

From: [GOVE, Michael](#)
To: [Southampton to London Pipeline Project](#)
Subject: Esso Pipeline
Date: 08 April 2020 18:23:22
Attachments: [The SLP - Response to the revised SSP for Turfhill Final V3 160320.docx](#)
[The SLP - Decision for Inspectorate re IROPI Test for Applicant Final 160320.docx](#)
[Surrey Heath Borough Council Deadline 7 Submission.pdf](#)

Dear Planning Inspector,

Further to my email of 31 July, I have held further discussions with residents, Councillors, Natural England, Affinity Water and Esso, but remain very concerned about Esso's proposed route running through Turf Hill in Lightwater.

As you will know, many Lightwater residents are understandably deeply worried that Esso's proposed route will result in the loss of a large number of trees, and I have attached the submissions from the Heronscourt and Colville Gardens Residents Associations, which detail why consent should not be given to this portion of the proposed route.

I have also attached the comprehensive submission from Surrey Heath Borough Council that highlights the lack of appropriate information concerning the trees in Turf Hill. As you will see, the Council agrees with the Heronscourt and Coleville Gardens Residents Associations that the lack of fundamental information has made the evaluation of potential tree loss and the resultant impact of the proposed pipeline on the landscape character of Turf Hill challenging.

In addition to Turf Hill, the Council also raises concerns about the impact of Esso's plans on the Windlemere and St Catharine's SANGS, which I share.

Regarding the Windlemere SANG, the ecological worries expressed by the Council relate to the absence of thoroughly detailed surveys on the Great Crested Newt. Owing to this lack of detail, the Council states that there is insufficient evidence to suggest that the safeguarding of these amphibians can be guaranteed.

The Council also raises the unsatisfactory levels of information about the impact of Esso's plans on St Catherine's SANG. This lack of clarity has left the Council unable to undertake a detailed assessment of the consequences of the proposal on habitat, tree and vegetation removal.

I am most anxious to ensure that our trees and wildlife are protected as much as possible, but it is evident that this is difficult without the necessary information.

I would be most grateful if you can carefully study all the attached submissions, and I shall look forward to hearing from you.

With every good wish,

Michael

Rt Hon. Michael Gove MP
Member of Parliament for Surrey Heath

☎ 0207 219 6804

🌐 www.michaelgove.com

🏠 House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA



You can view my data protection and privacy policy at the following website:
<https://www.michaelgove.com/privacy>

From: GOVE, Michael

Sent: 31 July 2019 18:43

To: SouthamptontoLondonPipeline@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Subject: Esso Pipeline

Dear Planning Inspector,

As the MP for Surrey Heath, I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed route running alongside Colville Gardens and Herons Court on Turf Hill in Lightwater. This is based on discussions with my local Parish, Borough and County Councillors who represent Lightwater, and a subsequent meeting with the Esso Project Team.

My concerns relate to what residents clearly feel has been an inadequate consultation with the local community in Lightwater, resulting in what they believe is a the less than ideal land selection for this portion of the pipeline. It appears that the land selected, whilst adhering to a Natural England directional report, simply swaps one environmental concern for another.

The current proposed land forming part of the application runs through ancient woodland, and represents a potentially significant root disruption, loss of trees, and habitat, which could have far-reaching consequences on the local environment and the safety of approximately 30 residents' homes. Quite understandably, those residents are extremely concerned at the possibility of flooding in an already flood-prone area, ground movement, noise pollution and disturbance to bat dwellings.

Whilst I understand Natural England has provided its report in good faith, and is consistent with its standard viewpoints as an aid to Esso and its pipeline land location decision-making process, it would appear that residents were not given the opportunity to question Natural England's report, or for them to provide Esso with local knowledge on the land selection.

To summarise:

- The preferred route along the existing pipeline in Lightwater has been set aside due to Natural England's report;
- Land on the right-hand side of the existing pipeline location only became designated as a special area years after its installation. This land is currently a protected area for ground-nesting birds during certain months of the year, meaning works can only be undertaken during other months of the year;
- Land on the left-hand side of the existing pipeline apparently became notable when it had a sand lizard release some years ago. I am told that this species has since flourished and spread throughout the heathland, so is no longer restricted to the release area; and the immediate land adjacent to the pipeline has also become compacted by dog walking, and is therefore not the ideal habitat for sand lizards.

I understand that were it not for these points above, the existing pipeline route (the preferred route) would have been selected, and would not lead to the loss of trees or give rise to residents' concerns.

