



AQUIND Limited

AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR

Environmental Statement – Volume 3 – Appendix 15.1 Consultation Responses

The Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations
2009 – Regulation 5(2)(a)

The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017

Document Ref: 6.3.15.1

PINS Ref.: EN020022

AQUIND Limited

AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR

Environmental Statement – Volume 3 –
Appendix 15.1 Consultation Responses

PINS REF.: EN020022

DOCUMENT: 6.3.15.1

DATE: 14 NOVEMBER 2019

WSP

WSP House

70 Chancery Lane

London

WC2A 1AF

+44 20 7314 5000

www.wsp.com

DOCUMENT

Document	6.2.15.1 Environmental Statement – Volume 3 – Appendix 15.1 Consultation Responses
Revision	001
Document Owner	WSP UK Limited
Prepared By	M. Boden
Date	9 October 2019
Approved By	A. Follis
Date	31 October 2019

CONTENTS

APPENDIX 15.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES		1
1.1.	SCOPING RESPONSES	1
1.2.	INFORMAL CONSULTATION PRIOR TO PEIR RESPONSES	6
1.3.	PEIR CONSULTATION	11
1.4.	POST-PEIR CONSULTATION	21

TABLES

Table 1 - Scoping Opinion Responses	1
Table 2 - Informal Consultation Prior To PEIR Responses	6
Table 3 - PEIR Consultation	11
Table 4 - Post-PEIR Consultation	21

APPENDIX 15.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

1.1. SCOPING RESPONSES

Table 1 - Scoping Opinion Responses

Scoping Opinion Ref	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
4.10	Landscape and Visual effects: The Inspectorate agrees that given the nature of the Proposed Development, landscape and seascape visual effects can be scoped out of the ES.	Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) of the Environmental Statement ('ES') Volume 1 (document reference 6.1.15) does not include an assessment of seascape as part of the impact of the Proposed Development.
14.3.1	Converter Station – Effects on visual receptors beyond 3km of the Converter Station boundary: The Scoping Report proposes to scope out this matter on the basis that changes will be limited due to the presence of built form and intervening vegetation. However, the Scoping Report does not contain sufficient evidence to support this conclusion and as such the Inspectorate cannot agree to scope this matter out. The Inspectorate notes that an initial ZTV	During initial consultations with Winchester City Council ('WCC'), East Hampshire District Council ('EHDC') and Havant Borough Council ('HBC') Local Planning Authorities ('LPAs') and the South Downs National Park Authority ('SDNPA'), and informed by a site assessment and the production of Zones of Theoretical Visibility based on the Parameter Plans an 8 km study area was agreed for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment ('LVIA'). This area was defined as suitable to inform an initial baseline review, including the identification of national/county/district level landscape character

Scoping Opinion Ref	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
	<p>has been prepared and discussed with local authorities, and also that viewpoints beyond 3 km have been included. No visual information has been provided with the Scoping Report and therefore supporting evidence with regards to visibility and screening is not apparent. The Inspectorate considers that effects on visual receptors beyond 3 km of the site boundary of the Converter Station should therefore be included in the ES, where likely significant effects could occur.</p>	<p>assessments and long-distance views for potential landscape and visual impacts of the Converter Station Area. The assessment concluded that visual effects beyond 3 km were not significant.</p> <p>It was also agreed with SDNPA and LPAs (WCC and EHDC) that a smaller, more detailed 3 km study area was also appropriate. This focused on local district and city landscape character and views from the nearest visual receptors around the Converter Station.</p> <p>A 1.2 km study area was also selected for the assessment of close range views from the nearest residential properties.</p>
<p>4.13.2</p>	<p>Onshore Cable Route and landfall – Effects on landscape and seascape character and features associated with the landfall during construction, operation and decommissioning: The Scoping Report proposed to scope out this matter on the basis that effects would be temporary/short term and the scale of works minimal, resulting in an underground structure to house the transition bay, and that the land would be reinstated. The Scoping Report does not</p>	<p>Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) includes an assessment of the impacts of the ORS and cable route at the Landfall on landscape and visual amenity based on an agreed study area of 300 m with a focus on landscape rather than seascape character given the position of the Landfall relative to Eastney Beach and the built-up nature of the surrounding area as well as the negligible impact associated with HDD up to the Landfall.</p>

