



AQUIND Limited

AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR

Applicant's Response to Written Questions ExQ1

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010, Rule 8(1)(b)
The Planning Act 2008

Document Ref: 7.4.1

PINS Ref.: EN020022

AQUIND Limited

AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR

Applicant's Response to Written Questions ExQ1

PINS REF.: EN020022

DOCUMENT: 7.4.1

DATE: 6 OCTOBER 2020

WSP

WSP House

70 Chancery Lane

London

WC2A 1AF

+44 20 7314 5000

www.wsp.com

DOCUMENT

Document	Applicant's Response to Written Questions ExQ1
Revision	001
Document Owner	WSP UK Limited
Prepared By	Various
Date	October 2020
Approved By	A. Hallam
Date	October 2020

CONTENTS

1.	RESPONSES TO FIRST WRITTEN QUESTIONS	1-1
1.1.	INTRODUCTION	1-1

TABLES

Table 1.1 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Miscellaneous and General	1-2
Table 1.2 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Air Quality	1-16
Table 1.3 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Compulsory Acquisition	1-24
Table 1.4 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Cultural Heritage	1-74
Table 1.5 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Draft Development Consent Order	1-78
Table 1.6 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Environmental Impact Assessment and Environmental Statement	1-102
Table 1.7 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Flood Risk	1-112
Table 1.8 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Habitats and Ecology (Onshore)	1-116
Table 1.9 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Landscape and Visual Amenity	1-123
Table 1.10 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Marine Environment	1-143
Table 1.11 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Noise	1-158
Table 1.12 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Onshore Water Environment	1-168
Table 1.13 - Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Planning Policy	1-175
Table 1.14 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Shipping and Navigation	1-178
Table 1.15 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Socio-Economic Effects	1-181

Table 1.16 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Traffic and Transport	1-190
Table 1.17 - Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Trees	1-205

1. RESPONSES TO FIRST WRITTEN QUESTIONS

1.1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1.1.1. This document is submitted on behalf of AQUIND Limited (the 'Applicant') in relation to an application (the 'Application') for a Development Consent Order ('DCO') to authorise the elements of AQUIND Interconnector (the 'Project') within England and the waters adjacent to England up to seaward limits of the territorial sea (the 'Proposed Development')
- 1.1.1.2. The Application submitted to the Secretary of State ('SoS') for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy ('BEIS') pursuant to Section 37 of The Planning Act 2008 (as amended) (the 'PA 2008') on 14 November 2019. The Application was accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate ('PINS') on behalf of the Secretary of State on 12 December 2019.
- 1.1.1.3. This document provides responses from the Applicant to the Examining Authority's first written questions.

Table 1.1 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Miscellaneous and General

