



**AQUIND Limited**

---

# **AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR**

## **Environmental Statement Addendum – Appendix 1 Environmental Statement Errata Sheet**

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: 7.8.1.1

PINS Ref.: EN020022

**AQUIND Limited**

---

# **AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR**

Environmental Statement Addendum –  
Appendix 1 Environmental Statement Errata  
Sheet

**PINS REF.: EN020022**

**DOCUMENT: 7.8.1.1**

**DATE: 6 OCTOBER 2020**

WSP

WSP House

70 Chancery Lane

London

WC2A 1AF

+44 20 7314 5000

+44 20 7314 5111

[www.wsp.com](http://www.wsp.com)

## DOCUMENT

<b>Document</b>	<b>7.8.1.1 Environmental Statement Addendum – Appendix 1 Environmental Statement Errata Sheet</b>
<b>Revision</b>	001
<b>Document Owner</b>	WSP UK Limited
<b>Prepared By</b>	M. Marsh
<b>Date</b>	2 September 2020
<b>Approved By</b>	K. Haddrell
<b>Date</b>	2 September 2020

## CONTENTS

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT ERRATA SHEET	1
--------------------------------------	---

---

## ***TABLES***

Table 1 – Errata noted in the 2019 ES.....	1
--	---

---

# ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT ERRATA SHEET

1.1.1.1. This Errata Sheet details minor errors in the 2019 ES Chapters and sets out their amendments in Table 1 below.

**Table 0 – Errata noted in the 2019 ES**

Location in the 2019 ES	Error noted in the 2019 ES	Amended text in ES Addendum
<b>Chapter 2 (Consideration of Alternatives) (APP-117)</b>	Paragraph 2.4.5.2 bullet 1, sub-bullet 2 states ‘appropriate’ instead of ‘inappropriate’.	The paragraph should instead read: <i>A distance over 2 km is considered inappropriate for AC cables as the transmission losses associated with a longer cable would significantly reduce the efficiency of the Interconnector’ and included in the Errata submitted with this document.</i>
<b>Appendix 2.1 (NGET Cost Benefit Analysis) (APP-350)</b>	Paragraph 1.1.1.2 contains an error in referencing ‘SC1’.	‘SC1’ has been replaced with ‘SCD1’, which relates to the Option Code for the new offshore link between Suffolk and Kent.
<b>Chapter 3 (Description of the Proposed Development)</b>	Paragraph 3.6.5.11 contains an error stating that each TJB will require an excavation of approximately 1,75 m in depth.	The paragraph should instead read: <i>“There will be two TJBs, one per HVDC circuit. Each TJB will require an excavation of approximately 15 m x 5 m, to a depth of up to 2 m.”</i>

Location in the 2019 ES	Error noted in the 2019 ES	Amended text in ES Addendum
<b>Chapter 9 (Fish and Shellfish) (APP-124)</b>	Paragraph 9.1.1.3 contains a typographical error in referring to Section 8.7.	The paragraph should instead read: <i>“Where effects arise as a result of both the combination of the impacts of the Proposed Development and the impacts of projects in the UK Marine Area and/or other Member States, these will also be identified and assessed in Section 9.7.”</i>
<b>Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) (APP-130)</b>	Section 15.4.2 Assumptions and Limitations includes a number of bullets under paragraph 15.4.72 which are neither assumptions nor limitations.	The points made under “Assumptions and Limitations” in paragraph 15.4.7.2 are more general statements of fact in terms of what was considered as part of the assessment. The title “Assumptions and Limitations” has therefore been updated to <i>“General points, Assumptions and Limitations”</i> in terms of what the LVIA has considered.
	Paragraphs 15.7.1.1 and 15.7.1.2 refer to ‘embedded’ mitigation and assumptions that ‘standard mitigation measures’ are in place ‘in line with GLVIA’. However, GLVIA guidance on mitigation suggests that there should be no such ‘assumption’ in relation to standard practice.	There is a mistake in terms of reference to GLVIA in paragraph 15.7.1.2. The paragraph should instead read: <i>“Whilst other ES chapters do not assume the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) as ‘embedded mitigation’, the LVIA assumes standard construction practice measures are in accordance with the Considerate Contractors Scheme.”</i>  The text in Section 15.7 (paragraph 15.7.1.1 to 15.7.1.3) has been be revised to cover <i>“general</i>

