

# Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

September 2016

THIS PAGE HAS INTENTIONALLY BEEN LEFT BLANK

---

# Silvertown Tunnel

---

---

## Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

---

*TfL Document Reference: ST150030-PLN-ZZZ-ZZ-SOC-ZZ-1294*

*SOCG Document Reference: SOCG001*

*Author: Transport for London*

<b>Revision</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description of new version</b>
1.0	August 2016	First issue for comment to stakeholder
1.1	September 2016	Second issue for approval and sign off
1.2	November 2016	Revise for Deadline 1 submission

## Contents

1.	Introduction .....	5
1.1	Purpose of the document .....	5
1.2	Parties to this Statement of Common Ground .....	5
1.3	Structure of the Statement of Common Ground .....	5
1.4	The proposed scheme .....	6
1.5	Introduction to Natural England .....	7
2.	Record of key engagement undertaken .....	8
2.1	Key meetings .....	8
3.	Topics contained within this SoCG .....	11
3.1	Topics included in SoCG .....	11
4.	Matters agreed .....	12
4.1	Assessment Methodology .....	12
4.2	Environmental Design Measures and Mitigation .....	14
4.3	Assessment Findings and Conclusions .....	16
4.4	Examination First Written questions – Terrestrial Ecology .....	20
4.5	Examination First Written questions – Habitats Regulation Assessment ...	25
5.	Matters still under discussion .....	27
5.2	Examination First Written Questions – Terrestrial Ecology .....	27
5.3	Examination First Written Questions – Marine Ecology .....	29
5.4	Examination First Written Questions – Habitats Regulation Assessment ...	35
6.	Matters not agreed .....	37
7.	Agreement .....	39

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Purpose of the document

1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is submitted to the Examining Authority in relation to the application by Transport for London (TfL) under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (the Act) for an order granting development consent for the construction of the Silvertown Tunnel (“the Scheme”).

1.1.2 The aim of this SoCG is to provide a clear record of the issues discussed and the current status of those discussions. The SoCG can be used as evidence of these discussions in representations to the Examining Authority as part of its examination of the DCO application.

### 1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

1.2.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been jointly prepared by the TfL and Natural England. It sets out matters which are agreed between both parties, as well as matters which are not agreed and matters which are under discussion.

### 1.3 Structure of the Statement of Common Ground

1.3.1 This SoCG comprises six sections:

**Section 1** is an introduction to the SoCG and the Scheme;

**Section 2** provides an overview of consultation to date between TfL and Natural England;

**Section 3** provides a summary of the main areas and topics covered by this SoCG;

**Section 4** provides a list of matters agreed;

**Section 5** provides a list of matters still under discussion;

**Section 6** provides a list of matters not agreed; and

**Section 7** contains the parties' signatures.

## 1.4 The proposed scheme

- 1.4.1 The Scheme involves the construction of a twin bore road tunnel providing a new connection between the A102 Blackwall Tunnel Approach on Greenwich Peninsula (Royal Borough of Greenwich) and the Tidal Basin roundabout junction on the A1020 Lower Lea Crossing/Silvertown Way (London Borough of Newham). The Silvertown Tunnel will be approximately 1.4km long and will be able to accommodate large vehicles including double-deck buses. It will include a dedicated bus, coach and goods vehicle lane, which will enable TfL to provide additional cross-river bus routes.
- 1.4.2 The Scheme also includes the introduction of free-flow user charging at both the Blackwall Tunnel (northern portal located in London Borough of Tower Hamlets) and the new Silvertown Tunnel. This measure will play a fundamental role in managing traffic demand and supporting the financing of the construction, maintenance and operation of the Silvertown Tunnel.
- 1.4.3 On the north side, the tunnel approach road connects to the Tidal Basin Roundabout, which will be altered to create a new signal-controlled roundabout linking the Silvertown Way, Dock Road and the Lower Lea Crossing. Dock Road will be realigned to accommodate the new tunnel and approach road. On the south side, the A102 will be widened to create new slip road links to the Silvertown Tunnel. A new flyover will be built to take southbound traffic exiting the Blackwall Tunnel over the northbound approach to the Silvertown Tunnel. The Scheme includes minor changes to Tunnel Avenue including the removal of the bus-only gate allowing access for all vehicles between Blackwall Lane and Ordnance Crescent. The Boord Street footbridge over the A102 will be replaced with a pedestrian and cycle bridge.
- 1.4.4 New portal buildings will be located close to each tunnel portal to house the plant and equipment necessary to operate the tunnel.
- 1.4.5 Main construction works could commence in late 2018 and will last approximately 4 years with the new tunnel opening in 2022/23. A Tunnel Boring Machine (TBM) will be used to bore the main tunnel sections under the river with shorter sections of cut and cover tunnel at either end linking the bored sections of the tunnel to the portals. The proposal is to erect and launch the TBM from specially constructed chambers at Silvertown and Greenwich Peninsula where the bored sections and cut and cover sections of the tunnel connect. The main construction worksite will be located at Silvertown, utilising

the existing barge facilities at Thames Wharf along with a new temporary jetty for the removal of spoil and delivery of materials by river. A secondary worksite will be located adjacent to the alignment of the proposed cut and cover tunnel on the Greenwich Peninsula.

