

Havant Thicket Reservoir – revised dual pipeline within two tunnels

Application reference: APP/24/00405

1. I **object to the application** unless it is made **explicitly clear** in any consent granted that the pipelines being approved are only permitted to carry **spring water** to and from the reservoir. This is currently **not** the case.

- The current planning application description refers to “Full permission for development of new pipelines **to transfer water from Bedhampton Springs** to fill the reservoir in the winter and draw it off to treat and supply when needed in the summer.
- As the Southern Water effluent recycling proposal is also to use these P. Water pipes to transfer ‘recycled water’ from the Bedhampton Springs Site to fill the reservoir the **current application description is inadequate to prohibit that use.**
- The 2 pipelines proposed in this application are not specifically needed by P. Water to fill and drawdown the reservoir concurrently, as these 2 operations would not be expected to happen at the same time. If there was spare spring water available during a drought period it would always be pumped direct to the Farlington WTW for supply to customers during that drought, not up to the reservoir. P. Water have confirmed this.
- The second pipeline which forms part of this application has come about to ‘future proof’ the construction in advance of the Southern Water effluent recycling scheme.

If the LPA are minded to approve the application for dual pipelines it is essential that the LPA make it clear that;

- Full permission is granted for development of new pipelines **to transfer spring water from Bedhampton Springs** to fill the reservoir in the winter and draw it off to treat and supply when needed in the summer.

- In approving this application the LPA are **in no way showing any implied support for the effluent recycling scheme**, which does not have the support of the local community, with key concerns about its environmental impact, including the increased pollution risk it poses to the reservoir, risk of bioaccumulation and loss of the opportunity to create a unique chalk spring fed reservoir. With other wider concerns about the sustainability of the scheme and the siting of the recycling plant which are not specifically relevant to the pipeline application.

2. I am **very concerned by the further loss of wet grassland habitat**. Each time an application is submitted in association with the Havant Thicket Reservoir project more of the existing wet grassland has been lost.

- This pipeline application includes the construction of 2 new 4m wide permanent roads and infrastructure in the SW of the reservoir site, on habitat that was formerly wet grassland (including priority habitat), and which should have been restored to wet grassland.
- The recent application to change the location/ extent of the southern embankment footprint moving it further south in the SW over more prime wet grassland habitat.
- Large soil mounds (up to 100m x 25m) proposed to be placed along the northern shore of the wetland, reducing the extent of, and devaluing the wet grassland habitat.

This creep in the loss of this critical wet grassland habitat must be stopped and additional mitigation for wet grassland provided.

Noting that the proposed transfer of wet grassland priority habitat soil from areas already excavated in the SW to the NE area of the site, as shown on recently submitted soft landscape drawings, is not appropriate as the ground level where shown is too high and not suitable for the establishment of new wet grassland. The priority habitat soils should be relocated in the SW alongside the stream

where they have the best chance of re-establishing priority habitat, especially if the embankment drainage can be harnessed to improve wetting, as was originally proposed.

3. Impact of new pipeline infrastructure at the reservoir site; The application includes for the provision of a new building structure & 2 new roads in the SW of the reservoir site, either within, or very close to the historic Conservation Area boundary. The new building is said to have dimensions of 10m x 5m x 3m and is set within a very open rural landscape. This element of the application is submitted in outline.

- The design quality of the building will be important given its open setting. It should not just be a standard green utility infrastructure kiosk. The applicant currently describes the building as an 'above ground kiosk'.
- Its new building must be designed in such a way as to be in keeping with the rural and historic parkland setting, landscaping to screen the structure will be important.

The LPA should **impose a planning condition on any consent granted** to require provision of a high quality design for the new building, commensurate with the setting, along with a detailed landscape and planting strategy to minimise the impact of the structure on the historic rural landscape.

4. While I support the change in construction method to a tunnel design, I would question **why it is not possible to tunnel the full length of the pipeline** from Bedhampton Springs up to the reservoir site.

