

Esso Petroleum Company Limited: Southampton to London Pipeline Project
Development Consent Order application ♦ Project reference no. EN070005

Runnymede Borough Council

Response to the Examining Authority's first written questions
and requests for information (ExQ1)

**Runnymede Borough Council
Runnymede Civic Centre
Station Road
Addlestone
KT15 2AH**

Contents

This document is Runnymede Borough Council's response to the Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1) issued on Wednesday 16 October 2019. The Council's responses are presented in the same numerical order as original questions, as follows.

ExA question number	Topic	Page
	General questions	
GQ1.4	Updates on development	5
GQ.1.7	Further information	5
	Biodiversity and habitats	
BIO.1.2	Landscape and Ecological Management Plan	5
BIO.1.43	Thames Basin Heaths SPA	6
	Draft Development Consent Order	
DCO.1.15	Part 3 Article 14 – access to works	7
DCO.1.16	Part 4 Article 17 – discharge of water	8
DCO.1.30	Schedule 2 Requirement 3 – states of the authorised development	8
DCO.1.33	Schedule 2 Requirement 6(2) – Construction Environmental Management Plan	9
DCO.1.34	Schedule 2 Requirement 6(2) – Construction Environmental Management Plan	10
DCO.1.35	Schedule 2 Requirement 8(3) – Hedgerows and trees	11
DCO.1.37	Schedule 2 Requirement 20 – Further information	11
DCO.1.38	Schedule 2 Part 2 – Procedure for discharge of Requirement	12
	Flood risk, water resources and geology	
FR.1.2	Surface and foul drainage system	12
	Historic environment	
HE.1.2	Written scheme of investigation	13
	Landscape and visual	
LV.1.2	Landscape and Ecological Management Plan	13
LV.1.20	Planting mitigation	13
LV.1.25	Viewpoints	15
	People and communities	
PC.1.1	Community receptors	15
PC.1.8	Working hours	15

ExA question number	Topic	Page
	Scope of development and environmental impact assessment	
EIA.1.7	Cumulative effects	17
EIA.1.8	Cumulative effects	18
	Traffic and transport	
TT.1.2	Construction Traffic Management Plan	18
TT.1.4	Study areas	19
TT.1.11	Heavily-trafficked roads	19
TT.1.15	Construction traffic routing	20
	APPENDIX	
RBC-1	List of planning permissions along the pipeline route	21

GQ.1.4: UPDATES ON DEVELOPMENT

Question addressed to all Relevant Planning Authorities

Provide an update of any planning applications that have been submitted, or consents that have been granted, since the Application was submitted that could either effect the proposed route or would be affected by the Proposed Development.

A list is provided in appendix RBC-1.

GQ.1.7: FURTHER INFORMATION

Question addressed to Runnymede Borough Council

Provide the dates for when the Chertsey Agricultural Show is held and over how many days the event is held.

The show is held annually in the first half of August. In 2020 it will be held over the weekend of 8-9 August. The event organisers occupy the site for at least a week before and after the event to set up and remove event structures.

BIO.1.2 LANDSCAPE AND ECOLOGICAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

Question addressed to all Relevant Planning Authorities

Comment on the absence of an Outline LEMP in the Examination and whether it is agreed that such a document could be submitted as part of the discharge of Requirement 12 of the draft DCO [AS-059].

The Council's Local Impact Report (LIR) submitted on 24 October 2019 identifies the specific landscape and ecology concerns raised by the pipeline proposals, particularly during the construction phase of the project. These concerns include the lack of detail over the effects on landscape and wildlife habitats at any given point along the pipeline route and the specific mitigation that would be implemented.

As the LIR explains, the Council lacks in-house ecological expertise and is concerned to avoid a situation where the burden of finding practical solutions to specific landscape and ecological sensitivities falls to the relevant planning authority when DCO Requirements are being discharged.

The Applicant's Environmental Statement (ES) places reliance on the measures contained in the LEMP to mitigate the effects on trees and wider biodiversity. Draft Requirement 12 provides for the submission and approval of the LEMP prior to the commencement of the relevant stage of development. However, with no outline LEMP provided as a part of the DCO application, it is unclear whether the measures that are being relied upon will be able to sufficiently mitigate the likely adverse effects identified.

The Council therefore considers that the specific measures proposed to remedy the effects upon biodiversity and landscape should be set out in an outline LEMP, made available for consideration during the current DCO examination. The outline LEMP should be presented in sufficient detail to enable ExA and interested parties to arrive at informed judgements at the likely effectiveness of the protective measures and mitigation that would be implemented should the development proceed.

