure the hedgerow and trees are not impacted by the proposal.
- The extent of any ground levelling needs to be clarified and whether the opportunity exists for a two tier site to be formed.
- The storage of any soils arising from levelling operations needs to be considered in terms of its location, that it is not stored under any trees or up against hedgerows and how it is consolidated and treated/seeded to prevent run off and weed formation.
- Groundwater needs protecting with specific measures adopted regarding those areas where fuels etc are stored and where any vehicle/plant is to be parked or maintained.
- There is no indication of the hours that the hub would be open. An appropriate noise report will be required to support whatever level of activity is proposed.
- Measures to control dust and the management of any waste need to be considered.
- A clear restoration scheme is needed for the site to be returned to agricultural use.

Statement of Community Consultation

The Statement of Community Consultation will need to be refined to add relevant parties who may be affected or interested in this temporary facility.

End.

WCC

18 February 2019



## 9. Appendix C

### 9.1 Long list of DCO/Other Developments considered in the Cumulative Effects Assessment

Table 7.1 Long list of DCO/Other Development 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	UK Government is expected to announce the next stage of the process for securing a private sector developer in early	Yes	3	>500m	No published timetable. However, if operation is due to commence in	Schedule 1 EIA development	Potential to have cumulative effects.	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?
		Water and Staines with Heathrow Terminal 5.	2019. Expected to become operational between 2025-2027.				2025, construction could overlap with the project construction timescale.		Scoped 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.	<p><b>Otterbourne Water Supply Works:</b> To submit planning application in March 2019. Expected to start construction in winter 2019 and end in spring 2020.</p> <p><b>Portsmouth Flood Alleviation:</b> Complete.</p> <p><b>Woolston Wastewater Treatment Works:</b> In construction and due for completion in summer 2019.</p> <p><b>South Hampshire (The Itchen, Candover and Testwood Water Abstraction):</b> Public Inquiry has now concluded</p>	Yes	1	Nearest is Portswood WTW at 7km	Yes, Otterbourne WSW and South Hampshire and Portsmouth WTW could have overlapping construction timescales with the project.	Schedule 1 EIA development	No direct receptor source pathway identified due to distance from the project. Scoped out of shortlist	No



ID_1	Name of Development	Description	Status	Long List	Tier	Distance from the Project	Temporal Scope / Overlap with Project Timescales	Scale and Nature of Development	Reason for Scoping In / Out	Short listed?
			and further plans are being drawn up. <b>Portswold Wastewater Treatment Works:</b> Construction activities are currently underway and due for completion in March 2025.							
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 7.2 Major Planning Applications

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?
Hampshire County Council										
B15	15/00188/HC C	Construction of a single-storey standalone extension to allow the school to expand to a two-form entry primary school. A number of internal alterations to the existing school will be carried out to facilitate the expansion. Additional parking spaces will also be provided to accommodate the increased staff numbers.	Approved	Yes	1	0 - 500m	No, already constructed.	N/A	Scoped out as it is already constructed.	No
B16	CS/17/81226	Construction of a bypass for Botley, providing a connection from Station Hill (A334/A3051 junction) to Woodhouse Lane together with associated improvements/enabling works to Woodhouse Lane	Approved	Yes	1	0 - 500m	Likely	Schedule 1 EIA development	Potential to have cumulative effects. Scoped into shortlist.	Yes
B17	CS/18/82664	Development of the site for a new two-form entry primary school, consisting of a two-storey building with single-storey kitchen/plantroom attached, inclusion of a grass sports pitch and hard courts as well as staff car parking	Approved	Yes	1	0 - 500m	Likely	Schedule 2 not EIA development	Potential to have cumulative effects. Scoped into shortlist.	Yes
Winchester City Council										
B75	15/00387/SC REEN	Proposed site to be used as a builders' merchant	Screening Opinion received	Yes	3	500m - 1km	Not known	Schedule 2 not EIA development	Insufficient information. Scoped out.	No
B76	16/00053/SC REEN	Proposed development at the Vineyard and land to the east of Tangier Lane, Bishop's Waltham. In relation to the development of 120 homes.	Screening Opinion received	Yes	3	500m - 1km	Not known	Schedule 2 not EIA development	Insufficient information. Scoped out.	No



ID	Name of Development	Description (based on information from the planning portal)	Status	Long List	Tier	Distance from the Project	Temporal Scope / Overlap with Project Timescales	Scale and Nature of Development	Reason for Scoping In / Out	Shortlisted?
B77	16/01322/FUL	Erection of 66 dwellings with associated access via Albany Road, associated parking, landscaping and public open space (Phase 1).	Approved	Yes	1	0 - 500m	Likely	Schedule 2 not EIA development	Not expected to generate cumulative effects due to the scale of the proposed scheme. Scoped out.	No
B78	13/02469/FUL	Demolition of existing barn and erection of indoor sand school; stabling and horse welfare facilities.	Approved	Yes	1	0 - 500m	Likely	Schedule 2 not EIA development	Not expected to generate cumulative effects due to the scale of the proposed scheme. Scoped out.	No
B79	15/00053/OUT	Outline Planning Application (all matters reserved except access): Erection of about 120 dwellings (including affordable housing), including provision of vehicular and pedestrian access, landscape and ecology management, parking, secure cycle storage and servicing.	Approved	Yes	1	0 - 500m	Likely	Schedule 2 not EIA development	Not expected to generate cumulative effects due to the scale of the proposed scheme. Scoped out.	No