I would be most grateful if the Planning Inspectorate team can carefully examine all the correspondence submitted by my constituents, the various local community groups, the Parish Council and local Tree Wardens regarding this highly sensitive project.

I also request that the Planning Inspectorate team visits the area in question with representatives from the Parish, Borough and County Councils, together with local residents, the Esso project team and representatives of Natural England.

You will see that this is an extremely important matter, and I would greatly appreciate it if you can keep me fully informed.

With every good wish,

Michael

Rt Hon. Michael Gove MP
Member of Parliament for Surrey Heath

☎ 0207 219 6804

🌐 www.michaelgove.com

📍 House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA



You can view my data protection and privacy policy at the following website:

<https://www.michaelgove.com/privacy>

UK Parliament Disclaimer: this e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. This e-mail address is not secure, is not encrypted and should not be used for sensitive data.

The SLP – Heronscourt & Colville Gardens (the RAs) response to the Applicant's Revision 2.0 of Site Specific Plan APP Document 8.58 dated March 2020

General

The revised SSP for Turfhill is primarily concerned with a detailed construction plan, apparently conforming to BS5837:2012. Much of the wording is structured to give reassurance that every possible contingency has been considered. The RA's are confident that the ExA will recognise this as a complete smokescreen. The RA's are certain that this plan **cannot be delivered** without contravening the Standard, causing severe damage to trees on Turfhill and in residents' gardens, and endangering the integrity of the water main.

The following sections substantiate this statement:

3.2 Vegetation Removal

3.2.2

A further trees survey has been carried out along F1a+.

However, once again, this survey is fundamentally flawed. The survey team measured the extent of the Order Limits from the fence line of the bordering properties along F1a instead of from the bottom of the adjacent ditch, the actual extent of the properties' boundaries.

This means that a one metre strip of the most dense woodland all along the southern boundary of F1a, has not been included in the survey.

In reviewing the map showing the trees to be removed, it is noted with astonishment, that only one tree has been added from the first survey, despite the Guildford Road sector now being included, and that a vast number of trees in excess of 75mm diameter, will be retained within the Order Limits despite having RPAs extending well across them.

If these are added to those to be removed and the groups of trees to be retained, a number in the region of 200 is arrived at. If those missing from the one metre strip are then added, it makes a total of well over 250 which are facing a direct threat of removal.

This is the very estimate that the RAs have been including in their predictions of hundreds of trees needing to be removed, throughout the Examination.

The complexity of laying a pipeline along this route, now having to negotiate all of these remaining multitude of individual tree root spreads and as yet, the unknown location of the water main, presents an almost impossible task for any Contractor.

However, the Contractor has a way out. The Applicant has stated, on a number of occasions, that it will be left to the Contractor to decide how many trees need to be removed. Could it be that the RAs original predictions that hundreds of trees would be removed is now a certainty?

It is also very unclear as to why the Applicant is replacing more trees than are being removed.

3.2.4

‘Vegetation screening and trees will not be removed....’, however it is highly likely that even without the route of the water main being known, the Applicant intends to lay its line in close proximity to these trees and particularly, at some points, extremely close to major trees in Residents gardens. This is despite stating a clear intention that the pipeline would be laid along the southern boundary of the Order Limits.

It is inconceivable, given all of the challenges of this route, that serious damage to the integrity of their roots can be avoided resulting in either immediate removal or, of more concern, subsequent collapse endangering life and property.

3.5 Open Cut

As previously stated, in the RAs response to the first version of the Applicant’s SSP for Turfhill, when conforming to BS5837:2012, under the conditions existing along F1a+, trenchless methods should be employed.

3.5.4/5

The standard makes it clear that extensive open cut using hand digging and air spade methods are unlikely to be either acceptable or practicable. BS5837:2012 states;

7.2.1 To avoid damage to tree roots, existing ground levels should be retained within the RPA. Intrusion into soil (other than for piling) within the RPA is generally not acceptable, and topsoil within it should be retained in situ. However, limited manual excavation within the RPA might be acceptable, subject to justification. Such excavation should be undertaken carefully, using hand-held tools and preferably by compressed air soil displacement. *NOTE Due to the demands that manual excavation places on a development project, and limitations arising from health and safety considerations, it is not realistic to plan for excavation using hand-held tools where there is a need for trench shoring or grading the sides of the excavation to a stable angle of repose.”*

On both counts;

- as root patterns of remaining and bordering trees, would be encountered along at least 90% of the total length of F1a+, hand held tools and air spade methods would not only be impractical but be in direct contravention of this paragraph
- as it would be for using Open Cut methods where trench shoring is needed. F1a stands on deep Bagshot Sand and by definition, as there will considerable work carried out in an expanded trench at each weld joint, for health and safety reasons, shoring will be essential.

