

# **XLINKS' MOROCCO-UK POWER PROJECT**

## **Environmental Statement**

**Volume 4, Chapter 4: Human Health**

**Document Number: 6.4.4**

**PINS Reference: EN010164/APP/6.4**

**APFP Regulations: 5(2)(a)**

**November 2024**

**For Issue**

**XLINKS' MOROCCO – UK POWER PROJECT**

<b>Document status</b>					
<b>Version</b>	<b>Purpose of document</b>	<b>Authored by</b>	<b>Reviewed by</b>	<b>Approved by</b>	<b>Review date</b>
For Issue	Application	RPS	Xlinks 1 Ltd	Xlinks 1 Ltd	November 2024

**Prepared by:**

**RPS**

**Prepared for:**

**Xlinks 1 Limited**

## Contents

<b>4</b>	<b>HUMAN HEALTH</b>	<b>1</b>
4.1	Introduction	1
4.2	Legislative and Policy Context	2
4.3	Consultation and Engagement	11
4.4	Study Area	26
4.5	Scope of the Assessment	27
4.6	Methodology	28
4.7	Baseline Environment	35
4.8	Mitigation Measures Adopted as Part of the Proposed Development	52
4.9	Key Parameters for Assessment	57
4.10	Assessment of Construction Effects	57
4.11	Assessment of Operational Effects	84
4.12	Assessment of Decommissioning Effects	91
4.13	Cumulative Environmental Assessment	92
4.14	Transboundary Effects	105
4.15	Inter-related Effects	105
4.16	Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Monitoring	105
4.17	References	110

## Tables

Table 4.1:	Summary of relevant NPS policy	4
Table 4.2:	Summary of NPPF requirements relevant to this chapter	7
Table 4.3:	Summary of inshore and offshore marine plan policies relevant to this chapter	10
Table 4.4:	Summary of local planning policy relevant to this chapter	11
Table 4.5:	Summary of Scoping Responses	12
Table 4.6:	Summary of consultation relevant to this chapter	21
Table 4.7:	Sensitivity criteria	29
Table 4.8:	Impact magnitude criteria	29
Table 4.9:	Assessment Matrix	30
Table 4.10:	Explanation of population health significance	30
Table 4.11:	Vulnerable Groups	32
Table 4.12:	Summary of desk study sources used	35
Table 4.13:	Deprivation breakdown by indicator	37
Table 4.14:	Baseline - summary indicators relevant to air quality health outcomes for wards.	38
Table 4.15:	Baseline - summary indicators relevant to noise health outcomes	41
Table 4.16:	Baseline - summary indicators relevant to transport health outcomes	42
Table 4.17:	Baseline - summary indicators relevant to open space, leisure and play	44
Table 4.18:	Baseline - summary indicators relevant to socio-economic health outcomes.	46
Table 4.19:	Baseline - summary indicators relevant to understanding of risk health outcomes.	47
Table 4.20:	Baseline - summary indicators relevant to healthcare	49
Table 4.21:	Key receptors taken forward to assessment	52
Table 4.22:	Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Proposed Development	53

Table 4.23: GP Primary care capacity close to the Proposed Development – July  
2024 data release .....83

Table 4.24: List of cumulative developments considered within the CEA .....94

Table 4.25: Summary of potential environmental effects, mitigation and monitoring. .... 107

Table 4.26: Summary of potential cumulative environmental effects ..... 109

**Figures (see Volume 4, Figures)**

<b>Figure Number</b>	<b>Figure Title</b>
4.1	Human Health Study Area
4.2	Cumulative projects considered within human health chapter

## Glossary

Term	Meaning
Alverdiscott Substation	The existing National Grid Electricity Transmission substation at Alverdiscott, Devon, which comprises 400 kV and 132 kV electrical substation equipment.
Alverdiscott Substation Connection Development	The development required at the existing Alverdiscott Substation Site, which is envisaged to include development of a new 400 kV substation, and other extension modification works to be carried out by National Grid Electricity Transmission. This does not form part of the Proposed Development, however, it is considered cumulatively within the Environmental Impact Assessment as it is necessary to facilitate connection to the national grid.
Alverdiscott Substation site	The National Grid Electricity Transmission site within which the Alverdiscott Substation sits.
Applicant	Xlinks 1 Limited.
Bipole	A Bipole system is an electrical transmission system that comprises two Direct Current conductors of opposite polarity (one conductor with positive voltage and one with negative voltage).
Climate change	A change in global or regional climate patterns, in particular a change apparent from the mid to late 20th century onwards and attributed largely to the increased levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide produced by the use of fossil fuels.
Construction Traffic Management Plan	A document detailing the construction traffic routes for heavy goods vehicles and personnel travel, protocols for delivery of Abnormal Indivisible Loads to site, measures for road cleaning and sustainable site travel measures.
Converter Site	The Converter Site is proposed to be located to the immediate west of the existing Alverdiscott Substation site in north Devon. The Converter Site would contain two converter stations (known as Bipole 1 and Bipole 2) and associated infrastructure, buildings and landscaping.
Converter station	Part of an electrical transmission and distribution system. Converter stations convert electricity from Direct Current to Alternating Current, or vice versa.
Development Consent Order	An order made under the Planning Act 2008, as amended, granting development consent.
Earthworks	Covers the processes of soil-stripping, ground-levelling, excavation, and landscaping, as defined by the Institute of Air Quality Management.
Environmental Impact Assessment	The process of identifying and assessing the significant effects likely to arise from a project. This requires consideration of the likely changes to the environment, where these arise as a consequence of a project, through comparison with the existing and projected future baseline conditions.
Environmental Statement	The document presenting the results of the Environmental Impact Assessment process.
Green and blue space	Blue spaces are dominated by a watery element, such as a lakeside, river or coast. Green spaces may include a watery element but are characterised by predominantly 'green' elements such as grass or trees.
Health	State of complete physical, mental and social wellbeing and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.
Health outcome	Change in health status of an individual, group or population attributable to a planned intervention or series of interventions, regardless of whether such an intervention was intended to change health status.
Health risk factor	A social, economic or biological status, or behaviours or environments which are associated with or that cause increased susceptibility to a specific disease, ill health or injury.
HVAC Cables	The High Voltage Alternating Current cables which would bring electricity from the converter stations to the new Alverdiscott Substation Connection Development.

## XLINKS' MOROCCO-UK POWER PROJECT

Term	Meaning
HVDC Cables	The proposed corridors (for each Bipole) within which the onshore High Voltage Alternating Current cables would be routed between the Converter Site and the Alverdiscott Substation Site.
Landfall	The proposed area in which the offshore cables make landfall in the United Kingdom (come on shore) and the transitional area between the offshore cabling and the onshore cabling. This term applies to the entire landfall area at Cornborough Range, Devon, between Mean Low Water Springs and the transition joint bays inclusive of all construction works, including the offshore and onshore cable routes, and landfall compound(s).
Likely health effect	This effect is one that, with reference to the scientific literature, shows a plausible theoretical link between source-pathway-receptor; and the occurrence of which is judged as probable, in a specific context.
Maximum design scenario	The realistic worst case scenario, selected on a topic-specific and impact specific basis, from a range of potential parameters for the Proposed Development.
Mean High Water Springs	The height of mean high water during spring tides in a year.
Mean Low Water Springs	The height of mean low water during spring tides in a year.
Mental health	State in which every individual realises his or her own potential, can cope with the normal stresses of life, can work productively and fruitfully, and is able to make a contribution to her or his community.
Offshore Cable Corridor	The proposed corridor within which the offshore cables are proposed to be located, which is situated within the UK Exclusive Economic Zone.
Onshore Infrastructure Area	The proposed infrastructure area within the Order Limits landward of Mean High Water Springs. The Onshore Infrastructure Area comprises the transition joint bays, onshore HVDC Cables, converter stations, HVAC Cables, highways improvements, utility diversions and associated temporary and permanent infrastructure including temporary compound areas and permanent accesses.
Onshore HVDC Cable Corridor	The proposed corridor within which the onshore High Voltage Direct Current cables would be located.
Order Limits	The area within which all offshore and onshore components of the Proposed Development are proposed to be located, including areas required on a temporary basis during construction (such as construction compounds).
Preliminary Environmental Information Report	A report that provides preliminary environmental information in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. This is information that enables consultees to understand the likely significant environmental effects of a project and which helps to inform consultation responses.
Proposed Development	The element of the Xlinks' Morocco-UK Power Project within the UK, which includes the offshore cables (from the UK Exclusive Economic Zone to landfall), landfall site, onshore Direct Current and Alternating Current cables, converter stations, and road upgrade works.
Population health	The health outcomes of a group of individuals, including the distribution of such outcomes within the group.
Significant health effect	An effect triggered by the Proposed Development that is judged to be important for public health (a positive or negative effect), highly desirable for public health (a positive effect) or unacceptable for public health (a negative effect).
Vulnerable groups or subpopulations	Sensitive to changes in health determinant in a given context. Can include groups such as ethnic minorities, people with disabilities, people who are homeless, people living in poverty, those struggling with addiction and substance abuse, and isolated older people.

## XLINKS' MOROCCO-UK POWER PROJECT

Term	Meaning
Wider determinants of health	Biological, behavioural, socio-economic, cultural or environmental factors which contribute to the health status of individuals or populations.
Xlinks' Morocco UK Power Project	The overall scheme from Morocco to the national grid, including all onshore and offshore elements of the transmission network and the generation site in Morocco (referred to as the 'Project').

## Acronyms

Acronym	Meaning
CEA	Cumulative Effects Assessment
On-CEMP	Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan
CoCP	Code of Construction Practice
COPD	Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease
DESNZ	Department for Energy Security and Net Zero
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMF	Electric and magnetic fields
ES	Environmental Statement
HDD	Horizontal Direction Drilling
HM	Her Majesty's Government
HNA	Health Needs Assessment
HVAC	High Voltage Alternating Current
HVDC	High Voltage Direct Current
IAIA	International Association for Impact Assessment
ICNIRP	International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection
IEMA	Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IPH	Institute of Public Health
IAQM	Institute of Air Quality Management
JSNA	Joint Strategic Needs Assessment
KSI	Killed and seriously injured
MARPOL	The International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships
MHWS	Mean High Water Springs
MLWS	Mean Low Water Springs
MMO	Marine Management Organisation
MPCP	Marine Pollution Contingency Plan
MPS	The UK Marine Policy Statements
NEET	Not in education, employment or training
NHS	National Health Service
NPPF	The National Planning Policy Framework
NPS	National Policy Statements
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Planning

Acronym	Meaning
OEP	The Office for Environmental Protection
OHID	Office of Health Improvement and Disparities
OSPAR	The Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
PM	Particulate matter
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
PRoW	Public Rights of Way
QOF	Quality and Outcomes Framework
SAR	Standardised Admission Rate
SSC	Suspended sediment concentrations
UK	United Kingdom
WHO	World Health Organization

## Units

Unit	Meaning
dB(A)	A-weighted decibel
ha	Hectares
km	Kilometres



## 4 HUMAN HEALTH

### 4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 This chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) presents the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) undertaken for the United Kingdom (UK) elements of the Xlinks' Morocco UK Power Project (the 'Project'). For ease of reference, the UK elements of the Project are referred to in this chapter as the 'Proposed Development'. The ES accompanies the application to the Planning Inspectorate for development consent for the Proposed Development.
- 4.1.2 This chapter considers the likely impacts and effects of the Proposed Development on human health during the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases. Specifically, it relates to onshore and offshore elements of the Proposed Development.
- 4.1.3 In particular, this ES chapter:
- identifies the key legislation, policy and guidance relevant to human health;
  - details the EIA scoping and consultation process undertaken for human health;
  - confirms the study area for the assessment, the methodology used to identify baseline environmental conditions, the impact assessment methodology, and identifies any assumptions and limitations encountered in compiling the environmental information;
  - sets out the existing and future environmental baseline conditions, established from desk studies, surveys and consultation;
  - details the mitigation and/or monitoring measures that are proposed to prevent, minimise, reduce or offset the possible environmental effects identified in the EIA process;
  - defines the project design parameters used to inform for the impact assessment;
  - presents an assessment of the likely impacts and effects in relation to the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development on human health; and
  - identifies any cumulative, transboundary and/or inter-related effects in relation to the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development on human health.
- 4.1.4 This Human Health chapter identifies and assesses the potential likely significant effects (both adverse and beneficial) of the Proposed Development on human health.
- 4.1.5 Health is '*a state of complete physical, mental and social wellbeing and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity*' (World Health Organization (WHO), 1948). Mental health is '*a state of mental well-being that enables people to cope with the stresses of life, to realize their abilities, to learn well and work well, and to contribute to their communities*' (WHO, 2022). 'Population health' refers to health outcomes within the group (Kindig and Stoddart, 2003).

- 4.1.6 The assessment considers how the Proposed Development affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health. This includes changes to the social, economic, behavioural, institutional and bio-physical environment.
- 4.1.7 Health in EIA takes a public health approach, meaning it reaches conclusions on the health outcomes to defined populations, rather than the health outcomes of individuals. The guidance that explains this is the correct approach to take in an assessment is set out in **section 4.6** (Relevant Guidance).
- 4.1.8 In this assessment the terms health and wellbeing are used interchangeably, and parity is given to considering both physical and mental health outcomes.
- 4.1.9 This chapter considers appropriate actions to avoid or mitigate health risks and promote health opportunities including targeting measures to respond to health inequalities for vulnerable groups.
- 4.1.10 This chapter also assesses the cumulative effects of the Proposed Development on health and wellbeing.
- 4.1.11 The chapter follows guidance and good practice, giving the public health perspective of impacts. In doing so, the chapter:
- takes a population health approach to assessing physical and mental health outcomes;
  - considers the wider determinants of health that may be significantly affected directly or indirectly;
  - assesses the potential for health inequalities to vulnerable groups; and
  - considers opportunities to improve population health.
- 4.1.12 The assessment presented is informed by the following technical chapters and should be read in conjunction with:
- Volume 2, Chapter 3: Hydrology and Flood Risk of the ES;
  - Volume 3, Chapter 4: Geology, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions of the ES;
  - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Traffic and Transport of the ES;
  - Volume 2, Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration of the ES;
  - Volume 2, Chapter 7: Air Quality of the ES;
  - Volume 2, Chapter 8: Land Use and Recreation of the ES;
  - Volume 3, Chapter 4: Commercial Fisheries of the ES; and
  - Volume 4, Chapter 3: Socio-economics of the ES.
- 4.1.13 This chapter also draws upon additional information to support the assessment contained within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description of the ES.

## 4.2 Legislative and Policy Context

### Legislation

- 4.2.1 The following legislation has been considered in the human health assessment.

- The Environment Act 2021 (Her Majesty's Government, 2021) establishes The Office for Environmental Protection (OEP) as a public body in England and Northern Ireland. The OEP sets targets and takes enforcement action to prevent, or mitigate, serious damage to the natural environment or to human health. This includes reducing adverse impacts on public health. The OEP objective (Office for Environmental Protection, 2022) is for environmental law (including EIA legalisation) and its implementation to be well designed and delivered, so that positive outcomes for the environment and people's health and wellbeing are achieved.
- The Environment Act 1995 sets provisions for protecting certain environmental conditions of relevance to health in the UK (HM Government, 1995). Part II covers contaminated land and Part IV covers air quality.
- The Environment Protection Act 1990 (as amended) part IIA covers contaminated land and Part III manages the control of emissions (including dust, noise and light) that may be prejudicial to health or a nuisance (HM Government, 1990).
- Control of Pollution Act 1974 (HM Government, 1974a) makes provisions in relation to waste disposal, water pollution, noise, atmospheric pollution and public health. It describes licencing of certain activities to avoid danger to public health or serious detriment to the amenity of the locality affected. It also covers control of, and consent for, noise on construction sites (sections 60 and 61), including defining 'best practicable means' (section 72).
- The Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 (HM Government, 1974b) places duties on employers to ensure, 'so far as is reasonably practicable': the health, safety and welfare at work of all their employees; and that persons not in their employment are not exposed to risks to their health or safety as a result of the activities undertaken.
- The Health and Social Care Act 2012 (as amended by the 2022 Act) HM Government, 2012; 2022). Sections 12 and 13 of the Act outline the responsibilities of Local Authorities regarding public health duties and the involvement of Integrated Care Boards (ICBs) in planning local healthcare services.
- The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (HM Government, 2017) sets out the topics to be assessed within the EIA process, including: *'The EIA must identify, describe and assess in an appropriate manner, in light of each individual case, the direct and indirect significant effects of the proposed development on the following factors – population and human health...'*
- The Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010 (amended in 2016) set out statutory health protection standards on ambient air quality (HM Government, 2016).
- The Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) Environmental Improvement Plan 2023 (2023) amends the national fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) standards. The Environmental Improvement Plan includes a long-term target for reducing population exposure to PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations to meet an annual mean of 10 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, as recommended by the WHO 2005 guideline.

## Planning Policy Context

4.2.2 The Proposed Development would be located within the UK Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) offshore waters (beyond 12 nautical miles (nm) from the English coast) and inshore waters, with the onshore infrastructure proposed to be located wholly within Devon, England. As set out in Volume 1, Chapter 1: Introduction of the ES, the Secretary of State for the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) has directed that elements of the Proposed Development are to be treated as development for which development consent is required under the Planning Act 2008, as amended.

## National Policy Statements

4.2.3 There are currently six energy National Policy Statements (NPSs), three of which contain policy relevant to the Proposed Development, specifically:

- Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) which sets out the UK Government’s policy for the delivery of major energy infrastructure (Department for Energy Security and Net Zero, 2023a);
- NPS for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (NPS EN-3) (Department for Energy Security and Net Zero, 2023c); and
- NPS for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (NPS EN-5) (Department for Energy Security and Net Zero, 2023b).

4.2.4 NPS EN-3 has been reviewed and it is considered that there are no relevant policy positions in relation to human health that need to be taken into account. **Table 4.1** sets out key aspects from the NPSs relevant to the Proposed Development, with particular reference to the need for and approach to consenting such infrastructure.

**Table 4.1: Summary of relevant NPS policy**

Summary of NPS requirement	How and where considered in the ES
<b>NPS EN-1</b>	
‘4.3.4 To consider the potential effects, including benefits, of a proposal for a project, the applicant must set out information on the likely significant environmental, social and economic effects of the development, and show how any likely significant negative effects would be avoided, reduced, mitigated or compensated for, following the mitigation hierarchy. This information could include matters such as [...] <b>health and well-being</b> .’ (p. 60)	The effects to population health, including the potential for adverse effects and opportunities to enhance health and wellbeing, are considered in the below assessment section, see <b>sections 4.10 to 4.12</b> . Well-being is an integral consideration throughout this chapter, reflecting that the WHO define health in terms of states of wellbeing.
‘4.4.1 Energy infrastructure has the potential to impact on the <b>health and well-being</b> (‘health’) of the population. Access to energy is clearly beneficial to society and to our <b>health as a whole</b> . However, the construction of energy infrastructure and the production, distribution and use of energy may have negative impacts on some people’s <b>health</b> .	The infrastructure benefits to public health, as well as potentially direct adverse transport, air quality, water quality, noise and vibration and radiation effects are considered in the assessment sections (see <b>sections 4.10 to 4.12</b> ).  Indirect effects that could influence public open space, public rights of way (PRoW) and

Summary of NPS requirement	How and where considered in the ES
<p>4.4.2 The direct impacts on <b>health</b> may include increased traffic, air or water pollution, dust, odour, hazardous waste and substances, noise, exposure to radiation, and increases in pests.</p> <p>4.4.3 New energy infrastructure may also affect the composition and size of the local population, and in doing so have indirect <b>health impacts</b>, for example if it in some way affects access to key public services, transport, or the use of open space for recreation and physical activity.' (p. 64)</p>	<p>recreational activities are considered in <b>section 4.10</b>.</p> <p>Issues of odour, waste and pests are scoped out of the human health assessment as not having the potential for likely significant population health effects due to the Proposed Development (see <b>section 4.5</b>).</p>
<p>'4.4.4 As described in the relevant sections of this NPS and in the technology specific NPSs, where the proposed project has an effect on <b>humans</b>, the ES should assess these effects for each element of the project, identifying any potential <b>adverse health impacts</b>, and identifying measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for these impacts as appropriate.</p> <p>4.4.5 The impacts of more than one development may affect people simultaneously, so the applicant should consider the <b>cumulative impact on health</b> in the ES where appropriate.</p> <p>4.4.6 Opportunities should be taken to mitigate indirect impacts, by promoting local improvements to encourage <b>health and wellbeing</b>, this includes potential impacts on vulnerable groups within society and impacts on those with protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, i.e. those groups which may be differentially impacted by a development compared to wider society as a whole.' (p. 65)</p>	<p>The effects to population health, including the potential for adverse effects and opportunities to enhance health and wellbeing, are considered in the assessment sections (see <b>sections 4.10 to 4.12</b>).</p> <p>Cumulative effects to population health are considered in <b>section 4.13</b>.</p> <p>Vulnerable groups, including relevant protected characteristics, are considered within this assessment (see <b>section 4.6 and sections 4.10 to 4.12</b>).</p>
<p>'4.4.7 Generally, those aspects of energy infrastructure which are most likely to have a significantly detrimental <b>impact on health</b> are subject to separate regulation (for example for air pollution) which will constitute effective mitigation of them, so that it is unlikely that <b>health</b> concerns will either by themselves constitute a reason to refuse consent or require specific mitigation under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>4.4.8 However, not all potential sources of <b>health impacts</b> will be mitigated in this way and the Secretary of State may want to take account of <b>health</b> concerns when setting requirements relating to a range of impacts such as noise.' (p. 65)</p>	<p>Impacts that are governed by separate regulation have been considered. Where appropriate issues have been scoped out, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024) and <b>section 4.5</b>.</p> <p>Mitigations have been considered throughout the assessment <b>sections 4.10 to 4.12</b> and are set out in <b>section 4.8</b>.</p> <p>Non-threshold health effects of noise and air quality, i.e., those even within regulatory standards, are considered in the assessment sections (see <b>sections 4.10 to 4.12</b>).</p>
<p>'4.12.2 Pollution control is concerned with preventing pollution through the use of measures to prohibit or limit the releases of substances to the environment from different sources to the lowest practicable level. It also ensures that ambient air, water, and land quality meet standards that guard against impacts to the environment or <b>human health</b>.' (p. 88)</p>	<p>Potential health effects relating to air quality, water quality and land quality are assessed in <b>section 4.10</b> and <b>section 4.12</b>.</p>
<p>'5.2.1 Energy infrastructure development can have adverse effects on air quality. The construction, operation and</p>	<p>Potential health effects relating to air quality are assessed in <b>section 4.10</b> and <b>section 4.12</b>.</p>



Summary of NPS requirement	How and where considered in the ES
<p><i>decommissioning phases can involve emissions to air which could lead to <b>adverse impacts on health</b></i>' (p. 96).</p>	
<p><i>'5.2.3 For many air pollutants there is not a threshold below which there is no health impact so it is important that energy infrastructure schemes consider not just how a scheme may impact statutory air quality limits, objectives or targets but also measures to mitigate all emissions in order to minimise <b>human exposure to air pollution</b>, especially for those who are more susceptible to the impacts of poor air quality'</i> (p. 96)</p>	<p>Potential health effects relating to air quality are assessed in <b>section 4.10</b> and <b>4.12</b>, including specific regard to non-threshold effects and vulnerable groups.</p>
<p><i>'5.11.7 Green and blue infrastructure can also enable developments to provide <b>positive</b> environmental, social, <b>health</b> and economic <b>benefits</b>.'</i> (p. 150).</p>	<p>Effects that could beneficially influence public open spaces, public rights of way (PRoW) and recreational activities are considered in <b>section 4.10</b> and <b>4.12</b>.</p>
<p><i>'5.12.1 Excessive noise can have wide-ranging impacts on the <b>quality of human life and, health such as annoyance, sleep disturbance, cardiovascular disease and mental ill-health</b>. It can also have an impact on the environment and the use and enjoyment of areas of value such as quiet places and areas with high landscape quality.'</i> (p. 155).</p>	<p>Potential health effects relating to noise and vibration are considered in assessments sections (see <b>sections 4.10</b> to <b>4.12</b>).</p>
<p><i>'5.12.6 Where noise impacts are likely to arise from the proposed development, the applicant should include the following in the noise assessment: an assessment of the effect of predicted changes in the noise environment on any noise-sensitive receptors, including an assessment of any likely impact on <b>health and quality of life / well-being</b> where appropriate, particularly among those disadvantaged by other factors who are often disproportionately affected by noise-sensitive areas; all reasonable steps taken to mitigate and minimise potential adverse effects on health and quality of life'</i> (p. 157).</p>	<p>Potential health effects relating to noise and vibration are considered in assessments sections (see <b>sections 4.10</b> to <b>4.12</b>).</p> <p>Relevant vulnerable population groups are considered within the assessment (see <b>section 4.10</b>, Vulnerable Groups).</p>
<p><i>'5.12.17 The Secretary of State should not grant development consent unless they are satisfied that the proposals will meet the following aims, through the effective management and control of noise: avoid significant <b>adverse impacts on health and quality of life</b> from noise; mitigate and minimise other adverse <b>impacts on health and quality of life</b> from noise; where possible, contribute to <b>improvements to health and quality of life</b> through the effective management and control of noise'</i> (p. 159).</p>	<p>Potential health effects relating to noise and vibration are considered in assessments sections (see <b>sections 4.10</b> to <b>4.12</b>).</p>
<p><i>'5.16.2 During the construction, operation, and decommissioning phases, development can lead to increased demand for water, involve discharges to water, and cause adverse ecological effects resulting from physical modifications to the water environment. There may also be an increased risk of spills and leaks of pollutants to the water environment. These effects could lead to adverse <b>impacts on health</b> or on protected species and habitats (see Section 4.3) and could result in surface waters, groundwaters or protected areas failing to meet environmental objectives established under the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 and the Marine Strategy Regulations 2010.'</i> (p. 167-168).</p>	<p>Potential health effects relating to water quality are assessed in <b>section 4.10</b> and <b>4.12</b>.</p>

Summary of NPS requirement	How and where considered in the ES
<b>NPS EN-5</b>	
<p>'2.9.46 All overhead power lines produce EMFs. These tend to be highest directly under a line and decrease to the sides at increasing distance. Although putting cables underground eliminates the electric field, they still produce magnetic fields, which are highest directly above the cable. EMFs can have both <b>direct and indirect effects on human health, aquatic and terrestrial organisms.</b>' (p. 25).</p> <p>'2.9.46 To prevent these known effects, the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) developed health protection guidelines in 1998 for both public and occupational exposure.' (p. 26).</p>	<p>This chapter considers public understanding of Electric and magnetic fields (EMF) exposure in terms of mental health outcomes associated with concern (see Table 9.5.2 of the Scoping Report) (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024), acknowledging that actual risks are unlikely to be significant for public health (see <b>section 4.11</b>).</p> <p>As noted in <b>Table 4.22</b>, the Proposed Development would adopt and implement relevant design guidelines of the ICNIRP and UK Government voluntary code of practice (Department for Energy Security and Net Zero, 2012; ICNIRP, 1998, 2010).</p>

## The National Planning Policy Framework

- 4.2.5 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in 2012 and updated in 2018, 2019 and 2021 and 2023 (Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities, 2023). The NPPF sets out the Government’s planning policies for England.
- 4.2.6 **Table 4.2** sets out a summary of the NPPF policies relevant to this chapter.
- 4.2.7 The Government published proposed reforms to the NPPF for consultation on 30 July 2024 (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, 2024). Following consultation, the NPPF will be updated.

**Table 4.2: Summary of NPPF requirements relevant to this chapter**

Policy	Key provisions	How and where considered in the ES
8. Promoting healthy and safe communities	<p>'96. <i>Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve <b>healthy, inclusive and safe</b> places which:</i></p> <p><i>a) promote social interaction, including opportunities for meetings between people who might not otherwise come into contact with each other – for example through... street layouts that allow for easy pedestrian and cycle connections;</i></p> <p><i>b) are <b>safe and accessible</b>, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion – for example through the use of...pedestrian and cycle routes, and high quality public space; and</i></p> <p><i>c) enable and <b>support healthy lifestyles</b>, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs – for example through the</i></p>	<p>Wider societal benefits have been assessed in <b>section 4.11</b>.</p> <p>Well-being is an integral consideration throughout this chapter, reflecting that the WHO define health in terms of states of wellbeing.</p> <p>Effects that could influence public open spaces, public rights of way (PRoW) and recreational activities are considered in <b>section 4.10 and 4.12</b>.</p>

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Key provisions</b>	<b>How and where considered in the ES</b>
	<i>provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure, sports facilities, local shops, access to healthier food, allotments and layouts that encourage walking and cycling.</i> (p. 27)	
9. Promoting sustainable transport	<p><i>'108. Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed;</i></li> <li><i>• opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised;</i></li> <li><i>• opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued;</i></li> <li><i>• the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account; and</i></li> <li><i>• patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places.'</i> (p. 30).</li> </ul>	Transport effects are assessed in <b>section 4.10</b> and <b>4.12</b> .

- 4.2.8 The consultation draft includes similar provisions as the designated NPPF. The consultation draft NPPF has been reviewed and there are no material updates for human health.
- 4.2.9 The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, 2023) supports the NPPF and provides guidance across a range of topic areas.
- 4.2.10 These include the 'healthy and safe communities'. As stated in the NPPG, planning and health need to be considered firstly in terms of creating environments that support and encourage healthy lifestyles, and secondly in terms of healthcare capacity. In addition, engagement with the Devon County Council (DCC) Director of Public Health was conducted on 29 February 2024 to help ensure local public health strategies and any inequalities are considered appropriately. The guidance notes that National Health Service (NHS) England and Clinical Commissioning Groups (now Integrated Care Boards) have strategies to refurbish, expand, reduce or build new facilities to meet the health needs of the existing population as well as those arising as a result of new and future development.