Scoping Opinion Ref	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
	<p>contain sufficient detail regarding the spatial and temporal nature of the proposed works associated with the landfall site, or the likely scale and significance of the acknowledged temporary effects, for the Inspectorate to agree that this matter can be scoped out of the ES. The Inspectorate notes the character area information including heritage assets within close proximity to the landfall site, as described in the Scoping Report. The ES should include an assessment of landscape and seascape character effects, including heritage assets, arising from the proposed landfall works, where likely significant effects could occur.</p>	<p>Effects on heritage assets are considered in Chapter 21 (Heritage and Archaeology) of the ES Volume 1 (document reference 6.1.21).</p>
<p>4.13.3</p>	<p>Onshore Cable Route - Effects on visual receptors within 100 m buffer on either side of the cable route up to 2 km of the proposed Converter Station: The Scoping Report does not provide a clear justification as to why this matter should be scoped out of the ES and the Inspectorate cannot agree to scope this issue out.</p>	<p>Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) includes an assessment of effects on visual receptors within a 120 m buffer on either side of the cable corridor up to 2 km of the Converter Station</p>
<p>4.13.4</p>	<p>Figures and receptors: The information included within the Scoping Report lacks detailed figures</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Scoping Opinion Ref	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
	<p>applicable to inform the scope of the assessment e.g. location of visual receptors. The ES must include clear figures of an appropriate scale and size to present the landscape and visual effect receptors considered in the impact assessment.</p>	<p>Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) includes a clear set of figures defining the study area based on an 8, 3 and 1.2 radius from the Converter Station and a smaller radius for the cable route and Landfall of 120 m and 300 m respectively. The Chapter also include figures detailing landscape planning designations and landscape character as well as the viewpoint location plans, viewpoints, wirelines and photomontages as well as indicative landscape mitigation plans.</p>
<p>4.13.5</p>	<p>Study Area: The Scoping Report does not clearly identify and justify the proposed study areas referenced in this aspect chapter. The ES should clearly define the study area for the matters considered in this aspect chapter. The Inspectorate advises that the study area should be based on the extent of potential impacts, and that the ZTV will be essential in selecting viewpoints. The Applicant should make effort to agree the viewpoints should be agreed with relevant consultation bodies e.g. local authorities.</p> <p>The Scoping Report does not clearly identify and justify the proposed study areas referenced in this</p>	<p>During initial consultations with WCC, EHDC and HBC LPAs and the SDNPA, and informed by a site assessment and the production of Zones of Theoretical Visibility based on the Parameter Plans an 8 km study area was agreed for the LVIA of the Converter Station. This area was defined as suitable to inform an initial baseline review, including the identification of national/county/district level landscape character assessments and long-distance views for potential landscape and visual impacts of the Converter Station Area. The assessment concluded that visual effects beyond 3 km were not significant.</p> <p>It was also agreed with SDNPA and LPAs (WCC and EHDC) that a smaller, more detailed 3 km study area was</p>

Scoping Opinion Ref	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
	<p>aspect chapter. The ES should clearly define the study area for the matters considered in this aspect chapter. The Inspectorate advises that the study area should be based on the extent of potential impacts, and that the ZTV will be essential in selecting viewpoints. The Applicant should make effort to agree the viewpoints should be agreed with relevant consultation bodies e.g. local authorities.</p> <p>The ES should explain how consultation with the relevant local authorities has informed the decisions taken with regards to the assessment. The ES should also document agreements reached with the local authorities with regards to the assessment methodology and justify the approach taken, should the chosen approach differ.</p>	<p>also appropriate for the Converter Station. This focused on local district and city landscape character and views from the nearest visual receptors around the Converter Station.</p> <p>A 1.2 km study area for the Converter Station was also selected for the assessment of close range views from the nearest residential properties.</p> <p>Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) documents how consultations have informed decisions and the agreements reached. Consultations with LPAs/SDNPA took place the study areas, assessment methodology, viewpoints, wirelines, photomontages, design of the Converter Station and mitigation considering cladding, colour, materials, roof profile, landform and planting including the retention and gapping up of existing planting where appropriate.</p>
4.13.6	<p>Relationship with Heritage, Archaeology and Ecology: The Inspectorate notes and welcomes the intention to assess effects on the settings of built assets including conservation areas and listed buildings, together with loss of features such as ancient woodland, hedgerows and trees. The ES should not duplicate</p>	<p>Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) refers to Heritage and Archaeology and Ecology where relevant referring to Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas. The chapter does not however attempt to undertake an assessment of such assets and</p>

Scoping Opinion Ref	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
	assessments in aspect chapters; however, the ES should ensure appropriate cross referencing is provided between these aspect chapters.	has used the information gathered to inform viewpoint selection and the value of landscape character.