- Tunnelling the section alongside the Rugby Club instead of using an open cut construction method would significantly reduce the adverse impact on the local community, in terms of loss of important recreational space for a period of at least 2 years, longer if you allow for the reinstatement. Reducing the adverse impact on residential roads, as well as the health & well being of the youngsters and adults who use this important sports and recreation facility. As stated in the ES assessment the long-term closure of this significant area of open space will inhibit physical activity and adversely affect the well being of children and low income groups.
- Tunnelling the northern section through the historic parkland at Staunton Country Park, to reduce the impact on the designated historic park and gardens.

5. Traffic impact of closures on major roads in Leigh Park; The ES Non Technical Summary emphasises that "fewer roads (and smaller sections within these roads) will be closed." However, it fails to highlight that the roads which will be impacted by construction at some shaft locations are major arteries running through Leigh Park, such as Dunsbury Way and Purbrook Way (see summary attached in Appendix B). Given the heavy use of these main roads the impact of any partial or full road closures will be very significant. For example, Purbrook Way fully closed for 2 weeks and lane closed for 14 months, Dunsbury Way closed for 2 weeks and lane closed for 10 weeks, Middle Park Way closed for 2 weeks and lane closed for 3 months, **will cause significant disruption to the local community**. Are the LPA satisfied that;

- The impact of these closures on the local community have been fully and appropriately considered?
- The impact on traffic flows minimised to reduce the impact on the local community?

Noting that there is a cumulative impact on the length of lane/ road closures from shaft construction and stream culvert works at both Dunsbury Way and Purbrook Way, extending the period of the construction works and lane/ road closure in these areas.

6. I fully support the comments made by the Ramblers SE group (24/7/24) in relation to diversion of footpath Havant 34, and **agree that the phasing plan should be reviewed to minimise the duration of the impact on local footpaths and open space during the very long construction period for the**

pipelines. The local community have already suffered the loss of extensive lengths of 'paths' and designated 'open access land' at the reservoir site for a period of at least 7 years.

- The in-combination impacts of further path/ open space closures associated with the pipeline construction **must be minimised** to protect the health & well being of the local community.
- Multiple areas of open space in Leigh Park and connecting paths along the Riders Lane & Hermitage Streams will be out of action to the community for long periods. This **significant impact on the local community should be compensated for in a robust manner which benefits the community.** For example, by providing an all weather connected path along the stream corridor which the pipeline follows on completion of the works, filling in the gaps where there is no surfaced path.
- **Mitigation during the works for the loss of paths and open space should also be provided by the developer to the local community to improve the communities access to alternative areas of open space during the long period of the works.** For example, in mitigation for the losses the applicant should be required to provide and fund a direct and safe link across the Riders Lane Stream from Warren Park to the HCC land at SCP, with the path being closed for as short a period as possible when the northern section of the pipeline is constructed. Ensuring good access to open countryside is maintained for the community, while restoring a safe circular route around the reservoir site for the duration of the reservoir and pipeline works.

Further comments and concerns of a more detailed nature are provided in Appendix A.

Link to application documents on HBC planning portal:

https://planningpublicaccess.havant.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=details&keyVal=DCAPR_258161

Appendix A - More detailed concerns / queries

A. Loss of reptile mitigation area – Meyrick Road, Bedhampton

The Bedhampton Layout Plan (Drg. HTR-WAB-W1-DR-T-001) shows a potential additional parking area on open space to the west of Meyrick Road. This is located on a reptile mitigation area for a previous nearby housing development, which was controlled by planning conditions, and to which reptiles were relocated.

- **What additional reptile mitigation is proposed for the loss of this area?**

B. New PAC Dosing area/ infrastructure at Bedhampton Springs

Infrastructure has been added at Bedhampton for Powdered Activated Carbon (PAC) dosing. Page 22 of the Planning Statement confirmed this is to allow PAC to be added to reservoir water in the pipeline before it is pumped up to the Farlington WTW.

- Is the PAC handling facility/ plant being sized to provide future proofing for the Southern Water effluent recycling scheme?
- If so, this is not clear in the application and would be a concern.

The original pipeline scheme did not include PAC dosing infrastructure at Bedhampton Springs, any new chemical dosing infrastructure was expected to have been located at Farlington WTW, subject to a separate application.