## Marine Policy

### UK Marine Policy Statement

- 4.2.11 The UK Marine Policy Statement (MPS) is the framework for preparing Marine Plans and taking decisions affecting the marine environment (Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs, 2011). The MPS highlights objectives for a healthy marine environment: *'The UK vision for the marine environment is for 'clean, healthy, safe, productive and biologically diverse oceans and seas'* (p.10).
- 4.2.12 The MPS outlines high-level marine objectives including *'ensuring a strong, healthy and just society'* (p. 11):
- 'People appreciate the diversity of the marine environment, its seascapes, its natural and cultural heritage and its resources and act responsibly.
  - The use of the marine environment is benefiting society as a whole, contributing to resilient and cohesive communities that can adapt to coastal erosion and flood risk, as well as contributing to physical and mental wellbeing.
  - The coast, seas, oceans and their resources are safe to use.
  - There is equitable access for those who want to use and enjoy the coast, seas and their wide range of resources and assets and recognition that for some island and peripheral communities the sea plays a significant role in their community.' (p. 11).
- 4.2.13 The MPS highlights the impact of the marine environment of human health. Specifically, air quality, noise and vibration and recreational effects on human health are considered, these are assessed in **sections 4.10 to 4.12**:
- *'2.6.2.1 Activities and developments in the marine and coastal area can have adverse effects on air quality at various stages. The construction, operation and decommissioning phases of projects can involve emissions to air which could lead to adverse impacts on human health'* (p. 19).
  - *'2.6.3.3 Noise from marine activities can also affect people. ... Excessive noise can have wide ranging impacts on the quality of human life, health, and use and enjoyment of areas, including those with high visual quality. Its impact therefore needs to be considered and managed appropriately.'* (p. 20).

### South West Inshore and South West Offshore Marine Plans

- 4.2.14 **Table 4.3** sets out a summary of the specific policies set out in the South West Inshore and South West Offshore Marine Plans (Marine Management Organisation, 2021) relevant to this chapter.

**Table 4.3: Summary of inshore and offshore marine plan policies relevant to this chapter**

Policy	Key provisions	How and where considered in the ES
Objectives of the South West Marine Plan	<p><i>'Achieving a sustainable marine economy (Objectives 1-4): Infrastructure is in place to support and promote safe, profitable and efficient marine businesses; marine businesses respect environmental limits and are socially responsible.</i></p> <p><i>Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society (Objectives 5-10): The use of the marine environment is <b>benefitting society as a whole [...] contributing to physical and mental wellbeing</b>; the coast, seas, oceans and their resources are <b>safe to use</b>; there is <b>equitable access</b> for those who want to use and enjoy the coast, seas and their wide range of resources and assets and recognition that for some island and peripheral communities the sea plays a significant role in their community.'</i> (p. 18)</p>	<p>Equitable access to health determinants is assessed throughout the assessment sections (see <b>sections 4.10 to 4.12</b>).</p> <p>Health effects from temporary changes to marine businesses (offshore commercial fisheries) are discussed in <b>section 4.10 and 4.12</b>.</p>
SW-WQ-1	<i>'Proposals that protect, enhance and restore <b>water quality</b> will be supported.'</i> (p. 43)	The water quality effects of the Proposed Development to population health are considered in <b>section 4.10 and 4.12</b> under 'Water quality'.
SW-REN-1	<i>'Proposals that <b>enable the provision of renewable energy technologies</b> and associated supply chains, will be supported.'</i> (p. 34)	Wider societal infrastructure and resources have been assessed in <b>section 4.11</b> .
SW-AIR-1	<i>'<b>Clean air</b> is essential for life, health, the environment and the economy. Air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions must be reduced to protect health.'</i> (p. 42)	The air quality effects of the Proposed Development on human health are discussed in <b>section 4.10 and 4.12</b> .
SW-TR-1	<i>'Proposals that promote or facilitate <b>sustainable tourism and recreation activities</b>.'</i> (p.45)	Effects that could influence public open spaces, PROWs and recreational activities are considered in <b>section 4.10 and 4.12</b> .
SW-SOC-1	<i>'Those bringing forward proposals should consider and demonstrate how their development shall <b>enhance public knowledge, understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of the marine environment</b> as part of (the design of) the proposal.'</i> (p. 46)	A summary of impacts, mitigation measures and monitoring is included, see <b>section 4.16</b> .

## Local Planning Policy

4.2.15 The onshore elements of the Proposed Development are located within the administrative area of Torridge District Council (TDC) (and Devon County

Council (DCC) at the County level). The relevant local planning policies applicable to human health based on the extent of the study areas for this assessment are summarised in **Table 4.4**.

**Table 4.4: Summary of local planning policy relevant to this chapter**

Policy	Key provisions	How and where considered in the ES
<b>North Devon Council and Torridge District Council Local Plan 2011-2031</b>		
Policy ST01: Principles of Sustainable Development	<i>'When considering development proposals the Councils will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development [...] secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.'</i> (p. 16)	Wider societal infrastructure and resources, in terms of the public health benefit of sustainable development, has been assessed in <b>section 4.11</b> .
Policy ST10: Transport Strategy	<i>'The Transport Strategy for northern Devon will: (1) Provide good strategic connectivity [...] (2) Meet the needs of local communities and visitors to the area [...] (3) Reduce the environmental and social impacts of transport...'</i> (p.42-43)	Transport effects are assessed in in <b>section 4.10 and 4.12</b> .

## 4.3 Consultation and Engagement

### Scoping

- 4.3.1 In January 2024, the Applicant submitted a Scoping Report to the Planning Inspectorate, which described the scope and methodology for the technical studies being undertaken to provide an assessment of any likely significant effects for the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. It also described those topics or sub-topics which are proposed to be scoped out of the EIA process and provided justification as to why the Proposed Development would not have the potential to give rise to significant environmental effects in these areas.
- 4.3.2 Following consultation with the appropriate statutory bodies, the Planning Inspectorate (on behalf of the Secretary of State) provided a Scoping Opinion on 7 March 2024. Key issues raised during the scoping process specific to human health are listed in **Table 4.5**, together with details of how these issues have been addressed within the ES.

**Table 4.5: Summary of Scoping Responses**

Comment	How and where considered in the ES
<b>Planning Inspectorate</b>	
<p>Human health matters: offshore</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the offshore effects on the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health related behaviours - physical activities; risk-taking behaviour; diet and nutrition.</li> <li>• Social environment - housing; relocation; open space, leisure and play; transport modes, access and connections; community safety; community identity, culture, resilience and influence; social participation, interaction and support.</li> <li>• Economic environment - education and training; employment and income.</li> <li>• Bio-physical environment – climate change and adaptation; air quality; water quality and availability; land quality; noise and vibration; radiation.</li> <li>• Institutional and built environment – health and social care services; built environment; wider social infrastructure and resources.</li> </ul> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that these matters as listed in Table 9.5.3 can be scoped out of the ES.</p> <p>The Inspectorate notes that any issues relating to shipping safety would be discussed within the Shipping and Navigation ES chapter and is content with this approach. The Inspectorate also notes that Table 9.5.2 scopes in in respect of offshore impacts an assessment of health effects from wider indirect economic impacts, for example temporary changes to commercial fishing, together with any potential unemployment or adverse economic implications. The Inspectorate is content with this approach.</p>	<p>The listed offshore determinants are scoped out of the assessment, as set out in Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p> <p>Offshore health effects from wider indirect economic impacts are scoped in, see <b>section 4.10</b>.</p>
<p>Health related behaviours – physical activity (all phases)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of onshore physical activity health effects for all phases, as the potential impacts would be considered under the open space, leisure and play health determinant instead. The Inspectorate is content with this approach.</p>	<p>Physical activity is scoped out, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024). To avoid duplication, potential health effects related to physical activity are addressed under open space, leisure and play, see <b>section 4.10</b>.</p>
<p>Health related behaviours – risk taking activity (all phases)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore health effects related to risk-taking behaviour for all project phases on the basis that the workforce will be comprised of professionals who would return to their usual place of residence during periods of leave and is unlikely to be</p>	<p>Health effects related to risk-taking behaviour are scoped out, see <b>Table 9.5.3</b> of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p>

Comment	How and where considered in the ES
<p>large enough to affect local markets to an extent which could significantly affect community health. The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	
<p>Health related behaviours – diet and nutrition (all phases)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore health effects related to diet and nutrition for all project phases on the basis that construction and operation of the Proposed Development would not change population diet or food prices.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	<p>Health effects related to diet and nutrition are scoped out, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p>
<p>Social environment – housing (operation and decommissioning)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore health effects related to housing for the operational phase on the basis that minimal workforce numbers are anticipated.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore health effects related to housing for the decommissioning phase on the basis that fewer workers would be required for a shorter duration than the construction phase. No further information is provided regarding likely numbers of workers during the decommissioning phase and so the Inspectorate considers that insufficient justification has been provided for scoping this matter out at this stage. The ES should include an assessment of this matter or evidence demonstrating agreement with the relevant stakeholders and the absence of likely significant effects.</p>	<p>During the construction phase, onshore health effects related to housing are scoped in, see <b>section 4.10</b>.</p> <p>During operation (and maintenance), minimal operational workforce numbers are anticipated to check and maintain the Proposed Development. The onshore infrastructure, is relatively low impact in terms of its built form, limiting the potential for any widespread adverse effect on housing value or affordability at a population level. This issue is therefore scoped out during the operational phase.</p> <p>Information regarding the likely number of workers is provided in section <b>4.10, Employment and Income</b> – Offshore. The decommissioning workforce number is expected to be no higher than for constructions (see Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description of the ES).</p>
<p>Social environment – relocation (all phases)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore effects related to housing for all project phases on the basis that the Proposed Development would not involve compulsory purchases of homes or community facilities.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	<p>Health effects related to relocation are scoped out, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p>

<b>Comment</b>	<b>How and where considered in the ES</b>
<p>Social environment – open space, leisure and play (operation)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore effects on open space for the operational phase on the basis that the Proposed Development would not involve the acquisition of land used for community recreation.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	<p>Open space, leisure and play health effects are scoped out of the assessment for the operational phase, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p>
<p>Social environment – transport modes, access and connections (operation and decommissioning)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore effects on transport modes, access and connections for the operational and decommissioning stages on the basis that the expected vehicle movements associated with the Proposed Development would have a minimal impact on road transport.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	<p>Transport modes, access and connections health effects are scoped out of the assessment for the operational and decommissioning phases, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p>
<p>Social environment – community safety (all phases)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore effects on community safety for all phases on the basis that appropriate management plans and fencing would be in place to manage security and safety risks to the public.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	<p>Community safety health effects are scoped out, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p>
<p>Social environment – community identity, culture, resilience and influence (all phases)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore effects on community identity, culture, resilience and influence for all project phases on the basis that visual impacts associated with the Proposed Development are not expected to be of a scale that could affect population health or community identity.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	<p>Community identity, culture, resilience and influence health effects are scoped out, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p>
<p>Social environment – social participation, interaction and support (all phases)</p>	<p>Social participation, interaction and support health effects are scoped out, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p>



<b>Comment</b>	<b>How and where considered in the ES</b>
<p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore effects on social participation, interaction and support for all project phases on the basis that the Proposed Development would not directly affect land or areas used for community interaction.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	
<p>Economic environment – education and training (all phases)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore effects on education and training opportunities for all project phases on the basis that the Proposed Development would not affect access to schools and would not involve a large influx of workers and their families which may affect educational capacity or quality.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	<p>Onshore health effects related to education and training opportunities are scoped out, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p>
<p>Economic environment – employment and income (all phases)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore effects on employment and income for all project phases on the basis that employment opportunities associated with the Proposed Development are not expected to be on a scale that could have significant population level effects.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES provided that information is included within the ES with regards to likely employment numbers and to evidence how this conclusion was reached.</p>	<p>Onshore health effects related to employment and income are scoped out, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p> <p>Information and evidence regarding likely employment numbers is provided in <b>section 4.10</b>, Employment and Income – Offshore.</p>
<p>Bio-physical environment – climate change and adaptation (all phases)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore effects on climate change and adaptation for all project phases on the basis that embodied carbon and climate altering pollutant emissions are not of a scale that could have population level effects.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p> <p>The Inspectorate notes that the public health benefits of electrical infrastructure during operation and</p>	<p>Onshore health climate change effects are scoped out, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p> <p>Wider public health benefits of electrical infrastructure during operation and maintenance are assessed under wider societal infrastructure and resources, see <b>section 4.10</b>.</p>

<b>Comment</b>	<b>How and where considered in the ES</b>
<p>maintenance of the Proposed Development are assessed in the 'wider societal infrastructure and resources' determinant and is content with this approach.</p>	
<p>Bio-physical environment – air quality (operation and maintenance) and odour (all phases)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore effects on air quality for the operation and maintenance phase on the basis that air emissions and odour from the Proposed Development are not expected to be on a scale that would affect population health.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	<p>Onshore air quality health effects during operation and maintenance are scoped out, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p>
<p>Bio-physical environment – water quality and availability (operation and maintenance)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore effects on water quality and availability for the operation and maintenance phase on the basis that impacts resulting from emissions to water are not expected to be on a scale that would affect population health.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	<p>Onshore water quality and availability health effects are scoped out for the operation and maintenance phase, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p>
<p>Bio-physical environment – land quality (operation and maintenance)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore effects on land quality for the operation and maintenance phase on the basis that activities requiring land excavations are considered unlikely and any risks would be managed by industry best practice contamination avoidance and response measures.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	<p>Onshore land quality health effects during operation and maintenance are scoped out, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p>
<p>Bio-physical environment – noise and vibration (maintenance only)</p> <p>The Inspectorate notes that while onshore effects on noise and vibration sensitive community receptors during the operational phase is scoped into the assessment, noise and vibration effects associated with maintenance checks and activities are not expected to be of a magnitude that could impact on human health and so have been scoped out. The Inspectorate is content with this approach.</p>	<p>Noise and vibration health effects during the maintenance phase are scoped out, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p>



<b>Comment</b>	<b>How and where considered in the ES</b>
<p>Bio-physical environment – radiation (all phases)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore effects on radiation for the construction and decommissioning phases on the basis that the Proposed Development would not use or make changes to major EMF producing electrical infrastructure, and for the operational phase on the basis that levels of exposure to EMF would not pose a risk to public health.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	<p>Onshore radiation health effects are scoped out during all phases, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p>
<p>Institutional and built environment – health and social care services (operation and decommissioning)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore effects on health and social care services for the operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases on the basis that a minimal number of workers will be required and so demands on local healthcare will not be significant.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	<p>Onshore effects on health and social care services during the operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases are scoped out, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p> <p>Onshore effects on health and social care services during construction are scoped in, see <b>section 4.10</b>.</p>
<p>Institutional and built environment – built environment (all phases)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore effects on the built environment for all project phases on the basis that significant population health implications associated with the Proposed Development are not anticipated, and long-term impacts on land use patterns are restricted to the converter stations.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	<p>Onshore built environment health effects are scoped out of the assessment, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p>
<p>Institutional and built environment – wider social infrastructure and resources (construction and decommissioning)</p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of the onshore effects on wider social infrastructure and resources during the construction and decommissioning phases on the basis that the Proposed Development's energy infrastructure would not be operational.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report,</p>	<p>Onshore effects on wider social infrastructure and resources during the construction and decommissioning phases are scoped out, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p> <p>Onshore effects on wider social infrastructure and resources during the operation and maintenance phases are discussed in <b>section 4.11</b>.</p>

Comment	How and where considered in the ES
<p>the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	
<p><b>Devon County Council</b></p>	
<p>Education</p> <p>Table 9.5.3 - Impacts proposed to be scoped out of the assessment for human Health states that <i>“During construction, the potential to adversely affect access to schools is limited by the use of trenchless techniques for major road crossings. A large influx for workers, including those bringing families, is not expected, so changes to educational capacity or quality, on a scale to affect population health, are unlikely and are scoped out”</i> but the County Council would like to also see consideration given to assessing the potential impacts of the routing of any cables and associated easement upon any new schools or extensions to existing schools which may come forward in the future.</p>	<p>No new schools or extensions to existing schools which may be impacted by the Proposed Development have been identified . The assessment of construction effects on schools and other receptors is provided at <b>section 4.10</b> ‘transport modes, access and connections’.</p> <p>In terms of cumulative effects, the Volume 2, Chapter 5: Traffic and Transport of the ES has not identified any new schools or extensions to existing schools within its cumulative assessment.</p>
<p>Public health</p> <p>We welcome the comprehensive assessment of human health effects in Section 9.5 of Chapter 9 as well as more detailed assessments around flood risk, traffic, noise, vibration, air quality, and recreation in Chapter 7, including potential inter-related effects (7.6.45). Also noted are assessments of effects on local economic activities, such as fishing (e.g. 4.7.38, and Chapter 8) and agriculture (Table 7.9.2, Chapter 7), recreation (Chapter 7), and climate change (Chapter 9). Each of these may influence local public health. It has been noted that National Policy Statements for Electricity Networks Infrastructure, particularly EN-5 applies. The following comments are made on the scope of the Environmental Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 437 - The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for Devon should be included with the Baseline data sources, alongside the Devon Health and Wellbeing Strategy, and Integrated Care System Strategy.</li> </ul>	<p>Health effects from wider indirect economic impacts, including temporary changes to commercial fishing are assessed in <b>section 4.10</b>.</p> <p>‘Diet and nutrition’ has been scoped out for offshore activities that are neither expected to require agricultural land take, nor disrupt food related production or transport, see <b>Table 9.5.3</b> of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).</p> <p>For onshore activities, reduction in availability or quality of agricultural land is not on a scale that could change population diet or food prices and significantly affect population health. This issue is scoped out, see <b>Table 9.5.3</b> of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024). Effects on agricultural land use are assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 8: Land use and Recreation of the ES.</p> <p>Benefits accrued from renewable energy generation assets are assessed under ‘wider societal infrastructure and resources’ in <b>section 4.10</b>.</p> <p>The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for Devon, the Devon Health and Wellbeing Strategy and Integrated Care System Strategy are covered in <b>section 4.7</b>.</p>
<p>Public health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 447 - Scoping out electromagnetic fields; although these should be very low risk due to depth and location (sparse housing), the EN-5 guidance suggests evidence should be provided that they comply with International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP). Scoping out would</li> </ul>	<p>Electromagnetic fields are mitigated by adhering the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure (Department for Energy Security and Net Zero, 2012; ICNIRP, 1998, 2010).</p>

Comment	How and where considered in the ES
<p>suggest this evidence would not be presented. Although the guidance may be interpreted that it may be out of scope, there are reasons to keep this within scope. Given that there may be perceived health risks, which in themselves may generate health problems, provision of sufficient information to mitigate against these perceived risks should be provided. Evidence provided should include that the line complies with National Policy Statements, including at the nearest residential properties for assurance.</p>	<p>Impacts arising from electric and magnetic fields (EMFs) in terms of public understanding of risks affecting mental health and wellbeing are scoped in, see <b>section 4.11</b>.</p>
<p>Other comments that may be useful at this stage include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 88 (4.9.17) - It is recommended that the application assesses any impingement from light pollution, and directional lighting, on local properties and communities. It is not clear if the effects from lighting would be significant and should be scoped into the Environmental Statement, but it is likely that any significant effects could be mitigated to an acceptable level through the application process.</li> <li>• In relation to data collection, should the perceived concerns around the effects of dust, noise, or other factors be raised, further monitoring should be put in place in consultation with the local Environmental and Public Health teams (we note that early consultation has already made). Should concerns emerge, additional requests for information may be made. We note the general statement around identification of potential for significant harm and further investigation as highlighted in table 7.5.4, and would expect this as a general coverall.</li> </ul>	<p>Visual and light impacts are not on a scale to impact population health and are therefore scoped out of the assessment, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024). A full assessment of visual and light impacts is provided in Volume 4, Chapter 2: Landscape, Seascape and Visual Resources.</p> <p>Dust control measures are secured through the Outline Dust Management Plan (DMP) (document reference 7.7.3), as an appendix to the Outline On-CEMP (document reference 7.7) which is secured as a DCO requirement.</p>
<p><b>Natural England</b></p>	
<p>The One Northern Devon Group <a href="https://onenortherndevon.co.uk/about-us/">https://onenortherndevon.co.uk/about-us/</a> play a strategic role in building partnerships for health and wellbeing and tackling inequalities and could advise on the local need and connections.</p>	<p>Noted. One Northern Devon Group are being consulted as part of the consultation process for the Proposed Development.</p>

## Preliminary Environmental Information Report

- 4.3.3 The preliminary findings of the EIA process were published in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) on 16 May 2024. The PEIR was prepared to provide the basis for statutory public consultation under the Planning Act 2008. This included consultation with statutory bodies under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008.
- 4.3.4 A summary of the key items raised specific to human health is presented in **Table 4.6**, together with how these issues have been considered in the production of this ES chapter.

## Further Engagement

- 4.3.5 Throughout the EIA process, consultation and engagement (in addition to scoping and section 42 consultation) with interested parties specific to human health has been undertaken.
- 4.3.6 A summary of the key items raised specific to human health is presented in **Table 4.6**, together with how these issues have been considered in the production of this ES chapter.

**Table 4.6: Summary of consultation relevant to this chapter**

Date	Consultee and type of response	Issues raised	How and where considered in the ES
May 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Torridge District Council;</li> <li>• North Devon Council;</li> <li>• Devon County Council;</li> <li>• Affected Parish Councils; and</li> <li>• Local residents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a better, less disruptive and visually intrusive, location for the converter station at the Old Webbery Showground, which is closer to the National Grid substation and substantially screened.</li> </ul>	<p>Resolved.</p> <p>Responding to this consultation feedback the Proposed Development reviewed the design and study areas. A revised location was adopted for the Converter Station at the Old Webbery Showground.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The underground cable runs too close to homes and schools in Abbotsham.</li> </ul>	<p>Resolved.</p> <p>Responding to this consultation feedback the Proposed Development reviewed the design and study areas. A revised route was adopted to avoid underground cables adjoining schools in Abbotsham.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need more details on the construction plans and are particularly concerned about potential road closures and the volume of traffic on local roads.</li> </ul>	<p>Information regarding construction plans, potential road closures and volumes of traffic on local roads will form part of the DCO application.</p>
February 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Devon County Council Public Health Team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Proposed Development would benefit from joint communication with other electrical infrastructure in North Devon to account for cumulative effects especially for vulnerable populations.</li> </ul>	<p>Cumulative effects to population health are considered in <b>section 4.13</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant is engaged in ongoing discussions with Statutory Utilities.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The human health chapter should consider transport effects regionally (South-West).</li> </ul>	<p>Regional transport effects are assessed in in <b>section 4.10</b>. Volume 2, Chapter 5: Traffic and Transport, of the ES has not identified regional transport effects.</p>

## XLINKS' MOROCCO-UK POWER PROJECT

Date	Consultee and type of response	Issues raised	How and where considered in the ES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The study area for human health should account for site-specific and Lower layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs) to account for deprivation.</li> <li>Housing and healthcare capacity are of significance to the North Devon Area. The process of housing construction workers and providing healthcare would need to be thoroughly managed.</li> <li>Visual and light impacts could affect the area, as extra light in rural areas can be perceived as actual impact.</li> <li>The assessment could incorporate discussion of the Proposed Development's effects both in the United Kingdom and North Africa.</li> </ul>	<p>The human health study area accounts for site-specific areas (see <b>section 4.4</b>) and throughout the assessment (see <b>section 4.10</b> and <b>section 4.11</b>).</p> <p>Particular regard has been given to Lower layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs) to account for deprivation, see <b>section 4.7</b>.</p> <p>Housing and health and social care services effects are addressed in the assessment (see <b>section 4.10</b>).</p> <p>Visual and light impacts have been scoped out of the assessment, as agreed in consultation. Visual and light impacts are not on a scale to impact population health, see Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024). A detailed assessment of visual and light impacts is provided in Volume 4, Chapter 2: Landscape, Seascape and Visual Resources of the ES, where the potential effects on the surrounding environment are fully assessed.</p> <p>Energy generation benefits in the UK are addressed in <b>section 4.11</b>. The geographic scope of the assessment is discussed in section 4.4.</p>
		The health assessment scope, study area and methodology were discussed and agreed in principle.	
June 2024	Devon County Council, Section 42 Responses	<p>We acknowledge that the associated documents for human health reflect previous discussions held with the consultants and comments submitted to address the issues raised in relation to public health.</p> <p>Although there are a number of minor adverse issues highlighted, these were not significant in terms of this Environmental Impact Assessment. Where appropriate further measures will be put in place as planning progresses to mitigate against potential adverse effects through normal industry practice. If we become aware of any further issues we may address these through working with other agencies.</p>	Noted. The human health impacts of the Proposed Development are set out in this chapter. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Proposed Development pertaining to human health are outlined in <b>section 4.8</b> .

## XLINKS' MOROCCO-UK POWER PROJECT

Date	Consultee and type of response	Issues raised	How and where considered in the ES
June 2024	Devon County Council, Section 42 Responses	<p>As some issues identified may become of public concern these will be addressed through ongoing consultation or additional measures. However, as we know some issues may become a foci of media, public, or political concern so we will assess any public health response, should the need arise.</p> <p>It is noted that the scheme aims to provide additional energy security to the UK, which all things considered brings a 'moderate beneficial' public health impact to the whole population.</p>	<p>We acknowledge the potential for certain issues to become of public concern and have addressed these through public consultation (see <b>Table 4.6</b>).</p> <p>Wider societal benefits and infrastructure, including the Proposed Development's potential to enhance energy security in the UK, is assessed in <b>section 4.11</b>, Wider Societal Infrastructure and Resources.</p>
June 2024	Devon County Council, Section 42 Responses	<p>Whilst the Council acknowledge that the process of determining an appropriate package of benefits and the governance of those benefits will involve ongoing discussions between key parties, we would wish to work with the developer to help ensure a strong strategically focused and locally administered programme of activity which meets the six priorities of the Devon Strategic Plan 2021 -2025, as set out below, whilst also having regard to other county council strategies such as the Barnstaple with Bideford and Northam LCWIP (February 2023) and relevant Torridge and North Devon District corporate strategies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Respond to the climate emergency</li> <li>2. Be ambitious for Children and young people</li> <li>3. Support sustainable economic recovery</li> <li>4. Tackle poverty and inequality</li> <li>5. Improve health and wellbeing</li> <li>6. Help communities be safe and resilient</li> </ol> <p>It should also be noted that we are working alongside and in partnership with both Torridge and North Devon District Councils to ensure that the full economic potential from Xlinks and other offshore renewable energy projects are realised and yield a long-lasting beneficial legacy. Torridge and North Devon are areas which have for many years suffered from poor economic performance, but which have very significant economic potential.</p>	<p>We acknowledge the importance of aligning the Proposed Development with the six strategic priorities of the Devon Strategic Plan 2021 – 2025. In particular, the Proposed Development's role in responding to the climate emergency whilst addressing public health has been a key focus in the assessment. Benefits including improvements in energy security and potential health and wellbeing outcomes are detailed in <b>section 4.11</b>, Wider Societal Infrastructure and Resources.</p> <p>The human health impacts of the Proposed Development are set out in this chapter. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Proposed Development pertaining to human health are outlined in <b>section 4.8</b>.</p>
June 2024	Local Residents, Section 42 Responses	<b>Residents</b>	We acknowledge the public's concerns regarding the potential human health impacts of the Proposed



**XLINKS' MOROCCO-UK POWER PROJECT**

Date	Consultee and type of response	Issues raised	How and where considered in the ES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns regarding the physical and mental health implications of the Proposed Development;</li> <li>• Concerns regarding elderly residents' health and wellbeing;</li> <li>• Concerns regarding traffic and transport impacts on health;</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the impact of noise on mental health and wellbeing;</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the impacts of EMFs on health.</li> </ul>	<p>Development. The following issues raised by residents have been addressed in this assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The potential effects on physical and mental health have been considered throughout the assessment, see <b>section 4.10</b> and <b>section 4.11</b>.</li> <li>• Elderly residents, as part of the vulnerable groups outlined in section 4.6 (Vulnerable Groups), have been particularly considered in the assessment in <b>section 4.10</b> and <b>section 4.11</b>.</li> <li>• The impacts of traffic and transport on health during the construction phase are considered in <b>section 4.10</b>.</li> <li>• The impact of noise and vibration on mental health and wellbeing is assessed in <b>section 4.10</b> and <b>section 4.11</b>.</li> <li>• Impacts arising from electric and magnetic fields (EMFs) in terms of public understanding of risks affecting mental health and wellbeing are assessed in <b>section 4.11</b>. As noted in <b>Table 4.22</b>, to avoid actual EMF risks the Proposed Development would adopt and implement relevant design guidelines of the ICNIRP and UK Government voluntary code of practice (Department for Energy Security and Net Zero, 2012; ICNIRP, 1998, 2010).</li> </ul>
July 2024	<b>Torrige District Council, Section 42 Responses</b>	Table 8.15 – Welcome the proposal to prepare both an outline and more detailed Public Rights of Way (PRoW) management plan(s). The PRoW network, and in particular the Tarka Trail and South West Coast Path, are important assets and valued both locally and by visitors for their recreation, health and wellbeing value. They are also an economic draw for an area that is renowned for its environmental quality. It is crucial that the programme of works, along with the design of individual work	We appreciate TDC's recognition of the importance of the PRoW network, particularly the Tarka Trail and South West Coast Path, as both recreational and economic assets. We acknowledge the Council's concerns regarding potential disruptions during construction and the need to minimise any potential impacts on the PRoW network.



