

Scottish Power Renewables
Wind Development
3rd Floor, 1 Atlantic Quay, Glasgow, G2 8JB

gliathree@ScottishPower.com

East Anglia THREE

Appendix 29.5

Assessment of Haul Road Remaining in situ between Projects

Environmental Statement

Volume 3

Document Reference – ~~6.3.29~~ ([OEI / Volume 4 / LVIA assessment / Appendix 5](#))

Author – Optimised ~~Environments Ltd~~ [Environment Limited](#)

East Anglia THREE Limited

Date – ~~November 2015~~ [July 2016](#)

Revision History – Revision [AB](#)

scottishpowerrenewables.com

~~**This Page Is Intentionally Blank**~~

~~This Page Is Intentionally Blank~~

Table of Contents

29.5	Assessment of Haul Road Remaining in situ between projects	<u>ASSESSMENT OF HAUL ROAD F</u>
29.5.1	Introduction	<u>13</u>
29.5.1 <u>29.5.2</u>		Assumptions <u>24</u>
29.5.1 <u>29.5.3</u>	Summary of potential construction impacts identified for landscape and visual receptors	<u>35</u>
29.5.1 <u>29.5.4</u>		Comparison of impacts <u>57</u>
29.5.1.1 <u>29.5.4.1</u>		Introduction <u>57</u>
29.5.1.1 <u>29.5.4.2</u>		Impacts on physical elements <u>67</u>
29.5.1.1 <u>29.5.4.3</u>		Impacts on landscape character <u>67</u>
29.5.1.1 <u>29.5.4.4</u>		Impacts on landscape designations <u>78</u>
29.5.1.1 <u>29.5.4.5</u>		Impacts on visual receptors <u>89</u>
29.5.1 <u>29.5.5</u>		Summary <u>89</u>

29.4 ASSESSMENT OF HAUL ROAD REMAINING IN SITU BETWEEN PROJECTS

29.4.1 Introduction

1. The Development Consent Order (DCO) for the East Anglia ONE project states that within 12 months of completion, land occupied by temporary uses must be reinstated. This would mean that the haul roads and Construction Consolidation Site (CCS) associated with East Anglia ONE would be removed and the disturbed land would be returned to pre-construction state.
2. As part of the worst case assumptions within the Environmental Statement (ES) for the proposed East Anglia THREE project, it is assumed that haul roads would be required to access jointing bay locations in remote areas in order to pull cables through, and therefore the impacts of the reconstruction of the haul road and CCSs are assessed.
3. East Anglia THREE Limited (EATL) are progressing an option that the haul road and CCS footprints may remain in situ between the completion of construction of the East Anglia ONE project and commencement of construction of the proposed East Anglia THREE project, and therefore would be used by the proposed East Anglia THREE project during construction.
4. This additional assessment has therefore been undertaken to consider a potential amendment to the East Anglia ONE DCO, which would allow for the haul road to remain in situ for use by the proposed East Anglia THREE project. This assessment specifically considers effects upon landscape and visual receptors, as per Chapter 29 Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA) of the ES for the proposed East Anglia THREE project. This assessment is based on a scenario in which the haul roads and CCSs are removed following construction of East Anglia ONE and then reconstructed for the construction of the proposed East Anglia THREE project.
5. The key advantages of leaving the haul road in place between East Anglia ONE and the proposed East Anglia THREE project are as follows:
 - Avoidance of additional construction works to remove haul roads and CCSs and then reinstate;
 - Reduction in the overall volumes of materials being brought on and off site and therefore reduction in presence and activity of vehicles (delivery of materials associated with the haul roads and CCSs would account for the majority of HGV movements);
 - Reduction in the impacts on landscape character and visual amenity owing to the reduced scale of the construction works; and

- Reduction in the duration of landscape and visual impacts as a longer programme of construction works would be undertaken.
6. This report considers the following approach to haul road and CCS construction for East Anglia ONE and the proposed East Anglia THREE project:
- The haul road and CCSs are installed during construction of the East Anglia ONE project.
 - The haul road and CCS are left in situ, and remain in place for construction of the proposed East Anglia THREE project.
 - ~~Under a Single Phase approach for the proposed East Anglia THREE project, the~~ The haul road is removed at the end of the construction period and land is reinstated.
 - ~~Under a Two Phased approach to construction for the proposed East Anglia THREE project, the haul road would be left in situ between Phase 1 and Phase 2, and would be removed following completion of Phase 2 and vegetation re-instated.~~
7. This report looks at each impact which has been originally identified as part of the East Anglia THREE SLVIA assessment within Chapter 29, and considers the effects of leaving the haul road and CCSs in place between projects ~~and phases~~, compared with ~~twice~~ removing the haul road and re-instating vegetation during this time.