1.2. INFORMAL CONSULTATION PRIOR TO PEIR RESPONSES

Table 2 - Informal Consultation Prior To PEIR Responses

Consultee	Date (Method of Consultation)	Discussion	Summary of Outcome of Discussions
SDNPA, WCC, EHDC and HBC	26 September 2017 (Meeting and follow up actions through email exchange sent by WSP 11 October 2017)	WSP presented the preliminary ZTVs and viewpoints and it was agreed that consideration should be given to historic characterisation and field boundaries, different characteristics of the site and micro-siting.	A revised viewpoint location plan, baseline viewpoints and landscape design principles were circulated. Reference to historic characterisation, local landscape features and micro-siting is detailed in Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity).
WCC	16 October 2017 (Email and phonecall from WCC, with follow up actions sent	WCC requested additional local viewpoints from which photomontages should be	WSP circulated three local viewpoints and accompanying viewpoint location plan following agreement with WCC.

Consultee	Date (Method of Consultation)	Discussion	Summary of Outcome of Discussions
	by WSP 18 October)	prepared	
HBC and EHDC/HBC and WCC	17 and 20 October 2017 (Email from EHDC/HBC and WCC)	Viewpoint locations, associated wirelines and additional local viewpoints covering viewpoints A, B and C for both Option A and B.	Agreement was reached over the viewpoint locations, wirelines and local viewpoints covering both options at the time but subsequently revised to demonstrate just Option B(i) as referred to in Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity).
SDNPA, WCC, EHDC and HBC	22 February 2018 (Email sent by WSP)	WSP issued an update on work of the LVIA, the wirelines and omission of viewpoint 18 (sites were not visible). The email explained that WSP were testing the options against proposed mitigation in terms of cut and fill and planting and would prepare revised ZTVs with mitigation.	No further action was required.
EHDC/HBC WCC/SDNPA	24 May 2018 (WSP email) with responses on 31 May 2018 from EHDC/HBC and WCC and subsequent email from SDNPA 1 2018 and email confirmation	WSP sought clarification over some specific queries raised by PINS Scoping Opinion as to whether a) additional viewpoints other than the ones previously agreed were required and b)	It was agreed that no additional viewpoints were required and that WSP would present two study areas - an 8 km study area referring to district/county level assessments and more long-distance views agreed and a 3 km which would focus on local landscape character and

Consultee	Date (Method of Consultation)	Discussion	Summary of Outcome of Discussions
	from WSP on 5 July 2018	<p>whether the study area should be widened to 8 km.</p> <p>HBC/EHDC/WCC and SDNPA confirmed they were happy with the agreed viewpoint locations and no additional viewpoints were required, however there was disagreement over the need for two study areas covering an 8 and 3 km area with both EHDC/HBC considering an 8km was unnecessary. SDNPA argued that an 8 km study area within accompanying ZTV would support the rationale for the viewpoint selection of the long distance views from within the SDNP.</p>	views. The different study areas are explained and justified in Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity).
SDNPA	1 June 2018 (Email) 2 July phone call with SDNPA, WSP email confirmation to LPAs and SDNPA of discussion on 4 July 2018	Discussion over the need for a night time visual/ perceptual assessment of lighting in the countryside (to include the infrastructure that goes with it)	<p>In terms of lighting it was agreed that a separate lighting assessment was not needed as part of Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity).</p> <p>The proposed Converter Station would be a dark site, with emergency lighting only turned</p>