Location in the 2019 ES	Error noted in the 2019 ES	Amended text in ES Addendum
		<p><i>standard and operational management practices</i>” rather than general embedded mitigation measures. Section 15.7 (paragraphs 15.7.1.13 to 15.7.1.41) referring to specific embedded mitigation should be altered to “<i>primary mitigation measures.</i>”</p> <p>No secondary mitigation measures were proposed. Paragraph 15.8.15.7 should be revised to read: “<i>No secondary mitigation or enhancement measures are proposed other than those undertaken during construction and forming either primary measures or standard construction and operational management practices.</i>”</p> <p>Whilst there has been a divergence in terminology it is considered this does not change the assessment and this is adequate</p>
	<p>Paragraph 15.8.3.6 – omission of clarity regarding the ‘raw edges’ of the Converter Station cut and fill.</p>	<p>To provide clarity text in paragraph 15.8.3.6 has been revised to include reference to the Access Road west of Broadway Lane stating:</p> <p><i>“[i]n terms of infrastructure, the widening of the access entranceway off Broadway Lane, the creation of a permanent Access Road across fields between Day Lane and the Converter Station and the loss of vegetation including hedgerow removal...”</i></p>

Location in the 2019 ES	Error noted in the 2019 ES	Amended text in ES Addendum
	<p>Paragraph 15.7.1.36 and Table 3 of Appendix 15.7 - contains reference to the use of cleavers as part of the proposed ground flora mix.</p>	<p>It is noted that cleavers can become difficult to control and inhibit growth of other vegetation and therefore on this basis we propose that they are omitted from the proposed planting palette referred to in paragraph 15.7.1.36 of Chapter 15 and Table 3 of Appendix 15.7 (Landscape Schedules, Planting Heights and Image Board) (APP-405).</p>
	<p>Section 15.8.3 – reference to ‘indirect’ impacts and the definition of these in this context and whether the use of ‘indirect’ here is in line with GLVIA guidance.</p>	<p>The words ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’ have been used in Chapter 15 as plain English reflecting the spatial relationship, rather than the consequential change referred to in GLVIA3.</p> <p>In the context of the EIA Regulations all effects are direct. To clarify, those identified as indirect based on the assessment methodology, but direct according to EIA Regulations are as follows:</p> <p>Section 1: Lovedean (Converter Station Area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape character area SDNPA D2</li> <li>• Setting of the SDNA</li> <li>• Tranquillity</li> <li>• Openness</li> </ul> <p>Section 3: Denmead / Kings Pond Meadow</p>



Location in the 2019 ES	Error noted in the 2019 ES	Amended text in ES Addendum
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Gap</li> </ul> <p>Section 4: Hambledon Road to Farlington Avenue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local designated open spaces – sense of openness</li> </ul> <p>Section 5: Farlington / Section 9 Moorings Way to Bransbury Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tranquillity</li> </ul> <p>Section 8: Eastern Road (Adjacent to Great Saltern Golf Course) to Moorings Way</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape Character Area PCC UCA17</li> <li>• Sense of openness</li> </ul> <p>Section 10: Eastney (Landfall)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tranquillity</li> <li>• Sense of openness</li> </ul>
<p><b>Appendix 15.3 (Landscape and Visual Assessment Methodology) (APP-401)</b></p>	<p>Tables 2 and 5 - do not include the value 'negligible', despite paragraph 1.5.3.3 stating that receptor value and value of views were evaluated on a four-point scale that includes 'negligible'.</p>	<p>The value 'negligible' is now included in Tables 2 and 5; there is no impact to the assessment as a result of this update.</p>

