

Fairoaks EIA Scoping Report April 2018

Surrey Heath Borough Council (SHBC), Runnymede Borough Council (RBC) and Woking Borough Council (WBC) (“The Councils”)

Comments

EIA Scoping Report Chapter	RBC Comment
General Comments	<p>The following comments are to be read alongside, and in addition to, those provided by statutory and non-statutory consultees. The Councils need to see more detail in respect of the potential link road corridor to A320 – the corridor is very wide and there are likely to be requirements for bridges over River Bourne/tributaries. The impacts of bridge construction could have ecological, air quality, water quality and flood risk implications. Given the implications upon water bodies in this area, there are question marks about how these would be crossed. There should at least be indicative zones of impact for water crossing, allowing for bridge/causeway and associated abutment engineering solutions. Furthermore, the proposed transport chapter (and linked chapters including Air Quality, Biodiversity, Noise) needs to address among other things in the order of 600 two-way movements at this junction (based upon figures in the applicant’s Design Review documents). It is not appropriate to exclude this corridor area from the EIA in these circumstances.</p> <p>In the absence of further ‘corridor detail’ it is difficult to conclude that the outline planning application as a whole would be acceptable in so far as EIA is concerned. It is noted that the applicants propose to leave this detail to a subsequent EIA at RM stage. However, the environmental impacts associated with development within this corridor need to be better understood at the outline stage. For example, there could be environmental impacts that fundamentally affect the routing options for the link to A320.</p> <p>The applicants are keen to emphasise that the development would deliver a successful and viable new garden village community. With this in mind, it is critical that there is enough understanding of likely development impacts at the Outline stage, in order to preclude unforeseen environmental obstacles to delivery beyond Phase 1. Therefore, whilst not strictly necessary for EIA Scoping purposes, it should be stated at this stage that the Councils will be requiring the red line of the application site to include the indicated corridor up to the A320 edge. The applicants can still pursue the necessary ‘Rochdale’ arguments for this area (which could be hatched within the red line if necessary), but the land must be included.</p> <p>Greater referencing to cross-chapter impacts is required – they should specify exactly which chapters will be cross-</p>

	<p>referenced and how these will be sign-posted.</p> <p>Consideration does not appear to have been given to a Recreation and Amenity chapter. Nonetheless, the Councils are satisfied that had this been addressed it would be acceptable as a Scoped Out topic. It is nonetheless recommended that this topic is addressed either as a stand-alone document or otherwise within the submitted Planning Statement and/or DAS.</p>
Introduction	No particular comment.
Overview of the Proposed Development	<p>The Summary of Environmental Sensitivities (2.13) – the applicants should add reference to Queenswood Golf Course SNCI, the Biodiversity Opportunity Area (River Bourne) and to existing TPOs.</p> <p>Para 2.24 – the applicants should also reference RBC SPG (Nov 2009) on TBHSPA and saved South East Plan policy NRM6</p> <p>Para 2.29 – see above comments re corridor land.</p>
EIA Methodology	<p>3.1 – same comments as for 2.24</p> <p>3.9 – site enabling/site preparation works need to be clarified – are these the same or different and how tie in with Construction phase?</p> <p>3.30 – Consideration ought to be given to inclusion of Surrey Heath Reserved Housing Sites (see cover letter). Omission of Longcross South and Martyrs Lane sites from the list of Cumulative Schemes is not advised. Whilst having regard to the 2017 Regulations this might be arguable, it is reasonably foreseeable that these major developments will come forward during the lifetime of a Fair Oaks build-out. A planning application for Longcross South is expected later this year. It is also anticipated that the Longcross South applicants will include reference to Fair Oaks and Martyrs Lane in their EIA (as set out in the respective RBC EIA scoping response for Longcross South). The Site Allocations for WBC are to be considered by the Local Development Framework Working Group and Council during September 2018. Subject to WBC being satisfied, it is hoped the preferred plan will be published by the end of October 2018 for a further and final consultation. Furthermore, the Strategic Highways Assessment Report (2017) which supports the draft RBC Local Plan 2030 and A320 Corridor Study (March 2018) includes Fair Oaks, Martyrs Lane and Longcross South development in modelling scenarios. Please also see</p>