Consultee	Date (Method of Consultation)	Discussion	Summary of Outcome of Discussions
	and confirmation by SNDP on 5 July 2018.	and the impact upon Dark Night Skies Reserve status.	on in exceptional circumstances. Appendix 15.5 (South Downs National Park) of the ES Volume 3 (document reference 6.3.15.5) has considered the visual impact of the proposed Converter Station on the Dark Night Sky Reserve and concluded that effects would be negligible. Lighting is also referred to in Chapter 3 (Description of the Proposed Development) and Chapter 16 (Onshore Ecology) of the ES Volume 1 (document references 6.1.3 and 6.1.16).
SDNPA, WCC, EHDC and HBC	10 July 2018 (Email from WSP and email feedback from WCC 16 July 2019, and EHDC/HBC on 17 July 2019 with an email confirmation from WSP on 17 July of agreed actions)	WSP explained that two Options would be considered and asked for confirmation regarding the preparation of three viewpoint wirelines (viewpoint 9, 11 and 17) and agreement of the viewpoints for the photomontages of both Option A and B.	The LPAs confirmed that they agree with the position of the wirelines and photomontages for both Options. WSP confirmed that the Preliminary Environmental Information Report ('PEIR') would include three wirelines and photomontages viewpoints for both Options, however prior to the PEIR submission a decision has been made to pursue Option B(i) and wirelines were presented for all viewpoints. Since the PEIR Option B(ii) has also been included which retains the existing western hedgerow/trees.

Consultee	Date (Method of Consultation)	Discussion	Summary of Outcome of Discussions
<p>SDNPA, WCC, EHDC and HBC</p>	<p>15 October 2018 (Meeting with LPAs, SDNPA and Norr Architects) and subsequent email feedback from WCC/EHDC/HBC on 16 October and SDNPA on 18 October 2018 with confirmation of actions from WSP on 24 October 2018.</p>	<p>WSP presented the background to project, change in nature of the project from Town and Country Planning to DCO Application, content and programme of the PEIR, assessment methodology, extent of study area for cumulative effects, planting palette and concept designs for the Converter Station including the colour palette and the two options (Option A and B).</p>	<p>The LPAs and SDNPA through discussions at the meeting and email feedback following the meeting agreed on the viewpoints, methodology and extent of cumulative effects covering an 8 km radius.</p> <p>Specific comments were made over the retention of mature hedgerow and trees along the western boundary of the Converter Station and the importance of existing vegetation in contributing to site and historic landscape character, connectivity of ancient woodland, planting measures should reflect local characteristics and concerns over the Access Road. Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) now presents two different options through the Parameter Plans, with Option B(ii) retaining the western boundary. The indicative landscape mitigation plans demonstrate the extent of existing vegetation retained and managed within the Order Limits.</p> <p>There was agreement (in the main) over the</p>

Consultee	Date (Method of Consultation)	Discussion	Summary of Outcome of Discussions
			<p>planting palette which includes pioneer species apart from beech, bramble and some non-native species which were removed. The planting palette is detailed in Chapter 15 and the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (document reference 6.10).</p> <p>There was a difference in opinion over bunds for planting /landscape mitigation, the approach to the design concepts was welcomed though there were different views over the colour and whether the Converter Station should be hidden or celebrated. Further to discussions post PEIR with LPAs and SDNPA have informed the Parameter Plans and Design Principles and the LVIA.</p>

1.3. PEIR CONSULTATION

Table 3 - PEIR Consultation

Consultee	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
Statutory Consultees		