Location in the 2019 ES	Error noted in the 2019 ES	Amended text in ES Addendum
<b>Appendix 15.7 (Landscape Schedules, Planting Heights and Image Board) (APP-405)</b>	Table 13 – the use of asterisks used after the following tree species is to be clarified: pedunculate oak, wych elm, alder, birch, whitebeam, rowan.	The asterisks used to follow the aforementioned tree species have been removed.
<b>Appendix 16.3 (Arboriculture Report) (APP-411)</b>	Paragraph 1.7.10.12 – there is an error in the wording which has been updated to clarify the meaning in particular of ‘minimising’ ‘significant constraints’ on tree groups.	The paragraph should instead read: <i>Impacts on tree group G900 within Milton Locks Nature Reserve and tree group G697 within Bransbury Park shall be minimised through design and construction methodology. Measures shall be taken to avoid positioning cables in conflict with RPAs of existing trees, following BS 5837 as a minimum, and overseen by a suitably qualified clerk of works. Liaison shall take place with the site manager at Milton Locks Nature Reserve to agree the most appropriate form of mitigation.</i>
<b>Chapter 18 (Ground Conditions) (APP-133)</b>	Paragraphs 18.7.3.3, 18.7.3.13, 18.7.3.26, 18.7.4.2 and 18.7.4.10 within Section 18.7 contain errors where the applied sensitivity for construction workers is stated to be low for Section 1 to 7 and 10 and medium for Section 8 and 9.	These paragraphs should instead read as resulting in ‘a Moderate Adverse Significant effect without mitigation in Section 1 to 7 and 10’ and ‘a Major to Moderate Adverse Significant Effect without mitigation in Section 8 and 9’.

Location in the 2019 ES	Error noted in the 2019 ES	Amended text in ES Addendum
<b>Chapter 19 (Groundwater) (APP-134)</b>	Paragraph 19.5.2.22 – reference to Section 3 under the heading of Section 4.	The information presented is correct, however the paragraph (as it relates to Section 3) has been placed under the wrong subheading, it should come under subheading ‘Section 3’ and not ‘Section 4’.
	Table 19.6 – contains repetitive entries.	These repetitions are instances where licences have been renewed based on Portsmouth Water changing its company name from Portsmouth Water Co. to Portsmouth Water Ltd. For example, in the case of Licence 11/42/33.1/1, the original licence ran from 23rd December 1965, until 11th June 2009 when the license was renewed following company name change.  In error all these entries are listed as “Portsmouth Water Ltd” in Table 19.6, whereas some should have been “Portsmouth Water Co.”
	Table 19.7 – includes several references to ‘ <i>mitigation measures outlined in...19.8</i> ’. Confirmation required as to what 19.8 is referring to.	The reference to Section 19.8 in Table 19.7 is a typographical error and should instead be referencing Section 19.7 (Proposed Mitigation and Enhancement).
<b>Chapter 20 (Surface Water Resources and Flood Risk) (APP-135)</b>	Paragraph 20.8.1.13 refers to transboundary effects instead of intra-project effects.	The text beneath the sub-heading ‘Intra-project Effects’ has been updated as follows:

Location in the 2019 ES	Error noted in the 2019 ES	Amended text in ES Addendum
		<p><i>“It is not currently considered that there are any significant intra-project effects as a result of the Proposed Development.”</i></p>
<p><b>Chapter 21 (Heritage and Archaeology) (APP-136)</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 21.8.2.2 refers to offsetting a minor effect.</p>	<p>The text has been amended to replace ‘offset’ with ‘reduced’. The reported effect, taking into account embedded mitigation planting, is not significant in EIA terms. There will be ‘harm’ but this is considered a minor adverse effect (not significant).</p>
	<p>Paragraph 21.4.1.4 contains ‘&lt;’ symbol.</p>	<p>The inclusion of ‘&lt;’ is a typographical error and has been removed from the paragraph.</p>
	<p>The Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment (‘HEDBA’) (Appendix 21.2 of the 2019 ES) (APP-442) was issued without the accompanying figures or appendices.</p>	<p>These have been appended to this ES Addendum as Appendix 17 (document reference 7.8.1.17) and are provided for information purposes.</p>
<p><b>Chapter 22 (Traffic and Transport) (APP-137)</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 22.4.3.4 makes reference to ‘IEMA topics’ but does not define these or their relevance.</p>	<p>The reference to IEMA topics is incorrect and should instead state ‘EIA topics’.</p> <p>EIA topics relate to Chapter 22 where assumptions included within this chapter have been used in other assessments or where information contained within the Transport Assessment, Framework Traffic Management Strategy or Framework Construction</p>