To this end it would be helpful if the outline LEMP identified the surveys, consultations, licenses, mitigation, site management and aftercare that the Applicant proposes to ensure satisfactory outcomes on the ground. In this context the Council recommends that the project should seek to achieve biodiversity net gain within each local authority area affected, rather than across the pipeline as a whole.

BIO.1.43: THAMES BASIN HEATHS SPA

Question addressed to the Applicant

Respond to the points raised in Surrey Heath Borough Council's RR [RR-093] with regards to the potential adverse effects on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA that would result from the Proposed Development's effect on the two SANGs (St Catherine's Road and Windlemere) within the borough.

The concerns raised by Surrey Heath Borough Council (SHBC) in respect of the effects of Esso's proposals on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and associated SANGs are shared by Runnymede BC. In its Written Representation submitted for Deadline 2 SHBC requests the addition of two additional DCO Requirements to provide safeguards in respect of the provision and capacity of SANGs and the management of open space generally during the construction of the proposed pipeline. These additional Requirements are set out below and Runnymede BC supports their inclusion in any DCO as made.

NEW REQUIREMENT XX - Provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace

(1) No stage of the authorised development which includes works or the siting or use of a construction compound in existing open space identified as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace must commence until, for that stage, a scheme for the provision of new or alternative Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

(2) The scheme submitted under requirement XX(1) above shall identify the likely impact of the works on the recreational capacity of the Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace and the means for securing the use of an alternative of at least the same recreational capacity and serving the same function of avoiding additional recreational pressure on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA.

NEW REQUIREMENT YY - Management of Works in Open Space

(1) No stage of the authorised development which includes works or the siting or use of a construction compound in open space must commence until, for that stage, a scheme for the management of the open space during the period of construction has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

(2) The scheme submitted under requirement YY(1) must include:

- i) Details of the method of construction within that open space;*
- ii) The proposed dates of construction activity and the siting of any construction compound within that open space;*
- iii) The proposed working hours for construction activity within that open space;*
- iv) Details of how public access to the open space will be maintained during the course of construction;*
- v) Details of how the open space will be restored at the end of the construction period.*

(3) Where the open space affected by the works is identified as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace for the purposes of the avoiding recreational pressure on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, the scheme submitted under requirement YY(1) must include an assessment of how the details of the works and measures in the scheme will avoid any displacement of recreational activity from the open space.

(4) The works comprised in any stage must be constructed in accordance with the scheme approved under requirement YY(1).

DCO.1.15: PART 3 ARTICLE 14 – ACCESS TO WORKS

Question addressed to all Relevant Planning Authorities

Comment on the provision contained within Part 3 Article 14 of the draft DCO [AS-059]

Part 3 Article 14 of the draft DCO (AS-059) provides:

‘The undertaker may, for the purposes of the authorised development, form and layout means of access, or improve existing means of access, at such locations within the Order limits as the undertaker reasonably requires for the purposes of the authorised development.’

Given the length of the scheme, and the wide order limits along on the route corridors, this is a particularly broad power. Potentially it would authorise substantial works by way

of the creation of new site accesses for construction traffic, which may have highways implications. It could also result in the loss of hedgerows, trees and other vegetation (pursuant to the power in Article 41) with (unassessed) biodiversity and landscape/visual impact issues. Since proposed means of access are identified on the Order plans, this is an additional power, which does not appear to be necessary. The applicant justifies the width of its pipeline working areas in part by reference to the need to construct a haul road along much of the route (see e.g. Statement of Reasons, 6.5.9). This means that the proposed means of access are sufficient, since the remainder of the route can be accessed through the internal haul road. In those circumstances, it is not necessary to also include a power for the creation of additional means of access.

The Explanatory Memorandum (paragraphs 6.70-71) refers to provisions for consent from the street authority for the creation of additional accesses. This explanation is inconsistent with the draft Article, which does not contain a consent provision.

The Council considers that either Article 14 should be deleted, or subject to approval provisions which will allow consideration of the effects of any additional site accesses.

DCO.1.16: PART 4 ARTICLE 17 – DISCHARGE OF WATER

Question addressed to all Relevant Planning Authorities

Comment on the provision contained within Part 4 Article 17 of the draft DCO [AS-059]

Article 17(1) of the draft DCO [AS-059] provides:

17. —(1) Subject to paragraphs (3) and (4) the undertaker may use any watercourse or any public sewer or drain for the drainage of water in connection with the carrying out or maintenance of the authorised development and for that purpose may lay down, take up and alter pipes and may, on any land within the Order limits, make openings into, and connections with, the watercourse, public sewer or drain.