## **1.5 Introduction to Natural England**

- 1.5.1 Natural England is a non-departmental public body, with the objective of ensuring that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced and managed for the benefit of present and future generations. TfL has engaged with Natural England on the Scheme during the pre-application process, including both non-statutory engagement and formal statutory consultation carried out pursuant to section 42 of the Planning Act 2008.

## 2. Record of key engagement undertaken

### 2.1 Key meetings

2.1.1 A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between Transport for London and Natural England in relation to the Scheme is outlined below.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Form of correspondence</b>	<b>Key outcomes and points of discussion</b>
03/07/14	Response to Scoping Report	Points of advice provided on the general EIA methodology including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Biodiversity and Geology</li> <li>- Landscape</li> <li>- Air quality</li> <li>- Climate change</li> </ul>
17/12/14	Response to non statutory consultation	Comments on the Introductory Environmental Assessment Report covering issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Epping Forest air quality</li> <li>- Bat emergence surveys</li> </ul>
9/9/15	Comments on the draft Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)	Comments on the draft PEIR, covering issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Black Redstart Phase 1 surveys</li> <li>- Bat surveys</li> <li>- Mitigation for Streaked Bombardier Beetle</li> </ul>

Silvertown Tunnel

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOCG001

---

<b>Date</b>	<b>Form of correspondence</b>	<b>Key outcomes and points of discussion</b>
27/11/15	Meeting	Consultation meeting to discuss assessment methodology and mitigation proposals, and how mitigation can be secured. Specific issues covered included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Notable invertebrate species and potential habitat enhancement</li><li>- Black Redstarts</li><li>- Approach to valuing land</li></ul>
30/11/15	Section 42 response letter to Statutory Consultation	Natural England's response to the PEIR, covering issues such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Open Mosaic Habitat</li><li>- Habitat deficit</li><li>- Habitats Regulations Assessment</li></ul>
16/5/16	Email with comments on Habitats Regulations Assessment	Minor typological comments on the draft Habitats Regulations Assessment
8/9/2015	Email with comments on draft Statement of Common Ground	Minor typological comments and confirmation of agreement of matters.
27/10/2016	Teleconference Call	Confirmation of agreement of matters relating to first written questions and progression of SoCG

2.1.2 Transport for London has aimed to address all the points raised by Natural England during consultation.

### 3. Topics contained within this SoCG

#### 3.1 Topics included in SoCG

3.1.1 The following topics have been discussed with Natural England with regards to Chapter 9 and 10 of the Environmental Statement (Terrestrial & Marine Ecology) and the relevant appendices – including the Habitats Regulations Assessment:

- Assessment Methodology
- Environmental Design Measures and Mitigation
- Assessment Findings and Conclusions

## 4. Matters agreed

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
<b>4.1 Assessment Methodology</b>			
4.1.1	<p>Study area</p> <p>Potential impacts of the Scheme on the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC) were raised in Natural England's response to the non statutory consultation on 17 December 2014.</p> <p>Epping Forest is under constraints with regards to air quality, exacerbated by transport pollution and should be considered as part of any assessment (as noted by NE during meeting on 27 November 2015).</p>	<p>As noted in Chapter 9 – Terrestrial Ecology, Table 9.2 of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1), this matter was discussed with Natural England in a meeting in November 2015. Epping Forest SAC was scoped in for further assessment in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Document Reference 6.3.9.1).</p> <p>It is agreed that the impact of air pollution as a result of the Scheme upon the Epping Forest SAC would be unlikely to be direct due to the distance between this SAC and the Scheme.</p>	Email 8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016
4.1.2	<p>Bat surveys</p> <p>Within their response to the non statutory consultation, Natural England expressed a concern that only one emergence bat survey was undertaken (Response to non statutory consultation, 17 December 2014). Natural</p>	<p>As set out in Appendix 9.B - Bat Activity Survey of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.3.9.2), a bat emergence survey was undertaken in May 2014 at a building identified as being suitable for roosting bats on the ASD Metals site (note that the building is now not included within the Order Limits). No bats were recorded during this survey.</p>	Email 8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016