Location in the 2019 ES	Error noted in the 2019 ES	Amended text in ES Addendum
		<p>Traffic Management Plan is relevant to these assessments.</p> <p>The reference to Heritage and conversation areas within Chapter 21 (Heritage and Archaeology) of the ES (APP-136) is incorrect and has been removed.</p>
	<p>Paragraph 22.4.9.6 requires clarification.</p>	<p>The paragraph should instead read:</p> <p><i>A breakdown of links by sensitivity is provided in Appendix 22.4 (Baseline and Methodology Tables (AS-017). For junctions included within the scope of the TA, the following methodology has been used to categorise their sensitivity:</i></p>

Location in the 2019 ES	Error noted in the 2019 ES	Amended text in ES Addendum
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Junctions over capacity in either the AM or PM 2026 DM scenario have been categorised as having a High sensitivity rating as set-out in Table 22.5;</i></li> <li>• <i>Junctions approaching capacity in either the AM or PM 2026 DM scenario have been categorised as having a Medium sensitivity rating as set-out in Table 22.5; and</i></li> <li>• <i>All other junctions have been classified as having a Low sensitivity rating, on the basis that they are not predicted to experience congestion in the 2026 DM scenarios.</i></li> </ul>
	<p>Paragraph 22.6.5.13 should clarify which highway is referred to in “However, given the potential for a temporary stopping up of the highway...”.</p>	<p>The paragraph should instead read:  <i>“However, given the potential for a temporary stopping up of Broadway Lane and Day Lane...”.</i></p>
	<p>Paragraph 22.6.5.16 requires revision.</p>	<p>The paragraph should instead read:  <i>“The majority of the Onshore Cable Corridor in Section 1 is off-carriageway and thus the impacts on Accidents and Safety from a traffic and transport perspective are considered to be <b>Negligible</b></i></p>

Location in the 2019 ES	Error noted in the 2019 ES	Amended text in ES Addendum
		<i>adverse and of a temporary and medium-term nature. This effect is considered to be <b>Not Significant</b> and the level of significance has not changed from the submitted 2019 ES.</i>
	Paragraph 22.6.8.19 and Table 22.10 contain a typographical error referring to ‘Ashton Road’ rather than ‘Aston Road.	The references to this location have been updated as follows: “B2105 Hambledon Road / Aston Road”
	Paragraph 22.7.1.4 is missing ‘not’.	The paragraph should instead read: “The cumulative effects assessment has not identified any other developments for consideration in Stage 3 & 4 either during the construction or operational stage.”
<b>Chapter 23 (Air Quality) (APP-138)</b>	Paragraph 23.3.7.3 contains typographical errors.	<i>Human and ecological health impacts resulting from the combustion of diesel as fuel for generators required to provide backup power (2 x 200 kVA) for the ORS and the Converter Station (2x 800 kVA). The operation of these is expected to be no more than six occasions per year for no more than 24 hours at a time, with a single annual test for one hour to ensure efficient operation of the backup generators.</i>

Location in the 2019 ES	Error noted in the 2019 ES	Amended text in ES Addendum
<b>Chapter 25 (Socio-economics) (APP-140)</b>	Paragraph 25.7.2.5 sits under the heading ‘ <i>Construction (and Decommissioning) Stage</i> ’ and clarification has been sought to understand if this paragraph relates to the Decommissioning Stage, or just the Construction Stage.	Paragraph 25.7.2.5 should be read in relation to the Construction Stage and not the Decommissioning Stage.
	Paragraph 25.7.2.20 incorrectly refers to “ <i>Chapter 24 (Noise and Vibration)</i> ”.	The text has been updated to refer to ‘Chapter 23 (Air Quality) (APP-138 Rev002) instead.
<b>Chapter 26 (Human Health) (APP-141)</b>	Table 26.3 did not clearly state the description for intensity, specifically that it is based on the size of the sensitive population affected by an impact.	The wording in Table 26.3 in the column for “intensity” should instead read as follows: Major effect: “ <i>The exposures tend to be of high intensity, over a large geographical area, or affect a large number of sensitive people</i> ”. Moderate effect: “ <i>The exposures tend to be of moderate intensity and/or over a relatively localised area and/or likely to affect a moderate-large number of sensitive people e.g. between 100-500.</i> ” Minor effect: “ <i>The exposures tend to be of a low intensity and/or over a small area and/or affect a small number of sensitive people e.g. less than 100.</i> ”