This is a very broad power, but is subject to the limitations in Article 17(3) which include the consent of the person who owns the relevant watercourse, drain etc. Accordingly, the provision is subject to an appropriate consent provision.

DCO.1.30: SCHEDULE 2 REQUIREMENT 3 – STAGES OF THE AUTHORISED DEVELOPMENT

Question addressed to the Applicant, all Host Relevant Planning Authorities

The ExA is concerned by this Requirement as it considers there is a lack of clarity in how it is worded and would operate in practice.

To the Applicant

- i) Explain how this Requirement would function when dealing with multiple

- authorities.
- ii) Explain whether it is the intention for all stages or Work Nos to be approved before development commences, or just individual stages and Work Nos with individual host authorities.
 - iii) If the former, explain when and how these stages will be identified.
 - iv) If the latter, explain whether this approach differs with the definition of “commence” in Part 1 Article 1 of the draft DCO [AS-059] or that all stages and all relevant Requirements must be approved by all host authorities prior to commencement (except in circumstances outlined).

To the Host Local Authorities and National Park Authority

- i) **Comment on the effectiveness of this Requirement.**

Schedule 2 Requirement 3 of the draft DCO [AS-059] states:

‘The authorised development may not commence until a written scheme setting out all stages of the authorised development relevant to it has been submitted to the relevant planning authority.’

It is agreed that there is a lack of clarity in this provision for the reasons set out by the ExA. It is unclear whether the written scheme for all stages will be sent for the approval of each local authority. If not, as would appear to be the only practicable option, it is unclear how the authority would control the “stages”. Further there is no provision for approval of the stages, which relates to a broader concern about the potential duration of the works.

DCO.1.33: SCHEDULE 2 REQUIREMENT 6(2) – CONSTRUCTION ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

Question addressed to the Applicant, all Host Relevant Planning Authorities

Requirement 6 of the draft DCO [AS-059] states that the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) must be substantially in accordance with the Outline CEMP. However, the Outline CEMP [APP-129] contains scant and in some cases no details regarding the plans and measures set out in Requirement 6(2)(d). The ExA is concerned that in discharging the Requirement, relevant planning authorities would be determining information and evidence which is not before the Secretary of State, and subsequently the CEMP will be a substantial departure from the Outline CEMP.

To the Applicant:

- i) Respond and justify the current approach

To All Relevant Planning Authorities:

- i) Comment on the above.

For the various reasons given throughout the Council's LIR, the Council shares ExA's concern that the outline CEMP submitted by the applicant (application document 6.4 – ES appendix 16.2, ref APP-130) suffers a near-complete lack of detail, offering instead the vague reassurance that it would be for Esso's contractors to work up the detail of the document.

Whilst appreciating the need for flexibility on matters such as the micro-siting of the pipeline, the Order Limits, Limits of Deviation and powers provided to the Undertaker of the Order are so broadly drawn that they could equally admit an acceptable development solution or one that would give rise to significant and unacceptable harm. A detailed draft CEMP could help to assuage this concern. It is requested that ExA invites the applicant to submit a detailed draft CEMP within a reasonable timeframe during the current DCO examination for consideration. This could provide important reassurances that are currently lacking.

The concern implicit in Written Question DCO.1.33 is exemplified in respect of tree protection (see paragraphs 2.3 through 2.14 of the Council's LIR), in respect of which Requirement 6(2)(d)(ix) requires the submission and approval of an Arboricultural Management Plan. As things stand the impacts of the proposed development on trees at any individual point along the pipeline route are unquantified and not accurately assessed.

DCO.1.34: SCHEDULE 2 REQUIREMENT 6(2) – CONSTRUCTION ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

Question addressed to the Applicant, all Host Relevant Planning Authorities

Requirement 6(2)(d)(vi) makes provision for a Community Engagement Plan to form part of the CEMP. The ExA places considerable importance on the need for such a plan to ensure effective engagement with the local community prior to and during construction. However, the ExA considers that a Community Engagement Plan or Local Liaison Officer should form a separate Requirement in draft DCO.

Given the number of communities and individuals that will be affected by construction of the pipeline, a separate DCO Requirement for a Community Engagement Plan is considered appropriate and is supported by the Council.

Local liaison groups with representatives from Esso and the relevant local authority would ensure that there is a clear channel of communication between the local community, the Applicant and the Applicant's contractors.

DCO.1.35: SCHEDULE 2 REQUIREMENT 8(3) – HEDGEROWS AND TREES

Question addressed to the Applicant, all Host Relevant Planning Authorities

Requirement 8(3) of the draft DCO [AS-059] states that any hedgerow or tree planting which is removed, uprooted, destroyed, dies or becomes seriously damaged or defective within a three-year period must be replaced.