A copy of a map of the local geology of the area is attached as Appendix A.

In para 7.7.2, it makes it clear that in cases such as F1a+, trenchless methods should be used and only for 'shallow service runs' might using hand held tools be acceptable. F1a+ is not a shallow service run.

However, should the Applicant continue to disregard its commitment to the standard and therefore good working practices by Open Cut working; (a) there is no statement committing to protection of roots exposed to the air (b) how the soil removed will be replaced to protect the integrity of the roots and (c) that any soil removed should be retained in situ and replaced as soon as possible. BS5837:2012 is very specific on these and similar issues in paras 7.2.2 to 7.2.4.

3.5.9

Similarly, there is no commitment to avoiding contamination of the site from construction activities which frequently involve a variety of phytotoxic materials. BS5837:2012 states in para 6.2.4.3 that any materials whose accidental spillage would cause damage to a tree should be stored and handled well away from the outer edge of its RPA.

BS5873; 2012 is entirely focussed on protecting the long term health of trees that could be impacted by construction activities. The RAs and other Local Authorities welcomed the commitment of the Applicant to apply it strictly to this project for this very purpose. It is clear from this SSP that it intends to ignore that commitment and is not concerned about the long term health of the trees along F1a+.

3.5.10

It is to be stressed, as it was in the RAs response to the Applicants first SSP for Turhill, that the RPAs shown are based on minimum calculations. Scientific views based on ground radar studies indicate that root spreads are more generally 120% of tree height. In the case of Turhill, root spreads are visually obvious to be greater than the minimums and in many instances blend with bordering trees to cover the total width of the Order Limits of F1a+.

It is obvious from the map attached to the SSP showing the line of the pipeline that it cuts through almost all of the RPAs along the Folly and Guildford Road and even some of those along F1a.

So to say that the pipeline alignment has been designed to avoid RPAs is a complete nonsense. The RAs find it hard to credit how an organisation can make this brazenly untrue claim.

3.5.12

It is also nonsense to show the alignment of the line without any detailed knowledge of the route of the water main which will have a major influence on where the pipeline will have to go.

Despite giving Residents notice that a survey to identify its route was to be carried out on two different occasions, to date the RAs have no evidence that this survey has been done nor have the Residents been advised of any further attempt.

The obvious conclusion is that by the end of this process, the water main's actual location will still not be known and it will be left, once again and unacceptably, to the Contractor.

3.6 Reinstatement

3.6.1

It is ironic that the Applicant has maintained throughout this process that one of its major considerations for switching to F1a+ was to avoid being in breach of EU Directives on damaging heathland. In what appears to be in flagrant breach of these Directives, it now plans, in constructing the Compound, to destroy a considerable area of wet heathland which will never truly regenerate.

At a recent meeting with Natural England (NE) and Mr Gove, it was clearly stated that this area of wet heathland was 'very precious' and of great concern to NE as it was of significant ecological importance. It is difficult therefore to understand how NE has endorsed this proposal unless their words have been taken out of context or misapplied in some way.

3.6.5 - 3.6.7

The present wording is insufficient and should be replaced with;

'Woodland will be reinstated using semi-mature trees of an appropriate native species in good condition and of a height not less than three metres planted in adjacent positions to the trees removed whilst outside the 6.3m pipeline easement and that of the water main. Replacement trees and vegetation will be subject to a five year after care period that ensures their continuing health and development with replacements as necessary.'

Appendix B Construction and Reinstatement Plans

There are obvious comments which need to be made;

- F1a is not a straight pathway and curves away out of sight from the Guildford Road, northwards at approximately midpoint and pipelines do not bend in straight lines!
- it makes no mention of the water main, unless the dotted red line is meant to indicate its position and which, in the absence of any actual survey, can only be an optimistic guess.
- even given that the RPAs of retained and bordering trees are shown using minimum calculations, the proposed line cuts through a considerable number of them. In some cases, it runs nearly through the middle of the indicated RPA. No apology is made for reiterating a statement made in the RAs response to the first SSP, that an RPA is not 'a no damage likely to be done' but is more 'a tree is unlikely to die immediately and may eventually recover.'
- at approximately midpoint, along the northern boundary, the line comes extremely close to a number of properties, in particular Nos 29 & 31 of Heronscourt and No 20 of Colville Gardens, where there are very substantial trees bordering F1a.