- **Where will the surface water from the PAC dosing area drain?**
- **Does it drain directly or indirectly to the Hermitage Stream?**
- **What are the potential impacts of PAC residues reaching the stream? (and/ or Langstone Harbour?)**

C. Environmental Impact of PAC Dosing?

I have seen a wetland nature reserve turned black by the discharge of water containing PAC, so given the proximity of the Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour SPA/SAC it is important that the LPA & EA fully understand any potential impacts from the introduction of PAC dosing at the Bedhampton Springs Site.

- **Has the risk of PAC settling out in the Farlington pipeline(s) been assessed?**
- **How often will the pipe(s) need to be flushed?**
- **Where will the flushed water containing PAC be discharged too?**
- **Do the Farlington pipe(s) washouts discharge directly, or via surface water sewers, to the Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour or Hilsea Creek?**
- **Have any direct or indirect impacts of the use of this new plant been assessed within the Habitats Regulation Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment?**

ES Volume 2, Revised Chapter 12, Noise & Vibration (Page 38) indicated;

12.223 The major contributor to the rating levels are the generator **and PAC equipment**. These two plant are rarely used, and **in the absence of these noise sources**, the impacts are expected to be low at all noise sensitive receptors.

While the initial use of the reservoir is expected to be limited to a drought or emergency maintenance, its operational use will increase over time. By 2040 P. Water have indicated that the use of the reservoir will become 'more routine'. **The operational impacts of the PAC dosing plant, including noise impacts, should therefore be more carefully considered in the current EIA.**

Noting that if the PAC dosing area is also to serve the Southern Water effluent recycling scheme the plant may be needed even more often, as the pipeline to Otterbourne will operate 365 days a year.

- **If the PAC dosing plant is already consented under the current P. Water pipeline planning application, will Southern Water have to consider its increased operational use during the EIA for their DCO application?**

D. Revised route for the reservoir inlet pipe;

The LPA need to **seek reassurance as to how the new inlet pipe will be sealed below the reservoir embankment in the SW where it will pass through the Bognor sands**, as the inlet pipe has been re-directed around the SW of the reservoir site where the geology is more porous.

- **What extra drainage provision will be made where the inlet pipe passes through the cut off wall needed, and where it intersects the existing spring line?**
- **Will the inlet pipe be visible in the bottom of the reservoir during drawdown?**
- **Have the visual & safety impacts of the exposed inlet pipe been fully assessed?**

E. Washouts

Washouts form a part of the application infrastructure and are confirmed as present on the long-sections showing the tunnel shafts, but the washout infrastructure is not shown on the dual pipeline layout plans above the long-sections. For example; Drg.P7 for shaft W7, Drg.P4 shaft W4 and shaft W1. This application is for full permission, **the detail for the location of all the washout infrastructure should be shown on these drawings.**

SCP washout is not shown connected to the Lake Stream, nor to the Riders Lane Stream on either the SCP Washout General Arrangement Drg. HTR-WAB-P1-P9-T-001, or the Section P9_Open_Cut_Site_Plan. Is it correct that there is no connection to the stream? If so, **how is the washout operated? Is it an overland flow across the SINC grassland?**

Section 6.145 of the ES Non Technical Summary suggests there will be no significant impact from the use of washouts. However, the purpose of washouts on a pipeline is to enable flushing of the pipeline to address sediment build up in the mains, as confirmed on page 29, Section 6.145. Water drawn from the reservoir will contain sediments and at times algae, giving the potential for sediment build up within the pipeline(s), which can then be flushed out using washouts.

Page 15 of the HRA confirmed that **there will be 8 washout valves** including at shaft 1, 4, 7, between shaft 8 and the reservoir site close to the Lake Strem, at the reservoir site, and at the run to waste connection at the Bedhampton Spring Site

Have the LPA & EA been provided with the adequate information to assess the impact of the washouts?

- **Details on the likely frequency of wash out operation?**
- **Likely volume of water that could be discharged?**
- **Any potential environmental impacts of their operation?**

Has the applicant indicated if there will be a sweetening flow maintained in the pipelines at all times? *(as Southern Water propose for their pipelines)*

F. Air Valves

Air valves form a part of the application infrastructure and are confirmed as being present on the long-sections for each tunnel shaft. The reservoir water may have an earthy odour, especially at times of algal bloom.