## XLINKS' MOROCCO-UK POWER PROJECT

Date	Consultee and type of response	Issues raised	How and where considered in the ES
		<p>locations and layout of operational compounds, access routes and wider works has regard to minimising disruption to the PRow network. It is important that consideration is not only afforded to the need for the stopping up or diversion of footways but also the impact of construction activity that could adversely affect the users of the PRow, as this could have an adverse impact on health &amp; well-being and potentially on the visitor economy – as a result of either perceived or actual deterioration of the environs during construction activity.</p> <p>Human Health Volume 4 chapter 4 – Health Table 4.16 – Summary indicators to transport health outcomes Percentage of physically active children and young people (5-16 years)?</p> <p>Percentage of physically active adults (19+ years) - We know from Active Lives survey 2020, that Torridge has the highest levels of inactivity in Devon. The opportunity to use active travel is therefore essential to these identified groups.</p> <p>Table 4.17 - Summary indicators to open space, leisure and play The above comments regarding Torridge inactivity levels applies to this also. Any disturbance in access to walking/cycling routes, open space in general will have an impact on the we</p>	<p>Section 4.10, Open Space, Leisure and Play of the assessment assesses the potential impacts associated with the construction and decommissioning for the Proposed Development on public open spaces and disruption of PRowS.</p> <p>Volume 2, Chapter 8: Land Use and Recreation of the ES includes plans to manage any potential disruptions to recreational routes, including the Outline PRow Management Plan (document reference 7.11) to be submitted as part of the DCO application.</p>

## 4.4 Study Area

- 4.4.1 The health study area is as shown in Volume 4, Figure 4.1.
- 4.4.2 The Order Limits are approximately 206 km<sup>2</sup> in area.
- 4.4.3 The onshore elements of the Proposed Development are based within the Onshore Infrastructure Area, which lies within the local authority area of Torridge District Council in north Devon. This covers the Converter Site (including two converter stations), highway improvement works, High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC) Cables, HVDC Cables, and Landfall.
- 4.4.4 The offshore elements of the Proposed Development includes the Offshore Cable Corridor, which would be located within the Bristol Channel and Celtic Sea, extending from the Landfall to the limit of UK EEZ, south west of the UK.
- 4.4.5 The human health study area has been defined on the basis of relevant human populations that may be affected directly or indirectly by the Proposed Development.
- 4.4.6 Consistent with IEMA 2022 guidance (Pyper, Waples, *et al.*, 2022), the health chapter uses study areas to determine the sensitivity of the populations in the areas, not set a limit on the extent of all health effects. This reflects that health study areas do not necessarily define the boundaries of all potential health effects, particularly mental health effects. The health study areas represent the locations that would drive any likely significant population health effect, i.e., where the great majority of the impact is anticipated to occur. Any effects beyond the study areas would not change the conclusions reached in relation to the likely significant population health effects of the Proposed Development. For this reason, and to maintain a proportionate assessment, the health assessment does not include every ward within the Order Limits. The selected wards reflect a realistic worst case of the local health baseline to inform a conservative characterisation of population sensitivity.
- 4.4.7 The study area reflects relevant indirect and direct effects to onshore populations from the nearshore works, cable corridor and converter stations. Local populations are relevant for onshore/nearshore activities associated with the Proposed Development including employment and educational opportunities, transport disruption and recreation and leisure.
- 4.4.8 The following areas comprise the human health study area. The geographic range, with both small areas and wider areas, links with the relevant health assessment, e.g., site-specific air quality effects or wider national public health benefits of renewable energy and energy security.
- The site-specific population is defined using the wards of:
    - E05011926 Monkleigh & Putford (for landfall);
    - E05011917 Bideford East (for the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor, representative of higher deprivation);
    - E5011919 Bideford South (for the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor); and
    - E05011929 Two Rivers & Three Moors (for the converter stations, HVAC cables).

- The local population is defined using the local government district area of TDC (and North Devon in relation to aligned discussion with Volume 4, Chapter 3: Socio-economics and Tourism of the ES in relation to housing and healthcare).
- The regional population is defined using the area of the South West.
- The national population is defined with reference to England.

4.4.9 The site-specific wards have been selected to reflect the relevant geographic locations, but also the more deprived areas to ensure potential inequalities are reflected.

4.4.10 The local and regional study areas reflected a broad area from which the majority of the Proposed Development workforces are likely to be drawn and the transport routes used by the Proposed Development. The study area does not extend to port related activities and associated port transport.

4.4.11 The health assessment has regard to the topic specific study areas defined by other chapters listed in **paragraph 4.1.12**. Those chapters inform the consideration of impact magnitude, including the extent of effects in the health chapter.

## 4.5 Scope of the Assessment

4.5.1 The scope of this ES has been developed in consultation with relevant statutory and non-statutory consultees as detailed in **Table 4.5** and **Table 4.6**. The impacts scoped into the assessment for the construction and decommissioning phases are transport modes, access and connections; open space, leisure and play; air quality; water quality; land quality; and noise and vibration.

4.5.2 The Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024) provides a comprehensive justification for the scoping of determinants in and out of the assessment (see Table 9.5.2 and Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report). The determinants scoped in are listed below and assessed in **section 4.10** and **section 4.11**:

- Transport Modes, Access and Connections;
- Open Space, Leisure and Play;
- Housing;
- Employment and Income – Offshore;
- Air Quality;
- Water Quality;
- Land Quality;
- Noise and Vibration;
- Health and Social Care Services;
- Public Understanding of Risk (Converter Stations); and
- Wider Societal Infrastructure and Resources.

## 4.6 Methodology

### Relevant Guidance

- 4.6.1 The Human Health chapter has followed the methodology set out in Volume 1, Chapter 5: EIA Methodology of the ES. Specific to human health impact assessment, the following guidance documents have also been considered.
- Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) 2022 guidance on health in EIA series: effective scoping (Pyper, Lamming, *et al.*, 2022) and determining significance (Pyper *et al.*, 2022).
  - Institute of Public Health (IPH) Guidance, Standalone Health Impact assessment and health in environmental assessment, 2021 (Institute of Public Health, 2021).
  - International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA) and European Public Health Association. A reference paper on addressing Human Health in EIA (Cave *et al.*, 2020) and academic discussion of the same (Cave *et al.*, 2021).
  - Public Health England. Advice on the content of Environmental Statements accompanying an application under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Planning (NSIP) Regime (Public Health England, 2021).
  - Public Health England. Health Impact Assessment in spatial planning (Public Health England, 2020).
  - World Health Organization (WHO) guidelines on air quality and noise (Berglund *et al.*, 1999; Guski *et al.*, 2017; WHO, 2009; 2021).

### Impact Assessment Methodology

#### Overview

- 4.6.2 The significance of an effect is an evidence-based professional judgement informed by the sensitivity of a receptor and the magnitude of an impact. This section describes the criteria applied in this chapter to characterise the sensitivity of receptors and magnitude of potential impacts. The terms used to define magnitude and sensitivity are based on IEMA Guidance (Pyper, Waples, *et al.*, 2022).
- 4.6.3 Judgments are based on most relevant criteria in **Table 4.7**, **Table 4.8** and **Table 4.9**. These are as set out by guidance (Pyper *et al.*, 2022). It is likely in any given analysis that some criteria will span score categories.

#### Receptor Sensitivity/Value

- 4.6.4 The criteria for defining sensitivity in this chapter are outlined in **Table 4.7** below.

**Table 4.7: Sensitivity criteria**

Sensitivity	Definition
<b>Very High</b>	<b>High</b> levels of deprivation (including pockets of deprivation); <b>reliance</b> on resources shared (between the population and the Proposed Development); existing <b>wide</b> inequalities between the most and least healthy; a community whose outlook is predominantly anxiety or <b>concern</b> ; people who are <b>prevented</b> from undertaking daily activities; <b>dependants</b> ; people with very poor health status; and/or people with a <b>very low</b> capacity to adapt.
<b>Medium</b>	<b>Moderate</b> levels of deprivation; <b>few alternatives</b> to shared resources; existing <b>widening</b> inequalities between the most and least healthy; a community whose outlook is predominantly <b>uncertainty</b> with some concern; people who are <b>highly limited</b> from undertaking daily activities; people providing or requiring <b>a lot of care</b> ; people with <b>poor</b> health status; and/or people with a <b>limited</b> capacity to adapt.
<b>Low</b>	<b>Low</b> levels of deprivation; <b>many alternatives</b> to shared resources; existing <b>narrowing</b> inequalities between the most and least healthy; a community whose outlook is predominantly <b>ambivalence</b> with some concern; people who are <b>slightly limited</b> from undertaking daily activities; people providing or requiring <b>some care</b> ; people with <b>fair</b> health status; and/or people with a <b>high</b> capacity to adapt.
<b>Very low</b>	<b>Very low</b> levels of deprivation; <b>no</b> shared resources; existing <b>narrow</b> inequalities between the most and least healthy; a community whose outlook is predominantly <b>support</b> with some concern; people who are <b>not limited</b> from undertaking daily activities; people who are independent (not a carer or dependant); people with <b>good</b> health status; and/or people with a <b>very high</b> capacity to adapt.

## Magnitude of Impact

4.6.5 The criteria for defining magnitude in this chapter are outlined in **Table 4.8** below.

**Table 4.8: Impact magnitude criteria**

Magnitude of impact	Definition
<b>High</b>	<b>High</b> exposure or scale; <b>long-term</b> duration; <b>continuous</b> frequency; severity predominantly related to <b>mortality</b> or changes in morbidity (physical or mental health) for very severe illness/injury outcomes; <b>majority</b> of population affected; <b>permanent</b> change; <b>substantial</b> service quality implications.
<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b> exposure or medium scale; <b>medium-term</b> duration; <b>frequent</b> events; severity predominantly related to moderate changes in <b>morbidity</b> or major change in quality-of-life; large minority of population affected; <b>gradual</b> reversal; <b>small</b> service quality implications.
<b>Low</b>	<b>Very low</b> exposure or <b>small</b> scale; <b>short-term</b> duration; <b>occasional</b> events; severity predominantly related to minor change in <b>morbidity</b> or moderate change in quality-of-life; small minority of population affected; <b>rapid</b> reversal; <b>slight</b> service quality implications.
<b>Negligible</b>	<b>Negligible</b> exposure or scale; <b>very short-term</b> duration; <b>one-off</b> frequency; severity predominantly relates to a minor change in <b>quality-of-life</b> ; very few people affected; immediate reversal once activity complete; no service quality implication.

4.6.6 The temporal scope of this chapter used the following summary terms:

- ‘very short term’ relates to effects measured in hours, days or weeks;
- ‘short term’ relates to effects measured in months (up to 23 months duration);
- ‘medium term’ relates to effects measured in years (2 years and more); and
- ‘long term’ relates to effects measured in decades (10 years or more).

## Significance of Effect

- 4.6.7 The significance of the effect upon human health has been determined by taking into account the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of the impact. The method employed for this assessment is presented in **Table 4.9**. Where a range of significance levels is presented, the final assessment for each effect is based upon expert judgement.
- 4.6.8 In all cases, the evaluation of receptor sensitivity, impact magnitude and significance of effect has been informed by professional judgement and is underpinned by narrative to explain the conclusions reached.
- 4.6.9 For the purpose of this assessment, any effects with a significance level of minor or less are not considered to be significant in terms of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.

**Table 4.9: Assessment Matrix**

Sensitivity of Receptor	Magnitude of Impact			
	Negligible	Low	Medium	High
Very Low	Negligible	Negligible or Minor	Negligible or Minor	Minor
Low	Negligible	Minor	Minor	Minor or Moderate
Medium	Negligible or Minor	Minor	Moderate	Moderate or Major
High	Negligible or Minor	Minor or Moderate	Moderate or Major	Major

- 4.6.10 The IEMA guidance requires that the conclusions, reached using sensitivity and magnitude, are then explained for the public health audience with a suitable concise narrative. The narrative summarises key considerations and supporting evidence. The guidance sets out the criteria for doing so, see **Table 4.10**.

**Table 4.10: Explanation of population health significance**

Level	Indicative criteria
<b>Major (significant)</b>	<p>The narrative explains that this is significant for public health because.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes, due to the project, have a <b>substantial</b> effect on the ability to deliver current health policy and/or the ability to narrow health inequalities, including as evidenced by referencing relevant policy and effect size (magnitude and sensitivity scores), and as informed by consultation themes among stakeholders, particularly public health stakeholders, that show <b>consensus</b> on the importance of the effect.</li> <li>Change, due to the project, could result in a regulatory threshold or statutory standard being <b>crossed</b> (if applicable).</li> <li>There is likely to be a <b>substantial</b> change in the health baseline of the population, including as evidenced by the effect size and scientific literature showing there is a <b>causal relationship</b> between changes that would result from the project and changes to health outcomes.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, health priorities for the relevant study area are of <b>specific relevance</b> to the determinant of health or population group affected by the project.</p>
<b>Moderate (significant)</b>	<p>The narrative explains that this is significant for public health because.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes, due to the project, have an <b>influential</b> effect on the ability to deliver current health policy and/or the ability to narrow health inequalities, including as evidenced by referencing relevant policy and effect size, and as informed by consultation themes among stakeholders, which may show <b>mixed</b> views.</li> <li>Change, due to the project, could result in a regulatory threshold or statutory standard being <b>approached</b> (if applicable).</li> </ul>



Level	Indicative criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is likely to be a <b>small</b> change in the health baseline of the population, including as evidenced by the effect size and scientific literature showing there is a <b>clear</b> relationship between changes that would result from the project and changes to health outcomes.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, health priorities for the relevant study area are of <b>general relevance</b> to the determinant of health or population group affected by the project.</p>
<b>Minor (not significant)</b>	<p>The narrative explains that this is not significant for public health because.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes, due to the project, have a <b>marginal</b> effect on the ability to deliver current health policy and/or the ability to narrow health inequalities, including as evidenced by effect size of limited policy influence and/or that <b>no relevant consultation themes</b> emerge among stakeholders.</li> <li>Change, due to the project, would be <b>well within</b> a regulatory threshold or statutory standard (if applicable); but could result in a guideline being crossed (if applicable).</li> <li>There is likely to be a <b>slight</b> change in the health baseline of the population, including as evidenced by the effect size and/or scientific literature showing there is only a <b>suggestive relationship</b> between changes that would result from the project and changes to health outcomes.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, health priorities for the relevant study area are of <b>low relevance</b> to the determinant of health or population group affected by the project.</p>
<b>Negligible (not significant)</b>	<p>The narrative explains that this is not significant for public health because.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes, due to the project, are <b>not related</b> to the ability to deliver current health policy and/or the ability to narrow health inequalities, including as evidenced by effect size or lack of relevant policy, and as informed by the project having <b>no responses</b> on this issue among stakeholders.</li> <li>Change, due to the project, would <b>not affect</b> a regulatory threshold, statutory standard or guideline (if applicable).</li> <li>There is likely to be a <b>very limited</b> change in the health baseline of the population, including as evidenced by the effect size and/or scientific literature showing there is an <b>unsupported relationship</b> between changes that would result from the project and changes to health outcomes.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, health priorities for the relevant study area are <b>not relevant</b> to the determinant of health or population group affected by the project.</p>

- 4.6.11 Health and wellbeing are influenced by a range of factors, termed the 'wider determinants of health'. Determinants of health span environmental, social, behavioural, economic and institutional factors. Determinants therefore reflect a mix of influences from society and environment on population and individual health.
- 4.6.12 Impacts of the Proposed Development that result in a change in determinants have the potential to cause beneficial or adverse effects on health, either directly or indirectly. The degree to which these determinants influence health varies, given the degree of personal choice, location, mobility, and exposure.
- 4.6.13 A change in a determinant of health affects does not equate directly to a change in population health. Rather the change in a determinant alters risk factors for certain health outcomes. The assessment considers the degree and distribution of change in these pathways. The analysis of health pathways focuses on the risk factors and health outcomes that are most relevant to the determinants of health affected by the Proposed Development. As there are both complex and wide-ranging links between determinants of health, risk factors and health outcomes, it would not be proportionate or informative for an assessment to consider every interaction.

- 4.6.14 Typically, the change in a risk factor may need to be large, sustained and widespread within a population for there to be a significant influence on public health outcomes (Pyper *et al.*, 2022).
- 4.6.15 Following IEMA (Pyper *et al.*, 2022), regard has been given to a range of health determinants and scoping in or out based on relevance. The list of issues scoped into the assessment and justification for their inclusion is reported in Table 9.5.2 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024). The issues scoped out of the assessment including justification, is reported in Table 9.5.3 of the Scoping Report (Xlinks 1 Limited, 2024).

## Vulnerable Groups

- 4.6.16 Of the vulnerable population groups identified in guidance (Pyper *et al.*, 2022), the following relevant groups are considered within the assessment. People falling into more than one group may be especially sensitive. This section has regard to groups reported as vulnerable by the Devon Joint Strategic Health Needs Assessment (Devon County Council, 2023).

**Table 4.11: Vulnerable Groups**

Vulnerable Group	Description	Health Needs Assessments that have informed the Devon JSNA
Young age	Children and young people (including pregnant women and unborn children).	Children and Young People with Neurological Conditions Associated with Physical Disability Needs Assessment 2016 JSNA for Children and Young People with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities, 2017 (Devon County Council, 2017)
Low income	People on low income, who are economically inactive or unemployed/workless.	N/A
Poor health	People with existing poor health; those with existing long-term physical or mental health conditions or disability that substantially affects their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities.	Long Term Neurological Conditions and Associated Physical Disability Needs Assessment 2016 Long Term Conditions Health Needs Assessment 2015 Dementia Health Needs Assessment 2014 Care Home Residents Health Needs Assessment 2014 Mental Health and Wellbeing Health Needs Assessment 2013
Social disadvantage	People who suffer discrimination or other social disadvantage, including relevant protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 or groups who may experience low social status or social isolation for other reasons.	N/A
Access and geographical factors	People experiencing barriers in access to services, amenities and facilities and people living in areas known to exhibit high deprivation or poor economic and/or health indicators.	N/A

- 4.6.17 The following establishments in the site-specific area (see **section 4.4**) have been identified as facilities associated with relevant vulnerable groups.



- Education:
  - St Helens C Of E Primary School;
  - Bideford East The Water Primary School;
  - The Shoreline Academy (Primary School);
  - West Croft School (Nursery);
  - Maryland Secondary School;
  - Kingsley School (Sixth Form College);
  - Kingsley Nursery;
  - Bideford Baptist Preschool; and
  - Bideford College.
- Health:
  - Bideford Medical Centre (GP surgery);
  - Wooda Surgery (GP surgery);
  - Northam Surgery (GP surgery);
  - Bideford Hospital;
  - Torrington Hospital;
  - North Devon District Hospital (including A&E services);
  - Abbotsvale (Mental health clinic in Bideford);
  - Torridgeside Link Resource Centre (Mental health clinic in Bideford);
  - Queen Annes Dental Practice;
  - Tower House Dental Practice;
  - Quay Dental Practice;
  - ASDA Pharmacy;
  - Boots Pharmacy;
  - Well Pharmacy; and
  - Bideford Pharmacy.

4.6.18 The following characterisations of how the general population may differ from vulnerable group populations were considered when scoring sensitivity.

- Heightened vulnerability is rarely due to a single cause and people may experience multiple forms of vulnerability due to intersecting social processes that result from inequalities (e.g., socio-economic status and income).
- As all development has the potential for adverse effects to some particularly vulnerable individuals, the 'role of determining EIA levels of effect on health (including identifying significant effects) is therefore not to set a threshold of 'no harm' from development, but to show where, at a population or sub-population level, the harm should weigh strongly in the balance alongside

the development's benefits for health and other outcomes' (Pyper *et al.*, 2022).

- In some situations, an effect may only be relevant to a few individuals, indicating that a population health effect would not occur. As stated by guidance: *'Where the effect is best characterised as only affecting a few individuals, this may indicate that a population health effect would not occur. Such individuals should still be the subject of mitigation and discussion, but in EIA and public health terms the effect may not be a significant population health change'* (Pyper *et al.*, 2022).

4.6.19 The assessment covers these populations within two groups. The general population for the geographical area, notably local residents, and the vulnerable group population for the area. The latter is a sub-population comprised of the vulnerabilities listed above. The differentiation of these two groups allows a discussion of any potentially significant health inequalities and the targeting of any mitigation.

4.6.20 For the purposes of the assessment the sensitivity score of the vulnerable group population is used to ensure that the potential for health inequalities is taken into account in the population health significance conclusions.

### Assumptions and Limitations of the Assessment

4.6.21 This assessment is based on publicly available statistics and evidence sources. No new primary research or bespoke analysis of non-public data was undertaken for the assessment.

4.6.22 The health assessment partially draws from and builds upon, the technical outputs from inter-related technical disciplines set out in **paragraph 4.1.12**.

4.6.23 As a consequence, the assumptions and limitations of those assessments also apply to any information used in this chapter. It is, however, considered that the information available provides a suitable basis for assessment.

4.6.24 Whilst not all uncertainty can be removed, the following steps have been taken to allow confidence in the health assessment conclusions.

- Methods are used that triangulate evidence sources and professional perspectives.
- The scientific literature reviews undertaken give priority to high quality study design, such as systematic reviews and meta-analysis, and strength of evidence.
- Quantitative inputs for other assessments have been used, which included model validation, as described in other chapters.
- The health assessment has been cautious, with conservative assessments, for example in taking account of non-threshold effects and vulnerable group findings.
- The need for monitoring and adaptive management has been considered.
- The health assessment has been transparent in its analysis and follows good practice.

4.6.25 It is also noted that a number of assumptions have been made on the required workforce of the Proposed Development which are detailed in Volume 4, Chapter 3: Socio-economics and Tourism, of the ES.

## 4.7 Baseline Environment

### Desk Study

4.7.1 Information on human health within the study area was collected through a detailed review of existing studies and datasets. These are summarised at **Table 4.12**.

**Table 4.12: Summary of desk study sources used**

Title	Source	Year	Author	Date Accessed
Small area health mapping	Local Health	2011-2024	Office of Health Improvement and Disparities (OHID)	August 2024
Public Health indicators, England	Fingertip's resource	2011-2024	OHID	August 2024
The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for Devon	NOMIS, Ordnance Survey, Office for National Statistics	2024	Devon County Council	August 2024
Small area deprivation mapping	Index Of Multiple Deprivation	2019	Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities	August 2024

### Local Health Priorities

#### Devon Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy

4.7.2 This assessment is informed by the Devon Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2020-25 (Devon County Council, 2020). The aim of the strategy is to promote and support the health and wellbeing of the local population.

4.7.3 The strategy is structured around four key priorities which cover the wider determinants of health and the community's priorities for reducing health inequalities:

'1. Create opportunities for all:

- *Inclusive economic growth, education and social mobility;*
  - a. *narrow gaps in educational attainment and adult skills;*
  - b. *reduce levels of child poverty;*
  - c. *support economic growth in more disadvantaged areas; and*
  - d. *increase social mobility.*

2. Heathy, safe, strong and sustainable communities:

- *Creating conditions for good health and wellbeing where we live, work and learn;*
  - a. *improve housing conditions, reduce homelessness, and increase supply of appropriate, high-quality housing;*
  - b. *create conditions for good health, physical activity and social interaction;*
  - c. *support healthy workplaces and schools; and*
  - d. *help keep communities and individuals safe.*
- 3. Focus on mental health:
  - *Building good emotional health and wellbeing, happiness and resilience;*
    - a. *reduce loneliness in all age groups;*
    - b. *identify people at risk and intervene to improve poor mental health as soon as possible;*
    - c. *proactively address the mental health consequences of trauma and adverse childhood experiences; and*
    - d. *promote a positive approach to mental health and wellbeing.*
- 4. Maintain good health for all:
  - *Support people to stay as healthy as possible for as long as possible;*
    - a. *prevent ill health by enabling people to live healthier lives;*
    - b. *detect disease in the early stages to reduce impact on health;*
    - c. *support those with long-term conditions to maintain a good quality of life; and*
    - d. *support carers to improve and maintain their own health & wellbeing'* (p. 5).

### **Integrated Care System Strategy**

- 4.7.4 The purpose of Integrated Care Systems (ICSs) is to bring together local authorities, NHS organisations, voluntary, community and social enterprise, and others, to take collective responsibility for planning services, improving health and reducing inequalities across geographical areas for people and communities (NHS Devon and One Devon, 2023).
- 4.7.5 The Devon Integrated Care System Strategy sets out the assessed needs of the population and the priority strategic goals, focusing on the four core purposes of ICSs:
- 'improving outcomes in population health and healthcare;
  - tackling inequalities in outcomes, experience and access;
  - enhancing productivity and value for money; and
  - helping the NHS support broader social and economic development' (p. 4).

**Deprivation**

4.7.6 The Proposed Development is located within the four wards of Monkleigh & Putford, Bideford East, Bideford South, and Two Rivers & Three Moors. In the 2019 Index of Multiple Deprivation, the following Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) were classified as amongst the most deprived neighbourhoods in country.

- In Monkleigh & Putford (for landfall): Torrridge 005C LSOA is classified amongst the 50% most deprived in the country. The neighbouring LSOA Torrridge 002C in Westward Ho! Ward is classified as amongst the 40% most deprived in the country.
- In Bideford East (for the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor): Torrridge 004A is amongst the 20% most deprived neighbourhoods in the country.
- In Bideford South (for the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor): 004E LSOA is classified as the 40% most deprived in the country. 00F LSOA is classified as the 30% most deprived in the country. 005D is classified as the 50% most deprived in the country. The neighbouring 003A and 003C in Bideford North are classified as the 20% and 30% most deprived in the country respectively.
- In Two Rivers & Three Moors: LSOA 004B is amongst the 40% most deprived in the country.

**Deprivation breakdown**

**Table 4.13: Deprivation breakdown by indicator**

Deprivation indicator	Monkleigh & Putford (005C LSOA)	Bideford East (004A LSOA)	Bideford South (004E LSOA)	Bideford South (004F LSOA)	Bideford South (005D LSOA)	Two Rivers & Three Moors (004B LSOA)
Overall	50%	20%	40%	30%	50%	50%
Income	40%	20%	40%	30%	30%	50%
Employment	30%	20%	30%	30%	30%	50%
Education	50%	10%	40%	10%	50%	40%
Health	50%	20%	30%	40%	20%	50%
Crime	10%	50%	40%	40%	10%	10%
Barriers to Housing and Services	10%	50%	30%	40%	10%	10%
Living Environment	10%	40%	40%	40%	10%	20%
Income deprivation affecting children	40%	20%	40%	30%	30%	50%
Income deprivation affecting older people	30%	30%	50%	30%	30%	40%
<b>Legend</b>						
		Least deprived				
		Most deprived				

- 4.7.7 All LSOAs in the site-specific area are amongst the 20-50% most deprived in the country.
- 4.7.8 Bideford East (004A LSOA) and Bideford South (004E and 004F LSOAs) are amongst the 20-40% most deprived in regard to income, 20-30% most deprived in regard to employment, 20-40% most deprived in regard to income deprivation affecting children, and 30-50% most deprived in regard to income deprivation affecting older people.
- 4.7.9 Bideford East (004A LSOA), Bideford South (004E and 004F LSOAs) and Two Rivers & Three Moors (004B LSOA) are amongst the 10-40% most deprived in regard to education.
- 4.7.10 Regarding health, all LSOAs except Bideford South (005D LSOA) are amongst the 20-50% most deprived in the country.
- 4.7.11 Monkleigh & Putford (005C LSOA), Bideford South (005D LSOA) and Two Rivers & Three Moors (004B LSOA) are in the 10% most deprived for barriers to housing and services.
- 4.7.12 All LSOAs except Bideford East (004A LSOA) are amongst the 10-40% most deprived in the country for living environment.

## Baseline Indicators by Determinant of Health

### Health and Wellbeing Effects Relevant to Air Quality

**Table 4.14: Baseline - summary indicators relevant to air quality health outcomes for wards.**

Population	Site specific (ward)				District	Regional	National
	Landfall	Onshore HVDC Cable Corridor		Converter Stations			
Indicator Name	Monkleigh & Putford	Bideford East	Bideford South	Two Rivers & Three Moors	Torridge	South West	England
Fraction of mortality attributable to particulate air pollution (new method) (30+ years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	3.0	4.6	5.8
Air pollution: fine particulate matter (new method – concentrations of total PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	NA	NA	NA	NA	3.9	6.1	7.8
Emergency hospital admissions for Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) Standardised Admission Rate (SAR)	37.3	102.2	78.2	NA	58.3	NA	100.0

Population	Site specific (ward)				District	Regional	National
	Landfall	Onshore HVDC Cable Corridor		Converter Stations			
Indicator Name	Monkleigh & Putford	Bideford East	Bideford South	Two Rivers & Three Moors	Torrige	South West	England
Emergency hospital admissions for coronary heart disease (SAR)	106.7	152.6	150.8	110.6	119.9	95.6	100.0
Emergency hospital admissions for Myocardial Infarction (heart attack) (SAR)	99.2	112.1	158.9	125.8	119.9	95.2	100.0
Emergency hospital admissions for stroke (SAR)	106.5	136.8	149.0	82.5	119.3	97.5	100.0
Under 75 mortality rate from respiratory disease considered preventable (2021 definition)	NA	NA	NA	NA	8.2 <sup>1</sup>	13.1	17
Under 75 mortality rate from cardiovascular diseases considered preventable (2021 definition)	NA	NA	NA	NA	21.71	25.0	30.2
Legend							
	Significantly better than national average						
	Significantly worse than national average						
	Not significantly different to national average						
	Comparative analysis unavailable						

4.7.13 **Table 4.14** shows overall air quality related health outcomes in the wards are variable compared to the national averages. It is noted there are fewer statistics available for the site-specific wards.

4.7.14 For the population near to landfall in Monkleigh and Putford ward, emergency hospital admissions for coronary heart disease and stroke are slightly higher than the national average, albeit the difference is not statistically significant. Similarly, the rate of emergency hospital admissions for myocardial infarction (heart attack) is not significantly different to the national average. Emergency hospital admissions for COPD are significantly better than the national average. These indicators are influenced by ambient air quality but are also influenced by other factors, including diet, smoking and exercise. The data suggests generally average to lower sensitivity to changes in air quality at landfall.

<sup>11</sup> This colour coding and determination of whether they are significantly different from the England average is a calculation undertaken by Office for Health and Improvement Disparities. Seeming differences between local and regional significance reflect the underlying basis for calculation rather than reporting error in this report.



- 4.7.15 For the populations near the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor, the opposite trend is observed in Bideford East ward and Bideford South ward, with emergency hospital admissions for coronary heart disease and stroke significantly worse than the national average. Emergency hospital admissions for myocardial infarction (heart attack) in Bideford East are worse though not significantly different to the national average but are significantly worse than the national average in Bideford South ward. Emergency hospital admissions for COPD are not significantly different than the national average for the populations near the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor. A notable difference can be observed however in Bideford South ward, showing better performance (78.2) than the national average (100). The data suggests generally average to higher sensitivity to changes in air quality along the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor.
- 4.7.16 Regarding the population near the converter stations, the emergency hospital admissions for coronary heart disease, stroke, and myocardial infarction (heart attack) in Two Rivers and Three Moors ward are all not significantly different to the national average. However, a notable difference can be observed in these health indicators, with emergency hospital admissions in coronary heart disease and heart attack higher (worse) than the national average and those for stroke lower (better) than the national average. Data suggests average sensitivity to changes in air quality near the converter stations.