Summary

From this SSP, the RAs can only predict;

- long term damage to Residents trees.
- long term damage to bordering trees.
- hundreds of trees in excess of 75mm diameter at the mercy of the Contractor and at high risk.
- disruption to the water supply to southern Lightwater during construction and subsequently, potential contamination through hydrocarbon leakage.
- permanent disturbance of the flood management system.
- permanent damage to the landscape.
- irreparable damage to a major community amenity.

By comparison, and now as NE has confirmed no ecological preference between the routes, the use of F1c or the Alternative route proposed to the ExA, would have none of these outcomes.

It remains inexplicable to the RAs why the Applicant persists in its determination to stay with F1a+. Can it be that the Applicant has some undisclosed concerns about the use of F1c?

Quite separately in a submission to ExA, the RAs have raised the issue that the Applicant has never responded to requests for comparative studies of the biodiversity net impact of using F1a+ or F1c or the Alternative route proposed. Under the Habitats Directive article 6(4), in these circumstances, the Applicant has to justify that there are 'Imperative reasons of overriding public interest' (**IROI**) for choosing F1a+. The RAs adamantly believe that the reverse is true.

Given all the above, it is very difficult to see how the ExA can consent to the Applicant's SSP for Turfhill Park.

Heronscourt Residents Association
Colville Gardens Residents association
Lightwater Residents

Decision for Inspectorate re Imperative Reason of Overriding Public Interest(IROPI) Test for Applicant

The RA's have maintained from the outset that there is a major biodiversity net loss by using route F1a+ in preference to the alternative proposed by the RA's, a modified version of F1c.

The applicant, by their own admission, has not carried out any comparative studies between the two routes.

Nor did it ask Natural England for advice on the pros and cons of the two routes since it had clearly already decided upon route F1a+.

Under the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Habitats Directive: Guidance on the Application of Article 6(4) it states that 'Competent Authorities may not consent to plans or projects they determine may have an adverse effect on the integrity of a European site' unless such an assessment is made.

The Directive provides a derogation under article 6(4) which allows such plans or projects to be approved provided three tests are met:

- There are no feasible alternative solutions to the plan or project which are less damaging.
- There are 'imperative reasons of overriding public interest' (**IROPI**) for the plan or project to proceed.
- Compensatory measures are secured to ensure that the overall coherence of the network of European sites is maintained.

The Directive states that 'these tests must be interpreted strictly'.

The Applicant fails all three tests because:

- There is an alternative solution which is less damaging to the environment. Natural England has confirmed that as far as it is concerned, either route can be used provided the necessary protection and mitigation takes place.
- There are no 'imperative reasons of overriding public interest' for the plan to proceed along F1a+. Indeed there are imperative reasons of public interest for the route not to proceed along F1a+.
- There are no compensatory measures secured to ensure that the overall coherence of the network of European sites is maintained.

Under 'Test 1: alternative solutions', it states that it is the competent authorities' responsibility (presumably the ExA) 'to assure itself there are no feasible alternative solutions'... 'Where necessary it may consult others on potential alternative solutions'... 'Alternatives must be considered objectively and broadly. This could include options that would be delivered by someone other than the Applicant ...'

As the Applicant has consistently refused to provide a comparative biodiversity study of the two routes, despite being required to do so by the ExA, it should now be subject to an **IROPI** test to justify its decision to continue with its SSP for Turf Hill.

Therefore, without any comparative studies, it is the view of the RA's that the ExA cannot recommend or consent to the use of F1a+.

The RAs are alarmed that the Examination has proceeded for the last six months without being able to direct the Applicant to carry out blatantly obvious actions and provide fundamental information to the Examination. Whilst this is procedurally correct, it significantly restricts the forensic aspirations of the participants.

Heronscourt Residents Association
Colville Gardens Residents Association
Lightwater Residents

15th March 2020

Surrey Heath Borough Council Deadline 7 Submission

Written Response to the The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ2) and submissions by Esso Petroleum Company Limited



**Esso Petroleum Company Limited Southampton to London Pipeline Project
Application for a Development Consent Order**

Project reference no. EN070005

Examining Authority's (ExA)

Consultation Draft Development Consent Order

Schedule of ExA's recommended amendments to the Applicant's draft DCO submitted at Deadline 6

Having regard to the Council's comments on the Site Specific Plan (SSP) for Turf Hill, as set out below, and the introduction of a new requirement for Queen Elizabeth Country Park as now recommended by the ExA, the Council is of the view that a new requirement should be introduced that requires that the Site Specific Plan for Turf Hill should be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. This is on the basis that, given the lack of appropriate information, the environmental and visual impacts of the proposed tree loss cannot, at present, be precisely understood. This is important given the sensitivity of the site and its trees, notwithstanding the applicant's commitment to narrow working. The submitted SSP for Turf Hill is not considered to be acceptable for the purposes of Requirement 17.