	<p>Natural England's response.</p> <p>3.34 See comments re Contamination chapter</p> <p>3.35 (including Table 3, row 2) - The Scoping Report does not really commit to the incorporation of HRA Screening Information into the relevant EIA Chapters and how this would be done. This needs to be set out as part of Volume 1. The applicant's attention is also drawn to the '<i>People over Wind and Sweetman</i>' ECJ case (C-323/17) which concludes that the need for appropriate assessment cannot necessarily be screened out of the AA stage by reason of pre-identified mitigation frameworks (as has been the case for Thames Basin Heaths SPA). If significant effects are likely, then an AA will be required. Subject to any interim reversal of this decision, the applicants must provide a suitable Habitat Regulations Report to assist the competent authority in this regard. Please also see Natural England's response.</p>
Proposed Scope of the ES	<p>3.42 – The assessment of effects will also need to consider the potential for in-combination construction and operation effects as part of a phased development eg. the drainage strategy may change at various stages during the phased delivery of the site.</p>
Scoped In Topics	
<i>Landscape and Visual Effects (including Cultural Heritage-Built Heritage)</i>	<p>5.36, 5.47 and Appendix A – Viewpoints have not been agreed with the Councils. There has not been a pre-application process that has enabled the Councils to fully consider the details of the proposals against a potential ZTV range and nor has there been an opportunity afforded for a site visit to assist in the verification of views. The impacts upon Ottershaw House and its setting is a significant material consideration in this regard. This should take place prior to completion of this Chapter.</p> <p>5.43 and 5.51 - there is no clear indication of timeframes for photomontages eg. 15 year timeframe for operational views. Some summer views would be beneficial for information/comparison.</p> <p>There would appear to be no mention of lighting and the potential effects of light pollution (see RBC EHO's comments).</p> <p>Regard must be had to the details provided in Annex A of Natural England's response.</p>
<i>Biodiversity</i>	<p>5.61 and Table 7 – Natural England advises that a habitat survey (equivalent to Phase 2) is carried out on site in order to</p>

	<p>identify any important habitats present. Further details are provided at paragraph 3.5 of Annex A of their response.</p> <p>In addition to the species listed, there are also recorded sightings of Kingfisher, Grayling, Goldcrest and Mistle Thrush at the River Bourne corridor.</p> <p>5.77 – impacts upon bats should include roosts, not just foraging and commuting. - There is also no reference to international site designations in this list – clearly these must be referenced or appropriately linked with the HRA Screening Information. - pollution from construction dust must also be referenced.</p> <p>5.83 The chapter must clearly tie in with other chapters, including Air Quality, Drainage and Water Quality, Noise, Ground Conditions and Contamination. There may be implications associated with effluent from any site-specific sewage treatment works.</p>
<p><i>Water Environment (including Flood Risk, Drainage and Water Quality)</i></p>	<p>5.90 There does not appear to be specific reference to pluvial flooding. This should be addressed. There needs to be clarity around potential alterations in drainage strategy as the development progresses eg. temporary and permanent drainage solutions.</p> <p>5.92 Having regard to the advice of the Environment Agency, the report does not satisfactorily address the Water Framework Directive. The ES will be expected to demonstrate how the development complies with the Directive and it is a concern that there has not yet been assessment of the chemical quality of the water of the River Bourne/Mill Bourne.</p> <p>It is noted that the report indicates areas of high groundwater and potential for groundwater flooding (5.96 and 5.106), including towards the south and south-east part of the site and the potential locality of the link road to the A320. The ES needs to consider risks of groundwater pollution in tangent with a Ground Conditions and Contamination chapter to address these scenarios. The EA have highlighted concerns about potential impacts to the secondary aquifer beneath the site, especially noting the airfield uses on site and the potential for foul sewerage drainage to ground.</p> <p>5.102 – 5.103, 5.109 – as noted as General Comments above, it is the Councils’ position that the planning application and ES will need to expressly include the A320 link road corridor and greater detail in respect of potential crossing points and engineering options. Notwithstanding flexibilities permitted via ‘Rochdale Envelope’ case law, the complete absence of details, even indicative, leaves the parameters insufficiently defined. The delivery of the link road forms a significant component of the delivery of the garden village and details will also be relevant to other key ES Chapters (notably</p>