Consultee	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
EHDC	<p>Concern over change to landscape character</p> <p>Can existing overhead wires/pylons be undergrounded?</p> <p>Concern over industrial design of CS which would impact on landscape character - Need for good design with a clear approach defined and which “roots” the buildings into its context, demonstrate its aesthetics rather than functionality and mitigates landscape and visual effects - reference made to EN-1.</p> <p>Limited extent and level of mitigation both on and off site to reduce landscape and visual effects as well as impact on setting of the National Park. Consideration required for net gain and long-term management in a coherent landscape strategy.</p> <p>Concern over prominence of access track and position is contrived and unrelated to landscape features impacts both landscape and visually.</p>	<p>Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) undertakes an assessment of landscape character.</p> <p>Overhead wires/pylons are the responsibility of National Grid, however one 11 kv cable close to Broadway Cottages, the entranceway and Broadway/Day Lane and running across the Access Road track into Lovedean Substation would be undergrounded as part of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The design of the Converter Station is based on Parameter Plans which present two different options for the siting of the Converter Station one of which would retain planting to the western boundary. Design Principles were derived from an analysis of site context and feedback from LPAs and other stakeholders. The detailed design would be approved by the relevant authority in consultation with the SDNPA. How the building design has evolved is covered in the Design and Access Statement.</p> <p>Working closely with ecology and arboriculture indicative landscape mitigation plans (Figures 15.48 and 15.49 of the ES Volume 2 (document reference 6.2.15.48 and 6.2.15.49)) have been prepared in consultation with LPAs and SDNPA which include “offsite” planting in the form of existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees as well as landscaped landforms and mitigation planting. An Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy has also been prepared which outlines the long-term management proposals for existing and mitigation planting.</p> <p>Permanent surfacing and landscaping of the Access Road would</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
		take account of the local context and be detailed in accordance with the principles of the landscape mitigation proposals.
Hampshire County Council ('HCC')	<p>The EIA should include a detailed assessment of the potential visual effects of operational lighting on nearby properties.</p> <p>Cumulative effects of inter and intra projects need to be considered.</p> <p>Reference to the considerable scale of the building and need for LPAs and SDNPA to comment on the appropriateness of the building in the countryside.</p>	<p>Whilst lighting columns, up to 15 m high (see items 15 and 16 in Plate 3.7 of Chapter 3 (Description of the Proposed Development)) are proposed to illuminate the outdoor areas of the Converter Station these would only be used during emergency situations, such as an intruder or unplanned maintenance work. The lights are not intended to be used during normal operation. No form of lighting would be provided to the new external Access Road. Based on discussions with SDNPA it was agreed that a night time visual impact assessment was not required.</p> <p>A cumulative assessment has been undertaken as part of the LVIA.</p> <p>The design of the Converter Station is based a set of Parameter Plans and Design Principles derived from an analysis of site context and feedback from LPAs and other stakeholders. The detailed design would be approved by the relevant discharging authority in consultation with the SDNPA.</p>
Historic England ('HE')	<p>Reference is made to the impact on Conservation Areas which have not been defined as a designated heritage asset.</p> <p>Noted no seascape characterisation assessment is within Chapter 14 (Marine Archaeology) and that this has been</p>	<p>The ES LVIA has reviewed Conservation Areas in terms of key views/vistas.</p> <p>Agreed as per scoping report.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
	scoped out.	
Horndean Parish Council	HPC support report by SDNPA.	Refer to comments relating to SDNP.
National Grid	<p>If a landscaping scheme is proposed we request that only slow and low growing species of trees and shrubs are planted beneath and adjacent to the existing overhead lines to reduce the risk of growth to a height which compromises statutory safety clearances</p> <p>Ground levels should not alter beneath or in close proximity to existing overhead lines</p>	<p>The indicative landscape mitigation plans (Figure 15.48 and 49) have only introduced new hedgerows underneath overhead lines and proposed scrub which would be maintained at a low height adjacent to the cables.</p> <p>Ground levels have had to be altered slightly by engineers to accommodate the Access Road.</p>
Natural England ('NE')	<p>Mitigation plan should maximise opportunities to enhance ecological networks / corridors and explore other opportunities – new pond, native vegetation, bird, bee and bat boxes, green roofs and species rich grassland</p> <p>This proposal should achieve a net gain for biodiversity</p>	<p>Indicative landscape mitigation plans Figure 15.48 and 15.49 have been prepared working with ecologists and consultation with LPAs and SDNPA to minimise landscape and visual impacts and maximise where practicable opportunities for enhancement.</p> <p>Opportunities to maximise biodiversity have been incorporated within the indicative landscape mitigation plans (see Figures 15.48, 15.49 and 15.50 of the ES Volume 2 (document reference 6.2.15.48, 6.2.15.49 and 6.2.15.50) and the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
PCC	<p>Biodiversity enhancement measures and a delivery programme for such improvements at Eastney beach after completion of works for the landfall underground connection bay would be essential mitigation works.</p>	<p>No biodiversity enhancement measures are proposed for Eastney Beach.</p>
SDNPA	<p>The proposal will generate impacts on the landscape and visual setting of SDNP and the mitigation measures fail to be commensurate with the likely levels of harm.</p> <p>The buildings with screening will remain visible and harm local views to points of interest to the south.</p> <p>Proposal will also impact on Monarchs Way.</p> <p>The buildings are large scale, very prominent, appear functional and utilitarian – block style exacerbates its incongruity with the setting and character of the area is essentially rural. It is important to understand the wider landscape within which it sits. Colour palette is unlikely to be successful need to also consider site</p>	<p>Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) undertakes an assessment of the landscape and visual setting of the SDNP within 3 km of the Converter Station refer to Appendix 15.5 (South Downs National Park). This used criterion in the South Downs Landscape Background Paper to the Local Plan, (South Downs National Park Authority, September 2017), and considered in this context Special Quality 1 of the National Park. As part of this review tranquillity was considered as part of its contribution to landscape character.</p> <p>Working closely with ecology and arboriculture indicative landscape mitigation plans (Figures 15.48 and 15.49) have been prepared in consultation with LPAs and SDNPA which include “offsite” planting in the form of existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees as well as landscaped landforms and mitigation planting. Existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees which serve a baseline visual screening function within the immediate vicinity of the Converter Station Area would be retained and managed long term and this in addition to new mitigation planting would minimise impacts on immediate local receptors.</p>