## Health and Wellbeing Effects Relevant to Noise Exposure

**Table 4.15: Baseline - summary indicators relevant to noise health outcomes.**

Population	Site specific (ward)				District	Regional	National
	Landfall	Onshore HVDC Cable Corridor	Converter Stations				
Indicator Name	Monkleigh & Putford Ward	Bideford East Ward	Bideford South Ward	Two Rivers & Three Moors Ward	Torrige	South West	England
The rate of complaints about noise	NA	NA	NA	NA	1.6	5.4	12.0
The percentage of the population exposed to road, rail and air transport noise of 65 dB(A) or more during the daytime	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3.7	5.5
The percentage of the population exposed to road, rail and air transport noise of 55 dB(A) or more during the night-time	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5.5	8.5
Self-reported wellbeing: people with a high anxiety score (16+ years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	14.9	22.1	23.3
Under 75 mortality rate from cardiovascular diseases considered preventable (2021 definition)	NA	NA	NA	NA	21.71	25.0	30.2
Hypertension: Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) prevalence (all ages)	NA	NA	NA	NA	17.9	15.7	14.4
Depression: QOF prevalence (18+ years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	10.2	13.6	13.2
Emergency hospital admissions for intentional self-harm (SAR)	72.4	201.1	222.7	107.6	136.0	177.8	100.0 (126.3)
<b>Legend</b>							
	Significantly better than national average						
	Significantly worse than national average						
	Not significantly different to national average						
	Comparative analysis unavailable						

4.7.17 **Table 4.15** shows limited statistics for the site-specific wards in relation to noise and its health outcomes. Overall, the available health outcome(s) are more variable than the national average.

- 4.7.18 For the population near to the Landfall, the emergency hospital admissions for intentional self-harm, as a general small-area indicator relevant to mental health, is not significantly different to the national average, however, it is lower (better) than the national average. The data suggests a lower sensitivity to changes in noise near Landfall.
- 4.7.19 Regarding the population near the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor, a significantly worse performance in emergency hospital admissions for intentional self-harm is observed in Bideford East ward and Bideford South ward with the rate being 100% higher than the national average in both wards. The data suggests generally higher sensitivity to changes in noise along the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor.
- 4.7.20 For the population near the converter stations, the rate of emergency hospital admissions for intentional self-harm in Two Rivers and Three Moors ward is not significantly different to the national average. The rate, however, is slightly higher (107.6) than the national average (100). Data suggests average sensitivity to changes in noise near the converter stations.
- 4.7.21 Considering the health indicators not reported at the site-specific area, the rate of complaints about noise in the local and regional area is significantly lower than the national average showing better performance in the local area. The percentage of population exposed to exposed to road, rail and air transport noise of 65 dB(A) or more during daytime and 55 dB(A) or more during the night-time is also lower in the regional area as compared to the national average. Data generally suggests better performance in noise in the local and regional area.

## Health and Wellbeing Effects Relevant to Transport

**Table 4.16: Baseline - summary indicators relevant to transport health outcomes**

Population	Site Specific Ward				District	Regional	National
	Landfall	Onshore HVDC Cable Corridor		Converter Stations			
Indicator Name	Monkleigh & Putford Ward	Bideford East Ward	Bideford South Ward	Two Rivers & Three Moors Ward	Torrige	South West	England
Killed and seriously injured (KSI) casualties on England's roads	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	72.9	94.5
Percentage of adults cycling for travel at least three days per week (16+ years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	1.1	2.1	2.5
Percentage of adults walking for travel at least three days per week (16+ years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	15.4	14.8	15.1

Population	Site Specific Ward				District	Regional	National
	Landfall	Onshore HVDC Cable Corridor	Converter Stations				
Indicator Name	Monkleigh & Putford Ward	Bideford East Ward	Bideford South Ward	Two Rivers & Three Moors Ward	Torrige	South West	England
Percentage of physically active children and young people (5-16 years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	46.2	50.8	47.2
Percentage of physically active adults (19+ years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	68.6	71.7	67.3
Depression: QOF prevalence (18+ years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	10.2	13.6	13.2
Legend							
	Significantly better than national average						
	Significantly worse than national average						
	Not significantly different to national average						
	Comparative analysis unavailable						

4.7.22 **Table 4.16** shows transport related health outcomes. Transport related health indicators are not reported at the ward level. As transport effects tend to relate to wider road network effects, the wider geographic areas are informative of sensitivity to change for the populations near the landfall, onshore HVDC Cable Corridor and the converter stations.

4.7.23 In relation to indicators where data is only available at the district level and above, for the local population of Torrige District Council, the percentage of adults cycling for travel at least three days per week (16+ years) are significantly lower (worse) than nationally and the percentage of adults walking for travel at least three days per week (16+ years) is similar to the national average. The percentage of physically active children and young people (5 to 16 years) is slightly lower (worse) but on par with the national average. The same trend is observed for the percentage of physically active adults (19+ years) in Torrige compared to the national average. This indicates generally average to lower sensitivity to changes in transport that could affect active travel.

4.7.24 Regionally, casualties on roads are slightly lower in the South West than the national average. The percentage of physically active children and young people (5 to 16 years) and the percentage of physically active adults (19+ years) are significantly better in the South West than nationally. The percentage of adults walking for travel at least three days per week (16+ years) and the percentage of adults cycling for travel at least three days per week (16+ years) are not significantly different to the national average. The prevalence of depression is however higher than the national average, noting that active travel is only one contributing factor to mental health. This suggests an average to lower sensitivity to changes in active travel in the health study area.

## Health and Wellbeing Effects Relevant to Open space, Leisure and Play

**Table 4.17: Baseline - summary indicators relevant to open space, leisure and play.**

Population	Site specific (ward)				District	Regional	National
	Landfall	Onshore HVDC Cable Corridor		Converter Stations			
Indicator Name	Monkleigh & Pufford Ward	Bideford East Ward	Bideford South Ward	Two Rivers & Three Moors Ward	Torridge	Southwest	England
Reception: Prevalence of overweight (including obesity) (4 to 5 years)	20.0	20.7	23.8	20.0	23.2	20.5	21.3
Year 6: Prevalence of overweight (including obesity) (10 to 11 years)	28.6	37.5	33.3	21.4	34.1	32.9	35.8
Percentage of adults classified as overweight or obese (19+ years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	68.8	71.7	67.3
Percentage of physically active children and young people (5 to 16 years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	46.2	50.8	47.0
Percentage of physically active adults (19+ years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	68.6	71.7	67.3
Emergency hospital admissions for coronary heart disease (SAR)	106.7	152.6	150.8	110.6	119.9	95.6	100.0
Emergency hospital admissions for stroke (SAR)	106.5	136.8	149.0	82.5	119.3	97.5	100.0
Emergency hospital admissions for Myocardial Infarction (heart attack) (SAR)	99.2	112.1	158.9	125.81	113.6	95.2	100.0
Emergency hospital admissions for intentional self-harm (SAR)	72.4	201.1	222.7	107.6	146.0	218.9	100.0 (163.7)
<b>Legend</b>							
	Significantly better than national average						
	Significantly worse than national average						
	Not significantly different to national average						
	Comparative analysis unavailable						

4.7.25 **Table 4.17** shows overall, open space and recreation related health outcomes in the site-specific wards are variable compared to the national averages. It is noted that there are fewer statistics at the ward level.

- 4.7.26 Regarding the population near landfall, the percentage of children in reception (4 to 5 years) classified as overweight or obese is lower (better) than the national average, albeit, statistically, the difference is not significant. Similarly, the prevalence of overweight including obesity in Year 6 (10 to 11 years) is lower than the national average, the difference is not significant. The rate of emergency admissions for coronary heart disease, stroke, myocardial infarction (heart attack) and intentional self-harm are not significantly different to the national averages. However, worse performance than the national average can be observed in emergency hospital admissions for coronary heart disease and stroke. On the other hand, better performance can be observed in emergency hospital admissions for intentional self-harm as the rate is lower (72.4) than nationally (100). A mixed picture is shown in sensitivity to changes in open space and recreation for the population along the landfall.
- 4.7.27 For the population near the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor, the percentage of children aged 4 to 5 years and 10 to 11 years classified as overweight or obese is not significantly different to the national average. The rate of emergency hospital admissions for coronary heart disease, stroke and intentional self-harm are all significantly worse than the national average. Emergency hospital admissions for myocardial infarction (heart attack) is not significantly different than the national average in Bideford East ward but significantly worse than the national average in Bideford South ward. Conservatively, informed by the Bideford East ward and Bideford South ward data, it is inferred that there is generally higher sensitivity to changes in open space and recreation close to the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor.
- 4.7.28 For the population near the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor, the rate of emergency hospital admissions for coronary heart disease, stroke and intentional self-harm are all significantly worse than the national average. Emergency hospital admissions for myocardial infarction (heart attack) is not significantly different than the national average in Bideford East ward but significantly worse than the national average in Bideford South ward. Conservatively, informed by the Bideford East ward and Bideford South ward data, it is inferred that there is generally higher sensitivity to changes in open space and recreation close to the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor.
- 4.7.29 For the population near the converter stations, emergency hospital admissions for coronary heart disease, stroke, myocardial infarction, and intentional self-harm are all not significantly different to the national averages. Data suggests average sensitivity to changes in open space and recreation for the population near the converter stations.

## Health and Wellbeing Effects Relevant to Socio-economic Factors

**Table 4.18: Baseline - summary indicators relevant to socio-economic health outcomes.**

Population	Site specific (ward)				District	Regional	National
	Landfall	Onshore HVDC Cable Corridor	Converter Stations				
Indicator Name	Monkleigh & Putford Ward	Bideford East Ward	Bideford South Ward	Two Rivers & Three Moors Ward	Torridge	South West	England
Inequality in life expectancy at birth (Male)	NA	NA	NA	NA	5.9	7.4	9.7
Inequality in life expectancy at birth (Female)	NA	NA	NA	NA	3.3	5.4	7.9
Children in absolute low-income families (under 16s)	NA	NA	NA	NA	18.0	13.1	15.3
16 to 17-year old's not in education, employment, or training (NEET) or whose activity is not known (%)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5.3	4.7
19 to 24-year old's not in education, employment, or training (%)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	13.6	13.2
Percentage of people in employment (16 to 64 years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	76.9	77.8	75.4
Average Attainment 8 score (15 to 16+ years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	46.4	NA	48.7
Population who cannot speak English well or at all (%)	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.6	1.7
Child Poverty Income Deprivation Affecting Children (%)	9.6	22.3	14.1	14.4	15.6	14.1	17.1
Older People in poverty: Income deprivation affecting older people (%)	7.6	14.3	14.2	14.2	11.8	11.4	14.2
<b>Legend</b>							
	Significantly better than national average						
	Significantly worse than national average						
	Not significantly different to national average						
	Comparative analysis unavailable						



- 4.7.30 **Table 4.18** shows overall socio-economic related outcomes at ward level are variable compared to the national average. It is noted that there are limited statistics available for socio-economic indicators at the ward level.
- 4.7.31 At the district level, inequality in life expectancy at birth in both males and females is lower than the national average. However, the proportion of children in absolute low-income families is significantly worse than the national average, and the percentage of people in employment in Torridge District is not significantly different to the national average. The data suggests generally higher sensitivity to changes in socio-economic opportunity at the district level.
- 4.7.32 For the population near the landfall, the percentage of children and older people living in income deprivation affecting children and older people is significantly better than the national average, indicating generally lower sensitivity to changes in socio-economic opportunity.
- 4.7.33 Socio-economic outcomes for the population near the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor are variable. Child poverty income deprivation in Bideford East ward is significantly worse than the national average, but in Bideford South ward it is significantly better than the national average. The percentage of income deprivation affecting older people is not significantly different to the national average in both Bideford East ward and Bideford South ward. Conservatively, the data represents higher sensitivity to socio-economic changes in near the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor.
- 4.7.34 For the population near the converter stations, the percentage of children living in income deprivation is not significantly different to the national average. The percentage of older people living in income deprivation is significantly better than the national average. The data indicates average to lower sensitivity to changes in socio-economic opportunity near the converter stations.

## **Health and Wellbeing Effects Relevant to Understanding of Risk (Risk Perception)**

**Table 4.19: Baseline - summary indicators relevant to understanding of risk health outcomes.**

Population	Site specific (ward)				District	Regional	National
	Landfall	Onshore HVDC Cable Corridor		Converter Stations			
Indicator Name	Monkleigh & Putford Ward	Bideford East Ward	Bideford South Ward	Two Rivers & Three Moors Ward	Torridge	South West	England
Self-reported wellbeing: people with a high anxiety score (16+ years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	22.6	24.0
Depression: QOF prevalence (18+ years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	10.2	13.3	13.2

Population	Site specific (ward)				District	Regional	National
	Landfall	Onshore HVDC Cable Corridor		Converter Stations			
Indicator Name	Monkleigh & Pufford Ward	Bideford East Ward	Bideford South Ward	Two Rivers & Three Moors Ward	Torridge	South West	England
Population who cannot speak English well or at all (%)	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.6	1.7
Emergency hospital admissions for intentional self-harm (SAR)	72.4	201.1	222.7	107.6	146.0	138.0	100.0
Suicide rate (10+ years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	13.01	12.0	10.4
Legend							
	Significantly better than national average						
	Significantly worse than national average						
	Not significantly different to national average						
	Comparative analysis unavailable						

- 4.7.35 **Table 4.19** summarises indicators that are relevant and may be affected by the population’s understanding of the Proposed Development’s risks.
- 4.7.36 Regarding the population near the landfall, the rate of emergency hospital admissions for intentional self-harm, as a general indicator relevant to mental health, is not significantly different to the national average. The percentage of people who cannot speak English well or at all, an indicator relevant to the extent to which the actual risks of the Proposed Development may be understood by the population, is significantly better than the national average. The data suggests generally lower sensitivity to changes in mental health associated with public understanding of risk at Landfall.
- 4.7.37 Regarding the population near the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor, the rate of emergency hospital admissions for intentional self-harm, as a general indicator relevant to mental health, is significantly higher than the national average. The percentage of people who cannot speak English well or at all, an indicator relevant to the extent to which the actual risks of the Proposed Development may be understood by the population, is significantly better than the national average. The data suggests generally higher sensitivity to changes in mental health associated with public understanding of risk at landfall.
- 4.7.38 For the population near the converter stations, the rate of emergency hospital admissions for intentional self-harm is slightly higher than the national average showing worse performance in the area in relation to mental health, noting that there are other contributing factors to this metric other than risk perception. The percentage of people who cannot speak English well or at all, is significantly better than the national average.

## Health and Wellbeing Effects Relevant to Healthcare

**Table 4.20: Baseline - summary indicators relevant to healthcare**

Population	Site specific (ward)				District	Regional	National
	Landfall	Onshore HVDC Cable Corridor		Converter stations			
Indicator Name	Monkleigh & Putford Ward	Bideford East Ward	Bideford South Ward	Two Rivers & Three Moors Ward	Torridge	South West	England
Access to NHS dental services - successfully obtained a dental appointment (Persons, 18+ years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	72.9	77.0
Percentage reporting good overall experience of making an appointment (Persons, 16+ years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	54.4
Percentage of people who have a positive experience of their GP practice (Persons, 16+ years)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	76.8	71.3
Emergency hospital admissions for all causes (SAR)	80.0	111.2	116.3	76.2	91.8	94.3	100
Legend							
	Significantly better than national average						
	Significantly worse than national average						
	Not significantly different to national average						
	Comparative analysis unavailable						

4.7.39 **Table 4.20** shows healthcare related health outcomes. Healthcare related health indicators are not reported at the ward level.

4.7.40 At the regional level, the percentage of people with access to NHS dental services and have successfully obtained a dental appointment is lower (worse) than the national average. On the other hand, the percentage of people who have a positive experience of their GP practice in Southwest England is higher (better) than nationally. Emergency hospital admissions for all causes are significantly lower in Monkleigh and Putford as compared to England, showing better performance in the population at landfall. Along the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor, emergency hospital admissions for all causes are significantly higher (worse) near the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor and significantly lower (better) near the Offshore Cable Corridor compared to the average of England. Better performance is also shown in the emergency hospital admissions for the population near the converter stations, with the rate significantly lower in Two Rivers and Three Moor compared to England.

## Future Baseline Conditions

- 4.7.41 As a generality there is a trend of poor health outcomes in coastal communities in England. The pleasant environment attracts older, retired citizens to settle, who inevitably have more and increasing health problems. An oversupply of guest housing can lead to Houses of Multiple Occupation which lead to concentrations of deprivation and ill health. The sea is a benefit but attracting NHS and social care staff to peripheral areas can be harder. It can also be the case that catchment areas for health services are artificially foreshortened by the coastline and transport is also often limited, in turn limiting job opportunities. Many coastal communities were created around a single industry such as previous versions of tourism, or fishing, or port work that have since moved on, meaning work can often be scarce or seasonal. (Chief Medical Officer, 2021)
- 4.7.42 Population health data presents a snapshot at a particular time. It is well recognised that population health is subject to continuing influences, both at the individual and community level. It is well recognised that population health is subject to continuing influences, both at the individual and community level. Influences may be environmental, such as seasonal variation in wellbeing and communicable diseases, they may also respond to socio-economic factors, such as migration and the availability of jobs.
- 4.7.43 Longer term trends and interventions in population health may influence the future baseline. Health and social care, public health initiatives and government policies aim to reduce inequalities and improve quality of life. The historic success of such interventions is increasingly challenged by national trends such as an aging population, rising levels of obesity and the COVID-19 pandemic. The implications of COVID-19 for public health will take years to be reflected within statistical data releases, but it is expected that the pandemic will have exacerbated public health challenges. The pandemic disproportionately affected vulnerable groups, including due to age and ill-health.
- 4.7.44 Climate change may also exacerbate physical and mental health risk factors, particularly around flooding and extremes of temperature. The impacts of climate change including extreme temperatures, flooding, increase in atmospheric pollutants and drought are well documented. These noted impacts on the future human health baseline are summarised below and taken into account by the assessment.
- Without adaptation, heat and cold-related deaths are forecasted to rise in the UK due to climate change and sociodemographic factors. Mortality risk from extreme temperatures rises with age, and despite fewer cold days expected mortality due to moderate cold is projected to increase with the ageing population with heat-related mortality increasing over time (UKHSA, 2023a).
  - Flood-affected individuals are prone to adverse health effects including death, injury, increased risk of infectious disease, and mental health effects including depression, anxiety and post-traumatic stress disorder. Increase in flood risk in the UK is largely driven by coastal flooding (UKHSA, 2023b).
  - Weather pattern shifts, notably in temperature, rainfall, and wind speed, are anticipated to influence the dispersion and concentration of air pollutants like PM and O<sub>3</sub>. Implementing climate change mitigation strategies to cut

greenhouse gas emissions will aid in lowering air pollution levels, thus enhancing health outcomes. While long-term exposure to PM<sub>2.5</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub> is forecasted to decrease by around 25% to 37% compared to 2018 levels, localised urban increases in O<sub>3</sub> could heighten health risks (UKHSA, 2023c).

- Climate has a significant impact on infectious diseases, influencing pathogen behaviour, human susceptibility, and transmission periods. Warmer temperatures can expand disease distribution and transmission windows. Weather and climate also play a significant role in influencing the presence and activity of disease-carrying ticks and mosquitoes. Rising temperatures are extending their range and activity periods, affecting the spread of pathogens and their habitats including potential expansion of tick species like *Ixodes ricinus*, which spread Lyme disease and tick-borne encephalitis, and invasive mosquitoes like *Aedes albopictus*, capable of transmitting diseases such as dengue and Zika. Climate change also increases the risk of diseases like West Nile virus in the UK, highlighting the need for collaborative efforts across sectors to address these climate-related public health challenges (UKHSA, 2023d).
- Climate change poses a threat to food supplies, increasing the risk of public health issues as the UK becomes more reliant on climate-vulnerable food-producing countries. This dependence on imports, especially plant-based foods, may lead to shortages of nutritious options and unhealthy dietary changes unless local production is strengthened. While initial benefits like crop diversification and extended growing seasons may occur due to warmer, drier conditions, inadequate adaptation measures could decrease overall yields in the long run. As climate impacts intensify, fluctuations in food imports and prices may make it challenging to access healthy foods and follow dietary guidelines (UKHSA, 2023e).

4.7.45 It would not be proportionate (or consistent with the qualitative assessment approach taken) to quantitatively model the population's future health. This reflects the complexities of interactions between the wider determinants of health, as well as the potential for macro-economic changes in the next decade that are hard to predict. Any predication would have such wide error margins that it would greatly limit the value of the exercise. Annual national population health trend forecasting is undertaken as a government public health activity (Department of Health and Social Care, 2023; Office for National Statistics, 2021) and has been taken into account by the health assessment.

## Key Receptors

4.7.46 **Table 4.21** identifies the receptors taken forward into the assessment.

**Table 4.21: Key receptors taken forward to assessment**

Receptor	Description	Sensitivity/Value
General population of each study area	The general population comprises groups including: current and future residents; Proposed Development workforces; service providers; visitors to the area; road users; and users of the Proposed Development's electricity.	Assessed for each determinant of health in <b>section 4.10</b> and <b>4.11</b> , but indicatively of low sensitivity as explained in <b>section 4.6</b>
Vulnerable group population of each study area	Vulnerability, or increased sensitivity, due to factors including: young age; old age; low income; poor health; social disadvantage; and access and geographical factors.	See <b>section 4.6</b> Vulnerable groups for further details.

## 4.8 Mitigation Measures Adopted as Part of the Proposed Development

4.8.1 For the purposes of the EIA process, the term ‘*measures adopted as part of the Proposed Development*’ is used to include the following types of mitigation measures (adapted from IEMA, 2016). These measures are set out in Volume 1, Appendix 3.1: Mitigation Register of the ES.

- Embedded mitigation. This includes the following.
  - Primary (inherent) mitigation - measures included as part of the Proposed Development design. IEMA describes these as ‘*modifications to the location or design of the development made during the pre-application phase that are an inherent part of the project and do not require additional action to be taken*’. This includes modifications arising through the iterative design process. These measures are secured through the description of the project and the parameters secured in the DCO and/or marine licences. For example, a reduction in footprint or height.
  - Tertiary (inexorable) mitigation. IEMA describes these as ‘*actions that would occur with or without input from the EIA feeding into the design process. These include actions that will be undertaken to meet other existing legislative requirements, or actions that are considered to be standard practices used to manage commonly occurring environmental effects*’. It may be helpful to secure such measures through a Construction Environmental Management Plan or similar.
- Secondary (foreseeable) mitigation. IEMA describes these as ‘*actions that will require further activity in order to achieve the anticipated outcome*’. These include measures required to reduce the significance of environmental effects (such as lighting limits) and may be secured through environmental management plan.

4.8.2 In addition, where relevant, measures have been identified that may result in enhancement of environmental conditions. Such measures are clearly identified within Volume 1, Appendix 3.1: Mitigation Register of the ES. The measures relevant to this chapter are summarised in **Table 4.22**.

4.8.3 Embedded measures that will form part of the final design (and/or are established legislative requirements/good practice) have been taken into account as part of the initial assessment presented in **section 4.10 to 4.11**



below (i.e., the initial determination of impact magnitude and significance of effects assumes implementation of these measures). This ensures that the measures to which the Applicant is committed are taken into account in the assessment of effects.

4.8.4 Where an assessment identifies likely significant adverse effects, further or secondary mitigation measures may be applied. These are measures that could further prevent, reduce and, where possible, offset these effects. They are defined by IEMA as actions that will require further activity in order to achieve the anticipated outcome and may be imposed as part of the planning consent, or through inclusion in the ES (referred to as secondary mitigation measures in IEMA, 2016). For further or secondary measures both pre-mitigation and residual effects are presented.

**Table 4.22: Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Proposed Development**

<b>Commitment Number</b>	<b>Measure Adopted</b>	<b>How the Measure are Secured</b>
<b>Embedded Measures</b>		
ONS31	In terms of electromagnetic field (EMF) exposure, the design of the Proposed Development would comply where reasonably practicable with exposure standards set out in Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) Voluntary Code of Practice (Department for Energy Security & Net Zero, 2012) including compliance with the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) public exposure guidelines (ICNIRP, 1998, 2010).	DCO Schedule 2. Requirement 17 (Electro-magnetic fields)
ONS06	A Dust Management Plan (DMP) would be incorporated within the On-CEMP(s) and measures in relation to air quality and dust management, as outlined in the Institute of Air Quality Management guidance (IAQM, 2024). A DMP assists in the appropriate management techniques to limit dust soiling from construction and decommissioning activities as far as reasonably practicable. Air quality and dust management measures, as outlined in IAQM guidance (IAQM, 2024) would be included. An Outline DMP has been provided as an appendix to the Outline On-CEMP as part of the application for development consent (document reference 7.7, Appendix C).	DCO Schedule 2, Requirement 7 (Management Plans)
ONS05	An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been submitted with the application for development consent (document reference 7.12). CTMP(s) will be developed in accordance with the Outline CTMP prior to commencement of construction and agreed with relevant stakeholders. The CTMP(s) will set out reasonably practicable measures that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managing the numbers and routing of HGVs during the construction phase;</li> <li>• Managing the movement of construction worker traffic during the construction phase;</li> </ul>	DCO Schedule 2, Requirement 8 (Construction Traffic Management Plan)



## XLINKS' MOROCCO-UK POWER PROJECT

Commitment Number	Measure Adopted	How the Measure are Secured
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of measures to manage the safe passage of HGV traffic via the local highway network; and</li> <li>• Details of localised road improvements if and where these may be necessary to facilitate the safe use of the existing road network.</li> </ul>	
ONS04	<p>An Outline Decommissioning Strategy has been submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference 7.17), which details that onshore and offshore decommissioning plans will be prepared in accordance with the principles set out in the Outline Decommissioning Strategy, if decommissioning of the Proposed Development is required at the end of the Proposed Development's operational life. The onshore decommissioning plan(s) will be developed in consultation with the relevant authority and in line with the latest available guidance, legislation and any new technologies available at the time of the Proposed Development's decommissioning. The onshore decommissioning plan(s) will include an assessment of the need to remove above ground infrastructure and the decommissioning of below ground infrastructure and include details relevant to flood risk (e.g. maintenance/reinstatement of existing land drainage), pollution prevention and avoidance of ground disturbance.</p> <p>The onshore decommissioning plan(s) will also include provision for the protection (during decommissioning) of any significant archaeological remains within the Onshore Infrastructure Area which were identified and protected from harm during construction.</p>	DCO Schedule 2, Requirement 16 (Decommissioning Strategy)
ONS09	<p>An Outline Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Management Plan has been prepared as part of the application for development consent (document reference 7.11). PRoW Management Plan(s) would be developed in accordance with the Outline PRoW Management Plan and would include measures to manage and mitigate as far as reasonably practicable the impacts and disturbance to the PRoW network during the construction phase of the Proposed Development, in consultation with the relevant authorities.</p>	DCO Schedule 2, Requirement 7 (Management Plans)
ONS11	<p>An Outline Soil Management Plan has been prepared as part of the Outline On-CEMP, which forms a part of the application for development consent (document reference 7.7, Appendix D). A Soil Management Plan(s) would be developed in accordance with the Outline Soil Management Plan. Measures to be adopted as far as reasonably practicable would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Separate stripping and storage of identified topsoil and subsoil resources to prevent mixing</li> </ul>	DCO Schedule 2, Requirement 7 (Management Plans)

<b>Commitment Number</b>	<b>Measure Adopted</b>	<b>How the Measure are Secured</b>
	<p>of soil materials which can reduce overall soil quality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location of topsoil and subsoil stockpiles to avoid cross-contamination of materials and the trafficking of soil stockpiles by construction traffic.</li> <li>• Maintenance of topsoil and subsoil heaps to reduce potential losses of soil materials throughout the duration of storage (e.g. maintaining soil heaps to prevent it blowing away in the wind, or spilling into drainage ditches).</li> <li>• Control of the timing of soil handling operations to reduce potential soil damage through handling in unsuitable conditions (e.g. avoiding the movement of soil in periods of severe wet weather).</li> <li>• Choice of soil handling machinery and method for its use, to reduce potential for soil compaction and soil damage.</li> <li>• Implementation of appropriate soil aftercare following reinstatement of land in accordance with the Outline Soil Management Strategy.</li> <li>• Careful supervision of soil handling operations on site to ensure that recognised good practice is effectively implemented on site.</li> </ul>	
<p>ONS32</p>	<p>An Outline Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (On-CEMP) has been prepared as part of the application for development consent (document reference 7.7). On-CEMP(s) will be developed to align with the prepared Outline On-CEMP. The On-CEMP(s) will incorporate measures to ensure that any potential environmental impacts would be minimised during construction as far as reasonably practicable. The On-CEMP(s) will include measures to maintain and address the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ecology and nature conservation (including protected species and invasive species);</li> <li>• surface water and groundwater environment (including flood protection and control, drainage, and pollution prevention);</li> <li>• transport and access;</li> <li>• noise management measures;</li> <li>• air quality and dust management;</li> <li>• land use and recreation;</li> <li>• landscape and visual;</li> <li>• historic environment;</li> <li>• climate change;</li> <li>• waste management;</li> <li>• site security; and</li> <li>• health and safety.</li> </ul>	<p>DCO Schedule 2, Requirement 7 (Management Plans)</p>
<p><b>Secondary (Further) Measures</b></p>		

<b>Commitment Number</b>	<b>Measure Adopted</b>	<b>How the Measure are Secured</b>
ONS29	During construction phase, the Applicant will engage with emergency and health care services and provide notification at least one week prior to the implementation of any temporary road closures, diversions or lane closures. If emergency works are required, the relevant local authorities and emergency services will be notified as soon as reasonably practicable.	DCO Schedule 2, Requirement 7 (Management plans)
<b>Enhancement Measures</b>		
ONS93	The construction phase would include community consultation and sharing of non-technical information relating to the Proposed Development (e.g., explaining compliance with public exposure guidelines, actual risks associated with the Proposed Development), to allow people to express concerns and gain awareness of actual health effects. The Applicant would develop a Community Liaison Plan, which will detail measures to facilitate community feedback and presentation of relevant technical information. The point of contact for community liaison would also be provided on the Proposed Development website.	DCO Schedule 2, Requirement 7 (Management plans)
ONS28	The Applicant will develop a Community Benefit Fund to provide community benefit during the construction period and for a period of up to 15 years following construction. The Applicant will engage with the community to facilitate applications to the fund. The fund will be administered by an independent grant making body.	Not secured through the DCO as the Community Benefit Fund is a discretionary enhancement measure.