Comment on the adequacy of the Requirement and on the time period allowed for reinstatement and management.

The Council is pleased that Esso is committed to ensuring that the mitigation planting would be cared for post-construction, not least because the loss of trees and other vegetation is one of the most significant adverse effects of the pipeline project.

However, the Council considers that a three-year aftercare period is insufficient to ensure that the proposed planting has established properly. A five-year aftercare period would be more appropriate, in keeping with widespread planning practice.

Paragraphs 2.3 – 2.14 of the Council's LIR offers further observations in respect of the tree protection and replacement.

DCO.1.37: SCHEDULE 2 REQUIREMENT 20 – FURTHER INFORMATION

Question addressed to the Applicant, all Host Relevant Planning Authorities

To the Applicant:

- i) Justify the time period of two business days from receipt of the application that the relevant planning authority has for requesting further information, which the ExA is concerned is unreasonably short.

To All Relevant Planning Authorities:

- i) Comment on the above.

The Council agrees that the period of two business days from receipt of an application to discharge a DCO Requirement to the relevant planning authority requesting further information when necessary is unreasonably short.

It is recommended that a period of fifteen business days is specified, with 'business days' defined expressly in Schedule 3 Part 1 Requirement 1: *Interpretation* of the draft DCO as follows:

"Business days" means days other than Saturdays, Sundays, bank holidays or days on which General or Local Elections are held.

The logic of the latter provision is that many local authority members of staff are deployed

to polling station duties on days when elections are held.

DCO.1.38: SCHEDULE 2 PART 2 – PROCEDURE FOR DISCHARGE OF REQUIREMENT

Question addressed to all Relevant Planning Authorities

Comment on the Requirements in Schedule 2 Part 2 of the draft DCO [AS-059] in particular regard to the timescales given and the deemed consent provisions.

The provisions for approvals are inadequate. In light of the potential involvement of multiple local authorities there is likely to be a need to adopt a coordinated approach, which is likely to take some of the determination period. It is suggested that the provision could be amended to *require* prior notification under paragraph 19, which would mean that a period of 20 days for consultation between the authorities before an application covering multiple authorities would be required. That provision could be amended as follows:

'19. ~~Without limiting the scope of paragraph 18 above,~~ Where an application is required to be made to more than one relevant authority for any single consent, agreement or approval under a Requirement, the undertaker shall submit a request for comments in respect of its proposed application to each relevant authority and, where it does so, each relevant authority must provide its comments in writing on the proposed application within a period of 20 days beginning with the day immediately following that on which the request is received by the authority, so as to enable the undertaker to prepare a consolidated application to each relevant authority in respect of the consent, agreement or approval required by the Requirement'.

FR.1.2: SURFACE AND FOUL DRAINAGE SYSTEM

Question addressed to all Relevant Planning Authorities, The Environment Agency

Comment on the absence of an Outline SFDS in the Examination and whether it is agreed that such a document could be submitted as part of the discharge of Requirement 9 of the draft DCO [AS-059].

Specific flood and drainage considerations raised by the section of pipeline passing through the Borough are identified throughout the Council's LIR. As a general point it is desirable that arrangements for drainage during the construction works are clearly specified and approved before implementation. These waters, if not disposed of correctly will have the potential to impede or cause damage to the works themselves and to contaminate watercourses and cause local disruption.

The Council appreciates why detailed site-specific provisions for surface and foul drainage will only become available post-consent. Subject to the Environment Agency's advice, Requirement 9: *Surface and foul water drainage* in the draft DCO (application document

3.1, ref. AS-059) appears to make appropriate provision for the submission and approval of surface and foul water drainage provisions.

However, the Council considers that it would assist the Examination and fill a lacuna in the current information base if the Applicant was asked to produce a SFDS method statement, explaining how the measures identified in the REAC would be implemented for the range of engineering works Esso proposes and in the general range of environments that the pipeline would pass through.

HE.1.2: WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION

Question addressed to all Relevant Planning Authorities

Comment on the absence of an Outline WSI in the Examination and whether it is agreed that such a document could be submitted as part of the discharge of Requirement 11 of the draft DCO [AS-059].

Subject to the advice of Historic England and the Surrey County Archaeologist, the Council is content that Requirement 11 of the draft DCO provides adequate protection for archaeological interests along the pipeline route. An outline WSI would presumably be a broad-brush document, unlikely to add materially to the information base on which the DCO application would be determined.

LV.1.2: LANDSCAPE AND ECOLOGICAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

Question addressed to all Relevant Planning Authorities

Comment on the absence of an Outline LEMP in the Examination and whether it is agreed that such a document could be submitted as part of the discharge of Requirement 12 of the draft DCO [AS-059].