- **What information has been provided to the LPA on whether there could be earthy smells generated at the air valve locations?**

Noting that the shaft locations at Purbrook Way, Dunsbury Way and High Lawn Way are very close to residential properties.

- **Will the operation of the air valves in shafts be audible at adjacent residential properties?** (especially at night? - not mentioned in the noise assessment)

G. Future access for maintenance of the pipeline

In various documents the text describes the shafts being backfilled on completion of construction. For example; HRA, Section 2.37 on page 12;

The shafts themselves **will then be backfilled** with manholes created inside the shaft and small access cover at the surface to provide permanent access to valves as required. For shafts 1, 4, 7 and the emergency discharge chamber the shafts themselves will become the permanent manholes with concrete cover slabs buried circa 1m below ground and small access covers at the surface. This method allows for future interventions to the pipe if required, whilst leaving minimal visible impact at the shaft location.

- **If most of the shafts are to be backfilled how will future access be achieved for maintenance of the tunnel / pipeline?**

Noting that Ward & Burke previously described to stakeholders using the shaft locations to pull back the pipe to where a repair was needed, replacing the damaged section of pipe, then restoring the other sections.

H. Compensation & Enhancement Package

The Pipeline Ecological Management & Monitoring Plan, Page 24, Section 4.6 indicates that **additional offsite compensation areas will be required;**

“Additional offsite compensation areas will be sought to ensure that the pipeline delivers the mandatory 10% net gain as the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment has concluded that it cannot be delivered on-site only. The maintenance and monitoring of any offsite BNG areas will need to be secured for a minimum of 30 years”.

- **Where is this offsite mitigation be proposed?**
- **Will its provision be required/ controlled by provision of a planning condition? (or a Section 106 agreement)**

J. Alternatives assessment – missing information

The Planning Statement indicated that ES Volume 2, Chapter 4 (Table 4.2) sets out the comparison between the original single open cut pipeline and a single tunnelled pipeline. I could not find this document on the planning portal. While it is likely that a single tunnel construction could be shown to have less overall environmental impact than an open cut pipeline, this is may not be the case when compared to a dual tunnel pipeline, with twice as much waste and transport of materials, pipes etc. required.

- Page 29 (4.27) of the Planning Statement acknowledges that the environmental impacts of the new dual pipeline cannot be easily compared to the original single pipeline previously approved by the LPA. Going on to claim that the dual pipeline scheme has less impact than installing 2 separate pipelines.

The latter only becomes relevant if the Southern Water effluent recycling scheme gets consent, as the 2 pipelines are not essential for the Portsmouth Water reservoir scheme in isolation.

K. Increased and significant impact on a smaller number of residents

The covering letter and ES Non-Technical Summary indicate that the use of a tunnel construction method will result in the number of residential properties significantly effected being reduced from 1100 to 69. While this is welcome, **a small number of residential properties will be extremely adversely impacted by noise and general disturbance for up to 2 years**, as their homes are located immediately adjacent to tunnel shafts.

It is highly unlikely given the proximity of properties adjacent to the shaft locations at Dunsbury Way, Purbrook Way and High Lawn Way, that the pipeline contractor will be able to reduce the impact to avoid a significant impact on the daily lives of these residents, especially if any of them work shifts. Imagine not being able to open your windows during the recent heat wave. As these residents will be taking the brunt of the disturbance for the 'greater good' of the community, **the applicant should be encouraged to offer some form of compensation to;**

a) those residents most severely impacted by the works.

b) the schools most significantly impacted by the works.

The residents and school most adversely impacted is set out in ES Volume 2, Revised Chapter 12, Noise & Vibration (page 36), with extracts provided below for ease of reference.