Response to Applicant's Deadline 6 submission – Code of Construction Practice

As a general point the works set out in paragraph 2.11, Working near trees, should be considered in the context of comments made below in relation to trees.

In relation to paragraph 2.15.2 it would be helpful to link these provisions to the SSPs for the relevant SANGS. In relation to the maintenance of the circular walk within the St Catherine's Road SANG, the Council would expect that bins and seats along the walk would be retained or, if not possible, replaced for the duration of the works which impact on the SANG. These facilities should be available and accessible for use concurrently with the provision of the revised circular walk.

With regard to the Windlemere SANG as referred to in Table 2.3, the Council remains concerned about the impact of the pipeline on the Great Crested Newt population

With regard to paragraphs 2.20.1 and 2.20.3 it is assumed that appropriately fenced and additional fencing would allow for flexibility based on the SSPs. This is because the Council has previously advised that there are some areas it would not wish to see fencing erected.

With regard to paragraph 2.24.3 it would helpful to have clarification on what "timely" means.

With regard to table 3.1 Embedded design measures D69, it is unclear what this would mean in practice and what the possible historic feature would be.

Response to Applicant's Deadline 6 submission - Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP)

With regard to paragraphs 1.3.7 and 4.38 and the reference to the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) in relation to working near trees, specifically paragraph 2.11.1 in the CoCP relating to "where such measures do not hinder or prevent the use of the relevant working width for construction", and Commitment number G95, the Council has concerns about this wording. This seems to potentially give the applicant carte blanche to avoid implementing appropriate tree protection measures for trees outside of the Order limits. This could easily result in the loss of further trees where there is currently an expectation that they would stay, further impacting on the landscape character of the borough.

New commitment G200 is not satisfactory nor is the statement made at paragraph 5.2.3. As the Council has previously advised in its submissions to the ExA, replacement of felled trees on a one for one basis is not adequate compensation or mitigation in landscape terms. The Council reiterates its view that, as a minimum, two replacement trees should be planted for every mature tree removed with replacement trees being standard, root balled, of between 15-20 years of age and of a broad leaf native species. This also relates to paragraph 2.18.1 in the Code of Construction Practice and the response made in Responses to Deadline 6 submission Applicants comments on responses submitted for Deadline 5 REP-5-048- Surrey Heath Borough Council in respect of paragraph 5.3.1 page 46

With regard to the paragraph 5.7.7 the Council does not have confidence that appropriate mitigation can yet be identified. Please also see the comments below in respect of commitment G59 on page 42 - Responses to Deadline 6 submission Applicants comments on responses submitted for Deadline 5 REP-5-048- Surrey Heath Borough Council

With regard to paragraph 6.2.1 and notwithstanding proximity to water courses or other sensitive habitats, the Council, as landowner, would wish to have control over chemicals used on land within its ownership and control.

Response to Applicant's Deadline 6 submission - Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP)

With regard to paragraph 2.3.1 it is unclear how the local planning authority would be advised of any changes arising from the pre-construction surveys. This is important as this could have potential impacts on landscape character, nature conservation and amenity.

The comments made above in relation to paragraph 1.3.7 of the LEMP are relevant to the paragraph 2.4.1 in the CEMP.

With regard to paragraph 3.4.3 the replacement of "propose" with "provide" is welcome but there does not appear to be any mechanism in place to ensure that this training is undertaken.

Response to Applicant's Deadline 6 submission - Outline Lighting Management Plan

With regard to paragraph 3.8.2 and notwithstanding the comments below about the removal of compounds during dormant periods, it would be helpful to understand the reasons why the lighting could not be turned off during dormant periods

Response to Applicant's Deadline 6 submission – Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan

With regard to paragraph there is no provision for the submitted site checks, remediation measures or monitoring to be provided to either the local planning or highway authorities. Please could this provision be included.

Response to the Applicants Deadline 6 submission on the Turf Hill SSP

With regard to paragraph 3.1.3 it is unclear where construction access for the remainder of the works will be from. Clarification of this would be helpful.

With regard to paragraph 3.2 in respect of Vegetation Removal, the Council is pleased that a tree survey of Turf Hill to BS5837:2012 has been undertaken by the applicant. However it is disappointed that, despite previous requests for such a survey to be done, the requisite survey will not be submitted until Deadline 7, giving the Council no opportunity to respond to this document. In this respect, the Council agrees with the Heronscourt and Coleville Gardens Residents Associations that the lack of fundamental information has made the evaluation of potential tree loss and the resultant impact of the proposed pipeline on the landscape character of Turf Hill challenging. Notwithstanding this, the Council notes that the tree survey has informed the revised Turf Hill SSP and it is in this regard the following comments are made.