N.B – This question is repeated in BIO1.2. The Relevant Planning Authorities may wish to address the issue in a combined response to both questions.

Please refer to the Council's response to Written Question BIO.1.2 above.

LV.1.20: PLANTING MITIGATION

Question addressed to all Relevant Planning Authorities

The REAC (Ref: G92 Table 16.2) [APP-056] states that a three-year aftercare period would be established for all mitigation planting and reinstatement.

Comment on the appropriateness of this measure and time length proposed.

As explained in response to Written Question DCO.1.35 (above), the Council considers

that a three-year aftercare period is insufficient to ensure that the proposed planting has established properly. A five-year aftercare period would be more appropriate, in keeping with widespread planning practice.

Requirement 12: *Landscape and Ecological Management Plan* of the draft DCO (application document 3.1, ref. AS-059) provides for the submission and approval of a LEMP by the Relevant Planning Authority. As drafted Requirement 12 only requires the LEMP to ‘reflect’ the survey results, ecological mitigation and SSSI working plans included in the Applicant’s Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC), which is set out in section 16.3 of ES chapter 16: *Environmental Management and Mitigation* (application document 6.2, PINS ref. APP-056). The REAC offers only broad-brush commitments. In respect of planting mitigation, the Council considers that the LEMP should include the following aftercare provisions for all new tree and shrub planting:

Aftercare of trees

- (i) *Maintenance of a weed free area around the base of each tree;*
- (ii) *watering to ensure moisture levels are maintained appropriate for optimum growth (establishment period only);*
- (iii) *application of a slow release fertiliser around the base of all trees, if required following soil fertility testing, to ensure soil fertility is maintained;*
- (iv) *remove any vandalised, unhealthy or dead specimens as soon as possible and replacement with trees of the same size to those adjacent, during the next available planting season;*
- (v) *inspection, adjustment and maintenance of anchors, stakes and ties;*
- (vi) *removal of any items that have been attached to trees*
- (vii) *re-firming of trees after strong winds, frost heave or other disturbances;*
- (viii) *pruning to remove dead, dying or diseased wood.*
- (ix) *remove suckers and formatively prune if necessary to achieve natural shape, healthy growth and to favour a single leader; and*
- (x) *topping up mulch at the end of the rectification period to achieve a 75mm layer.*

Aftercare of shrubs

- (i) Control and removal of weeds;
- (ii) pruning of shrubs for floral, foliage and stem colour effect and to remove weak, dead and diseased branches;
- (iii) pruning of species to ensure correct form; plus, to promote flowering/berry production/retention (where appropriate);
- (iv) remove any dead growth, avoiding damage to any new shoots that have emerged;
- (v) remove any failed, vandalised, unhealthy or dead specimens as soon as possible and provide replacements of the same size to those adjacent, during the next available planting season;
- (vi) watering of plants to ensure moisture levels are maintained appropriate for optimum growth;

- (vii) removal of litter from all planting beds to maintain site in a tidy condition; and
- (viii) top up mulch annually to achieve a 75mm layer.

LV.1.25: VIEWPOINTS

Question address to all Relevant Planning Authorities

- i) Confirm acceptance of the representative viewpoints as set out in Appendix 10 of the ES (APP-114); or
- ii) If not accepted, explain why.

The Council is content with the representative viewpoints identified.

PC.1.1: COMMUNITY RECEPTORS

Question addressed to all Relevant Planning Authorities

Confirm that the study area applied to community receptors (500m from the Order Limits) in Chapter 13 of the ES [APP-053] is adequate.

The Council considers that 500 metres from the Order Limits represents a reasonable study area for the identification of community receptors. Significant community effects are considered unlikely to arise at greater distances and would in any event be temporary.

PC.1.8: WORKING HOURS

Question addressed to the Applicant and all Relevant Planning Authorities

The proposed hours of work are 4 hours longer than a standard working day and would operate 6 days a week [APP-128].

To the Applicant:

- i) Advise why the extended working hours would be required.
- ii) Confirm that there would be no working on public as well as bank holidays.
- iii) What action is proposed to minimise the effect of deliveries and construction on the living conditions of residential properties particularly between the hours of 07:00 and 09:00.
- iv) Paragraphs 1.1.30 and 1.1.31 of the CoCP [APP-128] list a number of circumstances where working outside of these hours/days would be required. Explain the frequency that this may occur and what measures are proposed to inform residents when this does occur and what measures are proposed to minimise any harm to living conditions that may occur as a result of these alternative working hours.