12.200 After the implementation of mitigation measures and best practicable means, **it is still expected that the below 60 receptors would experience a significant effect:**

- 5-6 Brunswick Garden (two receptors close to Shaft 1);
- 11, 19-22, and 25-29 Tarrant Garden (ten receptors close to Shaft 3);
- 9, 11, 13 and 15 Harestock Road (four receptors close to Shaft 3);
- 39, 41, 43, 45 and 47 Corhampton Crescent (five receptors close to Shaft ED);
- **181-191, and 36 Purbrook Way (twelve receptors close to Shaft 5);**
- 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 15 Ellisfield Road (eight receptors close to Shaft 5);
- 1 and 3 Eversley Crescent (two receptors close to Shaft 5);
- 77-80 Riders Lane (four receptors close to Shaft 6);
- **43 and 45 Dunsbury Way (two receptors close to Shaft 6);**
- **220 and 218 Dunsbury Way (two receptors close to Shaft 6);**
- Flat on the south facade of Staunton Heights (three receptors close to Shaft 6); and
- **73, 75, 79, 81, 85, and 87 High Lawn Way (six receptors close to Shaft 7).**

12.212. The assessment of culvert works at Middle Park Way, Dunsbury Way and Purbrook Way shows potential for **significant daytime impacts at all three locations**. However, after implementing the mitigation measures and best practicable means, **the significant effect will be limited to 193 Purbrook Way, three flats to the south of Staunton Heights, 222, 220 and 218 Dunsbury Way.**

12.208. Re- Open cut route; After the implementation of mitigation measures and best practicable means, it is expected that the **significant effect will be limited to St Thomas More's Catholic Primary School and 53 Hook's Farm.**

12.226. **During sheet piling at culvert and emergency discharge spillway, there is potential for significant vibration effect at six receptors close to Shaft 6 / Dunsbury Way Culvert.** The total duration of piling activity is expected to be less than 5 days; due to moving nature of works, no one receptor will be affected during the entire piling phase. Therefore, considering the short duration of impacts, piling is unlikely to cause significant effect. Implementation of mitigation measures will help minimise the impacts from the sheet piling.

Tables 2-5 in the Noise & Vibration Impact Assessment outlined the number of receptors affected by construction noise during construction before mitigation measures are applied. Table 2, column 2, highlights the very long duration of the works assuming everything goes to plan.

Pipeline Shaft	Duration of Works (days)	Potential Impacts (residential)	Potential Impacts (non-residential)
Shaft 1	213	19	1
Shaft 2	381	21	2
Shaft 3	132	73	0
Shaft 4	429	25	0
ED Shaft	279	45	0
Shaft 5	447	82	1
Shaft 6	185	74	0
Shaft 7	514	58	0
Shaft 8	135	3	0
Culvert Middle Park Way	74	15	0
Culvert Dunsbury Way	68	65	0
Culvert Purbrook Way	88	46	1

Table 2 - Sensitive receptors affected by shaft, tunnelling, and culvert works.

Note 1: Page 13 indicated **night time works may be necessary in some situations**, as stopping tunnelling work at the end of the day shift may not be possible due to geological conditions and various unfavourable tunnelling factors. During such scenarios, the tunnelling works would be continued until a favourable situation is encountered to stop the tunnelling works. The impact of these night time works would only affect the associated shaft launch location.

Note 2: Page 18 (4.3.2) confirms in certain cases, **specific items of plant may be required to be left running overnight or over weekends, outside of core working hours**. Examples of such cases include pumps being kept on overnight or on weekends, and generators on particularly wet days to enable drying rooms to dry PPE, or to power security huts. These are exceptional circumstances, as in most cases plant should not be left running overnight or over weekends.

Note 3: It will be difficult to install boundary noise screens at the most confined shaft compound locations where space is extremely restricted. Even if they can the very close proximity of the residential properties mean they are unlikely to be effective at first floor level. Page 33 of the ES Volume 2, Chapter 12 acknowledges noise barriers may not be practical at shaft 5 & 6 suggesting acoustic shrouds could be deployed around the noisy plant and construction activity to minimise the impact of the construction noise

Noise insulation or temporary rehousing

- 12.189. Where works are expected to exceed the noise level thresholds for potential impacts for extended periods of time, it may be relevant to offer noise insulation or temporary rehousing to affected residents. BS 5228 Part 1 Table E.2 gives noise level thresholds and durations of works where noise insulation and temporary rehousing may be considered.
- 12.190. There is no statutory obligation to offer these, and any offer will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Extract of page 35 above – ES Volume 2, Revised Chapter 12, Noise & Vibration

L. Not clear if the core working hours are being fixed as part of the pipeline application?

Extract of page 34 – ES Volume 2, Revised Chapter 12, Noise & Vibration

- 12.188. The construction of pipeline corridor will be undertaken;
- during weekday daytime (07:00 – 19:00), and
 - Saturday (07:00 – 13:00).