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
MG1.1.1	The Applicant	What was the rationale and justification for confining the siting search for the converter station to 2km from the existing Lovedean substation? (Planning Statement [APP-108] refers.)	<p>The rationale and justification for confining the siting search area to 2km is the result of a number of factors including the following:</p> <p>The AC (alternating current) connection between the Lovedean substation and the proposed converter station will be by underground cables. AC cables generate a phenomenon known as Reactive Power¹, the level of which would increase linearly with the length of the underground cable. This unwanted reactive power would need to be compensated for in the design of the AC to DC (direct current) converter equipment, increasing its size, impacting on the footprint of the station and equipment costs.</p> <p>The use of longer AC cables between Lovedean substation and the proposed converter station also introduces the risk of harmonic resonances², which could severely disrupt the operation of the converter station and impact on the quality of the power delivered to consumers. Installing harmonic filter equipment at the converter station to counteract such effects would have added to the footprint and cost of the converter station. A typical harmonic filter has a footprint of 30m x 30m, with equipment about 10 – 12m in height.</p> <p>Compared with HVDC (high voltage direct current) cables, HVAC (high voltage alternating current) cables generate additional power losses in the insulation material (“dielectric losses”) and the metallic sheath (“sheath losses”), so the length of the AC cables should be minimised. Because AC circuits are 3-phase, and because of the additional power losses, 3-off cables with larger conductors would be required to transmit the same power as 2-off DC cables. The power losses in AC cables are about 75% higher than for DC cables, estimated to be 89kW/km for AC cables and 51kW/km for DC cables.</p> <p>From a construction perspective, the Converter Station will require seven Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) deliveries, i.e. the interface transformers. Each unit will weigh around 300 tonnes and will require a multi-axle transporter of around 60m in length. As similar AILs were installed in the National Grid Lovedean substation, it was known that the transportation of such AILs to the new station would be possible where the new station was close to Lovedean. Had a remote location been chosen the transport difficulties and disruption to local communities could have been much greater.</p> <p>The capital cost of long AC cables and the loss of power in the cables, in addition to reducing the extent of land to be affected by the wider AC Cable trenches and permanent easement, were compelling factors in minimising their length.</p>
MG1.1.2	The Applicant	<p>The application documents report that the siting of Converter Station is subject to ongoing discussions. Is there any progress and when can the ExA expect a conclusion for the purposes of the EIA and any DCO?</p> <p>If the optionality between B(i) and B(ii) was not concluded prior</p>	<p>The siting of the Converter Station is subject to ongoing discussion with a number of landowners. The status of negotiations with the respective parties is provided in the updated Statement of Reasons (APP-022 Rev-002). The Applicant is confident the negotiations with each of the parties can be concluded in advance of the end of the Examination.</p> <p>The optionality between Converter Station location options B(i) and B(ii) is dependent on securing the agreement of National Grid to use Plot 1-27 for the siting of part of the Converter Station to facilitate Option B(ii) without detriment to National Grid’s operations at the Lovedean substation. The Applicant is confident Heads of Terms will be agreed with National Grid in the near future and an Option Agreement for the necessary rights will be agreed between the parties before the end of the Examination.</p> <p>Where the optionality between B(i) and B(ii) remains within the Application, we would expect the ExA to make a recommendation based on either option being used, taking into account the impacts of each, on the basis that this is what has been assessed and applied for.</p>

¹ Reactive power is caused by electromagnetic effects in AC equipment, such as cables. It does no useful work (heat, light, etc.) but requires extra “effort” from the AC network, increasing the rating of all equipment.

² The AC network works at a frequency of 50 Hz (cycles/second), but the AC cable can excite resonance conditions at frequencies which are a multiple of 50Hz (100Hz, 150Hz, etc.) which can result in poor quality of the power to consumers on the AC network. The longer the AC cables the more impacts there may be from harmonic resonance effects.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		to the end of the Examination, would you expect the ExA to make a recommendation based on the worst-case in respect of each environmental factor associated with the two options (paragraph 3.6.3.32 of the ES [APP-118] refers)?	
MG1.1.3	The Applicant	Explain the design approach and design credentials of the Converter Station buildings and structures. Reference should be made to the objectives in section 4.5 of NPS EN-1 and how the proposed development seeks to address or exceed the expectations of good design set out in the National Design Guide.	The Applicant has produced a separate Position Statement submitted alongside these responses in relation to the National Design Guide and Optical Regeneration Stations, Appendix 1 to this document (document reference 7.4.1.1) which sets out how the Converter Station seeks to address or exceed the expectations of good design set out in the National Design Guide and the objectives in section 4.5 of NPS EN-1.
MG1.1.4	The Applicant	Explain the design approach and design credentials of the Optical Regeneration Stations. Reference should be made to the objectives in section 4.5 of NPS EN-1 and how the proposed development seeks to address or exceed the expectations of good design set out in the National Design Guide.	The Applicant has produced a separate Position Statement submitted alongside these responses in relation to the National Design Guide and Optical Regeneration Stations, Appendix 2 to this document (document reference 7.4.1.2) which sets out how the ORS seek to address or exceed the expectations of good design set out in the National Design Guide and the objectives in section 4.5 of NPS EN-1.
MG1.1.5	The Applicant	The Consultation Report [APP-025] describes a	The series of six design meetings held with the East Hampshire District Council, Winchester City Council and South Downs National Park Authority informed the set of design principles (including general, building design and landscape principles) set out at