To All Relevant Planning Authorities:

i) Comment on the working hours proposed.

According to paragraphs 1.1.29 – 1.1.31 of the Applicant's *Code of Construction Practice* (CoCP; Environmental Statement appendix 16.1, application document 6.4, ref. APP-128):

Working Hours

- 1.1.29 *The project is required under the DCO to adhere to normal working hours of 07:00 to 19:00 Monday to Saturday. Sunday or Bank Holiday working is not anticipated as being typical.*
- 1.1.30 *Exceptions may be required for Bank Holiday and Sunday working (restricted to 08:00 to 18:00) or night-time working for activities such as: the continuous pulling phase for a major crossing using HDD; where daytime working would be excessively disruptive to normal traffic operation; cleaning/testing of the pipeline; or overnight traffic management measures (G5).*
- 1.1.31 *During the 24-month construction period, the works would encounter environmental and other constraints such as unforeseen ground conditions, weather conditions etc. This may require Sunday and Bank Holiday working, so prolonged disruption in any one area could be limited.*
- 1.1.32 *To reduce congestion on the public highways, and to meet the requirements of the local authorities and the police, where practicable, abnormal loads would be transported outside normal working hours.*

Requirement 5: *Code of Construction Practice* in Schedule 2 Part 1 of the draft DCO (application document 3.1, ref. AS-059) states that:

5. The authorised development must be undertaken in accordance with the code of construction practice, or with such changes to that document as agreed by the relevant planning authority.

In other words, the CoCP would not be submitted to Relevant Planning Authorities for approval prior to the commencement of development. Requirement 14: *Construction hours* of the draft DCO recites the working hours set out in the CoCP, reinforcing the point that construction hours would be fixed by the DCO from the outset without any enforceable means of variation should a Relevant Planning Authority consider this necessary.

The Council appreciates that some construction activities might require work to take place outside of 'normal' working hours. The Council appreciates also that the sooner construction work can be completed, the sooner communities and environments affected can return to normal.

However, Esso's non-negotiable 'one size fits all' formula for managing construction working hours omits to acknowledge the wide range of environmental and amenity conditions encountered along the pipeline route. There are places – for example, in open farmland remote from sensitive receptors – where extended working hours might well be acceptable. In others, such as where the pipeline weaves through residential neighbourhoods or close to schools, restricted working hours would be justified.

In recognition of this it is proposed that:

1. Draft DCO Requirement 5: *Code of Construction Practice* is amended to require its submission and approval by the Relevant Planning Authority prior to the commencement of construction works. This would have the additional benefit of enabling input by Esso's contractors, who have yet to be appointed and in whom great faith is currently placed by the Applicant for the effective implementation of the proposed construction mitigation strategies.
2. Draft DCO Requirement 14: *Construction hours* is amended to require the submission of approval by the Relevant Planning Authority of construction working hours for defined sections of the pipeline. This would incentivise the Applicant or its contractor to negotiate practical local solutions with the relevant planning and highways authorities and environmental health officers.

In the event that the approach recommended above is unacceptable it is requested that the normal working hours specified in the CoCP and DCO are specified as 08:00 to 18:00 Mondays to Fridays and 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays with no working on Sundays and Bank Holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Relevant Planning Authority.

EIA.1.7: CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Question addressed to all Relevant Planning Authorities

- i) **Comment on the long list of other developments that have the potential to lead to inter-project cumulative effects at Appendix 15.1 of the ES [App-125].**
- ii) **Confirm that potential inter-project cumulative effects have been fully assessed in the ES.**

RBC as an individual LPA is not in a position to comment on this.

EIA.1.8: CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

All Interested Parties

Confirm the ES [App-055] to [App-127] and the HRA report [APP-130] and [APP-131] have adequately assessed the cumulative or in-combination effects that could arise from other development, plans and projects along the proposed route.

In addition to Esso's current pipeline proposals there are two other major infrastructure schemes affecting the Borough. These are:

- Heathrow Airport Expansion: <https://www.heathrowexpansion.com/>
- River Thames Scheme: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/river-thames-scheme-reducing-flood-risk-from-datchet-to-teddington/river-thames-scheme-reducing-flood-risk-from-datchet-to-teddington>

These do not appear to be represented in the ES and HRA report.

TT.1.2: CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN

Question addressed to all Relevant Highways and Planning Authorities

Comment on the absence of an Outline CTMP in the Examination and whether it is agreed that such a document can be submitted as part of the discharge of Requirement 7 of the draft DCO [AS-059].