Silvertown Tunnel

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOGC001

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
	<p>England's recommendation was that at least another one or two surveys are undertaken.</p>	<p>Further Bat activity surveys were undertaken in core bat activity season in 2015 (August and September) to confirm the usage of the site. Both sites presented generally low levels of bat activity.</p> <p>It is agreed that the further bat surveys undertaken by TfL and reported in Appendix 9.B - Bat Activity Survey of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.3.9.2) are sufficient to establish the level of bat activity in the Order Limits.</p>	
4.1.3	<p>Black Redstart surveys</p> <p>Natural England advised that there are known to be populations of Black Redstarts in the Silvertown area using the various brownfield and industrial sites along the Thames (NE comments on draft Preliminary Environmental Information Report, via email 9 September 2015). Therefore despite the lack of evidence of direct use on site during survey periods, there should be another extended Phase 1 Habitat survey undertaken to establish if there is habitat suitable for use by nesting birds or foraging black redstart.</p>	<p>It is agreed that targeted black redstart surveys were undertaken in April - June 2014, as detailed in Appendix 9.F: Dedicated Species Assessment for Reptiles and Black Redstart (Document Reference 6.3.9.6). No black redstarts were recorded during the surveys.</p> <p>It is agreed that TfL subsequently undertook an extended Phase 1 Habitat survey (paragraph 9.4.35 of Appendix 9.F), which confirmed that within the Order Limits there is habitat suitable for use by nesting birds and in particular, areas of Open Mosaic habitat, which are considered suitable for foraging black redstart.</p>	<p>Email 8<sup>th</sup> September 2016</p>

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOCG001

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
4.1.4	<p>Overall approach</p> <p>The overall methodology adopted to undertake the assessment of effects on terrestrial ecology (Chapter 9 Terrestrial Ecology of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1)).</p>	<p>The overall methodology adopted to undertake the assessment presented in Chapter 9 Terrestrial Ecology of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1) is agreed.</p> <p>It is agreed that the methodology reflects appropriate legislation, guidance and advice provided by Natural England during the pre-application stage.</p>	<p>Email 8<sup>th</sup> September 2016</p>
<b>4.2 Environmental Design Measures and Mitigation</b>			
4.2.1	<p>Black Redstart (<i>Phoenicurus ochruros</i>)</p> <p>Natural England considers that the mitigation proposed in the ES should assume Black Redstarts are present as a precaution, notwithstanding that the surveys undertaken by TfL have not identified their presence (NE comments on draft PEIR, via email 9 September 2015).</p>	<p>It is agreed that Black Redstart monitoring will be undertaken weekly between April and July during the construction period and that this is set out in paragraph 7.2.1 of the Code of Construction Practice (Document Reference 6.10).</p> <p>It is agreed that the further controls set out in paragraph 7.2.1 of the Code of Construction Practice (Document Reference 6.10) appropriately avoids any potential impact on Black Redstarts. These controls require that, should black redstarts be recorded, the Contractor will determine the need for additional mitigation, demarcation of exclusion zones or whether discrete elements of the works, proximate to the</p>	<p>Email 8<sup>th</sup> September 2016</p>

Silvertown Tunnel

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOGC001

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
		recorded sighting area and which may give rise to local disturbance, are required to stop temporarily until the birds have left the area (i.e. following the breeding period).	
4.2.2	<p>Streaked Bombardier Beetle (<i>Brachinus sclopeta</i>)</p> <p>Natural England noted that the Streaked Bombardier Beetle is known to have a number of populations in the area and isn't found elsewhere in the UK, with London's brownfields being its last stronghold (NE comments on draft PEIR, via email 9 September 2015). Rubble piles should be incorporated in open land within the Order Limits to help this beetle cement its foothold in the area.</p>	<p>It is agreed that operational ecological mitigation for the Scheme will include replacement habitat which would be targeted towards suitable foraging and sheltering habitat for terrestrial invertebrates (i.e. invertebrate hotels and dead wood loggeries), including for the Streaked Bombardier Beetle (paragraph 9.5.22 of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1) and paragraph 5.7.3 of Appendix 9.H: Biodiversity Action Plan and Mitigation Strategy (Document Reference 6.3.9.8).</p> <p>It is agreed that this is suitable mitigation for potential impacts on these species.</p>	Email 8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016
4.2.3	<p>Replacement habitat</p> <p>Environmental design measures and mitigation for invertebrates, the key habitat approach adopted for invertebrates and Black Redstarts,</p>	It is agreed that the quantum of replacement habitat required is identified based on the findings of the Terrestrial Ecology impact assessment. The mitigation aims to deliver the same proportions of habitats to those that are permanently lost, particularly for notable invertebrates and Black Redstart (paragraph 9.5.19 of	s42 response letter 30 November 2015

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOCG001

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
	and the replacement habitat approach.	<p>the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1) and Appendix 9.H: Biodiversity Action Plan and Mitigation Strategy (Document Reference 6.3.9.8).</p> <p>It is agreed that compliance with the Biodiversity Action Plan and Mitigation Strategy is secured by the Design Principles (Document Reference 7.4).</p>	
4.2.4	<p>Overall approach</p> <p>The mitigation measures set out in Chapter 9 Terrestrial Ecology, Appendix 9.H: Biodiversity Action Plan and Mitigation Strategy, and the Code of Construction Practice.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the mitigation measures and enhancements have been recommended based on the findings of the surveys and the assessment. These measures have been incorporated into Section 7 of the Code of Construction Practice (Document Reference 6.10) and Appendix 9.H: Biodiversity Action Plan and Mitigation Strategy (Document Reference 6.3.9.8).</p> <p>It is agreed that these are appropriate and adequately mitigate the impacts on terrestrial ecology resulting from the Scheme.</p>	Email 8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016
<b>4.3 Assessment Findings and Conclusions</b>			
4.3.1	<p>Notable invertebrate species</p> <p>Natural England noted (Meeting 27 November 2015) that that the Terrestrial Ecology Chapter</p>	It is agreed that notable terrestrial invertebrate species and their potential habitat (Open Mosaic on Previously Developed Land) are adequately addressed throughout Chapter 9 - Terrestrial Ecology of the Environmental	Email 8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016