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
	Local planning authorities	great deal of discussion and progress with a range of interested planning authorities on the concept design of the Converter Station buildings. What certainty does each of the local authorities have that its views and the agreements that have been made with them would be incorporated into the final design?	Section 6 of the Updated DAS (APP- 114 Rev02). These design principles are secured by Requirement 6 of the dDCO (APP-019) which require the Applicant to confirm how the final detailed designs of the Converter Station accord with the design principles and require the final detailed designs to be approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the South Downs National Park Authority before any works can commence. The Applicant is continuing discussions with the interested planning authorities to seek to reach a consensus with all.
MG1.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Please describe how the final finished floor level for the Converter Station was arrived at, and how this is dealt with in the design principles and parameter plans and tables ([APP-012] and [APP-019]).</p> <p>Confirm that the EIA used the 'worst case' within the Rochdale envelope that is set for this, especially LVIA and in relation to impacts on groundwater.</p>	<p>The proposed final finished floor level of 85.1 m above ordnance datum (AOD) for the Converter Station buildings was defined as a result of the recommendation of the Flood Risk Assessment, ground investigation and the initial earthworks review to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposed Converter Station level lies within structureless chalk to minimise impact on the SPZ1; an allowance is provided for within structureless chalk (to ensure no breach of the aquifer) for installation of below ground services such as drainage, low-voltage (LV) and high-voltage (HV) cable ducts and trenches; and maximum retention of the excavated material on site, thus minimising the need for offsite disposal of the excavated material, resulting in a lower environmental impact. <p>The preliminary ground investigation data supports the proposed converter station level of 84.80 m AOD to ensure below ground services will lie within the structureless chalk to mitigate the risk of Aquifer contamination. The design will be developed at the detailed design stage in full compliance with the updated Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy (APP-360 Rev 002) that is submitted as Appendix 7 to the updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev 002), and secured under Requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p> <p>It is confirmed the EIA used the 'worst case' within the Rochdale envelope that is set for this, including in relation to LVIA and in relation to impacts on groundwater.</p> <p>A response to this question has been provided within Appendix 3 to this document 'Proposed Site Level and Earthworks Methodology' (document reference 7.4.1.3).</p>
MG1.1.7	The Applicant	In the Onshore Outline CEMP [APP-505], there are numerous references to SINC's, but these do not seem to appear on the constraint maps in Appendix 1. Please can the Applicant clarify.	<p>The constraints map has been updated to include the SINC's, and the map submitted alongside the updated Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (APP-505), Appendix 1.</p> <p>WCC has requested inclusion of new Soake Farm SINC on 30 August 2020 and this has also been incorporated into the updated Onshore Outline CEMP as Appendix 1.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
MG1.1.8	The Applicant	<p>In Table 2.1 of the Onshore Outline CEMP [APP-505], please could the Applicant explain why:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not all receptors addressed later in the document are included in this summary list (for example, hedgehogs and Wildlife and Countryside Act Schedule 9 plants); • '<i>semi-improved negligible and calcareous grassland</i>' appears twice in the onshore ecology entry: and please clarify what is meant here by 'negligible'; • the list in the heritage and archaeology entry is restricted to below-ground archaeological assets and excludes built heritage assets. 	<p>Following further discussions with stakeholders and a comprehensive review including clarifications sought in the Written Questions, the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) has been reviewed and an update to this (Rev 002) is submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that some ecological features referenced later in the text were omitted from Table 2.1 and a correction has been made to include these in the updated Onshore Outline CEMP. The following additional features have been added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wintering intertidal birds • Hedgehog • Wildlife and Countryside Act Schedule 9 plants <p>With regard to 'semi-improved negligible and calcareous grassland', the repetition and the word 'negligible' was a typographic error and has been corrected in the updated Onshore Outline CEMP.</p> <p>As outlined in Table 21.1 of the ES (APP-136), an assessment of Construction Stage effects on above ground heritage assets in the vicinity of the Converter Station and Onshore Cable Route is scoped out of the ES.</p> <p>Due to the proximity of parts of the Order Limits to the possible curtilage structures of listed buildings (associated assets such as boundary walls), built heritage assets have now been included in the revised Table 2.1 of the updated Onshore Outline CEMP. The following has been added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above Ground Heritage Assets adjacent or close to the Order Limits, including curtilage of listed buildings (i.e. associated boundary walls) <p>Whilst such assets would not be physically affected by the development proposals, it is considered prudent to note the possibility (albeit very low) for accidental strike damage from the movement of plant involved in construction activities.</p>