The trenchless construction under the railway track is planned to take place 24 hours a day. Though no other night-time works are planned for the pipeline corridor, during unfavourable tunnelling conditions, the working hours could be extended as a last resort to avoid harm to people and equipment.

Note: Page 45 of the CEMP refers to different hours to protect bats; "No construction activity is to occur outside the hours of 07:30-18:00 on weekdays and 07:30-13:00 within the working areas of Shaft 1, 2, and 4 to prevent disturbance to bats emerging from/re-entering potential roosts or to commuting bats".

These long working hours will give the residents most significantly impacted very little respite from the construction noise.

Page 18 of the Noise & Vibration Impact Assessment states; “Construction of the pipeline will be undertaken within the hours agreed between WBCL and the LA, via any section 61 consents that may be required. Working hours will align with the thresholds set out in Table 8 and will not exceed the threshold limits set out in this table.” The hours set out in Table 8 below are very long and include Saturdays, giving residents most adversely impacted very little respite (see below).

- Will the working hours be agreed with the LPA/ Environmental Health Officer before councillors are asked to determine the application for the pipeline?
- Has it now been confirmed that each compound area can be connected to the mains electricity supply to avoid the need for generators to run overnight to power essential plant and facilities within the compound to minimise the noise impact at night?

4.1.4 Noise Thresholds

The ES Chapter found that “all receptors are considered to be in BS 5228 Part 1 Category A for daytime works and Category C for nighttime works”. On this basis, the thresholds for the potential construction noise impacts are defined in Table 8.

Assessment Period	Threshold value (dB) for potential impacts	Duration of works for potential impacts
Monday to Friday 07:00 to 19:00 Saturday 07:00 to 13:00	65	10 days in a 15-day period or 40 days in a 6-month period
Monday to Friday 19:00 to 23:00 Saturday 13:00 to 23:00 Sundays 07:00 to 23:00	55	
Night-time 23:00 to 07:00	50	

Table 8 - Threshold of potential impacts

Where all reasonable measures cannot reduce levels to below the threshold values, further mitigation could be provided, such as restrictions on working which prevent exceedances of the relevant temporal. Implementing working restrictions to eliminate these exceedances could significantly extend the works duration; thereby increasing the overall disturbance and nuisance of nearby residents. In this scenario, WBCL will seek consent under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act at the earliest opportunity to agree the preferred approach to managing

WB-1205-02 (Rev:0)

15

WARD & BURKE

April 2024

these effects. The central mechanism for controlling construction noise and vibration under the Control of Pollution Act (CoPA) 1974 relies on the demonstration that Best Practicable Means (BPM) is being employed at all times to minimise noise effects. It is therefore not considered appropriate to apply the threshold values in Table 8 as hard limits, as this can allow for works to be planned to generate noise levels up to those limits, which may not be in accordance with BPM. As such, the imposition of limits introduces legal uncertainty and is considered incompatible with BPM. Furthermore, planning works to meet limits does not allow for flexibility in working which may be advantageous to nearby occupants of nearby sensitive properties. For example, generating high noise levels but for only short periods of time with some periods of respite might be considered BPM and may reduce overall disturbance to neighbouring occupants. These periods of respite might not be available if hard limits are imposed.

Note: The last sentence saying periods of respite might not be available if hard limits are imposed.