Silvertown Tunnel

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOGC001

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
	<p>should adequately address the quality of the existing habitat with regards to notable invertebrate species.</p>	<p>Statement (Document Reference 6.1) and Appendix 9.H: Biodiversity Action Plan and Mitigation Strategy (BAP&amp;MS) (Document Reference 6.3.9.8, refer to Section 5.7).</p> <p>It is agreed that potential impacts to Open Mosaic habitat and notable invertebrate species would be mitigated via measures specified in Chapter 7 of the Code of Construction Practice (for construction impacts) and the BAP&amp;MS (for operational impacts).</p>	
4.3.2	<p>Black Redstart (<i>Phoenicurus ochruros</i>)</p> <p>Natural England noted (Meeting 27 November 2015) that although land is of low quality, it requires thorough assessment as species such as Black Redstart favour low grade habitat.</p>	<p>It is agreed that section 9.4 of the Environmental Statement (Document 6.1) appropriately considers Open Mosaic Habitat on Previously Developed Land within the Order Limits in terms of its value for Black Redstarts.</p> <p>The conclusions of the assessment are agreed; specifically that there would be a temporary Slight Adverse effect on Black Redstarts during construction but overall there would be a permanent Slight Beneficial effect for Open Mosaic Habitat and Black Redstarts due to proposed mitigation. Refer to Appendix 9.H: Biodiversity Action Plan and Mitigation</p>	<p>Email 8<sup>th</sup> September 2016</p>

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOCG001

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
		Strategy (Document Reference 6.3.9.8).	
4.3.3	<p>Tiered approach to land valuation</p> <p>Natural England suggested (Meeting 27 November 2015) TfL consider a tiered approach to valuing land based on: Borough Importance, Metropolitan Importance and Local importance.</p>	<p>It is agreed that a tiered approach to valuing land has been adopted by TfL. Table 9-3 of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1) assigns an importance classification to each ecological category from international to site importance.</p> <p>It is agreed that the approach to valuing habitats calculated in Annex 1: Natural Capital Assessment of Appendix 9.H: Biodiversity Action Plan and Mitigation Strategy (Document 6.3.9.8) is appropriate. Table 5-2 of the Natural Capital Assessment identifies the scale of importance for the ecological receptors, nominating Site, Local or Country scales.</p>	Email 8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016
4.3.4	<p>Open Mosaic Habitat</p> <p>Natural England stated that the Preliminary Environmental Information Report reported nationally important Biodiversity Action Plan species and Open Mosaic Habitat (OMH) within the Order Limits (s42 response letter 30 November 2015). This should be identified as</p>	<p>It is agreed that the extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey (Appendix 9A of the Environmental Statement, Document Reference 6.3.9.1) identifies areas of Open Mosaic Habitats on previously developed land (rather than wasteland) which provides suitable habitat for notable invertebrates and Black Redstarts.</p>	Email 8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016

Silvertown Tunnel

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOGC001

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
	such within the Environmental Statement - as the PEIR referred to this habitat as 'wasteland' which would undervalue its importance.	<p>It is agreed that Section 9.5 of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1) and Appendix 9.H: Biodiversity Action Plan and Mitigation Strategy (Document Reference 6.3.9.8) outline the requirement to replace Open Mosaic Habitat in the Order Limits.</p> <p>It is agreed that this mitigation is secured by Design Principles SUEN.02, SUEN.04 and SCP.11 (Document Reference 7.4). It is agreed that requirement 3(1) of the draft DCO requires the authorised development must be designed and implemented in accordance with the Design Principles.</p>	
4.3.5	Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) (s42 response letter 30 November 2015).	The conclusions of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Appendix 9G of the ES, document reference 6.3.9.7) are agreed. Given the distances to the nearest Natura 2000 (N2k) sites, such as the Epping Forest SAC, it is agreed that the Scheme is not likely to give rise to significant effects upon any N2k sites or their qualifying features, either alone or in combination with other known plans and projects. It is therefore not necessary to carry out an 'Appropriate Assessment' / Stage 2 HRA.	Email 8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOCG001