MG1.1.9	The Applicant	<p>At paragraph 4.1.1.1 of the Onshore Outline CEMP [APP-505], the list of legislation referred to at Appendix 2 includes the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and the Control of Pollution Act 1974. Does the Applicant believe any caveats need to be added here to acknowledge the powers that would be</p>	<p>As is detailed at paragraph 6.17 of the Explanatory Memorandum (APP-020), no person is able to bring statutory nuisance proceedings under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in respect of noise, if the noise is created in the course of carrying out construction, operation or maintenance of the Authorised Development and for which notice has been given under section 60 or consent obtained under section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974.</p> <p>Accordingly, where such a notice or consent is issued in relation to the Authorised Development, Article 9(1)(a)(i) of the dDCO (APP-019) is effective. No caveats are considered to be required to be included at paragraph 4.1.1.1 or within Appendix 2 of the updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002) to acknowledge this position.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		introduced by Article 9 of the dDCO [APP-019]?	
MG1.1.10	The Applicant	<p>In the Onshore Outline CEMP [APP-505], at 6.2.1.1, could the Applicant please clarify the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the meaning of the acronym 'SWBGS'; • the relevance of the list of SWBGS sites in Principle 3; • what is considered a 'notable' level of background noise, and whether a specific average background noise level should be specified here; • whether Principles 7 and 8 should apply to SWBGS sites as well as the SPA itself. 	<p>The Applicant can confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'SWBGS' Refers to Solent Wader and Brent Goose Strategy as defined through The Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy Steering Group which includes representatives from the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust, Natural England, RSPB, Hampshire County Ecologists and East Solent Coastal Partnership. This has been clarified in the updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1. • The sites identified in the SWBGS as being important for Solent Wader and Brent Goose that overlap with the Proposed Development are not intended to be directly relevant to Principle 3. As detailed in Appendix 16.14 of the ES (APP-422) this list is given as context only. The updated Onshore Outline CEMP in Section 6.2.1 takes account of any revisions to the winter working principles that are agreed with Natural England further updated through the Examination as expressed in the Statement of Common Ground submitted at Deadline 1. • 'Notable' levels of background noise are defined in the Waterbirds Disturbance Toolkit (Cutts, Hemingway and Spencer, 2013³) which states that low level disturbance stimuli include those of 55 – 72dB LAeq in a highly disturbed environment with for example ambient background noise levels of <u>>60dB LAeq</u>. <p>The Applicant has continued discussions with Natural England on the Application of Principles 7 and 8 with respect to SWBGS sites. The Applicant has provided a report on Construction Noise Impacts on SWBGS Sites (document reference 7.8.1.18) which has also informed ecological sections of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) and the updated HRA Report (APP-491 Rev002). This has considered noise impacts on the SWBGS sites in addition to the SPA and has led to an update to the Winter Working Principles. An agreement on this matter is captured in a Statement of Common Ground between the parties and an update to the principles is included in the updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev-002)..</p>
MG1.1.11	The Applicant	In the Onshore Outline CEMP [APP-505], is there a missing heading to introduce a new section following 6.2.1.3? (The following paragraphs do not seem to relate to winter SPA restrictions.)	A sub-heading is indeed missing above paragraph 6.2.1.3. This should state 'Habitat Preservation' and has been included in the updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
MG1.1.12	The Applicant	Section 6.2.1.7 of the Onshore Outline CEMP [APP-505] appears to relate to a specific	The advice in Section 6.2.1.7 is specific to the Farlington Playing Fields work site, which will support HDD. Specific measures are to be put in place here to avoid lighting disturbance of bats and permit working into the evening.