Appendix B – Road Closures and Lane Closures for pipeline/ culvert works

Extract of ES Volume 2, Chapter 13, Traffic & Transport – Pages 33 & 34

Table 13-11 – Review of road closure and parking suspension impacts

Table 13-11 – Review of road closure and parking suspension impacts

Road Name	Duration	Sig. of Impact	Justification
Middle Park Way	Two weeks	Minor	The potential road closure at Middle Park Way is expected to be for a duration of two weeks, however the diversion for some residential areas could be up to 3km. Therefore overall, a minor adverse impact is reported for a short section of Middle Park Way.
Middle Park Way (lane closure)	3 months	Minor	As part of the construction of the pipeline it is envisaged that lane closures will be required along sections of Middle Park Way for a combined total of 3 months; the temporary nature and continued operation of the network mean that a minor impact is being reported.
Residential loop off High Lawn Way	20 months	Neg	The potential road closure at the residential loop off High Lawn Way is expected to be for a duration of 20 months to facilitate site access, however no diversion is considered necessary as there is an adjacent access point available for residential properties. Therefore, a negligible impact is being reported.
High Lawn Way (parking suspension)	20 months	Minor	As part of the construction of the pipeline it is envisaged that parking suspensions will be required along a section of High Lawn Way on a single side of the carriageway for up to 20 months. There are no formal parking bays on High Lawn Way and parking surveys have indicated sufficient capacity to accommodate the suspension, and therefore a minor adverse impact is being reported.
Hooks Farm Way (parking suspension)	20 months	Minor	As part of the construction of the pipeline it is envisaged that parking suspensions will be required along a section of Hooks Farm Way on a single side of the carriageway for up to 20 months. There are no formal parking bays on Hooks Farm Way and parking surveys have indicated sufficient capacity to accommodate the suspension, and therefore a minor adverse impact is being reported.
Meyrick Road (parking suspension)	15 months	Minor	As part of the construction of the pipeline it is envisaged that parking suspensions will be required along a section of Meyrick Road on a single side of the carriageway for up to 15 months. Alternative parking arrangements are considered to be available, and therefore a minor adverse impact is being reported with alternative on-street parking to be used.
West Street (parking suspension)	15 months	Minor	As part of the construction of the pipeline it is envisaged that parking suspensions will be required along a section of West Street on a single side of the carriageway for up to 15 months. Alternative parking arrangements are considered to be available, therefore a minor adverse impact is being reported with alternative on-street parking to be used.

Road Name	Duration	Sig. of Impact	Justification
Riders Lane (Road closure)	19 months	Minor	The potential lane closure at Riders Lane is expected to be for a duration of 19 months, with alternative routes available with a diversion of less than 1km. Therefore overall, a minor adverse impact is reported for a short section of Riders Lane.
Purbrook Way	Two weeks	Minor	The potential road closure at Purbrook Way is expected to be for a duration of only two weeks, however the diversion for some residential areas could be up to 3km. Therefore overall, a minor adverse impact is reported for a short section of Purbrook Way.
Purbrook Way (lane closure)	14 months	Minor	As part of the construction of the pipeline it is envisaged that a lane closure for a short section of Purbrook Way will be required for 14 months; the short section will allow traffic to shuttle run, continuing the operation of the network, meaning that a minor impact is being reported. There would also need to be the temporary relocation of a bus stop for this duration.
Dunsbury Way	Two weeks	Minor	The potential road closure at Dunsbury Way is expected to be for a duration of only two weeks, however the diversion for some residential areas could be up to 3km. Therefore overall, a minor adverse impact is reported for a short section of Dunsbury Way.
Dunsbury Way (lane closure)	10 weeks	Minor	As part of the construction of the pipeline it is envisaged that lane closures will be required along sections of Purbrook Way for a combined total of 10 weeks; the temporary nature and continued operation of the network mean that a minor impact is being reported.
Stockheath Lane (parking suspension)	20 months	Minor	As part of the construction of the pipeline it is envisaged that parking suspensions will be required along a section of Stockheath Lane for up to 20 months. There are no formal parking bays along Stockheath Lane and parking surveys have indicated sufficient capacity to accommodate the suspension, therefore a minor adverse impact is being reported with alternative on-street parking to be used.

13.5 The review presented in Table 13-11 indicates that **there will be no significant effects resulting from the proposed road closures** or parking suspensions relating to the construction of the pipeline.

I suspect that everyone who lives in Leigh Park would consider the road/ lane closures set out above as significant. For example, Purbrook Way fully closed for 2 weeks and lane closed for 14 months, Dunsbury Way closed for 2 weeks and lane closed for 10 weeks, Middle Park Way closed for 2 weeks and lane closed for 3 months. These lane/ road closures **will cause significant disruption to the local community, especially when they are concurrent.**