With regard to paragraph 3.2.2 the proposed site compound is shown to be located in a relatively high density area of trees consisting of roughly 50/50 Silver Birch of a mainly early to mature age class, and Scots Pine of a more mature bias. The suggested number of trees to be removed for the access route of 18 self-set Silver birch is considered to be an underestimate and realistically double would be as more

accurate assessment. The compound removal estimate of 21 trees, but none of a mature status, is again considered to be unrealistic and there are at least 10 mature trees with another 25/30 early mature to be removed. Consideration should be given to other options which would require a significantly lower number of less important trees to be removed.

The 'footpath' to which the pipeline is to be located is approximately 6m wide. The information in the applicant's report details a working area of 10 /15m wide and the actual trench a width of 1m and unknown depth. This working area does then include a significantly greater number of trees than shown on their BS5837:2012 drawing and additionally when looking at the intended pipeline location there is a greater impact on supposedly retained trees.

Along the whole pipeline length the intended method of excavation is an 'open cut trench'. This will undoubtedly result in unacceptable amounts of root damage and of a root diameter exceeding the B.S. criteria, especially when their RPA calculations from some of the more critical trees do not appear to be correctly represented. Whilst noting the provision at paragraph 3.5.2, which should include reference to an appropriately qualified arboriculturalist, the Council has concerns that this would result in further tree loss to that identified, particularly given ground level variations and other root growth restrictions.

It is considered that, having regard to trees above a stem diameter of 200mm which will be necessary to remove to achieve the pipeline installation, there are in addition to the applicant's assessment of 21 trees, another 30 to be removed. These are of a proximity that even with a none mechanical excavation method, are of such close proximity that roots over 100mm in diameter will be revealed and how these could be retained whilst trying to lay this large pipe would be challenging if not viable. Unless the whole process is carried out under full arboricultural supervision then it is considered that roots would be severed on a frequent basis.

Being realistic on how the pipeline can be installed and given the shortcomings in the submitted tree information, there is sufficient concern to cast doubt on the actual level of tree removal/damage which will, in reality, be required for the construction of the pipeline. Furthermore it is unclear how a satisfactory balance could be struck to achieve a sympathetic excavation method which would protect the trees but equally would allow the excavations to be achieved at a reasonable rate. This would require, in a number of cases, the use of Air Spade and soil vacuum to expose roots. A decision would then be made on how to install the pipeline under them or agree removal if they could be removed without resulting in health issues. Again how this would work in practice, and notwithstanding the provisions as set out in paragraph 3.5.5 for example with the retention of an appropriately qualified arboriculturalist on site during the tree removal and construction phases to advise on methods of

excavation to ensure that roots are not unnecessarily removed or exposed, is unclear.

Tree related decisions should be made by an appropriately qualified arboriculturalist. Having regard to the above concerns and those raised by the Heronscourt and Colville Gardens Residents Associations, the Council seeks a new requirement in respect of the Turf Hill SSP, as set out above, to ensure that, following the consideration of all relevant information, a plan may be agreed where all the impacts of the development are known, understood and mitigated for.

As a general point it is assumed that where trees are to be removed, the reinstatement will be trees, although this is not entirely clear. There is a concern that there would be a conflict with the applicant's previous statements that it may not be appropriate or possible to undertake tree planting.

With regard to paragraph 3.4.8 it is noted that construction activities within the SANG are envisaged to last two years. However the estimated construction period is envisaged as being 24 weeks. On the basis that the compound could be inactive for a substantial period, the Council would wish to see the removal of fencing, built form, materials and equipment from the compound during periods of inactivity lasting more than one month.

In conclusion the Council is of the view that the submitted SSP for Turf Hill is currently not acceptable. More detailed tree information is required as is information on the methods of excavation/tree protection and method of supervision required. The Council remains committed to engaging with the applicant to address these issues.

Response to the St Catherine's SSP

It is noted that construction activities within the SANG are envisaged to last two years. However the estimated construction period is envisaged as being 56 weeks. On the basis that the compound could be inactive for a substantial period, the Council would wish to see the removal of fencing, built form, materials and equipment from the compound during periods of inactivity lasting more than one month.