Consultee	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
	<p>contours, cut and full and relationship to other infrastructure.</p> <p>Buildings will be visible in panoramic views from elevated positions and close to breaking the skyline – the building should not be a shiny box distracting panoramic views.</p> <p>Length and position of access track cutting across historic field boundaries, affecting character of Broadway Lane, preventing connection with ancient woodland and running through the centre of the fields – can access be used through NG substation?</p> <p>Agree there is a preference for Option 1 due to screening and potential to drop the building to reduce its visual impact however this is offset by the impact of the battery storage site if it gets consent.</p> <p>Tranquillity is a special quality of the SDNP and needs to be considered in terms of landscape character as well as impacts on residents, users of PRow and other visitors</p> <p>No landscape evidence in alternatives on</p>	<p>Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) has assessed the visual impact of the Converter Station on Monarch’s Way and has proposed through the indicative landscape mitigation plans mitigation planting to minimise effects.</p> <p>An Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy has also been prepared which outlines the long-term management proposals for existing and mitigation planting.</p> <p>The design of the Converter Station is based a set of Parameter Plans and Design Principles derived from an analysis of site context and feedback from LPAs, SDNPA and other stakeholders. The detailed design would be approved by the relevant authority in consultation with the SDNPA. How the building design has evolved is covered in the Design and Access Statement. Consideration has been given to cladding, roofing and colour as well as the impact of the building from short, middle and long-distance views.</p> <p>Alternative access routes to the Converter Station and landscape and visual impacts associated with Option C and D have been explored refer to Chapter 2 (Consideration of Alternatives) of the ES Volume 1 (document refence 6.1.2). The impact of the Access Road has been considered as part of the LVIA.</p> <p>The impact of the Proposed Development alongside the Battery Storage facilities has been considered in cumulative impacts.</p> <p>The LVIA has assessed the impact of the Converter Station Area on undertake a local landscape features and considered the</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
	<p>Options C and D.</p> <p>The assessment of landscape sensitivity and value fails to take a positive approach and relies on a discordant character rather than elements of inherent character including consideration of landscape history.</p> <p>Reference to study area being altered.</p>	<p>history as well as its contribution to the setting of SDNP.</p> <p>The LVIA refers to three study areas for the Converter Station Tow of these the 8 km and 3 km radius were agreed with LPAs and SDNPA. A 1.2 km radius was defined for close range residential receptors and a 3 km radius for the impact on the setting of the National Park.</p>
WCC	<p>Concern over building design, its approach and how it has evolved – consideration needs to be given to how it responds to local context</p> <p>Concern that 20 year mitigation is not effective, shows a loss of woodland to the west and retention of planting, bunding and earthworks must be considered</p> <p>If mitigation is unsuccessful then the building design and appearance assumes greater importance.</p> <p>Consider recessive tones or darker colours to reduce the bulk of the building.</p> <p>Consideration of how vegetation will be retained / managed and retain off site</p>	<p>The design of the Converter Station is based on Parameter Plans which present two different options for the siting of the Converter Station one of which would retain planting to the western boundary. Design Principles were derived from an analysis of site context and feedback from LPAs, SDNPA and other stakeholders. The detailed design would be approved by the relevant discharging authority in consultation with the SDNPA. How the building design has evolved is covered in the Design and Access Statement.</p> <p>Working closely with ecology and arboriculture indicative landscape mitigation plans (Figures 15.48 and 15.49) have been prepared in consultation with LPAs and SDNPA which include “offsite” planting in the form of existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees as well as landscaped landforms and mitigation planting. An Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy has also been prepared which outlines the long-term management proposals for</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
	<p>planting.</p> <p>Biodiversity net gain needs to be considered.</p>	<p>existing and mitigation planting.</p> <p>Opportunities to maximise biodiversity have been incorporated within the indicative landscape mitigation plans and the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy.</p>
Section 42a Statutory Consultees		