- 4.8.5 Embedded measures that are intended to form part of the final design (and/or are established legislative requirements/good practice) have been taken into account as part of the initial assessment presented in section 4.10 below (i.e., the initial determination of impact magnitude and significance of effects assumes implementation of these measures). This ensures that the measures that the Applicants are intending to commit to, are taken into account in the assessment of effects.
- 4.8.6 Where an assessment identifies likely significant adverse effects, further mitigation measures may be applied. These are measures that could further prevent, reduce and, where possible, offset these effects. They are defined by IEMA as actions that will require further activity in order to achieve the anticipated outcome and may be imposed as part of the planning consent, or through inclusion in the ES (referred to as secondary mitigation measures in IEMA, 2016). For further or secondary measures both pre-mitigation and residual effects are presented.
- 4.8.7 The Human Health chapter takes as the basis of its assessment the measures adopted as part of the Proposed Development (i.e., embedded mitigation) described in the technical chapters that it is informed by (as listed in **paragraph 4.1.12**). Secondary (i.e., additional) mitigation measures specific to human health are described in **section 4.10** under each health determinant as relevant.

## 4.9 Key Parameters for Assessment

### Maximum Design Scenario

- 4.9.1 The Human Health assessment uses the conclusions set out by the other technical chapters as the basis for assessment, as laid out in **paragraph 4.4.11**. As such, the maximum design scenarios described in the other technical chapters are inherent to the assessment for human health. To avoid duplication, the human health assessment does not repeat these here.

## 4.10 Assessment of Construction Effects

- 4.10.1 The construction impacts of the Proposed Development have been assessed. The potential impacts arising from the construction phase of the Proposed Development are listed in **Table 4.25**, along with the maximum design scenario against which each impact has been assessed.
- 4.10.2 A description of the potential effect on receptors caused by each identified impact is given below.

### Transport Modes, Access and Connections

- 4.10.3 This section considers how construction affects public health through changes in road safety and accessibility, including travel times for road users or emergency services, and access to health promoting goods and services. There is potential that construction works including construction vehicles and corridor construction may disrupt local vehicle traffic (private and public transport) as well as active travel along highways (pedestrians and cyclists). This includes road works, temporary diversions and traffic volumes required due to the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor construction. This has the potential to affect active travel and physical activity. The potential for changes to public rights of way to affect public health is addressed under “Open Space, Leisure and Play” below.
- 4.10.4 The scientific literature identifies the following general points relevant to potential exposures and health outcomes. For road safety, health effects may be associated with the severity or frequency of road traffic incidents. For accessibility, health effects may be associated with emergency response times or non-emergency treatment outcomes associated with delays or non-attendance. For active/sustainable travel, health effects may relate to physical health (e.g., cardiovascular health) and mental health conditions (e.g., stress, anxiety or depression) associated with obesity and levels of physical activity.
- 4.10.5 Transportation barriers are important to healthcare access, particularly for those with lower incomes. Transportation barriers lead to rescheduled or missed appointments, delayed care, and missed or delayed medication use. These consequences may lead to poorer management of chronic illness and thus poorer health outcomes (Syed *et al.*, 2013).
- 4.10.6 Walking and cycling for transportation (i.e., active transportation), provide substantial health benefits from increased physical activity. Active transport to

work or school is significantly associated with improved cardiovascular health and lower body weight (Xu *et al.*, 2013). The provision of convenient, safe and connected walking and cycling infrastructure is at the core of promoting active travel (Winters *et al.*, 2017). Physically active transport (i.e., walking or cycling) has been directly related to increased residential density, street connectivity, mixed land use and amenities within a walkable distance (Thomson *et al.*, 2008).

- 4.10.7 The health assessment has had regard to the population groups identified in the literature that may be particularly sensitive. For example, children, pregnant women and cyclists (particularly older cyclists) are generally more vulnerable in terms of road safety. People with lower socio-economic status typically face more transportation barriers in accessing health care.
- 4.10.8 This section has been informed by Volume 2, Chapter 5: Traffic and Transport of the ES, which sets out relevant assessment findings and mitigation measures that have been considered.
- 4.10.9 The construction activities comprise several distinct activities. Some of these activities are sequential and some are concurrent. The effects at any given location are therefore typically of a much shorter duration. The assessment takes into account where different sections of a route may be affected at different times, with localised effects influencing the overall route.
- 4.10.10 A potential population health effect is considered plausible as there is a theoretical source-pathway-receptor relationship.
- The source is disruption and disturbance to roads, cycle routes and footpaths.
  - The pathway is behavioural change in physical activity, transport delay, and road accidents and safety.
  - Receptors are coastal and inland residents and visitors.
- 4.10.11 Furthermore, the theoretical effect is considered applicable in the context of this Proposed Development.
- 4.10.12 The population groups relevant to this assessment are as follows.
- The site-specific population of Monkleigh & Putford, Bideford East, Bideford South and Two Rivers & Three Moors.
  - The local population of Torrington District Council.
  - The regional population of the South West.
  - The sub-population vulnerable due to:
    - young age vulnerability (children and young people are potentially more vulnerable road users);
    - old age vulnerability (older people are potentially more vulnerable road users);
    - poor health vulnerability (people with existing poor physical and mental health in relation to health trip journey times); and

- access and geographical vulnerability (people who experience existing access barriers or who rely on the affected routes, including for healthcare and other amenities).

### Sensitivity of the Receptor

- 4.10.13 The sensitivity of the general population is **low**. Common factors that differentiate the sensitivity of the general population and the vulnerable group population have been taken into account and are listed in **section 4.6**, Vulnerable Groups. This reflects that most people in the site-specific and local area would have many alternative routes in the road network to the affected sections. It also includes those who would only make occasional use of the affected sections of the road network. The general population comprise those members of the community with a high capacity to adapt to changes in access, including changes in healthcare access, for example due to greater resources and good physical and mental health.
- 4.10.14 The sensitivity of the vulnerable group is **high**. The vulnerable sub-population includes dependants, such as children, elderly and those receiving care due to poor health. This sub-population may have fewer resources and less capacity to adapt to changes. The population may therefore be more reliant on the affected routes with greater likelihood that any disruption or disturbance could affect safety or access to health supporting services. Vulnerability is linked to mode of travel, including pedestrians and cyclists being more sensitive to road safety changes. It also relates to age (young people and older people) being more vulnerable to accident severity, as well as to those who are reliant on services accessed on affected sections of the road network (e.g., traveling to schools). Vulnerability may be increased in areas of higher deprivation. Deprived populations may already face more access barriers compared to the general population and therefore be more sensitive to access changes. Low incomes may compound access barriers by limiting the ability to adapt. Vulnerability also includes those accessing health services (emergency or non-emergency) at times and locations affected by congestion. Ambulance services (and the recipients of their care) are particularly sensitive to delays in response times (time taken to arrive and stabilise the patient). People in poor or very poor health may be more frequent users of healthcare service and therefore be more sensitive to access changes.

### Magnitude of Impact

- 4.10.15 As reported in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Traffic and Transport of the ES, an Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been developed and submitted with the DCO (document reference 7.12). The CTMP sets out traffic management measures to maintain access and provide early notice of any route changes. Volume 2, Chapter 5: Traffic and Transport, of the ES concludes the following.
- The impact of driver delay at the Barnstaple Road/Manteo Way junction is minor adverse. The impact of driver delay at the A39 and the A386/Littleham Road junction and along Gammaton Road is negligible adverse.
  - The impact on severance is negligible adverse.



- The impact on Non-Motorised User Delay is negligible adverse.
- The impact on Non-Motorised User Amenity and Fear and Intimidation is negligible adverse.
- The impact on road safety for the sections of the A39 including Torridge Bridge, the junction with the B3233 and Heywood Roundabout is negligible adverse.
- The impact on road safety for the section of the A386 through Bideford is minor adverse.
- The impact on road safety for the section of Gammaton Road between Manteo Way and the access to TCC5 is negligible adverse.
- The impact on road safety for the section of the B3236 between the A39 and the access to TCC1 at Cornborough Sewage Treatment Works is negligible adverse.
- The impact on road safety for the section of Abbotsham Road between the A39 and the access to TCC3 is negligible adverse.
- The impact of AILs (Abnormal Indivisible Loads) is negligible adverse.

4.10.16 For population health, the magnitude of impact due to the Proposed Development is considered to be **low**.

4.10.17 In relation to active travel, as reported in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Traffic and Transport of the ES, there would be appropriate diversions of active travel routes to maintain access and provide early notice of any route changes. Such measures would be secured through the Outline CTMP submitted with the DCO application (document reference 7.12). The scale of change is considered small and medium-term, albeit of limited duration at any given location, including due to the transitory nature of construction works to lay cables. Only very minor changes in morbidity for cardiovascular and mental health outcomes would be expected for a small minority of the population due to the temporary disruption during construction works. Most adverse effects on health behaviours and outcomes would be expected to reverse on completion of the construction works.

4.10.18 In relation to road safety at the population level the scale of change in accidents would be small. The frequency of any incidents would be occasional, with severity related to a very minor change in risk of injury or mortality (though with outcome reversal gradual or permanent). The expectation is that very few people would be affected, with no or slight implications for healthcare services. As noted in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Traffic and Transport of the ES, there are a number of locations currently identified where accident risk is elevated by the Proposed Development during the construction, but mitigation is proposed. Reflecting the residual effects reported in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Traffic and Transport of the ES, the health chapter identifies a **low** magnitude of change on this issue.

4.10.19 In relation to health-related travel times and accessibility, the scale of change in delays is expected to be small. The frequency with which health related journeys may be affected is likely to be occasional for most people though for a few people, severity could relate to a small change in risk for morbidity or mortality. Ambulance services (and the recipients of their care) are particularly



sensitive to delays in response times (time taken to arrive and stabilise the patient). Even with the delays described in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Traffic and Transport of the ES, the priority given to ambulances travelling under blue lights would be expected to reduce any changes in journey times. Due to the temporary nature of the work and ability for people to adapt to known planned diversions or delays means there is a low magnitude of change in access to social infrastructure such as shops, employment and educational facilities. A **low** magnitude is assigned to active travel and health-related travel times.

### Significance of the Effect

- 4.10.20 The significance of the population health effect due to the Proposed Development is **minor adverse**, which is not significant in EIA terms. The magnitude of the impact is low, and the sensitivity of the vulnerable group population is high.
- 4.10.21 In relation to active travel and health-related travel times, the significance of the population health effect is **minor adverse**, which is not significant in EIA terms. The professional judgment is that there would, at most, be a slight *adverse* change in the health baseline. This conclusion reflects that road safety and access to health supporting services are public health priorities and there is causal association that is supported by the scientific literature. However, the change due to the Proposed Development is appropriately mitigated by standard good practice measures that minimise disruption and disturbance. The change is unlikely to result in significant differential or disproportionate effects between the general population (low sensitivity) and the vulnerable sub-population (high sensitivity). Consequently, no widening of health inequalities would be expected, and no influence is expected on the ability to deliver local or national health policy.
- 4.10.22 For road safety the significance of the population health effect is **minor adverse**, which is not significant in EIA terms. This conclusion reflects the potential for a slight change in the health baseline due to increased risk of high severity road accident outcomes. The change is not expected to widen inequalities and have marginal influence on the achievement of health policy relating to road safety.

### Further (Secondary) Mitigation and Residual Effect

- 4.10.23 Mitigation in terms of early and ongoing information sharing with emergency and healthcare services is secured within the Outline CTMP (document reference 7.12).
- 4.10.24 In relation to health-related journey times, the residual effect, taking account mitigation, is expected to be a **negligible adverse** (not significant) population health effect.
- 4.10.25 For active travel and road safety, the significance of the population health effect remains unchanged.

## Future Monitoring

- 4.10.26 As no significant adverse population health effects are anticipated, and as this conclusion is not predicated on the effectiveness of novel or atypical mitigation measures, it is not considered proportionate to undertake health related monitoring.

## Open Space, Leisure and Play

- 4.10.27 There is potential that works associated with the construction for the Proposed Development may lead to temporary disturbance of public open spaces and disruption of Public Rights of Way (PRoW), potentially affecting recreational activities. This may include disturbance or disruption in nearshore recreation (e.g., bathing, sailing and other water sports).
- 4.10.28 Time spent near green and blue space can positively affect mental wellbeing (Rojas-Rueda *et al.*, 2021). The evidence suggests an inverse association between surrounding greenness and all-cause mortality (Yang *et al.*, 2021). The health benefits of recreation and leisure include physical activity as well as mental wellbeing. Health outcomes include physical health (e.g., cardiovascular health) and mental health (e.g., decreased stress, anxiety or depression). Use of places of recreation may be affected by not only physical barriers but also changes in the amenity or setting of the destination. There are positive associations between access to green space and physical activity (Yang *et al.*, 2021). The availability of a natural environment, attractive views of nature and people's experiences using greenspace can enhance attitudes toward physical activity and perceived behavioural control via stress-relieving effects, leading to firmer intentions to engage in physical activity (Calogiuri & Chroni, 2014).
- 4.10.29 This section has been informed by Volume 2, Chapter 8: Land Use and Recreation of the ES, which sets out relevant assessment findings and mitigation measures that have been taken into account.
- 4.10.30 A potential population health effect is considered plausible as there is a theoretical source-pathway-receptor relationship.
- The source is disruption and disturbance including to open spaces and PRoW.
  - The pathway is behavioural change in use of leisure and recreational activities affecting physical activity and mental wellbeing.
  - Receptors are coastal and inland residents and visitors.
- 4.10.31 Furthermore, the theoretical effect is considered applicable in the context of this Proposed Development.
- 4.10.32 The population groups relevant to this assessment are:
- the site-specific populations near landfall, the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor and the converter stations: Monkleigh & Putford, Bideford East, Bideford South and Two Rivers & Three Moors;
  - the local population of Torridge District Council; and
  - the sub-population vulnerable due to:

- young age vulnerability (specifically children who are overweight or who have low physical activity levels);
- old age vulnerability (specifically the elderly for whom familiar routes with appropriate mobility considerations play a part in regular exercise);
- low income vulnerability (specifically people with limited access to alternative physical activity opportunities or means of transport);
- poor health vulnerability (specifically conditions where physical activity would be beneficial to physical or mental health, including routes suited to additional mobility and sensory needs); and
- access and geographical vulnerability (specifically the population who have limited access to natural green space accessed by the routes affected by the Proposed Development).

### Sensitivity of the Receptor

- 4.10.33 The sensitivity of the general population is **low**. Common factors that differentiate the sensitivity of the general population and the vulnerable group population have been taken into account and are listed in **section 4.6**, Vulnerable Groups. Most people in the local area would only make occasional use of the affected marine, coastal and inland recreational and leisure opportunities. The general population also includes those with access to many alternatives that are not affected. The general population comprise those members of the community with a high capacity to adapt to changes, for example due to greater resources and good physical and mental health.
- 4.10.34 The sensitivity of the vulnerable group population is **high**. Vulnerability in this case is linked to having fewer resources and less capacity to adapt to changes. The population may be more reliant on the affected recreational and leisure opportunities with greater likelihood that any additional disruption or disturbance could affect use and behaviours.

### Magnitude of Impact

- 4.10.35 Volume 2, Chapter 8: Land Use and Recreation of the ES notes that mitigation measures to be included in the Outline On-CEMP (document reference 7.7), submitted as part of the DCO application, would minimise potential impacts of construction works. Volume 2, Chapter 8: Land Use and Recreation, of the ES concludes:
- the temporary impact to the use of recreational resources (coastal areas, long distance routes and national cycle routes, other PRowWs and other recreational resources) is assessed to be minor adverse.
- 4.10.36 For population health, the magnitude of change due to the Proposed Development is considered to be **low**. There is likely to be a small scale of change over the medium-term from construction activities, including shipping movements and land access, affecting marine, nearshore and onshore recreational and leisure activities. At a given location the effect is likely to be short-term, affecting *occasional* usage of open spaces (e.g., at landfall or along the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor). It is likely there would be rapid reversal of

any effect once the given construction activity concluded, with limited potential to cause lasting behavioural change. The outcome is likely to be a minor change in quality of life and/or cardiovascular related morbidity for a small minority of the affected population. No effect on healthcare services would be expected.

## Significance of the Effect

- 4.10.37 The significance of the population health effect due to the Proposed Development is **minor adverse**, which is not significant in EIA terms. The magnitude of the impact is deemed to be low, and the sensitivity of the vulnerable group population is considered to be high.
- 4.10.38 The effect is characterised as being adverse in direction, temporary and indirect. Although the scientific literature supports a clear association between recreational and leisure activities and health outcomes, there is likely to be at most a slight change in the population health baseline. This would have at most a marginal effect on health policy delivery and is not expected to change population health inequalities.
- 4.10.39 The effect would, therefore, be of **minor adverse** significance, which is not significant in EIA terms.

## Further (Secondary) Mitigation and Residual Effects

- 4.10.40 **Section 4.8** (Mitigation Measures Adopted as Part of the Proposed Development) includes the Outline PRow Management Plan submitted as part of the DCO application (document reference 7.11). The Plan accounts for the needs of vulnerable groups, ensuring their safety and accessibility throughout the duration of the Proposed Development. Given these provisions, no additional secondary monitoring measures are required. Therefore the residual population health effect remains **minor adverse** (not significant).

## Future Monitoring

- 4.10.41 As no significant adverse population health effects are anticipated, and as this conclusion is not predicated on the effectiveness of novel or atypical mitigation measures, it is not considered proportionate to undertake health related monitoring.

## Housing

- 4.10.42 This section considers the effects of construction workforce housing needs during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Housing quality is considered, as well as potential for temporary housing market changes, affecting key worker recruitment and community cohesion. Housing demand may also have indirect impacts on economic outcomes, including seasonal tourism bedspaces.
- 4.10.43 Housing quality exerts one of the strongest directly measurable effects on physical and mental health (Ige *et al.*, 2019). The influence of housing on

population health, particularly mental health, is strongly linked to community and environmental factors. The WHO specifies that dwellings must be large enough to comfortably accommodate people of different ages with sufficient space for privacy. The WHO found a strong positive association between crowded housing and respiratory infections (Shannon *et al.*, 2018). The evidence also suggests that overcrowding may also be associated with poor mental health outcomes such as stress and depression (Shannon *et al.*, 2018). Adaptable homes that meet the needs of residents at different stages of their life are especially health-promoting. The literature suggests that people with disabilities living in accessible home environments have better health and wellbeing than those living in conventional or inaccessible home environments (MacLachlan *et al.*, 2018). Physical health benefits were also identified with adaptable homes, such as reductions in falls and injuries. Self-perceptions of increased quality of life and general wellbeing were found, along with psychological effects such as less fear of falling/accidents and reduced feeling of depression (MacLachlan *et al.*, 2018). The literature highlights an association between housing conditions (including air quality, noise levels, thermal comfort, access to natural light, access to high quality, and safe outdoor space) and health and wellbeing.

- 4.10.44 This section has been informed by Volume 4, Chapter 3: Socio-economics and Tourism, of the ES, which sets out relevant assessment findings and mitigation measures that have been considered.
- 4.10.45 A potential population health effect is considered plausible as there is a theoretical source-pathway-receptor relationship:
- the source is housing quantum, type, quality and conditions;
  - the pathway is housing availability, affordability and conditions affecting physical and mental health; and
  - receptors are residents in the local communities.
- 4.10.46 Furthermore, the theoretical effect is considered applicable in the context of this Proposed Development.
- 4.10.47 The population groups relevant to this assessment are:
- the local population of Torridge District Council and North Devon Council; and
  - the sub-population vulnerable due to:
    - young age vulnerability (including those residing in poor housing that can have lasting health effects across their life course);
    - disability and older age vulnerability (who have particular housing needs);
    - low income vulnerability (with fewer resources to respond to changes in housing availability or prices, as well as those dependant on incomes linked to accommodation, e.g., tourism related); and
    - poor health vulnerability (for whom impacts on housing and relocation would be disadvantageous to their health, wellbeing and independence).

## Sensitivity of the Receptor

- 4.10.48 The sensitivity of the general population is **low**. Common factors that differentiate the sensitivity of the general population and the vulnerable group population have been taken into account and are listed in **section 4.6**, Vulnerable Groups. The general population comprise those members of the community in good physical and mental health, whose access to stable housing would not be influenced by Proposed Development workers in the local area. The general population also comprise those with greater resources to access good quality housing.
- 4.10.49 The sensitivity of the vulnerable group is **high**. The sub-population includes a high representation of dependants, including children, elderly, and those receiving care due to poor health. The sub-population also includes those experiencing high levels of deprivation and low incomes. This sub-population may have fewer resources and less capacity to access good quality housing. The population may therefore be more sensitive to changes in local housing availability, including affecting key worker recruitment, and to economic outcomes, such as those linked to seasonal tourism.

## Magnitude of Impact

- 4.10.50 Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description of the ES reports that there are expected to be 400 (peak) full-time-equivalent (FTE) jobs during construction. The basis for the assessment is that the construction workforce are expected to be predominantly non-home-based. The Accommodation Strategy states the following. :
- The construction workforce is anticipated to first peak at 400 employees in Autumn 2028 (Oct – Dec). The workforce is then anticipated to peak again at 400 employees over the May 2029 to December 2029 period.
  - Beyond this point, construction employment is anticipated to fall to 140 employees in August 2030; and then to just 50 employees in January 2031 with this low level then maintained through 2031 and 2032.
- 4.10.51 Additionally, the following is stated in Volume 4, Chapter 3: Socio-economics and Tourism of the ES.
- It is expected that the peak employment for the onshore elements supported in the Local Area (defined as the local authorities of Torridge and North Devon) and the area of Devon County Council will be 70 and 190 jobs, respectively.
  - The main economic impacts will occur when the Proposed Development is under construction. During this period it was estimated that the peak annual impacts would be:
    - 70 jobs in the Local Area;
    - 190 jobs in Devon; and
    - 2,050 jobs across the UK.
  - The impact of the Proposed Development on community and social assets and local housing market is assessed to be minor.



- 4.10.52 Additionally, as outlined in the Accommodation Strategy, construction workforce peaks are expected to be short-term. The Accommodation Strategy Monitoring.
- 4.10.53 For population health, the magnitude of change due to the Proposed Development is considered to be **low**.
- 4.10.54 In relation to housing quality for local residents, although local housing pressures are noted, the relatively small number of workers would have access to accommodation across a wide area so the change is likely to be small scale over the medium-term. Any discernible change in housing availability is likely to affect a small minority of the population, with potential for minor changes in physical and mental health morbidity linked to living environment. The magnitude of change on this issue is therefore expected to be **low**.
- 4.10.55 In relation to potential changes in key worker recruitment and community cohesion linked to the short-term-let and hospitality sector (B&B and hotel bedspaces) market, the scale of change in required capacity for accommodation is considered small over the medium-term. This reflects that most essential workers would be seeking long-term rental or home ownership. Where demand for short-term-lets restricts the long-term rental market there is the potential for accommodation pressures, which may occasionally affect the ability of local communities to attract and retain essential workers, with implications for local public and voluntary services. The temporary effect is likely to have a minor influence on physical and mental health related morbidity for a small minority of the population. The magnitude of change on this issue is therefore expected to be **low**.
- 4.10.56 In relation to indirect economic outcomes, where Proposed Development workers use short-term-let or hospitality sector (B&B and hotel bedspaces) accommodation, this may provide benefits during the off-season when vacancies would be higher. During peak season, there may be some displacement of tourists, with indirect effects to other parts of the tourism economy. Both beneficial and adverse effects are considered small scale, albeit frequent over a medium-term duration. The changes are anticipated to result in minor changes in income related physical and mental health outcomes for a small minority of the population. Effects would be expected to reverse rapidly once the need for temporary accommodation ceased, without lasting population health outcome changes associated with tourism or housing markets. The magnitude of change for this issue is expected to be **low**.

### Significance of the Effect

- 4.10.57 The significance of the population health effect for this determinant of health is **minor adverse** (not significant). This score reflects that the literature establishes a clear relationship between housing availability, affordability, adaptability and health outcomes. Any change in the health baseline due to the Proposed Development is likely to be slight, with at most a marginal effect on health inequalities and delivery of health policy.



## Further (Secondary) Mitigation and Residual Effect

- 4.10.58 No additional mitigation is considered to be required. Therefore the residual population health effect remains **minor adverse** (not significant).

## Future Monitoring

- 4.10.59 As no significant adverse population health effects are anticipated, and as this conclusion is not predicated on the effectiveness of novel or atypical mitigation measures, it is not considered proportionate to undertake health related monitoring.

## Employment and Income – Offshore

- 4.10.60 The section considers the employment and income effects of the Proposed Development during the construction phase. The construction of the Proposed Development may lead to health effects from wider indirect economic impacts, including temporary changes to commercial fishing.
- 4.10.61 The scientific literature identifies the following general points relevant to potential effects and health outcomes. Employment is an important determinant of health and well-being both directly and indirectly by making health-promoting resources available to an employee and any dependants. The socio-economic benefits associated with employment are improved living conditions and the potential to make healthier choices, (e.g., eating a healthier diet and undertaking more physical activity). If members of the community are employed, this can also generate indirect economic activity.
- 4.10.62 There is strong evidence for a protective effect of employment on depression and general mental health. Statistics showed favourable effects on depression and psychological distress (van der Noordt *et al.*, 2014). Unemployment is associated with poor health outcomes, with more negative health effects linked to lower socio-economic status and unemployment due to health reasons, whilst a strong social network is beneficial in reducing the health effects of unemployment (Norström *et al.*, 2014).
- 4.10.63 This section has been informed by Volume 3, Chapter 4: Commercial Fisheries, of the ES, which sets out relevant assessment findings and mitigation measures that have been taken into account.
- 4.10.64 Potential effects on human health are considered plausible as there are theoretical source-pathway-receptor relationships:
- the source is changes in direct and indirect jobs and economic activity;
  - the pathway is good quality employment and income providing more health supporting resources; and
  - receptors are people of working age (and their dependants).
- 4.10.65 Furthermore, the theoretical effect is considered applicable in the context of this Proposed Development.
- 4.10.66 The population groups relevant to this assessment are:
- the regional populations of the South West; and

- the sub-population vulnerable due to:
  - young age vulnerability (including children and young people who are dependants, as well as young adults early in their careers);
  - old age vulnerability (older people who are dependants);
  - poor health vulnerability (people with existing poor physical and mental health, including for employment opportunities and as dependants);
  - low-income vulnerability (people living in deprivation, including those on low incomes for whom good quality employment may be particularly beneficial); and
  - access and geographical vulnerability (people for whom other job opportunities may be limited due to access and geographical limitations).

### Sensitivity of the Receptor

- 4.10.67 The sensitivity of the general population is **low**. Common factors that differentiate the sensitivity of the general population and the vulnerable group population have been taken into account and are listed in **section 4.6**, Vulnerable Groups. This reflects that most people would already be within stable employment that would be unaffected by the Proposed Development (or being a dependant of such a person).
- 4.10.68 The sensitivity of the vulnerable group population is **high**. Vulnerability in this case relates to people and their dependants who are in affected commercial fisheries related employment, on low incomes, have poor job security, poor working conditions or who are unemployed. Future young or older people may also come to rely on those employed.

### Magnitude of Impact

- 4.10.69 As reported in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Commercial Fisheries, of the ES, the Proposed Development is not anticipated to have significant residual effects on commercial fisheries. This includes the following impacts:
- reduction in access to, or exclusion from established fishing grounds;
  - displacement leading to gear conflict and increased fishing pressure on adjacent grounds;
  - disturbance of commercially important fish and shellfish resources leading to displacement or disruption of fishing activity;
  - increased vessel traffic associated with the Proposed Development within fishing grounds leading to interference with fishing activity; and
  - physical presence of infrastructure leading to gear snagging.
- 4.10.70 For population health, the magnitude of change due to the Proposed Development is considered to be **low**.
- 4.10.71 Changes in fishing access would be temporary and of short-to-medium-term duration. The effects are judged to relate to a small scale of change given access to alternative fishing grounds for most employers. A frequent or continuous effect on employment and/or income may occur to a very small

minority of the population associated with fishing activity on the Cornish coast and the Scilly Isles. This is likely to relate to minor changes in physical and mental health morbidity associated with job insecurity. At most there may be slight healthcare service implications. The magnitude is therefore, considered to be low.

### Significance of the Effect

- 4.10.72 The significance of the population health effect for this determinant of health is **negligible to minor adverse** (not significant). The changes to employment and income associated with some commercial fishing activities having loss or restricted access to fishing grounds or interrupted fishing activity near the Offshore Cable Corridor of the Proposed Development would have adverse physical and mental health effects (including to dependants). This conclusion is supported by a clear association between employment and health in the scientific literature. Consequently, there may be a slight adverse change in localised health baselines where coastal community employment is strongly linked to commercial fisheries activity by smaller vessels. This could be associated with a marginal increase in health inequalities.

### Further (Secondary) Mitigation and Residual Effect

- 4.10.73 No additional mitigation is considered to be required. The residual population health effect remains **negligible to minor adverse** (not significant).

### Future Monitoring

- 4.10.74 As no significant adverse population health effects are anticipated, and as this conclusion is not predicated on the effectiveness of novel or atypical mitigation measures, it is not considered proportionate to undertake health related monitoring.

### Air Quality

- 4.10.75 This section discusses changes to local air quality during construction of the Proposed Development, and related effects on human health. Construction activities have the potential to result in localised dust emissions.
- 4.10.76 The scientific literature indicates that there is an association between air quality emissions and health and wellbeing effects. The link is primarily between particulate matter and health effects. Whilst the literature supports there being thresholds set for health protection purposes, it also acknowledges that for particulate matter (PM) there are non-threshold health effects (i.e., when there is no known exposure threshold level below which adverse health effects may not occur). There are population groups that may be particularly sensitive to air quality effects. For example, young children are particularly susceptible to air pollution because of their developing lungs, high breathing rates per bodyweight, and amount of time spent exercising outdoors. Other vulnerable groups include the sick (e.g., people with type 2 diabetes), the elderly, and pregnant women.

