

Agenda Item 12
Report NPA15/18

Report to	South Downs National Park Authority
Date	26 April 2018
By	Wealden Heath Countryside Policy Manager
Title of Report Decision	South Downs National Park Authority Response to ESSO Pipeline Consultation

Recommendation: The Committee is recommended to:

- 1. Note the proposed scheme for the Replacement Pipeline.**
- 2. Note the impacts on the Special Qualities of the South Downs National Park.**
- 3. Approve the draft Response to ESSO, incorporating comments from Policy and Resources Committee, including a request that ESSO produce a fully costed scheme of mitigation and compensation before selecting the preferred route and going to formal consultation to allow proper consideration of the route.**
- 4. Endorse Members' and appropriate officers' continued engagement with the specific consultation and technical groups that ESSO has set up, to ensure National Park purposes are fully represented.**

1. Introduction

- 1.1 ESSO informed the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) in December 2017 that they were planning to replace 90km of the existing underground multi-fuel pipeline which feeds Heathrow and Gatwick airports with petrol, diesel and aviation fuel from Fawley Refinery near Southampton. The existing pipeline route passes through the South Downs National Park (SDNP) between Lower Upham and Alton, then between Binsted and Alice Holt. It was constructed in the 1960's and is coming to the end of its lifespan.
- 1.2 The new pipe will be 12 inches in diameter where the existing pipe is 10 inches, this increase in size will help to future proof the fuel supply to take account of increased air traffic. The working corridor for construction traffic along the proposed route is understood to be between 30m and 12m width. Construction depots along the route will be required as temporary working and storage areas for the duration of the works. Detailed information on the construction methodology and the proposed location of depots is not yet available.
- 1.3 The project will include both the construction of the proposed pipeline and also the subsequent process of decommissioning of the existing pipeline.
- 1.4 Officer meetings have taken place for ESSO to set out its plans for advancing the project and for the SDNPA to outline its approach to responding to major developments based on the impacts on the Special Qualities, as agreed by SDNPA members at the National Park Authority (NPA) meeting of Sept 14 and Dec 15, see **Appendix 1**.
- 1.5 This report includes the proposed draft response for approval, see **Appendix 3** which has been considered by, and updated to incorporate comments from Policy and Resources Committee in March 18, item 17.

2. Policy Context.

- 2.1 This proposal impacts and could contribute to the following policies of the PMP;
- 2.2 Policy 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 19, 24, 26, 28, 30, 31, 34, 37, 38, 47

3. Issues for consideration

- 3.1 The existing pipeline passes underground through the SDNP along the corridor shown in **Appendix 2a**, (parallel solid purple lines).
- 3.2 The wider corridor (200m – 300m) that is consulted over gives ESSO the flexibility to realign the pipeline should they need to avoid obstructions or environmental constraints.
- 3.3 When assessing which routes to take forward ESSO were mindful of the Major Development Test and ESSO have considered and assessed a route totally outside the SDNP to the west of Winchester, (**Appendix 2d** Option A, and the same route shown in **Appendix 2b** Route S2a).
- 3.4 Other routes not brought forward in **Appendix 2d** (options B, C, E) are to the west of the existing pipeline alignment that cross the SDNP for a shorter distance. These have not been brought for consultation due to likely higher impacts on the Special Qualities especially on the River Itchen SSSI and SAC, than the existing longer route (option G).
- 3.5 In selecting the route for consultation ESSO adopted 3 main principles to aid selection. The route should;
- Avoid environmentally protected and environmentally rich areas, albeit the routes are within the SDNP;
 - Be financially and physically viable;
 - Take into account the development plans in the Local Plans.
- 3.6 The routes which are outside the park have been discounted by ESSO as failing one or more of these criteria.
- 3.7 A corridor of around 200m to 300m will be consulted on, which will be narrowed down to a working corridor of around 30m when the works are in progress. A 6m wide way-leave will be required over the route of the buried pipeline for maintenance etc.

4. Summary of Evidence

- 4.1 Summaries of the impacts on the Special Qualities of the SDNP are given at the start of the Draft Response (**Appendix 3**) and are not repeated here.
- 4.2 The reports on the impacts on the special qualities (**Appendices 4-8**) also include assessments and comments on options that were considered by ESSO and haven't been brought forward, as it would have been necessary to rewrite the reports or commission new ones when by reference to the original sifted map and the consultation map orientation is relatively straightforward.
- 4.3 For completeness the full unabridged reports are presented in the **Appendices 4-8**.
- 4.4 In the pre-consultation discussions that took place between ESSO and the SDNPA officers, ESSO provided a map of 'sifted options' (**Appendix 2b** – sifted routes) and a route corridor map (**Appendix 2a** existing Route corridor) from which the reports were written. Subsequently ESSO have dropped some options (eg S2a and S1b_1, S1b, S1b_11 and renamed the remainder in an easier format for consultation purposes (**Appendix 2c** – Proposed routes for Consultation).

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 ESSO will be following the National Infrastructure Planning Process, looking to make a preferred route announcement in autumn 2018, with an application for a Development Consent Order to the Planning Inspectorate in 2019 with a view to the project starting in 2021.
- 5.2 The SDNPA will request that a fully mitigated scheme, or where mitigation is not possible that suitable compensation forms part of the scheme brought forward with the preferred route option/announcement to enable proper consideration and a full response to be made.

6. Other Implications

Implication	Yes*/No
Will further decisions be required by another committee/full authority?	No
Does the proposal raise any Resource implications?	No
How does the proposal represent Value for Money?	No VfM issues
Are there any Social Value implications arising from the proposal?	No
Have you taken regard of the South Downs National Park Authority's equality duty as contained within the Equality Act 2010?	Yes
Are there any Human Rights implications arising from the proposal?	No
Are there any Crime & Disorder implications arising from the proposal?	No
Are there any Health & Safety implications arising from the proposal?	No
Are there any Data Protection implications?	No
Are there any Sustainability implications based on the 5 principles set out in the SDNPA Sustainability Strategy	No

7. Risks Associated with the Proposed Decision

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation
None			

Andy Beattie

SDNPA response to ESSO Pipeline Northern and Southern Options

South Downs National Park Authority

Contact Officer:	Andy Beattie
Tel:	01730 819242
email:	andy.beattie@southdowns.gov.uk
Appendices	Appendix 1 Position Statement Appendix 2a Existing Pipeline Route Appendix 2b Sifted Routes Appendix 2c Routes for Consultation Appendix 2d Routes not brought forward Appendix 3 Draft Response Appendix 4 Biodiversity Impact Report Appendix 5 Cultural Heritage Impact Report Appendix 6 Landscape Impact Report and Volume 2 Figures Appendix 7 Access Impact Report Appendix 8 Trees and woodlands Impact Report Appendix 9 Letter to accompany Response
SDNPA Consultees	Chief Executive; Director of Countryside Policy and Management; Director of Planning; Chief Finance Officer; Monitoring Officer; Legal Services, Environment and Infrastructure Strategy Lead
External Consultees	None
Background Documents	NPA Sept 14, NPA Dec 15, P&R Mar 18