29.4.2 ~~29.5.1~~ Assumptions

8. For the purposes of this report, the following assumptions have been made in reviewing the impacts assessed in Chapter 29 Seascape, Landscape and Visual Assessment of the East Anglia THREE ES:
- As a worst case scenario, the haul road would be left in situ from construction of East Anglia ONE project to the end of construction of the proposed East Anglia THREE project.¹
 - Water crossings would be left in situ from construction of ~~the~~ East Anglia ONE project to the end of construction of the proposed East Anglia THREE project.
 - Jointing bay hard standing would be removed between construction of ~~the~~ East Anglia ONE project and the proposed East Anglia THREE project as the location of these may be different for each project.
 - At CCS hard standing would be left in place but fencing, portacabins or other infrastructure would be removed, leaving flat ground.

¹ Leaving haul road in situ would need to be agreed with landowners and the local authorities on a case by case basis, therefore in practice some sections may be left and others removed. However, as it is not possible to know exact locations, the assumption is therefore that the haul road is left.

- In the time between the East Anglia ONE project and the proposed East Anglia THREE project, ~~and Phases 1 and Phase 2 of the proposed East Anglia THREE project,~~ hedgerows would be reinstated up to the agreed gap left for haul roads (approximately 5.5m).
- At the earliest, construction of the East Anglia ONE would be finished in ~~2018,2019,~~ and therefore the worst case scenario would be the haul road and CCS hard standing remaining unused in situ from then until the start of construction of the proposed East Anglia THREE project (due to start between 2020 and 2022); i.e. four years.
- ~~The two phases of the proposed East Anglia THREE project would be separated by 18 months from the start of Phase 1 onshore to the start of the Phase 2 onshore.~~
- Use of haul road left in situ between projects ~~and phases~~ would be restricted to the landowner, or for the general public where PRowS cross the haul road.
- This report looks only at impacts along the onshore cable route. Impacts at landfall and the substation(s) locations are not re-considered.
- Construction, use and removal of the haul road and CCS and reinstatement of land are considered to be construction activities and therefore this report does not re-assess operation and maintenance or decommissioning impacts from Chapter 29 Seascape, Landscape and Visual Assessment of the East Anglia THREE ES.
- This assessment takes account of embedded mitigation detailed in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy.

29.4.3 ~~29.5.1~~ Summary of potential construction impacts identified for landscape and visual receptors

9. In Chapter 29 Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA) of the East Anglia THREE ES, the worst case scenario considers that the haul road and CCSs, relating to the onshore cable route, are constructed as part of the proposed East Anglia THREE project and removed at the end of the construction period. For the purposes of the Appendix, this scenario is referred to as Scenario 1.
- ~~10. The assessment considers Single Phase and Two Phased approaches, the Single Phase approach involving one continuous construction period and the Two Phased approach involving two separate construction phases with a break of 18 months between the start of the first phase and the start of the second phase. At the end of the first phase, it is assumed that the haul road and CCSs are removed and then reinstated at the start of the second phase.~~
10. ~~11.~~ The assessment considers the potential impact of the construction of the haul road and CCSs, along with the potential impact of the presence and activity of machinery,

and presence of materials and other equipment, relating to the onshore cable route construction. This takes into account the loss of vegetation necessary for the construction of the haul road and CCSs, with the assumption being that the vegetation being removed would largely be replacement planting used to infill gaps made during the construction of East Anglia ONE, and therefore less mature and well-established than the original surrounding vegetation.