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
		<p>It is agreed that the hydrological linkages between any of the N2k sites and the Scheme are not direct and as such wouldn't be likely to affect the designated sites.</p> <p>In respect to functional habitat and mobile species it is agreed that there will not be any birds or bats from the nearest N2k sites that would be likely to venture far enough to be affected by the proposal.</p>	
4.3.6	<p>Overall assessment and findings</p> <p>The overall assessment and findings of the likely effects of the Scheme and the conclusions reached within Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement and the Habitats Regulations Assessment.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the overall assessment and findings of the likely effects of the Scheme and the conclusions reached within Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement and the Habitats Regulations Assessment are robust and reflect advice provided by Natural England during the pre-application stage.</p>	Email 8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016
<p><b>4.4 Examination First Written questions – Terrestrial Ecology</b></p>			
TE1	<p>The Examining Authority's first written questions published on the 18<sup>th</sup> October 2016 for TE1 states;</p> <p>a) The Biodiversity Action Plan and Mitigation Strategy (BAPMS) [APP-065] states that</p>	<p>(a) ES paragraph 9.5.19 [APP-031] states that, with regards to ecology, "Residual significant effects will be mitigated within the Order Limits or offset within the wider area as set out in Section 9.6 and according to the principles set out in Appendix 9.H: Biodiversity Action Plan and Mitigation Strategy</p>	Teleconference Call 27/10/16

Silvertown Tunnel

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOGC001

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
	<p>compliance with this document would be secured by the design principles for the landscaping proposals, which in turn are secured by the dDCO Requirement 6. Should this document be secured directly by a Requirement in the dDCO as ecological matters are not always directly related to landscape matters?</p> <p>b) Has a draft landscaping scheme been prepared and submitted to the Examination? If not, why not?</p> <p>c) How does the BAPMS differ from the Ecology Management Plan which is to be “prepared in consultation with Natural England” pursuant to Requirement 5(2)(h), as currently worded in the dDCO?</p>	<p>[APP-065]”. The measures of the BAPMS are secured by Design Principles LSCP.11; SUEN.02; SUEN.03; and SUEN.04 (Pages 21 and 28) [APP-096], which relate to landscaping design, tree planting, the provision of green infrastructure and habitat offsetting. Compliance with these principles is secured by requirement 3 (detailed design) of the dDCO. However, to bring clarity on the face of the Order the applicant has added a new requirement to the dDCO which directly secures the implementation of the BAPMS.</p> <p>(b) A draft landscaping scheme has not been submitted to the Examining Authority. A concept illustrative design has been provided within the Design and Access Statement [APP-095], which has informed the assessment presented in the ES Chapter 9 Terrestrial Ecology [APP-031]. The illustrative design indicates one way that the relevant design principles can be applied. The Design Principles [APP-096], secured by the dDCO through requirement 3 in Schedule 2 to the dDCO, will guide the detailed landscaping arrangements to</p>	

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOCG001

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
		<p>be developed in line with the BAPMS and submitted to the relevant planning authority for approval under requirement 6, when the contractor has been appointed.</p> <p>(c) The requirement to provide an Ecological Management Plan is set out in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [APP-092]. It will detail the mitigation for ecology during the construction phase, including measures such as black redstart monitoring and the requirement for an ecologist to be on site during clearance. The BAPMS [APP-065] secures the operational mitigation by ensuring that the detailed landscape design maximises the biodiversity potential of the on-site habitats and the offsetting to ensure net gain.</p> <p>NE requested that some of the wording in the design principles should be changed from “shall/ would be” to “will be”.</p> <p>However it is agreed that the Design Principles and the BAPMS, can only ensure that this mitigation forms part</p>	

Silvertown Tunnel

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOGC001

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
		of the detailed design, and the principles by which the mitigation should be designed. It is only after the detailed design process is complete that the exact specification can be confirmed.	
TE6	<p>The Examining Authority's first written questions published on the 18th October 2016 for TE6 states;</p> <p>Do you agree with the Applicant's statement in paragraph 9.4.4 of the ES, that none of the nearby Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), National Nature Reserves (NNRs) and non-statutory Sites of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINCs) would be directly affected by the proposed development?</p>	Natural England is in agreement with the Applicant's statement in paragraph 9.4.4.	Teleconference Call 27/10/16
TE7	<p>The Examining Authority's first written questions published on the 18th October 2016 for TE7 states;</p> <p>Japanese Knotweed was found within the Order limits, as were other non-native species including Virginia Creeper and Butterfly-bush. Are Interested Parties (IPs) satisfied with the specific</p>	<p>Natural England is in agreement, on the basis that the removal of Japanese knotweed is in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990.</p> <p>Provided in Section 2.7.1 Appendix E Site Waste Management Plan of the CoCP.</p>	Teleconference Call 27/10/16