- 4.10.77 This section has been informed by Volume 2, Chapter 7: Air Quality, of the ES, which sets out the relevant assessment findings and mitigation measures that have been taken into account.
- 4.10.78 A potential population health effect is considered plausible as there is a theoretical source-pathway-receptor relationship.
- The source is air pollutants (dust) from construction emissions.
  - The pathway is diffusion through the air.
  - Receptors are residents and long-term occupiers of nearby properties and community buildings.
- 4.10.79 Furthermore, the theoretical effect is considered applicable in the context of this Proposed Development.
- 4.10.80 The population groups relevant to this assessment are:
- the site-specific population of Monkleigh & Putford, Bideford East, Bideford South and Two Rivers & Three Moors;
  - the local population of Torrridge District Council; and
  - the sub-population vulnerable due to:
    - young age vulnerability (children and young people are more susceptible to air quality due to time spent outdoors and physiological conditions);
    - old age vulnerability (older people are more susceptible due to physiological conditions);
    - poor health vulnerability (people with one or more chronic conditions such as COPD or asthma); and
    - access and geographical factors (people in close proximity to the Order Limits).
- 4.10.81 Construction activities that produce dust tend to relate to the coarser fractions of PM<sub>10</sub> and potential nuisance from dust deposition on property. The great majority of anthropogenic PM<sub>2.5</sub> health effects relate to combustion related processes, particularly changes in transport patterns, solid fuel burning from space heating or industrial processes that use fossil fuels.
- 4.10.82 Whilst the focus of discussion in this health chapter differentiates between coarse PM during construction and fine PM during operation, the health outcomes of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> are not distinguished in this assessment. This reflects that both are typically present (though the relative proportions change) and that the evidence base does not consistently distinguish their effects particularly given that PM<sub>2.5</sub> is a subset of PM<sub>10</sub>. However, generally, elevated concentrations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> are considered of greater concern due to their greater potential to interact within the body.
- 4.10.83 Environmental air pollution is associated with increased risk of respiratory and cardiovascular diseases. Environmental pollution exerts its detrimental effects on the heart by developing pulmonary inflammation, systemic inflammation, oxidative stress, endothelial dysfunction and prothrombotic changes (Meo & Suraya, 2015). The adverse effects on health of PM and NO<sub>2</sub> indicates that the effects occur at air pollution concentrations lower than those in guidelines (WHO, 2013). Long term exposure to particulate matter is associated with

incidence of coronary events, and this association persists at levels of exposure below the current limit values (Cesaroni *et al.*, 2014). The magnitude of the long-term effects of NO<sub>2</sub> on mortality is at least as important as that of PM<sub>2.5</sub>.

- 4.10.84 For construction dusts, the main health outcomes are likely to relate to exacerbation of existing conditions, such as asthma or COPD (i.e., airway inflammation by coarse PM) and to reductions in wellbeing associated with annoyance or reduced amenity. Whilst other outcomes (e.g., cardiovascular events) may be relevant in the event of brief high concentrations, such elevated exposures are expected to be avoided through the use of standard good practice mitigation that would be secured through the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) dust guidance as discussed in Volume 2, Chapter 7: Air Quality, of the ES.

### Sensitivity of the Receptor

- 4.10.85 The sensitivity of the general population is **low**. Common factors that differentiate the sensitivity of the general population and the vulnerable group population have been taken into account and are listed in **section 4.6**, Vulnerable Groups. The general population comprise those members of the community who live, work and study at a distance where high levels of dispersion and deposition would greatly limit the effects of any change in exposure due to the Proposed Development. Furthermore, most people enjoy good respiratory health (e.g., do not have asthma) and are not at a life stage (e.g., infant or frail elderly) with particular sensitivity to air quality.
- 4.10.86 The sensitivity of the vulnerable group population is **high**. This reflects that the sub-population includes a high representation of dependants, including both children, elderly and those receiving care due to poor health. For example, existing respiratory conditions including asthma, COPD and type 2 diabetes would increase sensitivity. People likely to be most affected by the Proposed Development are those living close to the construction works (see receptors listed in Volume 2, Chapter 7: Air Quality, of the ES).

### Magnitude of Impact

- 4.10.87 Volume 2, Chapter 7: Air Quality, of the ES asserts that the results of the risk assessment of construction dust impacts undertaken using the IAQM dust guidance, indicates that before the implementation of mitigation and controls, the risk of dust impacts would be high. Implementation of mitigation measures described in the IAQM construction dust guidance would be expected to reduce the residual dust effects to a level categorised as not significant. The resulting air quality effect of the Proposed Development is therefore considered to be negligible.
- 4.10.88 For population health, the magnitude of change due to the Proposed Development is considered to be **low**. The potential for effects is expected to be *occasional* and limited in extent. Such changes during construction are expected to be medium-term at any given location during the construction period, with a minor influence on quality of life and/or morbidity risk for respiratory and cardiovascular conditions for a small minority of the population. The transitory nature of the works along the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor is

relevant and indicates that at any given location exposures would be of shorter duration. Most effects on wellbeing would rapidly reverse, with no discernible influence for healthcare services.

### Significance of the Effect

- 4.10.89 The effect is characterised as being adverse in direction, temporary and direct. For the health assessment, the construction air quality effects are considered **negligible to minor adverse** (not significant in EIA terms). This assessment conclusion reflects that whilst the scientific literature establishes a causal effect relationship between changes in air quality and health outcomes, the changes would result in a very limited effect in the health baseline of the local population. This finding takes into account potential for mobilisation of new or historic contaminants in construction dusts. The conclusion also takes account of non-threshold effects of some air pollutants. The temporary and slight reduction in air quality is not expected to affect health inequalities. All air quality changes are predicted to be well within statutory standards set for health protection.

### Further (Secondary) Mitigation and Residual Effect

- 4.10.90 No additional mitigation is considered to be required. The residual population health effect remains **negligible to minor adverse** (not significant).

### Future Monitoring

- 4.10.91 As no significant adverse population health effects are anticipated, and as this conclusion is not predicated on the effectiveness of novel or atypical mitigation measures, it is not considered proportionate to undertake health related monitoring.

### Water Quality

- 4.10.92 This section considers water quality implications for population health from potential pollution releases during construction.
- 4.10.93 During construction, there is potential for the accidental release of lubricants, fuels and oils from construction machinery. This can occur because of spillages, leakage from vehicle storage areas and direct release from construction machinery working directly in or adjacent to water bodies, including land drainage channels. Bentonite, which is an inert clay-based material used at the drill head during the installation of trenchless crossings, can breakout during use and cause smothering of habitats, although it is inert and not a pollutant.
- 4.10.94 Pollution of surface water or groundwater bodies which are subsequently used as a potable source could pose a risk to public health. The Proposed Development Area is predominately agricultural and food safety could be compromised by contamination affecting agricultural land directly, or indirectly contaminating agricultural water sources. This includes contamination that occurs during flood events.



- 4.10.95 Bathing water quality at the nearshore of the possible landfall locations may be temporarily affected by activities of the Offshore Cable Corridor (including Horizontal Direction Drilling). The key health outcomes relevant to this determinant of health arise from toxicological exposures by skin contact, accidental swallowing of water or inhalation and can cause a wide range of acute or chronic illnesses.
- 4.10.96 Changes to water quality onshore may be due to either new accidental pollutant spills or mobilisation of historic pollutants. In both cases standard good practice pollution control measures form part of construction management plans. Increased suspended sediment concentrations (SSC) that do not pose toxicological risk may discourage bathing but are not expected to pose direct risks to population health.
- 4.10.97 The scientific literature identifies the following general points relevant to potential exposures and health outcomes. Recreational exposure to natural toxins by skin contact, accidental swallowing of water or inhalation can cause a wide range of acute or chronic illnesses (Koreivienė *et al.*, 2014). One of the main channels of human exposure to microorganisms and pollutants is through contact with polluted bathing water (Efstratiou, 2001). Several studies have concluded that a number of symptoms of ill health mainly affecting the gastrointestinal tract, ear, skin, eye and upper respiratory tract have been associated with direct contact with contaminated bathing water (Efstratiou, 2001; Eregno *et al.*, 2016; Iñiguez-Armijos *et al.*, 2020).
- 4.10.98 Drinking water supplies from both surface water and groundwater sources may also be contaminated during flooding events (Andrade *et al.*, 2018) including irrigation water for agricultural purposes which is a risk factor for microbial and chemical contamination of fruits and vegetables (Park *et al.*, 2012).
- 4.10.99 This section has been informed by Volume 2, Chapter 3: Hydrology and Flood Risk of the ES, which set out relevant assessment findings and mitigation measures that have been taken into account.
- 4.10.100 A potential population health effect is considered plausible as there is a theoretical source-pathway-receptor relationship:
- the source is mobilisation of contaminants or sediment or new leaks or spills of pollutants;
  - the pathway is transmission through marine or onshore waters. Exposure includes ingestion and dermal contact; and
  - receptors are populations of residents and visitors.
- 4.10.101 Furthermore, the theoretical effect is considered applicable in the context of this Proposed Development.
- 4.10.102 The population groups relevant to this assessment are:
- the site-specific population of Monkleigh & Putford, Bideford East, Bideford South and Two Rivers & Three Moors. The local population of Torridge District Council; and
  - the sub-population vulnerable due to:
    - young age vulnerability (children and young people as more sensitive to contaminants);



- old age vulnerability (older people as more sensitive to contaminants); and
- poor health vulnerability (people with existing poor physical health or mental health, as more sensitive to contaminants).

### Sensitivity of the Receptor

- 4.10.103 The sensitivity of the general population is **low**. Common factors that differentiate the sensitivity of the general population and the vulnerable group population have been taken into account and are listed in **section 4.6**, Vulnerable Groups. This reflects many people would make limited use of coastal waters for bathing or related recreation. The potential for any effect to public water supplies is considered very limited. The general population includes those who are in good health and less likely to be adversely affected by contaminants.
- 4.10.104 The sensitivity of the vulnerable group population is **high**. Vulnerability in this case relates to people more sensitive due to life stage or health status. For example, children and young people may spend more time in coastal waters and due to developmental stage or relative body size have increased risks from a given toxin exposure. Increase sensitivity to exposure may also apply to older people and those with existing poor health (e.g., long-term illness).

### Magnitude of Impact

- 4.10.105 Volume 2, Chapter 3: Hydrology and Flood Risk, of the ES concludes that following the integration of measures adopted in the Outline On-CEMP (document reference 7.7), effects in relation to the following.
- Contaminated runoff on the quality of surface water and ground receptors would be minor adverse.
  - Increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff would be negligible.
  - Increased flood risk arising from damage to existing flood defences would be minor adverse.
  - Increased flood risk arising from watercourse crossings would be minor adverse.
  - Damage to existing field drainage would be minor adverse.
  - Damage to existing water supply and drainage infrastructure would be minor adverse.
- 4.10.106 For population health, the magnitude of change due to the Proposed Development is considered to be **low**.
- 4.10.107 This reflects that nearshore works would be associated with high dispersion in relation to bathing waters and measures adopted in the Outline On-CEMP (document reference 7.7) would avoid and contain any spills or appropriately respond to historic contamination encountered. Such measures would also mitigate the potential for localised effects to water courses. The level of exposure to any contaminants would likely be very low, short-term and

associated with one-off events. The severity of health outcomes would likely relate to a very minor change in morbidity related risk factors associated with toxin exposures for a very few people. At most there may be slight healthcare service implications.

### Significance of the Effect

- 4.10.108 The effect is characterised as being adverse in direction, temporary and direct. The significance of the population health effect for this determinant of health is **negligible to minor adverse** (not significant in EIA terms). This conclusion reflects that although there are credible pathways in the scientific literature by which bathing waters and onshore waters (surface or ground) may be affected, these are addressed by mitigation and there is therefore potential for only a very limited effect on the population health baseline. Water quality is expected to be well within standards for bathing and drinking water and the changes are not expected to affect delivery of health policy or influence inequalities.

### Further (Secondary) Mitigation and Residual Effect

- 4.10.109 No additional mitigation is considered to be required. The residual population health effect remains **negligible to minor adverse** (not significant).

### Future Monitoring

- 4.10.110 As no significant adverse population health effects are anticipated, and as this conclusion is not predicated on the effectiveness of novel or atypical mitigation measures, it is not considered proportionate to undertake health related monitoring.

### Land Quality

- 4.10.111 Linked to the issue of air and water quality discussed in the assessment sections **section 4.10** (Air Quality, informed by Volume 2, Chapter 7: Air Quality, of the ES, and Water Quality, informed by Volume 2, Chapter 3: Hydrology and Flood Risk, of the ES ) as well as in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Geology, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions of the ES, the source of contaminants may include new or historic soil-based pollutants or toxins. Occupational soil contamination exposures are governed by statutory health and safety requirements, appropriately avoiding or reducing risks to the construction workforce, including through working practices, management plans and personal protective equipment. For the community, the potential for exposures may either be via water, as discussed in **section 4.10** Water Quality, or via construction dusts as discussed in the **section 4.10** Air Quality. Given restricted access to construction areas, it is unlikely that there is potential for the community to have direct contact with contaminated soils to an extent that could affect public health. The significance of effect would be **negligible to minor adverse**, which would not be significant. This is not assessed further as a separate issue.

4.10.112 A detailed Soil Management Plan would be prepared in general accordance with the Outline Soil Management Plan submitted as part of the application for development consent. An Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference 7.7.4) has been prepared as part of the wider Outline On-CEMP (document reference 7.7), secured as a requirement of the DCO.

## **Noise and Vibration**

- 4.10.113 There is the potential for noise and vibration effects from onshore activities. Construction activities may result in changes to noise during the day and at night. Some specific activities such as concrete pouring require periods of night-time working, however the majority of works would occur during normal daytime construction working hours.
- 4.10.114 In general, the scientific literature suggests the potential for annoyance with an indication of further stress due to exposure to environmental noise (Guski *et al.*, 2017). Annoyance describes negative reactions such as disturbance, irritation, dissatisfaction, and nuisance (Guski, 1999). Environmental noise can initiate physiological stress responses in an individual that leads to a cascade of effects including a rise in heart rate and in levels of stress hormones (Guski *et al.*, 2017). These responses influence risk factors for cardiometabolic health issues including blood pressure, blood sugar and blood fats and long-term exposure that may affect mental health and lead to diseases such as diabetes, heart attack, and stroke (Münzel *et al.*, 2017; Münzel, Schmidt, *et al.*, 2018; Münzel, Sørensen, *et al.*, 2018).
- 4.10.115 Night-time noise may disrupt the total sleep time and the required physiological and mental restoration in an individual even at low levels (Guski *et al.*, 2017). Evidence therefore suggests a relationship between environmental noise and annoyance (Guski *et al.*, 2017), sleep disturbance (Basner & McGuire, 2018), cardiometabolic health (Van Kempen *et al.*, 2018), learning outcomes (Clark *et al.*, 2020) and mental health (Brink *et al.*, 2008, 2008). Factors that can influence an observed annoyance response to exposure may include the source of the noise, sound level, perceived danger and fear associated with noise source, ability to cope, individual noise sensitivity, expectations, and individual factors that may increase vulnerability such as age, social disadvantage and employment status (Fenech *et al.*, 2021; Notley, 2014; UK Civil Aviation Authority, 2021).
- 4.10.116 This section has been informed by Volume 2, Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, of the ES, which sets out relevant assessment findings and mitigation measures that have been taken into account.
- 4.10.117 A potential population health effect is considered plausible as there is a theoretical source-pathway-receptor relationship:
- the source is noise and vibration generated by construction activities and vehicle movements.
  - the pathway is pressure waves through the air and ground vibrations.
  - receptors are residents and long-term occupiers of nearby properties and community buildings.

- 4.10.118 Furthermore, the theoretical effect is considered applicable in the context of this Proposed Development.
- 4.10.119 The population groups relevant to this assessment are:
- the site-specific population of Monkleigh & Putford, Bideford East, Bideford South and Two Rivers & Three Moors;
  - the local population of Torridge District Council;
  - the sub-population vulnerable due to:
    - young age vulnerability (particularly with regard to educational and sleep disruption);
    - old age vulnerability (particularly with regard to sleep disruption);
    - poor health vulnerability (people with an existing physical or mental health condition);
    - low income vulnerability (people on low incomes may have fewer resources to adapt e.g. seek respite or install insulation and people who are economically inactive may spend more time in affected dwellings); and
    - access and geographical vulnerability (people for whom close proximity to the proposed changes increases sensitivity).

### Sensitivity of the Receptor

- 4.10.120 The sensitivity of the general population is considered to be low. Common factors that differentiate the sensitivity of the general population and the vulnerable group population have been taken into account and are listed in **section 4.6**, Vulnerable Groups. The general population comprise those members of the community in good physical and mental health and with resources that enable a high capacity to adapt to change. Additionally, most people live, work or study at a distance from the construction works where noise and vibration would be unlikely to be a source of concern.
- 4.10.121 The sensitivity of the vulnerable group population is **high**. The sub-population more sensitive to noise includes children, elderly and those receiving care due to poor health. This sub-population may experience existing widening inequalities due to living in areas with increased noise and elevated deprivation, with limited capacity to adapt to changes. Vulnerability particularly relates to those living close to the construction activities and converter stations, including those spending more time in affected dwellings, e.g., due to low economic activity, shift work or poor health. People who are concerned or have high degrees of uncertainty about noise and its effect on their wellbeing may be more sensitive to changes in noise. The small population living at the coastal edge may experience nearshore noise (noise can travel longer distances across water than land) as well as night-time landfall noise. Occupants of dwellings with less acoustic insulation, such as caravans, may be more sensitive to noise effects.

## Magnitude of Impact

- 4.10.122 As reported in Volume 2, Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, of the ES, construction along the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor would involve activities that are mobile (i.e., only temporarily taking place at a given location during the construction period), such as trenching for cable laying. Mobile works would impact receptors for short periods of time.
- 4.10.123 Volume 2, Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, of the ES, concludes the following.
- Noise and Vibration impacts due to the Onshore HDVC Cables at Landfall – trenchless techniques are assessed to be negligible adverse.
  - Noise and Vibration impacts due to the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor Landward of the Transition Joint Bay – trenchless techniques are assessed to be minor adverse.
  - Noise and Vibration impacts due to the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor Landward of the Transition Joint Bay – open-cut Trenching Techniques are assessed to be minor adverse.
  - Noise and Vibration impacts due to the construction and use of the Construction Compounds and construction of the Converter Site are assessed to be minor adverse.
  - Noise impacts due to construction traffic on Local Highway Networks are assessed to be minor adverse.
- 4.10.124 Construction noise mitigation would be applied as best as reasonably practicable. Noise impacts from construction activities would be reduced via the implementation of the final On-CEMP(s). The On-CEMP, secured as a requirement of the DCO, will include construction noise and vibration limits and BPM to mitigate noise and vibration from construction activities associated with the Proposed Development.
- 4.10.125 For population health, the magnitude of change due to the proposed construction works is considered to be **low**.
- 4.10.126 The small scale of change in noise and vibration levels is likely to predominantly relate to a minor change in quality of life and/or cardiovascular and mental wellbeing morbidity for a small minority of the community populations at landfall, along the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor and near the converter stations. The changes would be short-term duration at any given location during the construction period, reflecting the transitory nature of works, with potential for frequent construction related noise exposures. Prolonged periods of construction noise at night or daytime disruption of educational activities at schools are not anticipated (see Volume 2, Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, of the ES).

## Significance of the Effect

- 4.10.127 The significance of the population health effect due to the Proposed Development is **minor adverse**, which is not significant in EIA terms. The magnitude of the impact is deemed to be low and the sensitivity of the vulnerable population group is considered to be high.

- 4.10.128 Noise and vibration impacts from construction activities and construction traffic would be mitigated through the use of appropriate construction hours and best practice measures set out in the Outline On-CEMP (document reference 7.7).
- 4.10.129 Based on these mitigation measures, the effect is characterised as being adverse in direction, temporary, short-term and direct. Although the scientific literature indicates a *clear* association between elevated and sustained noise and vibration disturbance and reduced health outcomes, the changes would result in a very limited effect in the health baseline of the population. The distribution of effects is not expected to affect health inequalities. The level of effect is not expected to affect the ability to deliver local or national health policy.

### Further (Secondary) Mitigation and Residual Effect

- 4.10.130 No additional mitigation is considered to be required. The residual population health effect remains **minor adverse** (not significant).

### Future Monitoring

- 4.10.131 As no significant adverse population health effects are anticipated, and as this conclusion is not predicated on the effectiveness of novel or atypical mitigation measures, it is not considered proportionate to undertake health related monitoring.

### Health and Social Care Services

- 4.10.132 This section considers the potential implications for NHS routine service planning, and any consequent population health effect of changes in demand associated with the Proposed Development's workforce.
- 4.10.133 Healthcare support needs would be scaled primarily with reference to the current and planned workforce numbers and would also take into account the nature of the activities being undertaken.
- 4.10.134 As a minimum, the level of healthcare provision would comply with the Health and Safety (First-Aid) Regulations 1981 and the UK Health and Safety Executive Guidance L74 (Third edition), published in 2013 and updated in 2024. These regulations require employers to provide adequate and appropriate equipment, facilities and personnel to ensure that employees receive immediate attention if they are injured or taken ill at work.
- 4.10.135 This existing legal requirement does not require securing through the DCO. Additionally, UK Health and Safety Executive guidance mandates that periodic needs assessments are undertaken. These assessments will consider, among other factors, the nature of the work, workplace hazards and risks, work patterns, the nature of the workforce, and both physical and mental health. Health service capacity may be affected by a non-permanent construction workforce in the area. These are people who are not usually residents in the area (so not registered with local NHS services). This group could include multinational workers. During construction of the Proposed Development, there is a potential for transient workers having an impact on the local healthcare



capacity. The health assessment considers the current level of demand, including primary care capacity near the Order Limits.

- 4.10.136 A potential population health effect is considered plausible as there is a theoretical source-pathway-receptor relationship:
- The source is changes in demand for medical and healthcare facilities as a result of unplanned need for NHS attendance.
  - The pathway is change in capacity, staffing and resources of the local NHS.
  - Receptors are local community populations accessing these services and facilities. This may include healthcare staff should they experience resource pressures.
- 4.10.137 Furthermore, the theoretical effect is considered applicable in the context of this Proposed Development.
- 4.10.138 The population groups relevant to this assessment are:
- the local population of Torridge District Council and North Devon Council; and
  - the sub-population vulnerable due to:
    - young age vulnerability (including children, young people and pregnant mothers as higher users of healthcare).
    - old age vulnerability (including older people as higher users of healthcare).
    - poor health vulnerability (people with existing poor physical and mental health as higher users of healthcare).
    - access and geographical vulnerability (people who experience existing access barriers to healthcare).
- 4.10.139 Whilst there is the potential for a broad range of services to be affected, the assessment distinguishes between:
- demand that is identified and met through routine NHS service planning, which is funded through general taxation; and
  - demand that is in addition to this.
- 4.10.140 In general, it can be assumed that home-based workers will continue to make use of community facilities, including healthcare, at their home location. It will therefore only be non-home-based workers that may generate regular additional demand for community facilities, including healthcare, in the area. Whilst there is the potential for additional healthcare demand from some members of the construction workforce, the scale is expected to be within normal health service planning margins and not a step-change in demand.
- 4.10.141 Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description, of the ES, estimates there would be 400 (peak) full-time-equivalent (FTE) jobs during construction. Information on the construction workforce is provided in paragraph 4.10.50 The basis for assessment is that all construction workers are expected to be non-home-based, i.e. from outside the North Devon and Torridge area. The expectation is that the non-home-based workforce would have either NHS entitlement or suitable medical insurance.



## Sensitivity of the Receptor

- 4.10.142 The sensitivity of the general population is considered to be **low**. Common factors that differentiate the sensitivity of the general population and the vulnerable group population have been taken into account and are listed in **section 4.6** (Vulnerable Groups). There are a suitable range of existing primary healthcare services located in proximity to the Proposed Development. However, as the construction workers are expected to be predominantly non-home-based (i.e., from outside the North Devon and Torridge area), their access to healthcare would primarily occur near their usual place of residence. For routine and preventative care, workers would return home or use services close to their residence. In cases where workers are unable to work due to ill health and are capable of traveling, it is anticipated that they would access healthcare services at their usual place of residence rather than using local services.
- 4.10.143 The sensitivity of vulnerable groups is considered **high**. This reflects the presence of people who require regular health care, e.g., older people with multiple long-term conditions. Members of the workforce, or their dependants, with particular health needs, e.g. chronic long-term conditions. Health professionals who are facing increased demand are also considered to be highly sensitive.

## Magnitude of Impact

- 4.10.144 This section has been informed by the healthcare capacity analysis undertaken below.
- 4.10.145 An indicative reference point (postcode: EX39 2DR) from which workers, whilst at work, may access healthcare services has been selected. This is situated within the central section of the Proposed Development and is used as a conservative approach to analysing primary healthcare capacity, i.e. gives a catchment with fewer services. If measured from the site boundaries, work compounds or access roads, the distance to GP practices in the vicinity will be shorter, and a larger number of practices would likely be included in the catchment area.
- 4.10.146 Both local context and the scientific literature (Santos et al., 2017) are informative in determining appropriate distances over which to assess primary healthcare capacity. The 2017 study by (Santos et al., 2017) based in the East Midlands of England, found that the average (mean) distance to a patient's chosen practice was 1.9 km (1.2 mile), which was further than the average of the nearest GP practice, 1.2 km (0.7 mile). The difference reflected patient choices and preferences, including driven by clinical quality. Santos et al. note that 91.5% of those in urban areas choose a GP practice within 3 km (1.9 mile) and 91.9% of residents in rural areas choose a practice within 7 km (4.3 mile).
- 4.10.1 The NHS Digital General Practice Workforce July 2024 (NHS Digital, 2024) data release provides information on existing capacity. There are 3 GP practices within both the 3 km and 7 km distances identified by Santos *et al.*, all are within

2.4 km of the aforementioned location<sup>2</sup> (Table 4.23). All three are currently accepting new patients and all are within the recommended patient to GP ratio of 1,800 patients per FTE GP (a commonly applied benchmark that is indicative but often exceeded in practice\*\* (HUDU, 2019). It is noted that patient ratios may not always reflect particular local context in terms of capacity, however, the data does give a broad indication of sensitivity to any changes in demand.

**Table 4.23: GP Primary care capacity close to the Proposed Development – July 2024 data release**

GP Practice	Patients	GP FTE	GP Patient ratio	Distance (km)	Accepting new patients?	Accepting out of area registrations?
Bideford Medical Centre	15,324	12.89	1,188	0.32	Yes	Yes
Wooda Surgery	9,469	6.33	1,496	0.48	Yes	Yes
Northam Surgery	12,949	9.34	1,386	2.41	Yes	Yes
<b>Total</b>	<b>37,742</b>	<b>28.5</b>	<b>1,324</b>	-	-	-

- 4.10.2 Whilst the Proposed Development does not rely on local primary care capacity, the data suggests that 13,558 additional patients could be registered before reaching the 1,800 patients per GP ratio benchmark across these three practices.
- 4.10.3 This indicative capacity calculation is a worst case as it is likely that the construction workforce would be accommodated across a wider area and therefore any medical needs would be distributed across a larger range of primary care providers. The expectation is that for non-urgent medical care many workers would, in the first instance, use either the NHS 111 service or the contractor’s occupational healthcare services. In the event of construction workers being signed-off work for health reasons and being fit to travel, the expectation is that they would return to their usual place of residence and receive medical care from their registered providers. Such measures would limit the potential for inappropriate attendance at local A&E or GP surgeries.
- 4.10.4 The magnitude of change due to the Proposed Development is **low**. There would be a small scale of change in NHS demand due to the presence of the construction workforce. There is likely to be some residual occasional access of services over the medium-term. Any impact on healthcare capacity is likely to equate to a very minor change in morbidity related outcomes for a small minority of the study area community populations. The effect on routine health service planning is likely slight.
- 4.10.5 It is noted that the construction and decommissioning workforces’ healthcare support provision would, as a minimum, comply with the Health and Safety

<sup>2</sup> Using NHS service search for postcode EX39 2DR

\*\* London’s Healthy Urban Development Unit (HUDU) uses the 1,800 people per GP as a default benchmark, based on guidance from the Royal College of GPs.

(First-Aid) Regulations 1981 and the UK Health and Safety Executive guidance L74 (Third edition) Published 2013 and updated in 2024. The Health and Safety (First-Aid) Regulations 1981 require employers to provide adequate and appropriate equipment, facilities and personnel to ensure their employees receive immediate attention if they are injured or taken ill at work.

### Significance of the Effect

- 4.10.6 The professional judgement is that the significance of the population health effect would be up to **minor adverse** (not significant). The score reflects a clear association in the scientific literature as to the importance of appropriate health care access, but also that there is some uncertainty as to the efficacy of occupational health interventions in avoiding inappropriate A&E attendance and other healthcare service usage. The level of change in the study areas health baseline due to the Proposed Development is likely to be very limited, with at most a marginal effect on the delivery of health policy and inequalities.

### Further (Secondary) Mitigation and Residual Effect

- 4.10.7 No additional mitigation is considered to be required. The residual population health effect remains **minor adverse** (not significant).

### Future Monitoring

- 4.10.8 As no significant adverse population health effects are anticipated, and as this conclusion is not predicated on the effectiveness of novel or atypical mitigation measures, it is not considered proportionate to undertake health related monitoring.

## 4.11 Assessment of Operational Effects

- 4.11.1 The impacts of the operation and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development have been assessed. The potential impacts arising from the operation and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development are listed in **Table 4.25** along with the maximum design scenario against which each impact has been assessed.
- 4.11.2 A description of the potential effect on receptors caused by each identified impact is given below.

### Noise and Vibration

- 4.11.3 This section discusses the operational changes in noise exposure from the Proposed Development that may be detrimental to population health. The converter stations include fixed plant such as transformers, which can cause community annoyance due to noise, including distinctive tonal characteristics. Noise effects from other operational activities are unlikely to have the potential to affect population health.

- 4.11.4 This section has been informed by Volume 2, Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, of the ES, which sets out relevant assessment findings and mitigation measures that have been taken into account.
- 4.11.5 The potential population health effect is considered plausible as there is a theoretical source-pathway-receptor relationship:
- the source is noise generated by converter stations;
  - the pathway is pressure waves through the air; and
  - receptors are residents and long-term occupiers of nearby properties and community buildings.
- 4.11.6 Furthermore, the theoretical effect is considered applicable in the context of this Proposed Development.
- 4.11.7 The population groups relevant to this assessment are the same as those listed in **paragraph 4.10.119**.

