



AQUIND Limited

AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR

Environmental Statement – Volume 3 – Appendix 25.1 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: 6.3.25.1

PINS Ref.: EN020022

AQUIND Limited

AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR

Environmental Statement – Volume 3 –
Appendix 25.1 Consultation Responses

PINS REF.: EN020022

DOCUMENT: 6.3.25.1

DATE: 14 NOVEMBER 2019

WSP

WSP House

70 Chancery Lane

London

WC2A 1AF

+44 20 7314 5000

www.wsp.com

DOCUMENT

Document	6.3.25.1 Environmental Statement – Volume 3 – Appendix 25.1 Consultation Responses
Revision	001
Document Owner	WSP UK Limited
Prepared By	K. Harrington
Date	10 October 2019
Approved By	U. Stevenson
Date	12 November 2019

CONTENTS

	APPENDIX 25.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES	1
1.1.	SCOPING RESPONSES	1
1.2.	PEIR CONSULTATION	6

TABLES

Table 1 – Scoping Responses	1
Table 2 – PEIR Consultation	6

APPENDIX 25.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

1.1. SCOPING RESPONSES

Table 1 – Scoping Responses

Scoping Opinion Ref	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
4.22.1	<p>Private or community assets</p> <p>Paragraph 27.3.1 of the Scoping Report states that there are no private assets beyond agricultural land (to be considered in the Soils and Land Use aspect chapter) and therefore, effects related to private or community assets will not be considered further. However, it is noted that paragraph 27.3.5 identifies “changes in community severance and accessibility to private and community resources” as a likely significant effect to be considered in the impact assessment. In the absence of clarity, the Inspectorate cannot agree to scope this matter out at this stage.</p> <p>The ES should clearly identify impacts to private or community assets, where likely significant effects could occur.</p>	<p>Section 25.6, Chapter 25 (Socio-economics) of the Environmental Statement (‘ES’) Volume 1 (document reference 6.1.25) identifies the private and community assets potentially impacted by the Proposed Development and Section 25.7 and 25.8, Chapter 25 (Socio-economics) assesses likely significant effects.</p>

Scoping Opinion Ref	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
4.22.2	<p>Site security during construction/ crime</p> <p>The Inspectorate agrees that effects in relation to crime arising during construction can be scoped out of the ES as significant effects are not likely to occur.</p>	No action required
4.22.3 – (paragraph 27.3.3 and 27.3.5)	<p>Community severance</p> <p>The Scoping Report contains very limited information with regards to the timings of likely disruption and the likely community receptors that could be affected by community severance during the construction of the Proposed Development. The Scoping Report also appears to identify the same matter as a ‘likely significant effect’ at paragraph 27.3.5. In the absence of sufficient evidence to support the statements made, the Inspectorate cannot agree to scope this matter out. The ES should include an assessment of community severance on sensitive receptors, where likely significant effects could occur.</p>	Section 26.6, Chapter 25 (Socio-economics) identifies community assets potentially impacted by the Proposed Development and is supported by Appendix 25.2 (Socio-economic Receptors within 500 m) of the ES Volume 3 (document reference 6.3.25.2).
4.22.4	<p>Generation of direct, indirect and induced employment opportunities during the operational phase.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development and the information provided within the Scoping Report,</p>	No action required

Scoping Opinion Ref	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
	the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.	
4.22.5	<p>Baseline – Study area</p> <p>The ES should clearly define and justify the study area applied to the assessment. It is noted that the Applicant intends to apply Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (‘DMRB’) Vol 11, Section 3, Part 8 guidance to the assessment of disruption and changes in amenity value for users of recreational/open space. The Inspectorate notes that DMRB Vol 11, Section 3, Part 8, Paragraph 2.2 states that community facilities ‘and their catchment areas’ should be addressed by such an assessment. The ES should clearly explain the selected study area.</p>	<p>Section 25.1.2, Chapter 25 (Socio-economics) identifies the Study Area for potential impacts on Public Rights of Way (‘PRoW’), recreational and open space which is 500 m from the Order Limits. However, in addition, the assessment also draws on information from other study areas, relating to visual amenity (defined as 1.2 km, 3 km and 8 km at the Converter Station) and the Transport Assessment (Appendix 22.1) of the ES Volume 3 (document reference 6.3.22.1) (5 km).</p>
4.22.6 (paragraph 27.3 and 27.4)	<p>Baseline - Community receptors</p> <p>It is noted in this aspect chapter that reference is made to community assets, community resources, and community facilities. It is unclear whether these are referring to one and the same. The ES should make this clear and use consistent terminology. The Scoping Report does not describe the community (including amenity) receptors in any detail and no figures have been provided to show their location. The ES should</p>	<p>The term community facility is now used throughout the Chapter and Figure 25.2 identifies all community facilities within 500 m of the Order Limits. These are also outlined in Appendix 25.2 (Socio-economic Receptors within 500 m).</p>

