

Hart District Council

Application for Southampton to London Pipeline Project

Response to Rule 17 Request for Further Information

Submitted 30/1/2020

In its letter of 12 December 2019 PINS asked Hart District Council for:

- (A) a response to the 'Written Questions' (ExQ1) posed of Hart District Council in document PD-008 and
- (B) a response to specific question on SANGs in light of discussions at the issue-specific hearing on the 4th December 2019.

The responses are set out below.

- (A) Responses to The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)

FR.1.16 Location of Private Water Supplies

i) Provide an update on whether the request for the location of Private Water Supplies (PWS) have been provided to the Applicant.

HDC response: The Council is not aware of any request for the location of private water supplies. In any event this is not information that the Council holds.

ii) Provide a view on how the absence of this information might affect the Applicant's assessment in ES Chapter 8 [APP-048] and ES Appendix 8.4: Groundwater Abstraction Assessment [APP-105].

HDC response: Groundwater abstraction licenses and other issues fall within the remit of the Environment Agency. This is not something that the Council is able to comment on.

PC.1.26 Hartland Village

St Edward Homes [RR-225] and [AS-040] have raised a concern that the location of a proposed logistics hub and site compound area would prevent the delivery of housing at the site. Respond.

HDC response: Hartland Village is allocated for a residential-led mixed use development in the emerging Local Plan Strategy and Sites which is currently at Examination (an Inspector's Report is expected in February 2020).

The site benefits from a hybrid planning permission (part full, part outline) and forms part of the Council's housing land supply. The Council is therefore interested in the timely delivery of housing on that site. Construction on the site is already underway.

The Council understands that the applicant and St Edwards have effectively resolved this issue. Esso has submitted a proposed reduction to the size and location of the proposed Logistics Hub at Hartland Park, reflecting ongoing negotiations with the landowner and developer, and has a signed land agreement with the landowner on that basis.

The agreed proposed location and size of the Logistics Hub, as proposed to be changed, is such that it will not delay or potentially prejudice housing development on that site by the temporary use of land as a logistics hub site prior to its use for residential development.

On this basis the Council has no concerns to raise.

B) SANGs

At the issue-specific Hearing held on the 4 December 2019 [EV-010b] the ExA heard from a number of local authorities who were concerned about the potential effect of the Proposed Development on the SANGs and the consequential potential effect that this could have on nearby European sites. The Applicant advocated that HDC had raised no concerns on this matter. However, the ExA notes that the effect of the Proposed Development on access to Crookham Park SANG during construction was listed as an outstanding matter in the draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) [REP2-028] between the Applicant and HDC. In addition, the ExA note that Taylor Wimpey in their representation [REP2-121] raised concerns about the effect of the Proposed Development on a SANG required for their development at Queen Elizabeth Barracks, which is located within the HDC administrative area. As such, please can HDC:

1. Confirm if the Crookham Park SANG and the SANG referred to by Taylor Wimpey are the same SANG? If they are different SANGs please provide details for both SANGs.

HDC response: The Council confirms it is the same SANG.

2. Confirm, in light of the draft SoCG and the comments by Taylor Wimpey, if the Applicant's comments at the Hearing that HDC are satisfied on this issue were

correct? If not, please explain what your outstanding concerns regarding this issue are.

HDC response: Following further discussions with the applicant the Council has no outstanding concerns regarding this issue, reflected in the latest SOCG.

The Council had sought clarification that access from the Naishes Lane car park to the SANG will be maintained during pipeline construction. The Applicant identified relevant good practice and mitigation measures included in the Code of Construction Practice to the Authority, including commitment OP04 in the Code of Construction Practice, that *“Principal pedestrian routes within SANGs crossing the working area would be managed with access only closed for short periods while construction activities occur. Additional signage for diversions on to alternative existing paths will be utilised as appropriate.”* The Applicant also confirmed that principal pedestrian routes within SANGs would be treated the same as rights of way in terms of crossings, with any temporary diversions around and during live construction works across the pedestrian route being made within the vicinity of the works. Advance notification to the local community of works affecting users of the SANG is secured through a site-specific Community Engagement Plan, as committed to within the Outline Community Engagement Plan.

On this basis, the Authority confirmed that its concerns are overcome.