

From: GOVE, Michael <michael.gove.mp@parliament.uk>
Sent: 20 August 2020 15:54
To: BEIS Correspondence <BEIScorrespondence@beis.gov.uk>
Subject: Esso Southampton to London Pipeline

Dear Alok,

The SLP - Turfhill Section

As you will recall, I recently wrote to you following the closure of the examination period for Esso's proposed Southampton to London Pipeline Project regarding late submissions, which I understand you will be examining.

Since my email, I have been contacted by my constituent, Mr Alan Blackham, who feels that further potentially vital information has come to light since the deadline, and wishes for this to be shared with you. I have copied his email below, which explains his concerns following receipt of a number of FOIs, and I would be most grateful if these too can be considered as late submissions.

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: A Blackham <a_blackham@hotmail.com>
Sent: 10 August 2020 10:34
To: BELL, Toby <BELLT@parliament.uk>
Cc: 'Clive Thompson' <clive.h.thompson@gmail.com>; 'Kaye Squires' <k.squires@btinternet.com>; 'Tim Brooks' <tm.brooks@gmail.com>; 'Bryan Frost' <frostybd2@tiscali.co.uk>; 'Katia Malcaus Cooper' <katia.malcauscooper@gmail.com>; 'Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans' <Rebecca.Jennings-Evans@surreyheath.gov.uk>; David.Mansfield@surreyheath.gov.uk
Subject: FW: The SLP - Turfhill Section

Toby,

Would you kindly pass this on to MG, please.

Dear Michael,

I've tried to make this as short as possible but, because of the importance of the conclusions that can be drawn from it, I thought it necessary to provide some of the details.

At our last conference call on the 3rd July, I mentioned that I had been trying for some time to obtain a copy of the exact route of the water main along the Bridle Path (F1a) through Turfhill Park. Now after 4 months of chasing, we have a response.

As this water main occupies an easement of 6.5metres of Esso's 15 metre Order Limits and as Esso requires 7 metres of easement for its fuel line, knowing the precise route of this line is vital in designing the route of the fuel line in order to;

- determine the number of trees that will be affected by laying the fuel line along the Bridle Path
- protect the integrity of the water supply to that part of Lightwater

In Esso's final SSP for Turfhill, it seems to indicate by a red dotted line, that the water main tightly follows the border with the Residents properties of the two estates, although there is no mention in the legend of the plan that confirms this and no other indication on the map of where it might be.

With Affinity's help, we identified two separate locations of the water main along the Bridle Path. By joining these two points, it is obvious that Esso's indicated route is inaccurate and we raised this issue in our submission to the ExA for Deadline 6.

Esso, in its response to this for Deadline 7 on the 6th April 2020, three days before the Enquiry closed, states "**The Applicant can confirm that utility data was originally obtained from Landmark (should be Landmarc) in March 2018, which included the location of the Affinity Water main, and this information was used by the Applicant to design the route through this location.**"

To obtain a copy of this data, we issued an FOI request to Landmarc Support Services, the DIO Landmarc -HO Security and Data Protection Manager. He replied that it could not locate a copy or original of that map and advised that the owner of this data (the map) was the MOD's Defence Infrastructure Organisation.

Our FOI was then forwarded to the Data Controller of the DIO MOD, to which he eventually replied "**A search for the information has now been completed within the Ministry of Defence (MOD) and I can confirm that no information in scope of your request is held**".

This was reported back to DIO Landmarc which has now completed a further and very comprehensive search throughout its entire network, of all email traffic on the subject as set out in the attached email from them. Having searched under the headings of Turfhill Park, Esso and Affinity Water, and finding only one irrelevant map, the DIO for Landmarc states "**I can confirm that within these search scopes, we have found no other information to support Esso's statement**".

To further underwrite the DIO's findings, the question has to be asked as to why Esso wrote to the Residents on the 13th February 2020, its second letter on this subject, to advise on a second attempt

to carry out a utility tracing survey to establish **"the exact location of the existing utilities (such as the Affinity Water pipe) along the length of the park. Safety is a key priority for the project and it's vital that we understand what is already in the ground and where it is, before we install the replacement pipeline, if we are granted permission."** This survey was to be carried out on the 6th March 2020.

This second attempt, like the first, was abandoned before it started although everything had been assembled on site. Certainly, we know that between then and to the end of the Enquiry, no such survey was carried out and we believe that no such survey has been carried out since. However, Esso will still need to carry out such a study, but its sole purpose will be to inform the contractor of the water mains location and give it carte blanc (under approved local change orders) to do whatever is necessary to lay the fuel line. The position the contractor will find itself in, is now one which Esso has always maintained it would be, during the examination process.

The conclusions and implications of the above are considerable, namely that;

- it is almost certain that despite Esso's statement to the contrary, it did not receive any information on the precise route of the water main in March 2018 and never has. Therefore, it could not have been used in the design of the route, yet a final SSP for Turfhill was issued on the 9th March 2020 showing such a design. This has enabled Esso, from this design, to maintain that only 21 trees would need to be removed, a statement which can have no credibility without knowing where the water main actually runs.

- the reality is that when the time comes for construction, it will be realised that the designed route cannot be followed and many more trees within the Order Limits will be affected as will the trees with roots protruding well into the Order Limits bordering the northern side (50+ in the Residents gardens) and more 100 bordering the southern side of the Order Limits.

At best it appears that Esso has been cavalier in its design of the section through Turfhill, at worst, unless they are able to prove otherwise, it has misled the ExA.

Whatever, there cannot be any credibility in Esso's SSP for Turfhill or any statements made in defence of its decision to use F1a+.

Best regards,

Alan Blackham
Heronscourt & Colville Gardens Residents Association

NB Copies of all of the documents containing the extracts mentioned above, are immediately available if required.

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.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