Scoping Opinion Ref	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
	<p>clearly identify and justify the applicable receptors, together with the study area. The presentation of receptors and study areas on figures accompanying the ES should also be provided.</p>	
<p>4.22.7 (Section 27.4.4)</p>	<p>Impacts – construction worker numbers</p> <p>The Scoping Report refers to potentially significant increase in workers relocating to the area. The ES should provide information on the likely number of workers and the assumptions made in the impact assessment.</p>	<p>Section 25.8, Chapter 25 (Socio-economics) provides detail on the predicted direct, indirect and induced employment in addition to the assumptions made to produce these numbers.</p>
<p>4.22.8 (paragraph 27.4.8)</p>	<p>Impacts – disruption and changes in amenity value</p> <p>The Scoping Report acknowledges that change to amenity value is concerned with changes in the degree and duration of a receptors exposure to traffic (fear/intimidation), noise, dirt and air quality. It goes on to state that air quality and noise and vibration will be considered elsewhere in the ES and will not be assessed within the Socio-economic chapter of the ES. Whilst the Inspectorate acknowledges that this will be the case, the Socio-economic chapter should in its assessment of impacts on amenity include appropriate cross-references the assessments presented elsewhere in the ES and consider the combination of</p>	<p>Appropriate cross references to Chapter 22 (Traffic and Transport), Chapter 23 (Air Quality), Chapter 24 (Noise and Vibration) and Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) of the ES Volume 1 (document reference 6.1.22, 6.1.23, 6.1.24, 6.1.15) have been made throughout the chapter, particularly in relation to disruption during construction.</p>

Scoping Opinion Ref	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
	these intra-related effects arising from the Proposed Development.	
4.22.9	<p>Assessment criteria</p> <p>It is unclear whether the different matters to be assessed within the Socio-economic aspect chapter will follow the same impact assessment methodology approach. The ES should clearly state the assessment criteria which the effects are to be assessed against and the value of receptors identified.</p>	<p>Section 25.4.5 and 25.4.6, Chapter 25 (Socio-economics) outline the assessment criteria and sensitivity values are ascribed to socioeconomic receptors where appropriate. The criteria for assigning sensitivity values is also outlined in Section 25.4.5.</p>

1.2. PEIR CONSULTATION

Table 2 – PEIR Consultation

Consultee	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
<p>Portsmouth City Council</p>	<p>Any loss of open space will result in significant adverse effects on health and wellbeing. Timing and the duration of construction associated with sports pitches will also be an integral consideration. PCC has requested that particular consideration is given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The re-provision of open space and sports pitches during the period of works • Impact on the municipal golf course; • The potential loss and impact on open space used for events; • The potential temporary loss of parking provision that serves open space; and <p>The potential loss of business activity within the city due to increased congestion.</p>	<p>Impacts on open and recreational space, golf course, events, parking and businesses are identified in Section 25.7 and 25.8 of this Chapter and those factors raised by PCC have been addressed in the assessment.</p> <p>Chapter 22 (Transport and Traffic) assesses impacts on congestion.</p> <p>Chapter 26 (Human Health) of the ES Volume 1 (document reference 6.1.26) also assesses the impact on health and wellbeing.</p>
<p>Winchester City Council</p>	<p>WCC requested that the range of mitigation responses need to be more expansive.</p>	<p>Section 25.10, Chapter 25 (Socio-economics) outlines a range of mitigation which are more expansive than what was</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comment Received	How this has been addressed by the Applicant
	<p>WCC stated that they wished to engage in a meaningful discussion on a range of community benefits which could potentially be brought forward.</p>	<p>listed in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report ('PEIR') and are specifically tailored to mitigate against potential significant effects of the Proposed Development.</p>
<p>Havant Borough Council</p>	<p>HBC have concerns over temporary disruption to businesses along the Onshore Cable Route due to potential access restrictions to roads and a reduction in footfall. There is the potential for significant adverse cumulative effects. HBC have requested that discussions regarding programming should be held with the Highway Authority, local business groups and local councillors to ensure that road space conflicts are managed and local knowledge is utilised when drafting the proposed traffic management systems.</p>	<p>Potential disruption to businesses has been identified as a potential impact in Section 25.7 and 25.8, Chapter 25 (Socio-economics). Those businesses which likely to be potentially impacted are identified and appropriate mitigation measures (including consultation with the Highway Authority and local businesses) are outlined in Section 25.10, Chapter 25 (Socio-economics).</p>