It is noted that additional mitigation measures have been added to the SSP in respect of Natural England's comments at paragraph 2.1.6. However, the Council provided a suite of more detailed mitigation measures that the applicant should consider including in the SSP. As a minimum the Council would expect the addition of the following measures, which were included in the Council's Deadline 5 submission:

'In advance of any construction works taking place, providing an information pack to every Keaver Drive residence detailing the timescale of the works, notification that the SANG will remain open and potential routes that can be utilised within Frith Hill and the Frimley Fuel Allotments'.

Given that the SANG mitigates the potential recreational displacement of the Keaver Drive development, providing an information pack to the residents is considered by the Council to be a key way of reducing and potential recreational displacement. The Council considers that this is a relatively simple measure and not overburdensome for the applicant.

'Laying the pipeline into the SANG outside bird nesting season to limit any potential impact'. It is noted that this is likely not possible for the construction compound."

In the event that the installation method at St Catherines's Road is not by HDD the Council would expect to be consulted on and approve the size and duration of the compound.

The Council welcomes confirmation that 'dog walking and dogs being allowed off the lead will be possible during the works' at paragraph 3.1.5. The comments made above concerning the circular walk in respect of paragraph 2.15.2 Response to Applicant's Deadline 6 submission – Code of Construction Practice are also relevant.

The Council is concerned about the statement given at paragraph 3.1.6. in respect of construction access. This introduces uncertainty in relation to site access which is, and would be, of concern in both amenity and highway safety terms. The applicant has consistently advised the Council that no construction access would go through Regent Way to the north but this paragraph would seem to allow for this. This would not be acceptable to the Council.

With regard to paragraph 3.2.3, there is a lack of clarity in relation to "some" and "younger" trees. In the absence of knowing how many and of what maturity it is difficult for the Council to fully understand the impact on the landscape character of the SANG. With regard to pruning there is also a lack of clarity as to what constitutes "nearby trees". Are they within or outside the Order limits? This is also relevant in respect of paragraph 3.2.4.

The Council welcomes the addition of 'acoustic material that will be applied to the fencing to limit the impact of noise pollution on the tranquillity of the SANG' at paragraph 3.4.4. and the inclusion of 'fencing material will be selected to reduce the visual impact on the SANG, maintaining reduced visibility of the compound area' at paragraph 3.4.5 of the SSP .

With regard to paragraph 3.5.12 it is difficult to quantify the difference in size between normal and smaller plant as no benchmark has been set.

The Council remains concerned that insufficient information has been provided to enable a detailed assessment of the impact of the proposal on habitat, tree and vegetation removal.

Response to Deadline 6 submission by applicant in response to Action Points from Issue Specific Hearing on Draft Development Consent Order (ISH4)

In response to the applicant's comments in respect of Action 5, and having regard to the Council's previous and current comments in relation to trees and the lack of appropriate and sufficient detail, the Council would support a requirement which affords appropriate protection of veteran, notable or protected trees.

Response to Deadline 6 submission by applicant in response to Action Points from Issue Specific Hearing on Environmental Matters (ISH5)

With regard to Action 10 on page 7 the Council has not had discussions concerning voluntary agreements concerning the Environmental Mitigation Areas.

As set out at paragraph 1.5 in response to Action 13 and in response to Action 30, the applicant is proposing tree replacement on a one for one basis. As advised in previous submissions and having regard to the verdant and treed landscape character of Surrey Heath, this level of replacement tree planting is inadequate. A minimum of at least two trees should be planted as replacements to appropriately address the impact of the pipeline on the landscape character of the borough.

With regard to Actions 17, 19, 22 and Appendix 2 the Council would wish to see minimal impacts on the local environments during the indicative two year periods particularly in relation to the St Catherine's Road SANG and Turf Hill. As such please see the comments above about the removal of built form, fencing, materials, plant etc from the compounds during periods of inactivity in excess of one month. This is also relevant in respect of Action 19.

With regard to Action 20 the Council notes that the applicant will undertake works outside of the bird nesting season.

The response to Action 23 concerning the construction compound at Frith Hill is confusing. The reference in paragraph 1.1 would appear to refer to the original compound. This is because at Deadline 5 the applicant proposed compound reference 5U and included it in the draft Development Consent Order. This would lead interested parties to reasonably conclude that the applicant had reached an

agreement with the MoD for a new and alternative compound with access from Deepcut Bridge Road, notwithstanding that the Council had raised concerns about what was being proposed at Deadline 6.