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOCG001

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
	mitigation for these species as described in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (Document reference 6.10) [APP-092]?		
TE8	<p>The Examining Authority's first written questions published on the 18th October 2016 for TE8 states;</p> <p>The ES [APP-031] states in section 9.4 that birds and bats were found within the Order limits.</p> <p>Are IPs satisfied with the specific mitigation for these animals as described in the CoCP (Document 6.10)[APP-092]?</p>	<p>NE requested that the wording for the timing of the breeding bird season relating to vegetation clearance is amended to February to August inclusive.</p> <p>The revised CoCP submitted at Deadline 1 will incorporate this amendment.</p>	Teleconference Call 27/10/16
TE11	<p>The Examining Authority's first written questions published on the 18th October 2016 for TE11 states;</p> <p>The East India Dock Basin SINC is only 50m away from a construction traffic track-out route.</p> <p>Are IPs satisfied with the dust suppression measures that are proposed in the CoCP [APP-092] to protect this SINC from fugitive dust? If not, why not?</p>	NE is in agreement with the dust mitigation measures proposed in the CoCP.	Teleconference Call 27/10/16
TE12	The Examining Authority's first written questions published on the 18th October 2016 for TE12 states;	NE is in agreement with the mitigation proposed for black redstarts set out in the CoCP.	Teleconference Call 27/10/16

Silvertown Tunnel

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOGC001

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
	<p>Are IPs satisfied with the measures set out at section 7.2 of the CoCP [APP-092] proposed by the Applicant for checking whether there are any black redstarts breeding within the Order limits before construction commences?</p> <p>Are IPs content with the proposed mitigation for this species, (and all other species of breeding birds)? If not, why not?</p>	<p>NE requested that the wording for the timing of the breeding bird season relating to vegetation clearance is amended to February to August inclusive.</p> <p>The revised CoCP submitted at Deadline 1 will incorporate this amendment.</p>	
<b>4.5 Examination First Written questions – Habitats Regulation Assessment</b>			
HRA1	<p>The Examining Authority’s first written questions published on the 18th October 2016 for HRA1 states</p> <p>Section 7.5 of the HRA Report [APP-064] reports on in-combination effects and notes that nine proposed plans/projects within or adjacent to the scheme have been considered, as detailed in Table 7-2.</p> <p>Has the list of projects to be considered in the in-combination assessment been agreed with Natural England?</p>	<p>NE are in agreement with the list of projects to be considered for the in-combination assessment within the HRA Report (APP-064).</p>	<p>Teleconference Call 27/10/16</p>
HRA4	<p>The Examining Authority’s first written questions published on the 18th October 2016 for HRA4 states</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the HRA [APP-064] cites evidence of these air quality exceedances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• footnote number 6 (page 36) “Air Pollution</li> </ul>	<p>Teleconference</p>

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOCG001

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
	<p>The HRA lists a number of air quality exceedances at Epping Forest SAC.</p> <p>a) Can the Applicant please confirm the source of this information; and</p> <p>b) Do NE have any views on this information?</p>	<p>Information system; www.apis.ac.uk; Accessed 01 September 2015” and;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• footnote number 7 (page 37) “Essex County Council and the City of London Corporation; Epping Forest Transport Strategy 2012-2016”.</li> </ul> <p>NE considers that the impacts upon Epping Forest SAC would be minimal given the distances involved and based on the screening criteria for local air quality impacts as stated in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 11 by Highways England.</p>	<p>Call 27/10/16</p>

## 5. Matters still under discussion

5.1.1 There are elements of the topics identified within Section 2 of this SoCG that are currently under discussion and the current status of discussion is presented below.

	Description of stakeholder issue	Transport for London response	Current Position	Record of discussions
<b>5.2 Examination First Written Questions – Terrestrial Ecology</b>				
TE9	<p>The Examining Authority’s first written questions published on the 18th October 2016 for TE9 states;</p> <p>The ES describes two Red Data Book invertebrate species that were found within the Order limits.</p> <p>Is Natural England satisfied with the specific mitigation for this species as described in the CoCP (Document 6.10) [APP-092]?</p>	<p>The Applicant is reviewing comments received from Natural England.</p>	<p>Based on current discussions NE would recommend that in paragraph 7.1.7 of the CoCP that the following wording is included:  <i>“Specific measures will be taken to ensure continual suitable open mosaic habitat is provided for the</i></p>	

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOCG001

	Description of stakeholder issue	Transport for London response	Current Position	Record of discussions
			<p><i>invertebrate assemblage prior to and during construction</i>".</p> <p>Provided wording as above is included then NE would be satisfied with the mitigation as specified.</p>	

	Description of stakeholder issue	Transport for London response	Current Position	Record of discussions
TE13	<p>The Examining Authority's first written questions published on the 18th October 2016 for TE13 states;</p> <p>Has the Applicant discussed the need for protected species licences with NE? If so, can the Applicant provide an agreed list of any that are required.</p> <p>Can NE confirm, in relation to each licence required, whether there is any known impediment to the issue of such licences?</p>	<p>There are no requirements for terrestrial protected species licences based on existing information provided within the ES.</p> <p>Discussions between the Applicant and Natural England are ongoing regarding the requirement for any licences required for marine protected species.</p>	<p>NE agree that there is no requirement for terrestrial protected species licences, however further clarification is required for marine protected species.</p>	
<b>5.3 Examination First Written Questions – Marine Ecology</b>				
ME1	<p>No surveys were undertaken to establish the marine mammal, fish and shellfish baseline; this was limited to desk based research.</p> <p>Can NE confirm that they are content with this approach?</p>	<p>Discussions between the Applicant and NE are ongoing. The Applicant is reviewing comments received from Natural England.</p>	<p>NE have raised concerns regarding impacts upon lagoon worm, sea slugs, seahorses and migrating smelt. NE are content</p>	