11. ~~12.~~ The finding of the assessment is that the construction of the onshore cable route would not give rise to a significant impact on the physical elements, landscape character receptors or visual receptors.
12. ~~13.~~ The impact on the physical elements would be not significant owing to the relatively small proportion of the wider physical elements that would be disturbed or removed, the localised extent of the impacts, and the reversibility of impacts through the reinstatement of vegetation on completion of the construction works. Where sections of hedgerow would be removed in relation to the construction of the haul road and CCSs, these would be the specimens replanted following the completion of East Anglia ONE and therefore would be relatively immature. Their removal would, therefore, have a lesser impact than if they were more mature and well established specimens. The land where the haul road and CCSs would be constructed, would coincide with the areas where the haul road and CCSs would ~~be reconstructed~~ have been originally constructed for East Anglia ONE and therefore, would also be relatively recently reinstated. These areas would predominantly be agricultural land, which by its very nature, would already be disturbed.
13. ~~14.~~ In terms of landscape character, this finding relates principally to the scale of the construction works relative to the scale of the Landscape Character Types and landscape designations, in respect of which the potential impacts are being assessed. The construction works would occupy localised extents of much wider landscape areas. The haul road would occur across areas where minor roads and tracks form part of the baseline character and with it being a surface feature in a relatively flat landform, it would not have a wide scale influence on the character of the landscape. The CCSs would occur intermittently, with seven occurring along the 37km length of the onshore cable route, such that inter-visibility would be unlikely to occur and, therefore, their influence would be singular rather than cumulative. Through the selection of locations, which are mostly afforded enclosure from existing hedgerows and woodland where possible, the prominence of these areas would be moderated. More visible features such as portacabins and temporary fencing would be more apparent, as well as the presence of vehicles and construction machinery, although still small scale features in a much wider landscape.
14. ~~15.~~ In terms of visual receptors, such as residents, road-users, cyclists and walkers, the impact of the construction, presence, and removal of the haul road and CCSs

would be not significant. Again, the siting of these elements has considered the potential impact on principal visual receptors, such as roads and settlements, and has maintained an appropriate separation distance where ever possible. With the exception of portacabins, storage piles of materials and temporary fencing, as ground-surface features, the haul road and the CCSs would not be prominent in views and the roads especially would relate to the existing presence of roads and tracks which are typical in views within this area.

15. ~~16.~~ The impacts on landscape and visual receptors would be not significant owing to the localised influence of the haul roads and CCSs, the limited extent to which the characterising features of the views would be altered by the addition of these components, the impermanent nature of the associated construction works and the reversibility of residual impacts. The impacts would be short term, lasting only the period of the construction process, albeit with some residual effects extending into the start of the medium term phase, as vegetation grows to infill gaps.

~~17. In the Two Phased approach, it is assumed that the haul road and CCSs are removed after the first phase and then reinstated prior to the second phase. Vegetation would be planted on removal of the haul road and CCSs and then removed again on reconstruction. The removal and reinstatement would give rise to a slight increase in the scale of the construction works but would not increase the magnitude of change to the extent that a significant effect would arise. This approach would prolong the duration of the impact, as the construction works would span a longer period of time.~~

29.4.4 29.5.1 Comparison of impacts

29.4.4.1 29.5.1.1 Introduction

16. ~~18.~~ The following section presents an assessment of the alternative scenario in which the haul road and CCSs are retained during the interim period between the East Anglia ONE construction and East Anglia THREE construction. This considers the potential impacts on physical elements, landscape character and visual receptors. For the purposes of the Appendix, this scenario is referred to as Scenario 2.

29.4.4.2 29.5.1.1 Impacts on physical elements

17. ~~19.~~ The impacts on the physical elements of the landscape, such as the arable farmland, hedgerows, and grasslands, as a result of retaining the haul road and CCSs would be not significant. The loss of arable farmland, mature trees, hedgerows and grassland, necessary to accommodate the haul road and CCSs, would occur during the construction phase of East Anglia ONE. With the retention of the haul road and CCSs into the construction phase of the proposed East Anglia THREE project, no further removal of physical elements would be required, with the exception of possible

small scale removals in localised parts. There would therefore be no, or negligible impacts on physical elements as a result of Scenario 2.