³ Cutts, N., Hemingway, K. and Spencer, J., 2013. Waterbird disturbance mitigation toolkit. Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, University of Hull.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>location on the cable installation route. Could the Applicant advise if this should be a general measure in relation to bats and lighting across the construction area?</p> <p>If not, why not?</p>	<p>These measures refine the general measures to control lighting disturbance on bats which apply more widely across the construction area included in the bullet point 'Restriction of Night working' under Section 5.3.1.1.</p>
<p>MG1.1.13</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Please could the Applicant clarify paragraph 6.3.2.1 of the Onshore Outline CEMP [APP-505], ('<i>The Outline Strategy will be prepared in accordance with the outline Strategy</i>').</p>	<p>This is an error. The Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002) has been updated to correct this with the revised text confirming 'The detailed landscaping scheme will be prepared in accordance with the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy'.</p>
<p>MG1.1.14</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>In the Onshore Outline CEMP [APP-505] at 6.3.5.9, a 'Temporary Site Water Management Plan' is 'proposed' to be developed and approved prior to commencement of construction work. Does the Applicant believe that this paragraph would be sufficient to secure its production through the DCO?</p> <p>Should an outline management plan be provided as an Appendix (similar to those at Appendices 3, 4 and 5 for the Outline Site Waste Management Plan, Outline Materials Management Plan and Outline Soils Resources</p>	<p>Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) paragraph 6.3.5.9 has been removed. The updated Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy (APP-360 Rev002) includes text in relation to construction water management and earthworks, which now forms Appendix 7 to the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev 002). The Applicant considers that the combination of the updated Requirement 15, the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) and Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy (APP-360) are sufficient to secure the required mitigations.</p> <p>The content of the updated Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy in relation to construction water management and earthworks were discussed and accepted in principle at the meetings with PW, EA and HCC on 5 August 2020 and 11 September 2020. At the request of PW, EA and HCC the Applicant is preparing a Generic Method Statement to cover outline construction water management and earthwork management plan in more detail to set out the minimum technical requirement for the construction water management and earthworks to mitigate the contamination of the Aquifer during the construction. The construction water management and earthwork management plan will be produced in full compliance with this document and this will be submitted to the relevant statutory authorities and other stakeholders prior to commencement of the construction. The Generic Method Statement will be an Appendix to Onshore Outline CEMP and will be secured under Requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019). It is anticipated this document will be submitted at Deadline 2.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		Plan respectively) or, as a minimum, a framework to clarify the intended content?	
MG1.1.15	The Applicant	Could the Applicant explain why the restrictions set out in the Onshore Outline CEMP [APP-505] at 6.3.5.11 and 6.3.5.12 are not applied to subsequent rural sections of the cable installation route.	<p>Paragraphs 6.3.5.11 and 6.3.5.12 of the original Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) were taken directly from the Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Strategy (APP-360). A new revision of this Strategy has been prepared and is appended to the updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002) at Appendix 7, with the amended text included within the updated Onshore Outline CEMP in paragraphs 6.3.5.1 and 6.3.5.2.</p> <p>Those restrictions relevant to General Mitigation across the Proposed Development are outlined in sections 5.5, 5.6 and 5.7 of the updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002).</p>