<p>Denmead Parish Council</p>	<p>Converter Station: Concern re impact of Converter Station including: lighting, operational noise (hum), construction noise, visual impact (including the chimney), traffic impact, and emissions, Impact on National Park and Dark Skies and observatory.</p> <p>Concern re design parameters for Converter Station and lack of detail at consultation stage.</p> <p>They have been advised that designs and landscape details will not be available until permission is granted and consider this is very wrong.</p> <p>Reference to development above ground in The Denmead Gap.</p>	<p>Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity), informed by the Parameter Plans and Design Principles assessed the landscape and visual effects including the impact of the Converter Station on the SDNP. It should be noted that reference to a chimney has arisen. There is no chimney associated with the Proposed Development. Impacts on traffic, emissions and noise are considered in Chapter 22 (Traffic and Transport) and Chapter 24 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES Volume 1 (document references 6.1.22 and 6.1.24) respectively.</p> <p>Lighting columns, up to 15 m high (see items 15 and 16 in Plate 3.7 of Chapter 3 (description of the Proposed Development)) are proposed to illuminate the outdoor areas of the Converter Station during emergency situations, such as an intruder or unplanned maintenance work. The lights are not intended to be used during normal operation. No form of lighting would be provided to the new external Access Road. Based on discussions with SDNPA it was agreed that a night time visual impact assessment was not required.</p> <p>The design of the Converter Station is based on Parameter Plans</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
		<p>which present two different options for the siting of the Converter Station and Design Principles. The detailed design would be approved by the relevant discharging authority in consultation with the SDNPA.</p> <p>Reference has been made to Denmead Gap in Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity).</p>
Non-statutory Consultees		
<p>CPRE Hampshire</p>	<p>The proposal will have impacts on the SDNP – given the sensitivity and high value of the SDNP landscape, buildings of this scale, utilitarian in appearance and form sited in this location could not but cause significant harm to the setting of the SDNP in relation to landscape character and visual amenity – landscape would change from essentially rural to one which is far more industrial and confirmed in the PEIR.</p> <p>Whilst located close to the substation with pylons and overhead lines and woodland this does little to mitigate the dominant adverse impact based on the size of the converter stations and could not be much reduced. Impact amplified further through</p>	<p>Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) assesses the impact of the Converter Station on the setting of the SDNP and an assessment has been undertaken from some key visitor locations within the SDNP.</p> <p>Tranquillity levels have been considered in Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) as well as the visual impact on the Monarch’s Way.</p> <p>The indicative landscape mitigation plans measures retain initially “offsite” planting in the form of existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees as well as introducing further planting to serve a visual screening function.</p> <p>The design of the Converter Station as referred to in the Parameter Plans and Design Principles has sought to reduce its impact on landscape character and visual receptors as well as the setting of the SDNP. The detailed design of the Converter Station would be approved by the relevant discharging authority in</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
	<p>loss of hedgerows and trees.</p> <p>Noise impact on a largely tranquil rural area and impact on Monarchs Way.</p> <p>Proposals contrary to purposes of the SDNP, EHLP and WCC policies.</p> <p>If size of buildings is essential an alternative/urban site needs to be found – if not then mitigation is essential and introduced at the beginning of the project consider middle (500 m) and further 1-2 km distance).</p>	<p>consultation with SDNPA.</p>
Status to be determined		
<p>Ramblers</p>	<p>Area is very quiet and noise is harder to ignore than visual effects – impacts on tranquillity need to be considered.</p> <p>Suggest further woodland to the west of the site to mitigate noise impacting on Millfield Farm.</p> <p>Impact on visual amenity of PRow users ensuring existing footpaths are affected and where they are an alternative route provided.</p>	<p>Tranquillity has been considered as part of Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) and additional mitigation planting in the form of new woodland has been introduced to the west of the Converter Station (note Millfield Farm is not a residential property) see Figure 15.48 and 15.49.</p> <p>Mitigation proposals do not include measures to link existing Public Rights of Way ('PRow').</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
	<p>Additional routes which could be considered linking to existing PRowWs north and south and taking walkers off some of the local lanes.</p> 	