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOCG001

	Description of stakeholder issue	Transport for London response	Current Position	Record of discussions
			<p>that no surveys are undertaken to date, further desk based assessment by liaising with the EA (Ian Humpheryes) is recommended to ensure no adverse impact upon these species from the installation and decommissioning of the jetty.</p> <p>NE requested that a paragraph is included in the marine ecology chapter to</p>	

Silvertown Tunnel

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOCG001

	Description of stakeholder issue	Transport for London response	Current Position	Record of discussions
			summarise the effects upon the MCZ, breaking it down for each interest feature of the MCZ and relevant protected species.	
ME2	<p>The Examining Authority's first written questions published on the 18th October 2016 for ME2 states</p> <p>a) Please can the MMO/NE give the anticipated timescales for designation of the Thames Estuary recommended Marine Conservation Zone (rMCZ) and comment on whether the Silvertown tunnel development could delay any such designation?</p> <p>b) Please can the MMO/NE/Applicant provide a view to the ExA on how the</p>	The Scheme Order Limits fall within the boundary of the Thames Estuary recommended Marine Conservation Zone	<p>NE- The rMCZ should be equally weighted throughout the planning examination.</p> <p>NE - Part A / B agreed and part C we can report that the</p>	

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOCG001

	Description of stakeholder issue	Transport for London response	Current Position	Record of discussions
	<p>rMCZ should be weighted as part of the planning examination?</p> <p>c) Please can the MMO/NE explain the process and timescale for the designation of the MCZ and whether it is possible that the designation would not occur?</p>	<p>(rMCZ) which stretches from Richmond to the wider mouth at Southend and Grain. Four subtidal and intertidal habitats and two species are under consideration for designation in this zone. The habitat features are: intertidal mixed sediments (note: intertidal mud or saltmarshes are considered to be sufficiently protected by other designations), subtidal coarse sediment, subtidal sand and subtidal mud. The species are: tentacled lagoon worm (<i>Alkmaria romijni</i>) and European smelt (<i>Osmerus eperlanus</i>).</p> <p>This rMCZ was not among the first or second tranches of MCZs designated in 2013 and 2016 respectively. Designation of the recommended site is currently on hold as Defra has indicated a need to better understand the implications of the designation of the site for potential developments within the estuary. A formal MCZ assessment is consequently not required at this time as per the MMO Guidance <i>Marine conservation zones and marine licensing</i>. MMO, April 2013 (attached as Appendix A).</p> <p>As such, the Thames Estuary is not a designated MCZ, and is not protected by the</p>	<p>Government are committed to a 3<sup>rd</sup> tranche of MCZs which includes this site.</p> <p>Further info for full process could be supplied by NE if absolutely required.</p> <p>Discussions ongoing between The Applicant and Natural England</p>	

Silvertown Tunnel

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOCG001

	Description of stakeholder issue	Transport for London response	Current Position	Record of discussions
		<p>provisions of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 (such as the need for decision making authorities to refer assessments to the JNCC where there could be effects to protected features). It is therefore considered that little or no weight can be applied to it.</p> <p>Furthermore, even if the site was a designated MCZ, it is considered that the habitats would be of moderate importance (i.e. nationally designated) though this would be reduced to low due to the highly impoverished nature of the benthic community within the study area (as discussed in the ES). Species observed would also be expected to have a relatively rapid recovery rate. Even if the level of importance of the habitats cited within the rMCZ were to be raised to high, it is considered that this would increase the significance of the effects to minor adverse at worst, and would not materially change the conclusions of the assessment as presented in Chapter 10 Marine Ecology of the ES (APP-031).</p>		
ME7	The Examining Authority's first written questions published on the			