- 18.** ~~20.~~ The impact of Scenario 2 on the physical elements is less than the impact of Scenario 1 in which the haul road and CCSs would be removed at the end of the construction phase of East Anglia ONE and then reinstated ~~them~~ at the start of the construction phase of East Anglia THREE ~~(with potentially a further removal and reinstatement between phase one and two, if the Two Phased approach were to be adopted)~~. In Scenario 1, reinstated vegetation would be removed ~~once or twice~~, resulting in a greater overall loss of vegetation, although the species removed would be those that were replanted as part of the reinstatement works and therefore smaller and less well established than the indigenous vegetation. This vegetation would, none-the-less, help to mitigate landscape and visual effects within the interim period, which could be **for** up to four years.

29.4.4.3 ~~29.5.1.1~~ **Impacts on landscape character**

- 19.** ~~21.~~ The potential impact on the landscape character types and landscape designations, as a result of the retention of the haul road and CCSs, would be not significant. These components would have an influence on the character of the landscape, as they would be apparent as additional areas of hard-standing, which would contrast with the predominantly agrarian character, albeit in a landscape where rural roads and tracks form part of the baseline character. While their prominence would be moderated by their ground surface location, their presence would be accentuated by the gaps in the hedgerows that would occur along the length of the roads and across the CCSs. Overall, their presence would give rise to a low magnitude of change and their impact would be not significant.
- 20.** ~~22.~~ Scenario 2, compared with Scenario 1 assessed in the East Anglia THREE ES, would have less of an impact in respect of the scale of change to the landscape, but more of an impact in respect of the presence of the haul road and absence of mitigation planting during the interim period.
- 21.** ~~23.~~ In Scenario 1, the additional construction works and traffic volumes which would be required to remove the haul road and CCSs, ~~once, or potentially twice if the Two Phased approach were adopted~~, would, during the very short term (0-1 years) or short term (1-2 years), marginally increase the magnitude of the change. The growth of mitigation planting over a period of up to seven years would, however, mean that gaps in hedgerows would gradually be filled and the magnitude of change on landscape character would be reduced. Overall, the slight increase in impact as a result of the additional construction works to remove and reinstate the haul road and CCSs, would be greater than the slight decrease in impact that would arise as a result of the temporarily reinstated planting.

29.4.4.4 29.5.1.1 Impacts on landscape designations

- 22.** ~~24.~~ The potential impact on the landscape designations, as a result of the retention of the haul roads and CCSs, would be not significant. The Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB, as well as the local designation of the SLAs, denote landscapes with a special sensitivity. While the construction of ~~these~~ the haul roads, CCSs and other associated components during East Anglia ONE would have an impact that is assessed in the East Anglia ONE ES, the impact of their retention would be notably lesser as no further construction works would be required and it would ~~be~~ only be their presence that would have an influence on the character of the designated areas. As roads and tracks are an existing feature within the AONB and SLAs, the presence of the haul road ~~will~~ would not appear as an untypical feature. It ~~will~~ would none-the-less add to the existing presence of roads and tracks, and would possibly, in more rural parts, detract from the character of the landscape.
- 23.** ~~25.~~ Overall, the scale of the haul roads and CCSs are relatively small, especially in relation to the much wider extent of the designated areas. Their often ~~sensitive~~ enclosed location, temporary nature and the ease with which reinstatement can take place means that their impact ~~will~~ would be limited.
- 24.** ~~26.~~ In comparison to Scenario 1, in which the haul road and CCSs would be removed and reinstated, ~~either once or twice,~~ the impact of Scenario 2 would be less, even taking into account the absence of reinstated planting in the interim. This relates principally to the additional construction works and vehicular movements that would be required for the removal and reinstatement, as well as the longer duration over which the impacts would be experienced.

29.4.4.5 29.5.1.1 Impacts on visual receptors

- 25.** ~~27.~~ The potential impact on the visual receptors, as a result of the retention of the haul roads and CCSs, would be not significant. ~~These~~ The haul roads, CCSs and other associated components would have an influence on the views of local residents, road-users, cyclists, walkers, and other viewers, as they would be apparent as additional areas of hard-standing. These would contrast with the predominantly agrarian character, albeit seen in views where rural roads and tracks are a typical feature of the baseline character. While their prominence would be moderated by their ground surface location, their presence would be accentuated by the gaps in the hedgerows that would occur along the length of the roads and across the CCSs. Overall, their presence would give rise to an impact that would be not significant.