Location in the 2019 ES	Error noted in the 2019 ES	Amended text in ES Addendum
<b>Other Documents</b>		
<b>Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan ('CEMP') (APP-505)</b>	Paragraph 6.10.1.1 – there is an error in the wording which has been updated to clarify the meaning in particular of 'minimising' 'significant constraints' on tree groups.	This wording has been updated as follows: <i>Impacts on tree group G900 within Milton Locks Nature Reserve and tree group G697 within Bransbury Park shall be minimised through design and construction methodology. Measures shall be taken to avoid positioning cables in conflict with RPAs of existing trees, following BS 5837 as a minimum, and overseen by a suitably qualified clerk of works. Liaison shall take place with the site manager at Milton Locks Nature Reserve to agree the most appropriate form of mitigation.</i>
<b>Mitigation Schedule (APP-489)</b>	Entry 28.3 makes reference to the Onshore Outline CEMP and has been updated to refer to the correct document.	<i>Marine Outline CEMP (APP-488 Rev002)</i>
	Entry 28.5 and 28.6 has misplaced and missing text.	For 28.5 in the 'ES Source (Para)' column it should state ' <i>Table 28.17</i> ' and not ' <i>Table 28.15</i> '.  In the 'Mitigation Measures (as set out in the ES)' column it should state ' <i>The mitigation measures listed at Table 28.17 which are embedded within the Construction Stage</i> ' and not ' <i>The mitigation</i> '

Location in the 2019 ES	Error noted in the 2019 ES	Amended text in ES Addendum
		<p>measures listed at Table 28.15 which are embedded within the Construction Stage’.</p> <p>For 28.6 in the ‘ES Source (Para)’ column it should state ‘<i>Table 28.19</i>’ and not ‘Table 28.17’.</p> <p>In the ‘Subject/ Potential Impact’ column it should state ‘<i>Embedded mitigation within the of the Converter Station design</i>’ and not ‘within the of the Converter Station design Embedded mitigation’.</p> <p>In the ‘Mitigation Measures (as set out in the ES)’ column it should state ‘<i>The mitigation measures listed at Table 28.19 which are embedded within the design of the Converter Station</i>’ and not ‘The mitigation measures listed at Table 28.15 which are embedded within the design of the Converter Station’</p>
<p><b>Indicative Telecommunications Buildings Elevations and Floor Plans (APP-015);</b></p> <p><b>Indicative Converter Station Area Layout Plans (APP-013);</b></p> <p><b>Indicative Optical Regeneration Station(s) Elevations and Floor Plans (APP-016);</b></p>	<p>The Indicative Telecommunications Buildings Elevations and Floor Plans, Indicative Converter Station Area Layout Plans, Indicative Optical Regeneration Station(s) Elevations and Floor Plans and Optical Regeneration Station(s) Parameter Plan appear to lack scale</p>	<p>The following plans have had scale bars added and have been resubmitted with this document:</p>

Location in the 2019 ES	Error noted in the 2019 ES	Amended text in ES Addendum
<b>Optical Regeneration Station(s) Parameter Plan (APP-017).</b>	bars and it is not clear what scale they should be printed or viewed at.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicative Telecommunications Buildings Elevations and Floor Plans (APP-015 Rev02);</li> <li>• Indicative Converter Station Area Layout Plans (APP-013 Rev02);</li> <li>• Indicative Optical Regeneration Station(s) Elevations and Floor Plans (APP-016 Rev02);</li> <li>• Optical Regeneration Station(s) Parameter Plan (APP-017 Rev02).</li> </ul> <p>Information relating to scale of the drawing and paper size is included within the drawing title block.</p>
<b>Funding Statement (APP-023)</b>	Paragraph 7.2.1 – incorrect reference to paragraph 7.4.3 instead of 7.2.3	Reference updated to refer to paragraph 7.2.3 instead.
<b>Marine Outline CEMP (APP-488)</b>	Paragraph 5.6.2.2 is incomplete	<p>Text has been updated to be read as follows:</p> <p><i>“Contractors will ensure that Cable Laying Vessels (‘CLV’) will display appropriate marks and lights, and broadcast their status on AIS at all times, to indicate the nature of the work in progress, and highlight their restricted manoeuvrability.”</i></p>