The basis for the applicant's conclusion that the construction compound at Frith Hill/Deepcut is not an appropriate replacement during construction, because the works to St Catherine's Road require the road to be closed to traffic, is unclear and clarification of this would be helpful. It is difficult to understand why the main deliveries eg the pipe could not be organised to be done before St Catherine's Road is closed with any smaller items coming from Frith Hill. The Council queries why reference is made to the use of the SANG reducing the potential impact of delivery vehicles through the residential areas when the applicant has advised the Council on numerous occasions that this would not happen, please also see comments above on this issue relating to the St Catherine's SANG SSP.

With regard to Action 31 the Council has concerns about the wording at the end of the response at paragraph 1.2 relating to "where such measures do not hinder or prevent the use of the relevant working width for construction". This seems to potentially give the applicant carte blanche to avoid implementing appropriate tree protection measures for trees outside of the Order limits. This could easily result in the loss of further trees where there is currently an expectation that they would stay.

With regard to Action 32 the Council has previously acknowledged that it recognises that replacement planting may not be appropriate in the same location from where trees have been removed. The Council restates its commitment to working with the applicant to ensure that appropriate levels of replacement tree planting are achieved within the borough to ensure that its landscape character is not adversely impacted by the proposed pipeline.

Responses to Deadline 6 submission Applicants comments on responses submitted for Deadline 5 REP-5-048- Surrey Heath Borough Council

Many of the issues raised in this submission have been dealt with above. However the following matters are relevant:

In response to the comments on page 34 the Council would wish to ensure that the link between the Code of Construction Practice and the Site Specific Plans is clear particularly if the SSPs are to be certified documents.

With regard to the response to the CoCP on page 39, the applicant's comments are noted. However this does not address the fact that whilst tree surveys have been undertaken they have not been provided to the Council. Given the number of trees within the borough, the absence of this information has made it difficult for an informed understanding of the impacts on the landscape and nature conservation.

This is dealt with in more detail above and below in relation to Turf Hill and St Catherine's.

With regard to the response to commitment G59 on page 42, it is difficult to understand how the applicant can identify mitigation measures when the relevant surveys on the Great Crested Newts have only recently been commenced. In the absence of detailed surveys to fully understand the impact on the Great Crested Newts at Windlemere, including the role of the ditches, the Council has little confidence that these amphibians will be appropriately safeguarded or be able to re-establish following the construction of the pipeline.

With regard to the response to paragraph 4.3.6 RPAS on page 43, it is unclear why the working method statements could not be made available, as a minimum, to the local planning authority.

With regard to the response to paragraphs 4.5.2 and 4.5.3, the Council queries what is meant by short term. Throughout the Examination process the applicant has consistently referred to a two year construction period. In nature conservation terms this is not considered to be short term. It is expected that new surveys would be undertaken to inform the site specific method statement and this information provided, as a minimum, to the local planning authority.

With regard to the responses to the LEMP on page 48, it is unclear why landscape inspection reports could not be made available, as a minimum, to the local planning authority and the landowner. The latter is so that the landowner has an understanding of the inspections that have taken place when considering future maintenance. The response to Ecological Monitoring seems incomplete.

With regard to the response on page 49, the Council would wish to have a copy of the dormice survey that was undertaken.

The applicant's comments in respect of the answer given to paragraphs 3.3.3 and 3.3.4 are noted. However it is unclear in respect of Commitment G9 who the Council would need to request it from and where and how it would be available to view.

The response to paragraph 3.6.1 on page 51 is noted but it is unclear where this is explicitly stated and how the local planning authority would be kept informed.

The response to paragraph 3.7.2 on page 52 is noted but it is unclear where this is explicitly stated

With regard to the response to paragraph 4.2.1 on page 52, it is unclear who the Council would need to contact to receive this information.

With regard to the response to paragraph 3.3.17 on page 55, the Council is of the view that root protection zones should be included in the definition of sensitive areas for the purposes of paragraph 3.3.5.

With regard to the response in respect of the Water Management Plan on page 59, it is not clear how and where the impact on the Windlemere would be captured or used to inform the impact on the Great Crested Newts nor is it clear why the applicant does not believe that there is a risk from pipeline installation to the levels of groundwater experienced in the Windlemere SANG. Clarification of this would be helpful.

With regard to the response to Chapter 11 of the CEP, it would be helpful to know what would be an appropriate method for reporting incidents that may require immediate or urgent actions and where would this be found

With regard to the response on page 64 in relation to Turf Hill it is unclear how the details of the finalised compound layout would be provided to the local planning authority, particularly in light of the concerns raised in respect of the Turf Hill SSP.

With regard to the response on page 65 in relation to Turf Hill it is unclear what measures would be in place to prevent the applicant erecting fencing.