

Mr David Pedlow
Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council
Redcar & Cleveland House
Kirkleatham Street
Redcar & Cleveland
TS10 1RT

**Real Estate
Department**
10 Priestley Road
Surrey Research
Centre
Guildford
Surrey
GU2 7XY
United Kingdom

10 September 2021

Dear Mr Pedlow

**Planning Application reference R/2021/0676/FF
Engineering operation to create trench associated with the subterranean
diversion of the BRAVO-10 pipe bridge**

BOC Ltd wrote to you on 9 September 2021 setting out our objections to the above planning application.

On behalf of key customers on Teesside SABIC Petrochemicals, who BOC have a long-term business relationship with and who will be jointly impacted by this proposal, we wish to add to those comments as follows:

- The Bravo 10 pipe bridge is a vital part of the infrastructure of the South and North Tees industrial areas. BOC supplies Nitrogen to SABIC across the pipe bridge and SABIC itself has other pipelines on the pipe bridge which are vital to its operations. Interruption to any of the flows through these pipelines would have significant implications to SABIC's business and the upstream and downstream activities of those supplying SABIC and customers who SABIC supply.
- It is not clear that the culvert proposed has been assessed and determined suitable for the wide-ranging duties it will perform as an alternative route for the various pipelines. SABIC is not convinced that the culvert is actually capable of providing a genuine alternative to the pipe bridge. This relates not just to the characteristics of the pipelines themselves but also the additional complexities of making connections either side of the bridge/ proposed culvert. The matters requiring consideration include the number of pipelines affected, the nature of the hazardous substances carried by those pipelines, access for inspection, operation, and maintenance.
- SABIC believes that the answer to Question 20 on the planning application form, which states there is no hazardous substance used or stored is wrong. The pipelines carry large volumes of hazardous substances e.g. hydrogen. The HSE would require to be very closely involved with works to divert the pipelines.

- The information submitted by STDC does not contain any evidence that the proposed culvert has been assessed as suitable for the duties required (number of pipes, nature of hazardous substances carried, access for inspection, operation and maintenance etc).

BOC has set out the planning policy context in the letter submitted on the 9th September. The implications of the proposed project highlighted by SABIC above and endorsed by BOC underline further that existing business activities in Teesside would be very seriously set back by the implementation of the project as applied for. The adverse effects of this would be contrary to the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Redcar & Cleveland Local Plan, as BOC has already explained in the 9 September letter.

In short, we see this application does not give a full representation of the arrangements for intended use. As a result, SABIC has asked BOC to confirm to the council that it formally objects to the planning application.

Yours sincerely,



Glen Jenkins

Head of Estates, UK and Africa