26. ~~28.~~ Scenario 2, compared with Scenario 1, as assessed in the East Anglia THREE ES, would have less of an impact on viewers in the area. This would be as a result of there being no additional construction works, compared with removal and reinstatement of haul road and CCSs ~~once or twice~~, and therefore less movement of materials and fewer vehicular movements visible to viewers. The additional impact in respect of Scenario 2 would relate to the absence of mitigation planting during the interim period.

29.4.5 ~~29.5.1~~ Summary

27. ~~29.~~ Chapter 29 Seascape, Landscape and Visual Assessment of the ES assesses a scenario in which the haul road and CCSs are removed following the construction of East Anglia ONE and reinstated at the start of the proposed East Anglia THREE project, ~~and possibly removed and reinstated again between Phase One and Phase Two (should a Two Phased approach to construction be adopted)~~. Following removal of the haul road and CCSs planting would be reinstated, mostly comprising hedgerow planting, which would be removed again prior to reconstruction of the haul roads and CCSs. The impact of these components on the physical elements, landscape character and visual receptors would be not significant owing to a combination of the following factors;

- The localised extent of the haul road and CCSs;
- The considered siting of the haul road and CCSs to ensure separation space from sensitive receptors and benefit from local screening where possible;
- The relatively small scale of the works required for the removal and reinstatement of the haul road and CCSs;
- The reduction in landscape and visual impacts as a result of the reinstatement of hedgerows between projects ~~(and potentially phases)~~;
- The temporary nature of the haul roads and CCSs and the reversibility of the potential impacts; and
- The relatively short duration of the construction works, ~~even taking into account the possibility of a Two Phased approach.~~

28. ~~30.~~ This Appendix considers an alternative scenario to that assessed in Chapter 29 Seascape, Landscape and Visual Assessment of the ES, in which the haul road and CCSs are not removed, but instead retained in-situ between the construction phase of East Anglia ONE and the construction phase of the proposed East Anglia THREE project. None of the impacts assessed would change in significance from those stated in Chapter 29 SLVIA of the East Anglia THREE ES, where the scenario assessed involves the removal of the haul road and CCSs. The factors leading to not significant effects include the following:

- The localised extent of the haul road and CCSs;
- The considered siting of the haul road and CCSs to ensure separation space from sensitive receptors and benefit from local screening where possible;
- The absence of any further construction works or movement of materials; and
- The temporary nature of the haul roads and CCSs and the reversibility of the potential impacts.

29. ~~31.~~ A comparison between these two scenarios has been presented and is summarised in table 29.5.1 below, which reveals that in terms of potential impacts on landscape and visual receptors, while both scenarios would not give rise to significant effects, Scenario 2, as assessed in this Appendix would have a lesser impact than Scenario 1, as assessed in Chapter 29 Seascape, Landscape and Visual Assessment of the ES. The principal reason for this is that there would be no further construction works required, as removal and reinstatement of the haul road and CCSs would not occur.

Table 29.5.1 Comparison of impacts between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2

Physical Elements	Not significant	Not significant	No change
Landscape Character	Not significant	Not significant	No change
Landscape Designations	Not significant	Not significant	No change
Visual Receptors	Not significant	Not significant	No change

Appendix 29.5 Ends Here

Document comparison by Workshare Compare on 22 September 2016
14:27:56

Input:	
Document 1 ID	interwovenSite://DMSCLUSTER/4A-LIVE/33880145/1
Description	#33880145v1<4A-LIVE> - For D5 comparite: ORIGINAL 6.3.29 (5) Volume 3 Chapter 29 Seascape Landscape and Visual Appendix 29.5
Document 2 ID	interwovenSite://DMSCLUSTER/4A-LIVE/33880184/1
Description	#33880184v1<4A-LIVE> - For D5 comparite: OEI_Seaascape Landscape and Visual Appendix 29.5
Rendering set	BP2 - Basic - colour

Legend:	
<u>Insertion</u>	
Deletion	
* <u>Moved from</u> *	
* <u>Moved to</u> *	
Style change	
Format change	
Moved deletion	
Inserted cell	
Deleted cell	
Moved cell	
Split/Merged cell	
Padding cell	

Statistics:	
	Count
Insertions	82
Deletions	88
Moved from	0
Moved to	0
Style change	0
Format changed	0
Total changes	170