### Sensitivity of the Receptor

- 4.11.8 The sensitivity of the general population is **low**. Common factors that differentiate the sensitivity of the general population and the vulnerable group population have been taken into account and are listed in **section 4.6**, Vulnerable Groups. Most people in the study area live, work or travel at a distance from the Proposed Development's converter stations where noise effects would be imperceptible.
- 4.11.9 The sensitivity of the vulnerable group population is **high**. The sub-population is sensitive for reasons discussed in the **section 4.10** Transport modes, access and connections. Vulnerability relates to those living close to the converter stations, including those spending more time in affected dwellings e.g., due to low economic activity, shift work or poor health.

### Magnitude of Impact

- 4.11.10 Volume 2, Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration of the ES, states:

*'The exact converter stations plant strategy is not yet known and thus upper range sound power levels have been assumed for each plant item. However, due to the low existing background sound levels at receptors for the Converter Site the unmitigated operation of the converter station may generate noise emission levels in excess of the background levels. However, mitigation will be incorporated as part of the design and, as such, noise levels will be reduced to a level where any significant adverse effects are avoided.'*

*Operational noise limits will be delivered and secured as a requirement of the DCO which will inform the design principles for the converter stations. These limits will be derived to ensure significant effects are avoided via the implementation of appropriate mitigation and design principles. As such, the effect is minor adverse.'*

- 4.11.11 The magnitude of change due to the operational activities is expected to be no greater than **low**. In terms of population health, the expectation is that there

would be a small scale of change in noise levels and, if this is the case, it would predominantly relate to a minor change in quality of life and/or cardiovascular and mental health morbidity for a very few people. This reflects the predominantly rural context of the converter stations setting away from population centres. That level of change at the individual level, whilst appropriate to mitigate, would be unlikely to constitute a population health effect. The change is expected to be long-term duration and continuous, potentially affecting daytime and night-time periods.

4.11.12 It is likely that much of the plant would be housed internally, either in one or multiple buildings. As outlined in Volume 2, Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration of the ES, the following noise control measures will be incorporated in the design of the Converter Stations and secured by DCO Schedule 2, Requirement 4(2) (detailed design approval).

- The orientation and layout of the converter stations will be considered to minimise noise levels at nearby receptors.
- Quieter equipment will be selected, where available and practicable.
- Mitigation measures such as acoustic barriers and enclosures will be specified where necessary.
- Earth bunds will be created around the Converter Site as part of the ground works required during site preparation. These are an inherent mitigation feature for the site and aid to screen receptors from operational noise.

### Significance of the Effect

4.11.13 The significance of the population health effect due to the Proposed Development is **negligible to minor adverse**, which is not significant in EIA terms. This score reflects that noise and vibration impacts from the operation of the converter stations will be minimal and kept under thresholds set to be protective of health through their design, secured through DCO requirement. Although the scientific literature indicates a clear association between elevated and sustained noise and vibration disturbance and reduced health outcomes, the changes would result in a very limited effect in the health baseline of the population. The distribution of effects are not expected to affect health inequalities. The level of effect is not expected to affect the ability to deliver local or national health policy.

### Further (Secondary) Mitigation and Residual Effect

4.11.14 No additional mitigation is considered to be required. The residual population health effect remains **negligible to minor adverse** (not significant).

### Future Monitoring

4.11.15 As no significant adverse population health effects are anticipated, and as this conclusion is not predicated on the effectiveness of novel or atypical mitigation measures, it is not considered proportionate to undertake health related monitoring.

## Public Understanding of Risk (Converter Stations)

- 4.11.16 This section considers the potential operational population health effect due to electro-magnetic fields (EMF) exposure associated with the Proposed Development.
- 4.11.17 All electrical systems, including natural processes and living organisms, generate EMF. EMF effects diminish rapidly with distance, often requiring only a few metres, or less, to reach background levels (Gajšek *et al.*, 2016).
- 4.11.1 In line with good practice, public understanding of risk in relation to operational EMF is assessed. This includes considering how mental health effects can be avoided or reduced through provisions of timely and non-technical information explaining how actual health risks are mitigated.
- 4.11.2 The scientific literature identifies the following general points relevant to potential effects and health outcomes. The way risks are understood has important influences on health behaviour (Ferrer and Klein, 2015). Awareness of risk can affect mental, physical and emotional wellbeing, and can be worse when it is accompanied by uncertainty (Luria *et al.*, 2009).
- 4.11.3 The ultimate goal of dialogue between regulators and communities is to produce an informed public (Sinisi, 2004). Trust, credibility, competence, fairness and empathy are of great importance (Sinisi, 2004) and the routine monitoring and clear communication of results can greatly increase trust, empower people and reduce fear factors (WHO, 2013).
- 4.11.4 The views that people hold can be associated with low-grade illnesses (e.g., headaches or hypertension) and can be exacerbated when there is uncertainty (Luria *et al.*, 2009).
- 4.11.5 As noted in **Table 4.22**, the Proposed Development would adopt and implement relevant design guidelines of the ICNIRP and UK Government voluntary code of practice (Department for Energy Security and Net Zero, 2012; ICNIRP, 1998, 2010). Such guidelines are deemed sufficient for avoiding actual EMF risk. The focus of this assessment section is therefore not on the actual risk, which is considered appropriately mitigated, but on people's understanding of risk (risk perception). This relates to the potential for community concern about their proximity to the electrical infrastructure, including cable corridors and the converter stations, to affect mental health, even where relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are met.
- 4.11.6 The potential health effect is considered plausible as there is a theoretical source-pathway-receptor relationship:
- the source is electrical equipment introduced by the Proposed Development;
  - the pathway is concern about EMF exposure, affecting mental health; and
  - receptors are residents in the local community, particularly those living in close proximity to new electrical infrastructure.
- 4.11.7 Furthermore, the theoretical effect is considered applicable in the context of this Proposed Development.



- 4.11.8 The population relevant to this assessment are:
- the site-specific populations near landfall, the onshore HVDC Cable Corridor, and the converter stations: Monkleigh & Putford, Bideford East, Bideford South and Two Rivers & Three Moors;
  - the local population of Torridge District Council (reflecting potential for wider community concern); and
  - the sub-population vulnerable due to:
    - low-income vulnerability (people with fewer resources may feel less able to adapt to changes that concern them);
    - poor health vulnerability (people with existing poor mental health may be more sensitive to changes that concern them); and
    - access and geographical vulnerability (people for whom close proximity increases sensitivity).

### Sensitivity of the Receptor

- 4.11.9 The sensitivity of the general population is considered to be **low**. Common factors that differentiate the sensitivity of the general population and the vulnerable group population have been taken into account and are listed in **section 4.6**, Vulnerable Groups. Most people in the study area live, work or travel at a distance from the Proposed Development's electrical infrastructure where they would not be concerned about the potential for EMF risks. This group also includes that portion of the population who are ambivalent or not concerned about EMF as a risk factor.
- 4.11.10 The sensitivity of the vulnerable sub-population is **high**. The sub-population includes people who may be uncertain or concerned about EMF and this may exacerbate existing mental health conditions or be a source of stress and anxiety in itself. This may particularly be the case for people with near views and/or who live in close proximity to the converter stations.

### Magnitude of Impact

- 4.11.11 The magnitude of change due to the Proposed Development is considered to be **low**. The level of actual exposure is negligible, however the scale of change that may contribute to community concern about EMF is medium, continuous and long-term. The severity of health outcome relates to concern about risks of EMF, as no actual risks are anticipated. These relate predominantly to a minor change in mental health related morbidity for a very few people within the population. Such individual level effects are unlikely to have implications for health service capacity. For many people there is likely to be a rapid reversal of effects should their concerns be responded to and resolved to their satisfaction.

### Significance of the Effect

- 4.11.12 The significance of the population health effect is **minor adverse** which is not significant in EIA terms. The magnitude of the impact is deemed **low** and the sensitivity of the vulnerable population group is considered to be **high**.



- 4.11.13 The professional judgement is that there could be a slight adverse change in the health baseline for the local population if concerns are widespread. This conclusion reflects scientific understanding of the impact of uncertainty or concern about environmental risks on mental health. It also reflects that the actual risks would be well within regulatory standards for EMF and that most members of the public would expect this to be the case. The context that electrical transmission infrastructure and converter stations are relatively common features would also be expected to inform population risk perception.

### Further (Secondary) Mitigation and Residual Effect

- 4.11.14 The following additional mitigation and enhancements are proposed, to be secured through DCO mitigation measures:
- 4.11.15 Continued community consultation and sharing of non-technical information relating to the Proposed Development (e.g., explaining compliance with public exposure guidelines, actual risks associated with the Proposed Development), to allow people to express concerns and gain awareness of actual health effects. This will partially be met through the application process, including ES and the EIA Non-Technical Summary. Non-technical information and a point of contact for community liaison can also be provided on the Proposed Development website.
- 4.11.16 The residual effect, taking account of such mitigation, is expected be a **negligible** (not significant) population health effect.

### Future Monitoring

- 4.11.17 As no significant adverse population health effects are anticipated, and as this conclusion is not predicated on the effectiveness of novel or atypical mitigation measures, it is not considered proportionate to undertake health related monitoring.

### Wider Societal Infrastructure and Resources

- 4.11.18 The electricity transmitted by the Proposed Development would enable many aspects of everyday life that either protect or promote good health.
- 4.11.19 UK energy security is important for maintaining continuous and affordable electricity which supports many aspects of public health. This includes power to safely cook and refrigerate food, regulate the temperature and lighting of homes and schools, operate health and social care services, maintain economic productivity and employment, and operate technologies that improve quality of life and social support. Sustained interruption of supply or rapid increases in costs would both be expected to result in reductions in health and well-being outcomes. Increases in the cost of electricity, particularly in the context of rising costs of living, can cause some people to prioritise essential costs (e.g., food, shelter) over electricity demands (e.g., heating a home).
- 4.11.20 Energy insecurity is a public health concern particularly for vulnerable populations (e.g., low-income, children, elderly). It is associated with hazardous exposures, heat stress, cold stress, asthma, chronic disease, poor mental

health, parental fear and stigma, family disruption and residential instability (Hernández, 2016). In children, energy insecurity has been shown to affect development, hospitalisation and overall child health (Cook *et al.*, 2008).

- 4.11.21 The potential health effect is considered plausible as there is a theoretical source-pathway-receptor relationship:
- the source is renewable energy generation;
  - the pathway is energy security whilst avoiding climate altering emissions; and
  - receptors are population connected to the national power grid.
- 4.11.22 Furthermore, the theoretical effect is considered applicable in the context of this Proposed Development.
- 4.11.23 The population group relevant to this assessment are as follows.
- The 'national' populations of England and the wider UK.
  - The vulnerable sub-populations including young and old people, people with low income and their dependants, people with poor health or disabilities, people experiencing social disadvantage and people with access and geographical vulnerability.

### Sensitivity of the Receptor

- 4.11.24 The sensitivity of the general population is considered to be **low**. Common factors that differentiate the sensitivity of the general population and the vulnerable group population have been taken into account and are listed in **section 4.6**, Vulnerable Groups. The general population comprise those members of the community in good physical and mental health and with greater resources to respond to the costs of energy or to interruptions in supply.
- 4.11.25 The sensitivity of the vulnerable group population is considered to be **high**. The sub-population on low incomes, for whom energy security and interruption of energy supplies are more sensitive, pose a greater risk. This is particularly the case for dependants at risk during temperature extremes, including heatwaves and cold weather, as well as people in poor health, including when accessing healthcare.

### Magnitude of Impact

- 4.11.26 The magnitude of change due to the Proposed Development is considered to be **medium**. The impact is predicted to be of national spatial extent, with direct and indirect effects to population health.
- 4.11.27 Proposed Development transmission of renewable electricity would have continuous public health benefits to energy security despite the scale of contribution being relatively small within the national energy generation context. The effects are likely to provide a minor reduction in risks for population mortality (e.g., reducing excess winter deaths) and morbidity of physical and mental health outcomes related to standard of living and access to health supporting infrastructure. Such an effect may extend via the national grid to a

large minority of the national population. Such effects may bring small benefits to healthcare service quality by reducing capacity burdens.

### Significance of the Effect

- 4.11.28 The significance of the population health effect is **moderate beneficial**, which is significant in EIA terms.
- 4.11.29 The Proposed Development provides a protective effect on the health baseline and this would be important for public health. This conclusion reflects the scientific literature, which establishes a clear association between energy security and health outcomes. The Proposed Development is likely to be influential to delivering health policy, including in narrowing inequalities that are at risk of widening due to reduced national energy security and rising costs of living.
- 4.11.30 Whilst the public health effects are reliant on, and may extend to, other parts of the wider Xlinks' Morocco UK Power Project, i.e., in North Africa, consistent with the scope of this assessment, these are not assessed as part of this report.

### Further (Secondary) Mitigation and Residual Effect

- 4.11.31 No further enhancements or monitoring is considered necessary to increase the moderate beneficial effect. The residual population health effect remains **moderate beneficial** (significant).

### Future Monitoring

- 4.11.32 As no significant adverse population health effects are anticipated, and as this conclusion is not predicated on the effectiveness of novel or atypical mitigation measures, it is not considered proportionate to undertake health related monitoring.

## 4.12 Assessment of Decommissioning Effects

- 4.12.1 The application is seeking consent for the installation, operation and maintenance of two converter stations and associated development including transmission infrastructure and highways improvements.
- 4.12.2 The converter stations would be designed, manufactured and installed for a minimum operational lifetime, which is currently assumed to be 50 years. The operational lifetime of the onshore and offshore electricity cables (including both HVDC and HVAC) would exceed that of the converter stations. The highways improvements will not have a forecast end of life and will not be decommissioned.
- 4.12.3 For the electricity infrastructure only, the end of the operational lifetime is estimated at 50 years from date of full commissioning. Subject to relevant additional consents and legislative requirements, it is anticipated that potential refurbishment and operational life extension of the Proposed Development may occur. This potential refurbishment and extension of operational life would be considered closer to the end of the initial operational lifetime.

4.12.4 In the event that the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development is not extended, decommissioning would take place. The decommissioning sequence will generally be the reverse of the construction sequence. The numbers of vehicles, vessels and equipment would be no higher than during construction. Therefore, it is likely that the effects of decommissioning on the environment would be no worse than those effects identified during the construction phase, as detailed within **section 4.10**.

## **4.13 Cumulative Environmental Assessment**

4.13.1 The Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) takes into account the impact associated with the Proposed Development together with other projects and plans. The projects and plans selected as relevant to the CEA presented within this chapter are based upon the results of a screening exercise (see Volume 1, Appendix 5.3: CEA Screening Matrix). Each project has been considered on a case-by-case basis for screening in or out of this chapter's assessment based upon data confidence, effect-receptor pathways and the spatial/temporal scales involved.

4.13.2 The human health CEA methodology has followed the methodology set out in Volume 1, Chapter 5: EIA methodology of the ES. As part of the assessment, all projects and plans considered alongside the Proposed Development have been allocated into 'tiers' reflecting their current stage within the planning and development process.

- Tier 1
  - Under construction
  - Permitted application
  - Submitted application
  - Those currently operational that were not operational when baseline data were collected, and/or those that are operational but have an ongoing impact
- Tier 2
  - Scoping report has been submitted
- Tier 3
  - Scoping report has not been submitted
  - Identified in the relevant Development Plan
  - Identified in other plans and programmes.

4.13.3 This tiered approach is adopted to provide a clear assessment of the Proposed Development alongside other projects, plans and activities.

4.13.4 The CEA also considers the Proposed Development and the anticipated National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) substation (which will be implemented by NGET and thus, does not form part of the Proposed Development) together. This is because the NGET substation will be required for the connection of the Proposed Development to the national grid.

- 4.13.5 The specific projects, plans and activities scoped into the CEA, are outlined in **Table 4.24**. The locations of such projects, plans and activities are presented on Volume 4, Figure 4.2 of the ES.

**Table 4.24: List of cumulative developments considered within the CEA**

Project	Status	Distance from Proposed Development	Description	Temporal overlap with the Proposed Development	
				Construction Phase	Operation Phase
<b>Tier 1</b>					
Land To The South Of Clovelly Road Bideford Devon	Permitted	Partially within the Onshore Infrastructure Area  Partially within the Order Limits	Reserved matters application for details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale in respect of a proposal for 274 no. dwellings, associated infrastructure and open space pursuant outline planning permission 1/0039/2014/OUTM (Amended Plans)	Yes	Yes
Land At Webbery Barton And Cleave Farm Bideford Devon	Permitted	Partially within the Onshore Infrastructure Area  Partially within the Order Limits	Installation and operation of a Solar Farm together with all associated works, equipment and necessary infrastructure	Yes	Yes
Land At Grid Reference 247387 125654 Coates Road Bideford Business Park Bideford Devon	Permitted	0.05 km from Onshore Infrastructure Area  0.05 km from Order Limits	Extension of time of Planning Permission 1/1140/2008/FUL - Industrial letting units for B1 B2 and B8 uses - Plot 6, within the Bideford Business Park Development area.	Yes	Yes
Land South Of Clovelly Road Littleham Devon	Permitted	0.10 km from Onshore Infrastructure Area  0.10 km from Order Limits	Reserved matters application for details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale in respect of a proposal for 276 no. dwellings, associated infrastructure and open space pursuant outline planning permission	Yes	Yes
Land North Of Clovelly Road Bideford Devon	Pending	0.10 km from Onshore Infrastructure Area	Reserved matters application for details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale in respect of a proposal for 61 no. dwellings and associated works pursuant to	Yes	Yes

## XLINKS' MOROCCO-UK POWER PROJECT

Project	Status	Distance from Proposed Development	Description	Temporal overlap with the Proposed Development	
				Construction Phase	Operation Phase
		0.10 km from Order Limits	Outline Planning Permission LPA Ref; 1/1086/2017/OUTM.		
Land At Manteo Way Alverdiscott Road East The Water Devon	Permitted	0.20 km from Onshore Infrastructure Area  Adjacent to the Order Limits	300 dwellings with associated infrastructure and public open space (Variation of conditions 1 (the reserved matters), 11 (highways) and 18 (contamination). This proposal is situated within the Development Plan Allocation BID03.	Yes	Yes
Land Off Cornborough Road Westward Ho! Devon	Permitted	0.25 km from Onshore Infrastructure Area  0.25 km from Order Limits	Outline application for the erection of up to 400 dwellings, amenity open space, footpath links, associated landscaping and infrastructure works with all matters reserved except access (Affecting a Public Right of Way)	Yes	Yes
Land At Grid Reference 242647 125879 Clovelly Road Bideford Devon. Land At Grid Reference 242647 125879 Clovelly Road Bideford Devon	Permitted	0.25 km from Onshore Infrastructure Area  0.25 km from Order Limits	Application for approval of Reserved Matters pursuant to 1/0947/2020/OUTM (layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping) for 200 dwellings and associated infrastructure.	Yes	Yes
Travel Chapter House Gammaton Road Bideford Devon	Permitted	0.35 km from Onshore Infrastructure Area  0.35 km from Order Limits	Proposed new business hub incorporating a conference centre, new offices, a gym, nursery, associated car parking and landscaping	Yes	Yes
Land East And West Of Manteo Way Manteo Way East The Water Devon	Permitted	0.60 km from Onshore Infrastructure Area	Reserved matters application for appearance, access, landscaping, layout & scale pursuant to planning approval 1/0111/2016/OUTM for the erection of 26	Yes	Yes



## XLINKS' MOROCCO-UK POWER PROJECT

Project	Status	Distance from Proposed Development	Description	Temporal overlap with the Proposed Development	
				Construction Phase	Operation Phase
		0.20 km from Order Limits	residential dwellings, associated infrastructure and open space.		
Land At Caddsdwn Industrial Park Bideford Devon	Permitted	0.70 km from Onshore Infrastructure Area 0.70 km from Order Limits	Outline application for up to 211 dwellings - use classes B2, B8 and E(g), public open space and other associated infrastructure with all matters reserved except access	Yes	Yes
Land To The West Of Buckleigh Road Westward Ho! Devon	Permitted	0.70 km from Onshore Infrastructure Area 0.50 km from Order Limits	Erection of 117 dwellings and associated works including site access	Yes	Yes
Land Off Cornborough Road Cornborough Road Westward Ho! Devon	Under Construction	0.70 km from Onshore Infrastructure Area 0.70 km from Order Limits	Reserved Matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) application pursuant to 1/1084/2015/OUTM application for 145 dwellings, with associated public open space, play areas, landscaping and access from Cornborough Road following demolition of 2 existing dwellings.	Yes	Yes
Land North Of Abbotsham Road Abbotsham Bideford Devon EX39 3QP	Permitted	0.80 km from Onshore Infrastructure Area 0.40 km from Order Limits	Outline planning application for the erection of up to 290 dwellings, including affordable housing with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and two vehicular access points from Abbotsham Road. All matters reserved except access	Yes	Yes

## XLINKS' MOROCCO-UK POWER PROJECT

Project	Status	Distance from Proposed Development	Description	Temporal overlap with the Proposed Development	
				Construction Phase	Operation Phase
<b>Tier 3</b>					
Development Plan Allocation - BID04: Site South of East-the-Water	N/A	Partially within the Onshore Infrastructure Area  Partially within the Order Limits	A site of about 34 hectares south of East-the-Water, as defined on the Policies Map 2, is allocated to deliver a sustainable, high quality mixed use development that includes:  (a) approximately 600 dwellings, providing a mix of housing types and size to reflect local need, including affordable housing, of which approximately 430 are expected to be delivered in the plan period; (b) a 420 place primary school, including a nursery and a children's centre delivery base; (c) a hill top park; and (d) strategic planting along the site's southern and eastern boundaries.	Yes	Yes
Land at Adjavin Farm, south of Clovelly Road	N/A	Partially within the Onshore Infrastructure Area  Partially within the Order Limits	Land at Adjavin Farm, south of Clovelly Road, extending to 41 hectares and as defined on Policies Map 2, is allocated for residential and associated development, that includes:  (a) approximately 700 dwellings including affordable homes, with an emphasis on providing a mix of housing types and sizes that reflects local needs; (b) integrated social and community infrastructure, including a neighbourhood community centre; (c) on site provision of sport and recreation facilities, including sports pitches adjoining Clovelly Road/Atlantic Village; (d) a vehicular link forming part of a wider distributor link to the south of Clovelly Road connecting with the Caddsdow Industrial Park Extension, allocated by Policy BID05; and	Yes	Yes

## XLINKS' MOROCCO-UK POWER PROJECT

Project	Status	Distance from Proposed Development	Description	Temporal overlap with the Proposed Development	
				Construction Phase	Operation Phase
			(e) strategic planting along the site's southern boundary and western boundaries.		
Land at the Glebe, as shown on Policies Map 2	N/A	0.12 km from Onshore Infrastructure Area 0.12 km from Order Limits	Policy ABS01: Land at The Glebe Land at the Glebe, as shown on Policies Map 27, is allocated for residential development that includes: (a) approximately 23 dwellings, including affordable homes, with a focus on providing a mix of housing types and sizes to reflect local need.	Yes	Yes
Land At Grid Reference 246891 126041 Manteo Way East The Water Devon	Pending	0.15 km from Onshore Infrastructure Area 0.05 km from Order Limits	Erection of building for the provision of vehicle workshop, office & welfare and all ancillary facilities, access and cycle/pedestrian improvements	Yes	Yes
Land at Cleave Wood	N/A	0.15 km from Onshore Infrastructure Area Adjacent to the Order Limits	Land at Cleave Wood, extending to about 13 hectares and as defined on Policies Map 2, is allocated as a mixed use development that includes: (a) approximately 250 dwellings including affordable homes, with an emphasis on providing a mix of housing types and sizes that reflects local needs; (b) health care facilities, including related car parking on a site of about 0.6 hectares; and (c) a neighbourhood community centre, including a Children's Centre base and satellite youth facilities.	Yes	Yes

## Scope of Cumulative Effects Assessment

- 4.13.6 The cumulative effects presented and assessed in this section have been based on the Project Design Envelope set out in Volume 1, Chapter 5: Project Description of the ES as well as the information available on other projects and plans. The maximum design scenario as described for the Proposed Development (see **section 4.9**) has been assessed cumulatively with other projects/plans (see **Table 4.24**).
- 4.13.7 The CEA has considered the Proposed Development, alongside the NGET substation to be developed at the existing Alverdiscott Substation Site. The assessed design of NGET substation has been based upon a combination of reasonable worst case parameters, as detailed within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description of the ES. The development area for the NGET substation would comprise up to 3.8 ha of land. Within that area it is assumed that the substation itself will occupy a footprint of approximately 2.8 ha, with a maximum height of 15 m, excluding connecting tower structures.

## Cumulative Effects Assessment

- 4.13.8 A description of the significance of cumulative effects upon human health receptors arising from construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning is given below.

## Transport Modes, Access and Connections

### Tier 1 Projects

#### Construction and Decommissioning Phases

- 4.13.9 This section has been informed by Volume 2, Chapter 5: Traffic and Transport of the ES which sets out relevant cumulative assessment findings and mitigation measures that have been taken into account.
- 4.13.10 The following is noted in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Traffic and Transport, of the ES.
- The cumulative impact on driver delay at the Barnstaple Road/Manteo Way T-Junction is assessed to be minor adverse.
  - The cumulative impact on driver delay along A39 is assessed to be negligible adverse.
  - The cumulative impact on severance on Link 2, Link 4, Link 5, and Link 6 is assessed to be negligible adverse.
  - The cumulative impact on severance on Link 8 is assessed to be minor adverse.
  - The cumulative impact on non-motorised user delay on Link 2, Link 4, Link 5, and Link 6 is assessed to be negligible adverse.
  - The cumulative impact on non-motorised user delay on Link 8 is assessed to be minor adverse.
  - The cumulative impact on non-motorised user amenity and fear and intimidation on Link 2, Link 5 and Link 8 is assessed to be minor adverse.

- The cumulative impact on non-motorised user amenity and fear and intimidation on Link 4 and Link 6 is assessed to be negligible adverse.
- The cumulative impact on road safety for the sections of the A39 including the junction with the B3233 and Heywood Roundabout are assessed to be negligible adverse.
- The cumulative impact on road safety for Manteo Way is assessed to be minor adverse.

4.13.11 On this basis, the population groups, sensitivity, magnitude and significance conclusions relevant to the cumulative health assessment are not new or materially different to those listed for the Proposed Development in **section 4.10** (Transport modes, access and connections).

## Open Space, Leisure and Play

### Tier 1 Projects

#### Construction and Decommissioning Phases

- 4.13.12 This section has been informed by Volume 2, Chapter 8: Land Use and Recreation, of the ES, which sets out relevant cumulative assessment findings and mitigation measures that have been taken into account.
- 4.13.13 As stated in Volume 2, Chapter 8: Land Use and Recreation, of the ES:
- based on the location of the cumulative schemes and the implementation of the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan provided as part of the DCO application (document reference 7.11), it is assessed that there would be no temporary cumulative effects arising between the cumulative schemes and the Proposed Development.
- 4.13.14 On this basis, the population groups, sensitivity, magnitude and significance conclusions relevant to the cumulative health assessment are not new or materially different to those listed for the Proposed Development assessment in **section 4.10**.

## Housing

### Tier 1 Projects

#### Construction and Decommissioning Phases

- 4.13.15 This section has been informed Volume 4, Chapter 3: Socio-economics and Tourism, of the ES, which sets out relevant cumulative assessment findings and mitigation measures that have been taken into account.
- 4.13.16 For the purposes of this assessment, cumulative infrastructure developments within the CEA Longlist have been identified. These include other infrastructure projects as well as the following housing schemes.
- Dwellings At Land To The South Of Clovelly Road Bideford Devon.
  - Dwellings At Land South Of Clovelly Road Littleham Devon.
  - Dwellings At Land North Of Clovelly Road Bideford Devon.

- Dwellings At Land Off Cornborough Road Westward Ho! Devon.
- Dwellings At Land At Manteo Way Alverdiscott Road East The Water Devon.
- Dwellings At Land At Grid Reference 242647 125879 Clovelly Road Bideford Devon.
- Dwellings At Land At Caddsdwn Industrial Park Bideford Devon.
- Dwellings At Land To The West Of Buckleigh Road Westward Ho! Devon.
- Dwellings At Land Off Cornborough Road Cornborough Road Westward Ho! Devon.
- Dwellings At Land North Of Abbotsham Road Abbotsham Bideford Devon.
- Dwellings At Daddon Hill Northam Devon.
- Dwellings At Land North Of Clovelly Road Abbotsham Devon.
- Dwellings At Brunswick Wharf Barnstaple Street Bideford Devon.
- Dwellings At Land At Honestone Street Bideford Devon.
- Dwellings At Land Between Tadworthy Road And Golf Links Road Westward Ho! Northam Devon.
- Dwellings At Land At Grid Reference 249644 119976 Torrington Devon.
- Dwellings At Land At Grid Reference 249583 119849 (Former Meat Factory Site) Torrington Devon.
- Dwellings At Land South of A39 Brynsworthy Barnstaple Devon.
- Dwellings At Land At Burwood Lane Torrington Devon.
- Dwellings At Former Yelland Power Station Lower Yelland Barnstaple Devon.

4.13.17 As stated in Volume 4, Chapter 3: Socio-economics and Tourism, of the ES, there is a potential for an influx of transient workers during construction of the cumulative developments, leading to potential impacts on temporary accommodation. However, it is concluded that this is unlikely to lead to any additional impacts on community and social assets during construction.

4.13.18 On this basis, the population groups, sensitivity, magnitude and significance conclusions relevant to the cumulative health assessment are not new or materially different to those listed for the Proposed Development assessment in **section 4.10**.

## Air Quality

### Tier 1 Projects

#### Construction and Decommissioning Phases

4.13.19 This section has been informed by Volume 2, Chapter 7: Air Quality, of the ES, which sets out relevant cumulative assessment findings and mitigation measures that have been taken into account.

4.13.20 It is noted that the combined effect is driven by the interaction of the Proposed Development with other projects which contribute to the reduction in air quality.

- 4.13.21 Volume 2, Chapter 7: Air Quality, of the ES, concludes there should be no residual cumulative air quality effect during construction and decommissioning, assuming that all developments implement suitable primary and tertiary mitigation, as recommended in the Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction (IAQM, 2014).
- 4.13.22 The population groups, sensitivity, magnitude and significance conclusions relevant to the cumulative health assessment are not new or materially different to those listed for the Proposed Development assessment in **section 4.10**.