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOCG001

	Description of stakeholder issue	Transport for London response	Current Position	Record of discussions
	<p>18th October 2016 for ME7 states</p> <p>The EA, in its RR [RR-299] identifies a discrepancy between the information provided in the CMS [APP-046] in relation to the techniques to be used in piling and those described in paragraph 10.6.69 of the ES [APP-031]. The EA also makes a request for a piling method statement to be secured through the dDCO.</p> <p>a) Can the Applicant please confirm the techniques to be used for piling, including providing a map showing the location and duration at each piling site;</p> <p>b) Should this be different to that assessed in the ES, the Applicant is requested to provide a revised assessment; and</p> <p>c) Do other IPs consider that there should be a piling method statement secured through a</p>	<p>As described in paragraph 4.4.71 of the CMS [APP-046] the envisaged construction of the temporary jetty will require steel tubular piles being driven into the river bed. The final construction methodology will be developed by the Contractor at the detailed design stage; this will be in accordance with the conditions of the CoCP and the dDML. Envisaged Temporary Jetty Details are shown on Drawing ST150030-ATK-ZZZ-ZZ-DR-CE3151 Rev P01 within Appendix B of the CMS (APP-046) and Engineering Section Drawings &amp; Plans Envisaged Temporary Jetty Regulations 5(2) (o) &amp; 5(2)(p) &amp;6 (2) Sheet 23 of 23, ST150030-</p>	<p>An updated DML will be submitted for DL1.</p> <p>NE to review the DML to ensure all the correct mitigation is included. MMO to consult NE.</p>	

	Description of stakeholder issue	Transport for London response	Current Position	Record of discussions
	<p>Requirement in the dDCO or condition in the dDML which identifies piling methods, locations, duration (number of days and hours per day), seasonal limitations on piling and where/how soft start procedures would be implemented?</p>	<p>ATK-ZZZ-ZZ-DR-CE-3036 Rev P01 (APP-011). As set out in paragraph 10.6.69 of the ES [APP-031], for the purposes of the assessment of any potential impacts it has been assumed a most likely scenario, i.e. soft start vibro piling will be used for the burial of the first 12.5 metres and percussive piling will be used to achieve the final 12.5 metres depth. It is proposed that the piling work will take place up to 12 hours per day over approximately eight weeks.</p> <p>Piling methodology will be controlled through the dDCO as it will form part of the construction plans and method statements which will need to be submitted to the PLA and MMO pursuant to the Protective Provisions and dDML.</p>		
<p><b>5.4 Examination First Written Questions – Habitats Regulation Assessment</b></p>				
<p>HRA2</p>	<p>The Examining Authority’s first written questions published on the 18th October 2016 for HRA2 states</p> <p>The justification for the conclusions reached in the in-combination</p>	<p>Discussions between the Applicant and NE are ongoing.</p> <p>The Applicant is reviewing comments received from Natural England.</p>	<p>Discussions between the Applicant and NE are ongoing</p>	

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Natural England

SOCG Reference: SOCG001

	Description of stakeholder issue	Transport for London response	Current Position	Record of discussions
	assessment provided in section 7.5 of the HRA Report [APP-064] is on the basis that the Greenwich and Newham local plans have had their own HRA screening assessment which concluded no significant effect and that policies in the Core Strategies are to enhance biodiversity. Has NE agreed with this approach taken by the Applicant?			
HRA3	The Examining Authority's first written questions published on the 18th October 2016 for HRA3 states  The EA has raised concerns regarding the mobilisation of contaminants in its RR [RR-299] in relation to Water Framework Directive (WFD) compliance. The Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsar site are downstream of the Silvertown tunnel proposal and has features which could potentially be sensitive to changes in water quality.	Chapter 16 Water quality and Flood Risk and Chapter 10 - Marine Ecology of the ES [APP-031] provides full details of the predicted effects on water quality from mobilisation of contaminants during the construction of the Scheme. As set out in Paragraph 16.6.13 of the revised Chapter 16 Water quality and Flood Risk submitted at Deadline 1, the proposed works at Silvertown are not expected to lead to a long-term deterioration of the assessed contaminants (i.e. specific pollutants, priority substances or priority hazardous substances) within the Thames Middle transitional water body, nor prevent the water body from meeting its WFD objectives.	Discussions between the Applicant and NE are ongoing	

	Description of stakeholder issue	Transport for London response	Current Position	Record of discussions
	<p>a) Can the Applicant provide commentary on whether mobilisation of contaminants could open up pathways for effects to the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsar site; and</p> <p>a) Please can the EA expand on their concerns in relation to this SPA and Ramsar site?</p> <p>b) Please can NE provide their views on this matter?</p>	<p>Section 7.3 of the HRA [APP-064] presents further the assessment of the potential effects (direct and indirect) on European Sites as a result of changes in water quality or changes of flow, concluding that:</p> <p><i>The Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsar site is sufficiently far removed at 30km east of the Scheme not to be within the zone of influence of water quality effects.</i></p> <p>Due to no hydrological connectivity between the Scheme and the site, the residual effects are recorded as Neutral. Furthermore it should be noted, there is not sufficiently functionally linked wetland within the zone of influence of the Scheme. Therefore, no likely significant effects upon the Natura 2000 sites from water quality or flow have been identified resulting from the Scheme, either alone or in combination with other known plans and projects.</p>		

## 6. Matters not agreed

6.1.1 There are no elements of the topics identified within Section 2 of this SoCG that are not agreed.

## 7. Agreement

Signed	
Name	
Position	
Company	Transport for London
Date	
Signed	
Name	
Position	
Company	Natural England
Date	