Given the propensity of pipeline construction works to impede road access and disrupt traffic flows the Council is disappointed at the absence of a draft CTMP for consideration during the DCO examination. It is requested that ExA invites the submission of a substantial draft CTMP by Examination Deadline 5 (Thursday 13 February 2020) with comments on the draft CTMP to be submitted by Examination Deadline 6 (Thursday 5 March 2019). By 'substantial' we mean a draft document with reasoned content under each heading, in contrast with the Applicant's draft Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP, application document 6.4, ref. APP-130) which is only a skeleton document.

As described in the paragraphs 2.29 – 2.34 of the Council's LIR, it is requested also that the following provision is added to DCO Requirement 7: Construction Traffic Management Plan:

The CTMP for each stage will provide details of the following:

- a) Development phasing*
- b) Vehicle types*
- c) Abnormal indivisible load movements*

- d) *Recording of construction vehicle movements*
- e) *Local highway issues and constraints*
- f) *Highway condition survey*
- g) *Access and route strategy*
- h) *Signage strategy*
- i) *Core working hours*
- j) *Use of banksmen*
- k) *Management of public rights of way*
- l) *Wheel-washing and maintenance of a clean highway*
- m) *Travel plan for construction workers*
- n) *Temporary traffic management procedures*
- o) *Temporary repositioning of bus stops*
- p) *Communications and community engagement*
- q) *Liaison with emergency services*
- r) *Monitoring arrangements*
- s) *Compliance and enforcement procedures*

TT.1.4: STUDY AREAS

Question addressed to the Applicant, all Relevant Highway and Planning Authorities

To the Applicant:

- i) **Confirm that the Traffic and Transport assessment study area [APP-135] is established relevant to the locations of the proposed logistics hubs, construction compounds and where works are within roads which are anticipated to exceed four weeks in duration.**

To all relevant Highway and Planning Authorities

- i) **Explain whether the extent of the study area for this assessment is acceptable.**

The Council defers to Surrey County Council in its capacity as the Local Highway Authority in respect of this question.

TT.1.11: HEAVILY TRAFFICKED ROADS

Question addressed to the Applicant and All Relevant Highway and Planning Authorities

Paragraph 1.1.4 of the Planning Statement [APP-132] refers to the selection criteria for when trenchless as opposed to open cut techniques would be used. Amongst other things this includes 'heavily trafficked roads'.

To the Applicant:

- i) **Explain the criteria which determined roads which are deemed to be 'heavily trafficked'**

To all relevant Highway and Planning Authorities:

- i) Confirm the roads selected as being correct.**
- ii) Explain whether additional roads could be defined as 'heavily trafficked' and should benefit from trenchless crossings and if so, why.**

The Council defers to Surrey County Council in its capacity as the Local Highway Authority in respect of this question.

TT.1.15: CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC ROUTING

Question addressed to all relevant Planning Authorities

- i) Comment on the extent to which the local community (including local businesses, schools and farms) might be affected by the construction traffic routing, diversions and related arrangements as proposed by the Applicant.**
- ii) Comment on the suitability of the local road network for the size, quantity and type of construction traffic which is proposed would use it.**

The Council defers to Surrey County Council in its capacity as the Local Highway Authority in respect of this question.