1.4. POST-PEIR CONSULTATION

Table 4 - Post-PEIR Consultation

Consultee	Date (Method of Consultation)	Discussion	Summary of Outcome of Discussions
WCC, EHDC and SDNPA	21 June 2019 (Converter Station	Presentation of existing site constraints/offsets required, proximity	WSP to produce indicative landscape mitigation plans and sections and Norr to develop further

Consultee	Date (Method of Consultation)	Discussion	Summary of Outcome of Discussions
	design meeting)	of residential receptors to the Converter Station and associated mitigation proposals, retention and gapping up of existing hedgerows/hedgerow trees, preparation of indicative landscape mitigation plans, access track and confirmation that views of the Converter Station would be limited from agreed long distance views. Discussion over the design of the Converter Station covering profile, materials, colour, angles and cladding.	the architectural plans for discussion.
PCC (Landscape)	6 July 2019 (Site meeting with representative landscape officer)	Clarification of viewpoints and visualisations and mitigation requirements	Inclusion of five verified baseline photographs with two wirelines, preparation of an indicative landscape mitigation plan and supporting images demonstrating the mix of planting including hedgerows and tree planting following the line of the existing ash tree.
PCC (Parks and Open Space)	7 July 2019 (Email correspondence)	Clarification of the position and size of the ORSs and that tree planting would be inappropriate.	WSP provided a response to the location of the buildings and size, plans to be confirmed and that the purpose of the planting as to provide some screening for immediate residential

Consultee	Date (Method of Consultation)	Discussion	Summary of Outcome of Discussions
<p>WCC, WHDC and SDNPA</p>	<p>10 July 2019 (Converter Station design meeting)</p>	<p>Presentation of indicative landscape mitigation plans, indicative sections, cut and fill, offsets which apply to existing features and the Converter Station, western hedgerow and initially “offsite” mitigation. Presentation of concepts for the Converter Station discussing materials, cladding and colour</p>	<p>receptors.</p> <p>LPAs and SDNPA to review and comment on indicative landscape mitigation plans, agreed that additional “offsite” mitigation would have limited impact further away which would be best dealt by the design of the building.</p> <p>Agreed that the rounding of corners of buildings was positive, the roof would be non-reflective, the colour green should be discounted, darker colours explored and that the concepts of the building provide an element of interest.</p> <p>Opportunities to maximise biodiversity have been incorporated within the indicative landscape mitigation plans (see Figures 15.48, 15.49 and 15.50 and the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy. It should be noted that such an assessment is not a requirement for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (‘NSIP’) under current legislation.</p>
<p>PCC (Landscape)</p>	<p>11 and 18 July 2019 (Email correspondence)</p>	<p>Discussion over viewpoint location plan and extent of study area.</p>	<p>Confirmation PCC was happy with the viewpoint locations, location of the wirelines and that the study area would be fixed at 300 m from the Landfall given the built-up nature of the</p>

Consultee	Date (Method of Consultation)	Discussion	Summary of Outcome of Discussions
			area and restricted visibility.
NE	17 July 2019 (Meeting with presentation material)	Presentation of indicative landscape mitigation plans, offsets which apply to existing features and the Converter Station and initially “offsite” mitigation	No further actions proposed.
WCC, EHDC and SDNPA	20 August 2019 (Converter Station design meeting)	Confirmation over a parameter approach for Converter Station demonstrating two options, response to email comments on the indicative landscape mitigation plans, inclusion of initially “offsite” mitigation within the Order Limits, presentation of colour palette for the Converter Station and Design Principles	Parameter plans prepared to demonstrate the two Converter Station options including one which minimises impact on the western hedgerow. Agreement that the Converter Station colour should concentrate on autumnal colours and design principles should be updated and shared with LPAs and SDNPA.
PCC	22 August 2019 (Planning meeting)	An indicative landscape mitigation plan around the ORS was presented illustrating the buildings, compound and potential landscaping as well as “fall” distance from the buildings to accommodate trees for visual screening of adjacent visual receptors.	Parameter plans prepared to demonstrate the parameter envelope of two different options for the ORS within Fort Cumberland car park at Eastney.