### Water Quality

#### Tier 1 Projects

##### Construction and Decommissioning Phases

- 4.13.23 This section has been informed by Volume 2, Chapter 3: Hydrology and Flood Risk, of the ES which sets out relevant cumulative assessment findings and mitigation measures that have been taken into account.
- 4.13.24 Volume 2, Chapter 3: Hydrology and Flood Risk, of the ES, concludes the following.
- The impact of contaminated runoff on the quality of surface water and ground receptors is deemed to be minor adverse.
  - The impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is assessed to be minor adverse.
  - No effect would arise increased flood risk arising from damage to existing flood defences.
  - The impact of damage to existing field damage is assessed to be minor adverse.
  - The impact of damage to existing water supply and drainage infrastructure is assessed to be minor adverse.
- 4.13.25 The population groups, sensitivity, magnitude and significance conclusions relevant to the cumulative health assessment are not new or materially different to those listed for the Proposed Development assessment in **section 4.10**.

### Land Quality

#### Tier 1 Projects

##### Construction and Decommissioning Phases

- 4.13.26 This section has been informed by Volume 2, Chapter 4: Geology, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions of the which sets out relevant cumulative assessment findings and mitigation measures that have been taken into account.
- 4.13.27 Volume 2, Chapter 4: Geology, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions of the ES concludes the following.



- Any dewatering is not expected to have a direct impact on groundwater quality in the shallow aquifer except through accidental spillages which will likely be mitigated through the On-CEMP. The cumulative impact is minor adverse to negligible.
  - The cumulative impact of temporary discharge of surface water runoff to ground during construction on recharge to the shallow Secondary A aquifer, which could result in localised increase in recharge and groundwater levels, is minor adverse.
- 4.13.28 An Outline Soil Management Plan forms Appendix D of the Outline Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (On-CEMP) (document reference 7.7, Appendix D) and has been prepared as part of the application for development consent..
- 4.13.29 Based on the location of the cumulative schemes and the implementation of the Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference 7.7.4), it is assessed that there would be no temporary cumulative effects arising between these cumulative schemes and the Proposed Development.
- 4.13.30 On this basis, the population groups, sensitivity, magnitude and significance conclusions relevant to the cumulative health assessment are not new or materially different to those listed for the Proposed Development assessment in **section 4.10**.

## Noise and Vibration

### Tier 1 Projects

#### Construction, Operations and Maintenance, and Decommissioning Phases

- 4.13.31 This section has been informed by Volume 2, Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, of the ES, which sets out relevant cumulative assessment findings and mitigation measures that have been taken into account. It is noted that the Alverdiscott Substation Connection Development (Alverdiscott) is likely to be constructed at the same time as, and operate in conjunction with the Proposed Development. It has therefore been assessment cumulatively with the Proposed Development. Volume 2, Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, of the ES, concludes the following.
- The cumulative effects during construction are considered to be of minor adverse.
  - During operation, the cumulative noise level predicted at relevant receptors is primarily influenced by the operation of the Converter Site which is proposed to be controlled to comply with an operational noise limit as a requirement of the DCO. Therefore, cumulative noise effects are considered to be minor adverse.
- 4.13.32 The population groups relevant to the cumulative health assessment are the same as those listed for the Proposed Development in **section 4.10** and **section 4.11**.
- 4.13.33 The cumulative effect for population health is predicted to be similar to the individual effect described in **section 4.10** and **section 4.11**.

## Health and Social Care Services

### Tier 1 Projects

#### Construction and Decommissioning Phases

- 4.13.34 This section has been informed by the healthcare capacity analysis undertaken in **section 4.10**; and Volume 4, Chapter 3: Socio-economics and Tourism of the ES, which sets out relevant cumulative assessment findings and mitigation measures that have been taken into account.
- 4.13.35 The cumulative residential developments identified in paragraph **4.13.16** above (Housing determinant) are also relevant for this section.
- 4.13.36 It is assumed that these developments will have appropriate healthcare contributions to address changes in demand to local health and social care services.
- 4.13.37 Volume 4, Chapter 3: Socio-economics and Tourism, of the ES concludes that cumulative developments are unlikely to lead to any additional impacts on community and social assets during construction.
- 4.13.38 The population groups relevant to the cumulative health assessment are the same as those listed for the Proposed Development in **section 4.10**.
- 4.13.39 The cumulative effect for population health is predicted to be similar to the individual effect described in **section 4.10**.

## Public Understanding of Risk (Converter Stations)

### Tier 1 Projects

#### Operations and Maintenance Phases

- 4.13.40 For the purposes of this assessment, cumulative electrical infrastructure developments within the CEA Longlist have been identified including the following.
- Alverdiscott Substation Connection Development
  - White Cross Offshore Windfarm (Onshore Project);
  - Solar Farm At Webbery Barton And Cleave Farm Bideford Devon; and
  - Solar Farm At Litchardon Cross Newton Tracey.
- 4.13.41 It is also noted that the Alverdiscott Substation Connection Development is a Tier 3 development. The expectation is that it would be built in compliance with public health EMF exposure standards as set out in the Voluntary Code of Practice (Department for Energy Security & Net Zero, 2012) including compliance with the ICNIRP public exposure guidelines (ICNIRP, 1998, 2010). As such, no potential for a significant cumulative EMF population health risk is expected.
- 4.13.42 The remaining identified projects are not anticipated to include their own substations. On this basis, cumulative effects in terms of actual risks or public understanding of risk from visual or auditory stimuli, are not expected.

## Wider Societal Infrastructure and Resources

### Tier 1 Projects

#### Operations and Maintenance Phases

- 4.13.1 In combination with other projects assessed cumulatively, the Proposed Development will provide enhanced energy security. The national context of such energy security has been considered and the individual effects are not expected to be collectively greater. Sensitivity of the population remains unchanged as does the overall magnitude. On this basis the cumulative effect would remain **moderate beneficial**, which is significant in EIA terms.

## 4.14 Transboundary Effects

- 4.14.1 A screening of transboundary impacts has been carried out and has identified that there was no potential for significant transboundary effects with regard to human health from the Proposed Development upon the interests of other states.

## 4.15 Inter-related Effects

- 4.15.1 Inter-relationships are the impacts and associated effects of different aspects of the Proposed Development on the same receptor. These are as follows.
- Project lifetime effects: Assessment of the scope for effects that occur throughout more than one phase of the Proposed Development (construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning), to interact to potentially create a more significant effect on a receptor than if just assessed in isolation in these three phases.
  - Receptor led effects: Assessment of the scope for all relevant effects (including inter-relationships between environmental topics) to interact, spatially and temporally, to create inter-related effects on a receptor.
- 4.15.2 A description of the likely interactive effects arising from the Proposed Development on human health is provided in Volume 4, Chapter 5: Inter-related effects of the ES.

## 4.16 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Monitoring

- 4.16.1 Information on human health within the study area was collected through a review of relevant public health evidence sources, including scientific literature, baseline data, health policy, local health priorities and health protection standards with reference to corresponding chapters as set out in
- 4.16.2 **Table 4.25** presents a summary of the impacts, measures adopted as part of the Proposed Development and residual effects in respect to human health. The impacts assessed include:
- transport modes, access and connections;

- open space, leisure and play;
- housing;
- employment and income (offshore);
- air quality;
- water quality;
- land quality;
- noise and vibration;
- health and social care services;
- public understanding of risk; and
- wider societal infrastructure and resources.

4.16.3 Overall, it is concluded that there will be no significant adverse population health effects arising from the Proposed Development during the construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning phases. A significant beneficial public health effect in relation to energy security is noted.

4.16.4 **Table 4.26** presents a summary of the potential cumulative impacts, mitigation measures and residual effects. The cumulative impacts assessed include:

- transport modes, access and connections;
- open space, leisure and play;
- housing;
- employment and income (offshore);
- air quality;
- water quality;
- land quality;
- noise and vibration;
- health and social care services;
- Public understanding of risk (converter stations); and
- wider societal infrastructure and resources.

4.16.5 Overall, it is concluded that there will be no significant adverse population health cumulative effects from the Proposed Development alongside other projects/plans. The significant beneficial public health effect in relation to energy security remains.

4.16.6 No potential transboundary impacts have been identified in regard to effects of the Proposed Development on human health of populations in other states.

**Table 4.25: Summary of potential environmental effects, mitigation and monitoring.**

<sup>a</sup> C=construction, O=operational and maintenance, D=decommissioning

Description of impact	Phase <sup>a</sup>			Embedded Mitigation	Sensitivity of the receptor	Magnitude of impact	Significance of effect	Further mitigation	Residual effect	Proposed monitoring
	C	O	D							
Transport modes, access and connectivity	✓	*	✓	ONS05 (see <b>Table 4.22</b> ).	C: high D: high	C: low D: low	Minor adverse (not significant)	ONS29 (see <b>Table 4.22</b> ).	Unchanged for active travel and road safety.  Negligible adverse (not significant) for health related travel times.	None proposed.
Open space, leisure and play	✓	*	✓	ONS09 (see <b>Table 4.22</b> ).	C: high D: high	C: low D: low	Minor adverse (not significant)	No further mitigation	Unchanged	None proposed
Housing	✓	*	✓	None	C: high D: high	C: low D: low	Minor adverse (not significant)	No further mitigation	Unchanged	None proposed
Employment and income (Offshore)	✓	*	*	None	C: high D: high	C: low D: low	Negligible to Minor adverse (not significant)	No further mitigation	Unchanged	None proposed
Air quality	✓	*	✓	ONS32 and ONS06 (see <b>Table 4.22</b> ).	C: high D: high	C: low D: low	Negligible to Minor adverse (not significant)	No further mitigation	Unchanged	None proposed
Water quality	✓	*	✓	None	C: high D: high	C: low D: low	Negligible to Minor adverse (not significant)	No further mitigation	Unchanged	None proposed
Land quality	✓	*	✓	ONS11 (see <b>Table 4.22</b> ).	C: high D: high	C: low D: low	Negligible to Minor adverse (not significant)	No further mitigation	Unchanged	None proposed
Noise and vibration	✓	✓	✓	None	C: high O: high	C: low O: low	C&D: Minor adverse (not significant)	No further mitigation	Unchanged	None proposed

## XLINKS' MOROCCO-UK POWER PROJECT

Description of impact	Phase <sup>a</sup>			Embedded Mitigation	Sensitivity of the receptor	Magnitude of impact	Significance of effect	Further mitigation	Residual effect	Proposed monitoring
	C	O	D							
					D: high	D: low	O: Negligible to Minor adverse (not significant)			
Health and social care services	✓	*	✓	None	C: high D: high	C: low D: low	Minor adverse (not significant)	No further mitigation	Minor adverse (not significant)	None proposed
Public understanding of risk (converter stations)	*	✓	*	ONS31 (see <b>Table 4.22</b> ).	O: high	O: low	Minor adverse (not significant)	ONS93 (see <b>Table 4.22</b> )	Negligible (not significant)	None proposed
Wider societal infrastructure and resources	*	✓	*	None	O: high	O: medium	Moderate beneficial (significant)	No further mitigation	Unchanged	None proposed

**Table 4.26: Summary of potential cumulative environmental effects**

<sup>a</sup> C=construction, O=operational and maintenance, D=decommissioning

Description of effects	Phase <sup>a</sup>			Sensitivity of the receptor	Magnitude of impact	Significance of effect	Further mitigation	Residual effect	Proposed monitoring
	C	O	D						
<b>Tier 1 &amp; 2</b>									
Transport modes, access and connectivity	✓	×	✓	No change	No change	No change	No further mitigation	No change	None proposed
Open space, leisure and play	✓	×	✓	No change	No change	No change	No further mitigation	No change	None proposed
Housing	✓	×	✓	No change	No change	No change	No further mitigation	No change	None proposed
Employment and income (Offshore)	✓	×	×	No change	No change	No change	No further mitigation	No change	None proposed
Air quality	✓	×	✓	No change	No change	No change	No further mitigation	No change	None proposed
Water quality	✓	×	✓	No change	No change	No change	No further mitigation	No change	None proposed
Land quality	✓	×	✓	No change	No change	No change	No further mitigation	No change	None proposed
Noise and vibration	✓	✓	✓	No change	No change	No change	No further mitigation	No change	None proposed
Health and social care services	✓	×	✓	No change	No change	No change	No further mitigation	No change	None proposed
Public understanding of risk (converter stations)	×	✓	×	No change	No change	No change	No further mitigation	No change	None proposed
Wider societal infrastructure and resources	×	✓	×	No change	No change	No change	No further mitigation	No change	None proposed



## 4.17 References

- Andrade, L., O'Dwyer, J., O'Neill, E., & Hynds, P. (2018). Surface water flooding, groundwater contamination, and enteric disease in developed countries: A scoping review of connections and consequences. *Environ. Pollut.*, 236, 540–549. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2018.01.104>
- Basner, M., & McGuire, S. (2018). WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region: A Systematic Review on Environmental Noise and Effects on Sleep. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(3), 519. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15030519>
- Berglund, B., Lindval, T., Schwela, D. H., & Organization, W. H. (1999). *Guidelines for community noise*. WHO Occupational and Environmental Health Team.
- Brink, M., Wirth, K. E., Schierz, C., Thomann, G., & Bauer, G. (2008). Annoyance responses to stable and changing aircraft noise exposure. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 124(5), 2930–2941. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.2977680>
- Calogiuri, G., & Chroni, S. (2014). The impact of the natural environment on the promotion of active living: An integrative systematic review. *BMC Public Health*, 14, 873. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-14-873>
- Cave, B., Claßen, T., Fischer-Bonde, B., Humboldt-Dachroeden, S., Martin-Olmedo, P., Mekel, O., Pyper, R., Silva, F., Viliani, F., & Xiao, Y. (2020). *Human health: Ensuring a high level of protection A reference paper on addressing Human Health in Environmental Impact Assessment As per EU Directive 2011/92/EU amended by 2014/52/EU*.
- Cave, B., Pyper, R., Fischer-Bonde, B., Humboldt-Dachroeden, S., & Martin-Olmedo, P. (2021). Lessons from an International Initiative to Set and Share Good Practice on Human Health in Environmental Impact Assessment. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 18(4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18041392>
- Cesaroni, G., Forastiere, F., Stafoggia, M., Andersen, Z. J., Badaloni, C., Beelen, R., Caracciolo, B., de Faire, U., Erbel, R., Eriksen, K. T., Fratiglioni, L., Galassi, C., Hampel, R., Heier, M., Hennig, F., Hilding, A., Hoffmann, B., Houthuijs, D., Jöckel, K.-H., ... Peters, A. (2014). Long term exposure to ambient air pollution and incidence of acute coronary events: Prospective cohort study and meta-analysis in 11 European cohorts from the ESCAPE Project. *BMJ*, 348, f7412. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.f7412>
- Chief Medical Officer. (2021). *Chief Medical Officer's Annual Report 2021 Health in Coastal Communities*.
- Clark, C., Crumpler, C., & Notley, H. (2020). Evidence for Environmental Noise Effects on Health for the United Kingdom Policy Context: A Systematic Review of the Effects of Environmental Noise on Mental Health, Wellbeing, Quality of Life, Cancer, Dementia, Birth, Reproductive Outcomes, and Cognition. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17020393>
- Cook, J. T., Frank, D. A., Casey, P. H., Rose-Jacobs, R., Black, M. M., Chilton, M., Ettinger de Cuba, S., Appugliese, D., Coleman, S., Heeren, T., Berkowitz, C., & Cutts, D. B. (2008). A brief indicator of household energy security: Associations with food security, child health, and child development in US infants and toddlers. *Pediatrics*, 122(4), e867-75. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2008-0286>
- DEFRA. (2023). *Environmental Improvement Plan 2023*. [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1168372/environmental-improvement-plan-2023.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1168372/environmental-improvement-plan-2023.pdf)
- Department for Energy Security and Net Zero. (2012, March). *Power Lines: Demonstrating compliance with EMF public exposure guidelines A voluntary Code of Practice*. [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/48308/1256-code-practice-emf-public-exp-guidelines.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/48308/1256-code-practice-emf-public-exp-guidelines.pdf)
- Department for Energy Security and Net Zero. (2023a). *a. Overarching National Policy Statement for energy (EN-1)*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/overarching-national-policy-statement-for-energy-en-1>

Department for Energy Security and Net Zero. (2023b). *c. National Policy Statement for electricity networks infrastructure (EN-5)*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statement-for-electricity-networks-infrastructure-en-5>

Department for Energy Security and Net Zero. (2023c). *c. National Policy Statement for renewable energy infrastructure (EN-3)*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statement-for-renewable-energy-infrastructure-en-3#full-publication-update-history>

Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs. (2011). *UK Marine Policy Statement*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-marine-policy-statement>

Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities. (2023). *National Planning Policy Framework*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government. (2023). *Planning practice guidance*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>

Department of Health and Social Care. (2023). *Chief Medical Officer's annual report 2023: Health in an ageing society*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/chief-medical-officers-annual-report-2023-health-in-an-ageing-society>

Devon County Council. (2017). *Devon's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for Children and Young People with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) 2017*. <https://devoncc.sharepoint.com/sites/PublicDocs/PublicHealth/Wellbeing/Needs%20Assessments/Joint%20Strategic%20Needs%20Assessment%20for%20CYP%20with%20SEND%20Final.pdf?ga=1>

Devon County Council. (2020). *Health and Happy Communities—Devon's Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2020-25*. <https://devoncc.sharepoint.com/sites/PublicDocs/PublicHealth/Wellbeing/Forms/AllItems.aspx?id=%2Fsites%2FPublicDocs%2FPublicHealth%2FWellbeing%2FStrategies%2FHealthy%20and%20Happy%20Communities%2C%20Devons%20Joint%20Health%20and%20Wellbeing%20Strategy%202020%2D25%2C%20Final%20Version%2Epdf&parent=%2Fsites%2FPublicDocs%2FPublicHealth%2FWellbeing%2FStrategies&p=true&ga=1>

Devon County Council. (2023). *Joint Strategic Needs Assessment*. <https://www.devonhealthandwellbeing.org.uk/jsna/>

Efstratiou, M. (2001). Managing Coastal Bathing Water Quality: The Contribution of Microbiology and Epidemiology. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 42, 425–432. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-326X\(00\)00225-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-326X(00)00225-3)

Eregno, F. E., Tryland, I., Tjomslund, T., Myrmel, M., Robertson, L., & Heistad, A. (2016). Quantitative microbial risk assessment combined with hydrodynamic modelling to estimate the public health risk associated with bathing after rainfall events. *Science of The Total Environment*, 548–549, 270–279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.01.034>

Fenech, B., Lavia, L., Rodgers, G., & Notley, H. (2021). *Development of a new ISO Technical Specification on non-acoustic factors to improve the interpretation of socio-acoustic surveys*.

Gajšek, P., Ravazzani, P., Grellier, J., Samaras, T., Bakos, J., & Thuróczy, G. (2016). Review of Studies Concerning Electromagnetic Field (EMF) Exposure Assessment in Europe: Low Frequency Fields (50 Hz-100 kHz). *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 13(9). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph13090875>

Guski, R. (1999). Personal and social variables as co-determinants of noise annoyance. *Noise & Health*, 1(3), 45–56.

Guski, R., Schreckenberg, D., & Schuemer, R. (2017). WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region: A Systematic Review on Environmental Noise and Annoyance. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 14(12). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph14121539>

- Health and Social Care Act 2012 (2012). <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2012/7/contents/enacted>
- Hernández, D. (2016). Understanding 'energy insecurity' and why it matters to health. *Social Science & Medicine*, 167, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.08.029>
- HM Government. (1974a). *Control of Pollution Act*.
- HM Government. (1974b). *Health and Safety at Work Act 1974*. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1974/37/contents>
- HM Government. (1990). *Environmental Protection Act 1990*. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/43/contents>
- HM Government. (1995). *Environment Act 1995*.
- HM Government. (2016). *The Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010 (amended in 2016)*. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2016/1184/made>
- HM Government. (2017). *The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017*. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2017/572/contents/made>
- HM Government. (2021). *The Environment Act*.
- HM Government. (2022). *Health and Care Act 2022*. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2022/31/contents/enacted>
- HUDU. (2019). *HUDU Planning Contribution Model Guidance Notes*. <https://www.healthyrurbandevelopment.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/GuidanceNotes-2009.pdf>
- IAQM. (2014). *Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction*.
- ICNIRP. (1998). *ICNIRP Guidelines For Limiting Exposure To Time-Varying Electric, Magnetic And Electromagnetic Fields (Up To 300 Ghz)*. International Commission. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>
- ICNIRP. (2010). *ICNIRP Guidelines For Limiting Exposure To Time-Varying Electric, Magnetic And Electromagnetic Fields ( 1-100 kHz)*. International Commission. <https://icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPLFgdl.pdf>
- IEMA. (2016, July). *Environmental Impact Assessment Guide to: Delivering Quality Development*.
- Ige, J., Pilkington, P., Orme, J., Williams, B., Prestwood, E., Black, D., Carmichael, L., & Scally, G. (2019). The relationship between buildings and health: A systematic review. *Journal of Public Health*, 41(2), e121–e132. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdy138>
- Iñiguez-Armijos, C., Sánchez, J., Villareal, M., Aguilar, S., & Rosado, D. (2020). Effects of bathing intensity, rainfall events, and location on the recreational water quality of stream pools in southern Ecuador. *Chemosphere*, 243, 125442. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2019.125442>
- Institute of Public Health. (2021). *Health Impact Assessment Guidance: A Manual and Technical Guidance. Standalone Health Impact Assessment and health in environmental assessment*. <https://publichealth.ie/hia/guidance.pdf>
- Kindig, D., & Stoddart, G. (2003). What Is Population Health? *Am. J. Public Health*, 93(3), 380–383.
- Koreivienė, J., Anne, O., Kasperovičienė, J., & Burškytė, V. (2014). Cyanotoxin management and human health risk mitigation in recreational waters. *Environ. Monit. Assess.*, 186(7), 4443–4459. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-014-3710-0>
- MacLachlan, M., Young Cho, H., Clarke, M., Mannan, H., Kayabu, B., & Ludolph, R. (2018). *Web Annex F. Report of the systematic review on potential benefits of accessible home environments for people with functional impairments. In: WHO Housing and health guidelines*. World Health Organization. <https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/275844/WHO-CED-PHE-18.07-eng.pdf>

- Marine Management Organisation. (2021). *South West Inshore and South West Offshore Marine Plan*. [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1004494/FINAL\\_South\\_West\\_Marine\\_Plan\\_\\_1\\_.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1004494/FINAL_South_West_Marine_Plan__1_.pdf)
- Meo, S., & Suraya, F. (2015). Effect of environmental air pollution on cardiovascular diseases. *Eur. Rev. Med. Pharmacol. Sci.*, *19*, 4890–4897.
- Münzel, T., Herzog, J., Schmidt, F. P., & Sørensen, M. (2017). Environmental stressors and cardiovascular disease: The evidence is growing. *Eur Heart J*, *38*(29), 2297–2299. PubMed. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehx306>
- Münzel, T., Schmidt, F. P., Steven, S., Herzog, J., Daiber, A., & Sørensen, M. (2018). Environmental Noise and the Cardiovascular System. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, *71*(6), 688–697. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2017.12.015>
- Münzel, T., Sørensen, M., Schmidt, F., Schmidt, E., Steven, S., Kröller-Schön, S., & Daiber, A. (2018). The Adverse Effects of Environmental Noise Exposure on Oxidative Stress and Cardiovascular Risk. *Antioxid. Redox Signal.*, *28*(9), 873–908. <https://doi.org/10.1089/ars.2017.7118>
- NHS Devon and One Devon. (2023). *One Devon Partnership Integrated Care Strateg*. <https://devon-ics.gsmicrosites.net/wp-content/uploads/sites/151/2023/07/Devon-Plan-ICS-Strategy-FINAL-300623-1.pdf>
- NHS Digital. (2024). *NHS Digital General Practice Workforce*. <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/general-and-personal-medical-services>
- Norström, F., Virtanen, P., Hammarström, A., Gustafsson, P. E., & Janlert, U. (2014). How does unemployment affect self-assessed health? A systematic review focusing on subgroup effects. *BMC Public Health*, *14*(1), 1310. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-14-1310>
- Notley, H. (2014). *National Noise Attitude Survey 2012 NNAS2012) Summary Report*. <https://vdocuments.mx/summary-report-gov-summary-report-december-2014-this-report-was-authored.html?page=1>
- Office for Environmental Protection. (2022). *Our Strategy and Enforcement Policy*. [https://www.theoep.org.uk/sites/default/files/reports-files/E02754649%20OEP%20Our%20strategy\\_WEB.pdf](https://www.theoep.org.uk/sites/default/files/reports-files/E02754649%20OEP%20Our%20strategy_WEB.pdf)
- Office for National Statistics. (2021). *Population projections*. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationprojections>
- Park, S., Szonyi, B., Gautam, R., Nightingale, K., Anciso, J., & Ivanek, R. (2012). Risk Factors for Microbial Contamination in Fruits and Vegetables at the Preharvest Level: A Systematic Review. *J. Food Prot.*, *75*(11), 2055–2081. <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-12-160>
- Public Health England. (2020). *Health Impact Assessment in spatial planning*.
- Public Health England. (2021). *Advice on the content of Environmental Statements accompanying an application under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Planning Regime*.
- Pyper, R., Lamming, M., Beard, C., Buroni, A., Douglas, M., Turton, P., Hardy, K., Netherton, A., McClenaghan, R., Barratt, T., Bhatt, A., Cave, B., & Gibson, G. (2022). *IEMA Guide: Effective Scoping of Human Health in Environmental Impact Assessment. England*: Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment.
- Pyper, R., Waples, H., Barratt, T., Hardy, K., Turton, P., Netherton, A., McDonald, J., Buroni, A., & Bhatt, A. (2022). *IEMA Guide: Determining Significance for Human Health in Environmental Impact Assessment*. Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment.
- Rojas-Rueda, D., Morales-Zamora, E., Alsufyani, W. A., AlBalawi, S. M., Alsukait, R., & Alomran, M. (2021). Environmental Risk Factors and Health: An Umbrella Review of Meta-Analyses. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, *18*(2), 704. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18020704>
- Santos, R., Gravelle, H., & Propper, C. (2017). Does Quality Affect Patients' Choice of Doctor? Evidence from England. *Econ. J.*, *127*(600), 445–494. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eoj.12282>



Shannon, H., Allen, C., Clarke, M., Dávila, D., Fletcher-Wood, L., & Gupta, S. (2018). *Web Annex A. Report of the systematic review on the effect of household crowding on health*. In: *WHO Housing and health guidelines*. World Health Organization.

Syed, S., Gerber, B., & Sharp, L. (2013). Traveling towards disease: Transportation barriers to health care access. *J. Community Health, 38*(5), 976–993.

Thomson, H., Jepson, R., Hurley, F., & Douglas, M. (2008). Assessing the unintended health impacts of road transport policies and interventions: Translating research evidence for use in policy and practice. *BMC Public Health, 8*(1), 339. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-8-339>

UK Civil Aviation Authority. (2021). *Survey of Noise Attitudes 2014: Aircraft Noise and Annoyance, Second Edition CAP 1506*. <https://publicapps.caa.co.uk/docs/33/CAP1506%20Second%20Edition.pdf>

UKHSA. (2023a). *Health Effects of Climate Change (HECC) in the UK: 2023 report Chapter 2. Temperature effects on mortality in a changing climate*.

<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/659ff712e96df5000df844bf/HECC-report-2023-chapter-2-temperature.pdf>

UKHSA. (2023b). *Health Effects of Climate Change (HECC) in the UK: 2023 report Chapter 3. Climate change, flooding, coastal change and public health*.

<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/657086ad746930000d488919/HECC-report-2023-chapter-3-flooding.pdf>

UKHSA. (2023c). *Health Effects of Climate Change (HECC) in the UK: 2023 report Chapter 4. Impacts of climate change and policy on air pollution and human health*.

<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6570a68b7469300012488948/HECC-report-2023-chapter-4-outdoor-air-quality.pdf>

UKHSA. (2023d). *Health Effects of Climate Change (HECC) in the UK: 2023 report Chapter 7. Effect of climate change on infectious diseases in the UK*.

UKHSA. (2023e). *Health Effects of Climate Change (HECC) in the UK: 2023 report Chapter 9. Climate change and food supply*.

van der Noordt, M., IJzelenberg, H., Droomers, M., & Proper, K. I. (2014). Health effects of employment: A systematic review of prospective studies. *Occup. Environ. Med., 71*(10), 730–736.

<https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2013-101891>

Van Kempen, E., Casas, M., Pershagen, G., & Foraster, M. (2018). WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region: A Systematic Review on Environmental Noise and Cardiovascular and Metabolic Effects: A Summary. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 15*(2).

<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15020379>

WHO. (2009). *Night Noise Guidelines for Europe*.

<https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/326486/9789289041737-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

WHO. (2013). Review of evidence on health aspects of air pollution – REVIHAAP Project Technical Report. *World Health Organization*. <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/341712/WHO-EURO-2013-4101-43860-61757-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

WHO. (2022). Mental health: Strengthening our response. *Retrieved September, 2022*.

<https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/mental-health-strengthening-our-response>

Winters, M., Buehler, R., & Götschi, T. (2017). Policies to Promote Active Travel: Evidence from Reviews of the Literature. *Curr Environ Health Rep, 4*(3), 278–285. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40572-017-0148-x>

World Health Organization. (1948). *The Preamble of the Constitution of the World Health Organization*. Bulletin of the World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2021). *WHO global air quality guidelines: Particulate matter (PM2.5 and PM10), ozone, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide and carbon monoxide*. World Health Organization. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/345329>

Xlinks 1 Limited. (2024). *Scoping Report submitted to the Secretary of State on 29 January 2024*. <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010164/EN010164-000011-EN010164%20-%20Scoping%20Report.pdf>

Xu, H., Wen, L. M., & Rissel, C. (2013). The Relationships Between Active Transport to Work or School and Cardiovascular Health or Body Weight: A Systematic Review. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Health*, 25(4), 298–315. JSTOR. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26724093>

Yang, B.-Y., Zhao, T., Hu, L.-X., Browning, M. H. E. M., Heinrich, J., Dharmage, S. C., Jalaludin, B., Knibbs, L. D., Liu, X.-X., Luo, Y.-N., James, P., Li, S., Huang, W.-Z., Chen, G., Zeng, X.-W., Hu, L.-W., Yu, Y., & Dong, G.-H. (2021). Greenspace and human health: An umbrella review. *Innovation (Camb)*, 2(4), 100164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xinn.2021.100164>