Runnymede Borough Council
November 2019

Appendix RBC-1

Response to written question GQ.1.4: updates on development

List of planning applications and permissions
along the pipeline route

Planning applications awaiting decision (as of 31/10/2019) within SLP Final Route Order Limits (March 2019); SLP Final Route Possible Pipeline Location (March 2019); SLP Final Route Limits of Deviation (March 2019); SLP Consultation Corridor (Autumn 2018)		
Application number	Site address	Application description
RU.19/1310	Sandgates Guildford Road Chertsey Surrey KT16 9LT	Tree works application
RU.19/0916	Land at Hanworth Lane	Minor Material Amendment to RU.18/1280 amending the mix of three and 4 bedroom houses and including garages to the 4+bedroom units.
RU.19/0915	Land at Hanworth Lane Chertsey	Details pursuant to condition 24 of RU.18/1280 for SUDS for the access road only.
RU.19/0765	Abbeymoor Golf Club Green Lane Addlestone KT15 2XU	Replacement of existing driving range and associated buildings with an Adventure Golf Course at existing golf club: Playgolf Abbey Moor. Proposed additional car parking to north of existing car parking provisions. (revised plans received 11 October 2019 amending parking provision at the site and with additional lighting information).
RU.19/0011	Land at and north of 124 Green Lane Addlestone KT15 2TE	Outline planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and development of up to 240 residential dwellings, public open space, community room, vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access, with landscaping, nature conservation areas and associated matters (with access, landscaping, layout and scale to be determined)
RU.19/1360	The Annexe Hatch Farm Chertsey Road Addlestone Surrey KT15 2EH	Tree works application
RU.18/1321	158 Chertsey Road Addlestone Surrey KT15 2EJ	Erection of single storey rear extension and creation of first floor to property to provide habitable accommodation.
RU.19/1410	159 Chertsey Road Addlestone KT15 2EL	Single storey side and rear extension
RU.19/1565	15 Birch Close New Haw KT15 3JT	Part conversion of garage into habitable accommodation. First floor front/side extension
RU.19/1288	Lilypond Farm (Land to rear of) Longcross Road Chertsey KT16 0DT	Details pursuant of condition 2 of planning permission RU.18/1972- details of biodiversity scheme
RU.19/1433	St Peter's Hospital Guildford Road Chertsey KT16 0PZ	Prior notification of demolition of buildings within Area A (retirement) of planning approval RU.17/1815) in accordance with part 11, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)
RU.19/1505	St Peter's Hospital Guildford Road Chertsey KT16 0PZ	Non- material amendment to planning approval RU.17/1815
RU.19/1204 RU.19/1314 RU.19/0923 RU.19/0931 RU.19/0933 RU.19/0930 RU.19/1372 RU.19/0932 Ru.19/0929 RU.19/1440	St Peter's Hospital Guildford Road Chertsey KT16 0PZ	Multiple applications (some decided/some still awaiting decision): Details Pursuant to Discharge of Conditions of Planning permission RU.17/1815

RU.19/1140 RU.19/1419 Ru.19/1368 RU.19/1369 RU.19/1443 RU.19/1441 RU.19/1194 RU.19/1442 RU.19/1009 RU.19/0953 RU.19/0917 RU.19/0898 RU.19/0954 RU.19/1249 RU.19/1205 RU.19/1312 RU.19/1203 RU.19/1206 RU.19/1313		
RU.19/1506	St Peter's Hospital Guildford Road Chertsey KT16 0PZ	Installation of non-illuminated v board sign relating to area A
RU.19/1501	Land West of Salesian School Guildford Road	Details pursuant of condition 19 (hard & soft landscaping) of planning approval RU.18/1279 (formation of sports pitched, with associated earthworks and pavilion, with associated access, car parking and landscaping) comprising modification of boundary treatment from post and rail fencing to mesh fencing
RU.19/1304	Salesian School Guildford Road Chertsey KT16 9LU	Tree works application

Planning applications decided in last 90 days (as of 31/10/2019) within SLP Final Route Order Limits (March 2019); SLP Final Route Possible Pipeline Location (March 2019); SLP Final Route Limits of Deviation (March 2019); SLP Consultation Corridor (Autumn 2018)

Application number	Site address	Application description	Decision
RU.19/1317	Hanworth Lane Chertsey	Details pursuant to condition 24 (Surface Water Drainage for residential parcel of land) of Planning Permission RU.18/1280	Grant – 24/10/2019
RU.19/1099	The Round House Addlestone Road Addlestone KT15 2RX	Tree works application	No objection – 23/09/2019
RU.19/1100	The White House Addlestone Road Addlestone KT15 2RX	Tree works application	No objection – 23/09/2019
RU.19/1149	5 Woodham Lane Addlestone KT15 3LZ	Discharge of condition 10 of approved development RU.18/1388	Grant – 10/09/2019
RU.19/0476	St Peter's Hospital Guildford Road Chertsey KT16 0PZ	Non-Material Amendment to planning approval RU.17/1815	Refuse – 17/04/2019

Planning applications extracted from RBC GIS System					
Application Number	Application Type	Location	Proposal	Registered Date	Decision
RU.19/0696	Discharge of Conditions	Land West of Salesian School	Details pursuant to conditions 10 (surface water drainage); 14 (new tree planting); 17 (landscaping); condition 18 (scheme to enhance biodiversity); & 20 (Construction Environmental Management Plan) of application ref RU.18/1279 granted for Formation of sport pitches, associated earthworks and pavilion, with associated access, car parking and landscaping	15/05/2019	FINAL DECISION
RU.19/1288	Discharge of Conditions	Lilypond Farm (land to the rear of) Longcross Road Chertsey KT16 0DT	Details pursuant to condition 2 of planning permission RU.18/1972 - details of biodiversity enhancement scheme	12/09/2019	REGISTERED
RU.19/0922	Discharge of Conditions	Land West of Salesian School, Guildford Road, Chertsey	Details Pursuant to Discharge of Conditions 16 (tree protection) and 21 (bat roost assessment/mitigation) of Planning Approval RU.18/1279.	25/06/2019	