	<p>Transport). There are also implications for ecology, flood risk, flood storage measures, air quality, water quality and noise, both from construction and operational phases. At the very least, indicative corridors for different route options must be indicated for all engineering scenarios and an indication of potential bridge design options to support 'Rochdale' assessment.</p>
<i>Transport and Access</i>	<p>Comments in respect of the A320 Link (above) are to be noted.</p> <p>The applicants are advised to note the particular concerns of Highways England in respect of the SRN and the request for a meeting to be arranged in this regard.</p> <p>5.116 – reference to 'short term' construction phase is considered misleading. Whilst specific construction activities may be short term in isolation, the construction phase would be spread over many years, as will related traffic impacts.</p> <p>5.118 – The Councils consider that a TA should be appended in its entirety to the ES.</p> <p>5.120 – The Councils would wish to be party to TA Scoping discussions</p>
<i>Air Quality</i>	<p>5.137 – the monitoring locations are not specified.</p> <p>5.144 – fugitive dust emissions (first bullet point) and exhaust generated by on-site plan and road traffic should include operational phase and in-combination phases. Conversely, impacts upon human and ecological receptors from traffic exhaust (third bullet) should also include dust emissions from construction.</p> <p>5.146 – details of indicative construction compounds/corridors is required to better understand potential air quality impacts. The ES should be supported by a Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) that identifies potential construction compounds/corridors and indicative HGV/construction traffic routes.</p> <p>5.149 – It is considered that PM2.5 levels will also need to be modelled to address all potential impacts upon sensitive receptors (See SHBC's EHO comments)</p>
<i>Noise and Vibration</i>	<p>5.155 – there does not appear to be background noise monitoring in respect of the A320. Having regard to anticipated usage of the link road to the A320, the ES should be supported by up to date baseline noise data in the vicinity of the proposed link road junction.</p>

	(See RBC's EHO comments in respect of noise from helicopters which need to be considered. In addition, noise from other established noise sources e.g. McLaren test facility).
<i>Socio-Economic Effects</i>	5.1 There should be consideration given to supply-chain employment impacts in addition to those listed.
Scoped Out Topics	
<i>Ground Conditions and Contamination</i>	<p><u>DISAGREE – MUST BE SCOPED IN</u></p> <p>Having regard to the potential sources of contamination identified in the report, together with potential for risks to water quality and biodiversity (and potentially human health) and site topography relative to controlled waters, a specific ES Chapter is required to facilitate direct cross-chapter referencing. It is not agreed that intrusive site investigation analysis can be deferred by way of planning condition and these should be undertaken in support of the ES. The implications of site preparation (eg. ground break-up and/or compaction) and associated drainage strategies need to be understood, drawing upon a dedicated Ground Contamination chapter alongside Water and Biodiversity chapters. It would be difficult to conclude acceptable levels of development impact upon sensitive receptors in the absence of a full understanding of contaminant concentrations, locations, pathways and mitigation proposals.</p>
<i>Archaeology</i>	The Councils accept that this can be scoped out. However, it is surprising not to see reference to geophysical or LIDAR survey. SCC Heritage Officers and Historic England will advise accordingly.
<i>Waste Management</i>	The Councils accept that this can be scoped out. It would be beneficial, if possible at the Outline stage, to understand potential cut and fill zones if possible to gauge spoil management proposals and quantities. This should be provided for the 'Full' application component if a Hybrid application is pursued.
<i>Daylight, Sunlight and overshadowing</i>	The Councils accept that this can be scoped out.
<i>Wind</i>	The Councils accept that this can be scoped out.
<i>Climate Change</i>	The Councils accept that this can be scoped out.
<i>Human Health</i>	The Councils accept that this can be scoped out.
<i>Agriculture and Soils</i>	<p>The Councils accept that this can be scoped out.</p> <p>6.52 – this should also tie in with Ground Conditions and Contamination chapter.</p> <p>Please see section 6 of Annex A of Natural England's response.</p>

<i>Major Accidents and Disasters</i>	The Councils accept that this can be scoped out.
List of Consultees	This is acceptable.
Schedule of Viewpoints	See LVIA comments above.