MG1.1.16	The Applicant	For the avoidance of doubt, please could the Applicant re-word paragraph 6.10.1.1 of the Onshore Outline CEMP [APP-505] to clarify the meaning in particular of 'minimising' 'significant constraints' on tree groups.	<p>This is an error in the wording. The text should state:</p> <p><i>"Tree group G900 within Milton Locks nature reserve is an arboricultural constraint, and impacts to this tree group must be minimised through avoidance where practicable. The group G697 within Bransbury Park must also be avoided where practicable."</i></p> <p>This has been corrected in the updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002) and it is noted that a correction is also required in 1.7.10.12 of the ES Appendix 16.3 Arboriculture Report (APP-411). The correction to the Arboriculture Report has been addressed in the Errata Sheet contained in Appendix 1 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1.1) submitted at Deadline 1.</p>
MG1.1.17	The Applicant	The Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy [APP-506] summarises impacts on existing vegetation features through all phases of the Proposed Development and suggests mitigation, mostly through replacement planting for affected features. However, the replanting and management prescriptions in part 1.6 of the Plan appear to be restricted to sections 1 (Converter Station) and 10 (Optical	<p>Landscape mitigation and management prescriptions have only been prepared for sections 1 (Lovedean - Converter Station Area) and 10 (Eastney-Landfall).</p> <p>For the Onshore Cable Corridor, the flexibility required for design and construction means the necessary mitigation cannot be designed until the final alignment and construction areas have been determined and actual impacts are confirmed.</p> <p>Reference is made in the updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (APP-506 Rev002) to the mitigation measures associated with the Onshore Cable Corridor in Section 1.5. Paragraph 15.4.7.2 bullet point 6 of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) (APP-130) states <i>"[A]ll planting lost will be replaced with like for like species where practicable and in agreement with the relevant discharging authority."</i> The wording in the updated Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy has been revised in paragraph 5.1.3 and 5.3.2 to replicate this statement for mitigation measures associated with the Onshore Cable Route and to add that trees should be positioned at least 5 m away from the cable route and more specifically the cable trench within the Order Limits.</p> <p>Draft DCO (APP-019) Requirement 7 (provision of landscaping) has been updated so as to require a detailed landscaping scheme in relation to each phase of the Onshore Cable Route.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>Regeneration Station and landfall). Could the Applicant identify where the landscape management plans and outline management prescriptions for affected features along the cable route in sections 2 to 9 are set out.</p>	
<p>MG1.1.18</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Does the Applicant believe any updates are required to sections 1.1.2.4, 1.1.3.9, 1.6.1.3, 1.6.1.4 and 1.6.2.12 of the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy [APP-506]?</p>	<p>Following further discussions with stakeholders and clarifications sought through the Written Questions in conjunction with an overall review, the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (APP-506) has been updated (APP-506 Rev002) and is submitted at Deadline 1. The update includes amendments to sections 1.1.2.4, 1.1.3.9, 1.6.1.3, 1.6.1.4 and 1.6.2.12 as summarised below:</p> <p>Section 1.1.2.4 has been revised to align with references in the dDCO (APP-019) Requirements 7 and 8 which refer to a detailed landscaping scheme. The paragraph now states that a post consent detailed landscaping scheme which accords with the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy, will be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority before any phase of works within Works No. 2 (in consultation with the South Downs National Park Authority), Works No.4 and the construction of the ORS (Optical Regeneration Stations) within Works No.5 can commence. Landscaping provided in connection with Works No.2 and the ORS within Works No.5 will be required to be maintained by the undertaker for the operational life of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The detailed landscaping scheme will include detailed landscape mitigation plans together with management, maintenance and monitoring plans and responsibilities.</p> <p>Section 1.1.3.9 has been revised to be more specific to each section of the Proposed Development and has been reformatted to reflect the numbering in the document.</p> <p>Section 1.6.1.3 has been updated to clarify that this covers new planting which will be subject to a five-year establishment maintenance period as part of the landscape or construction contract and Appendix 2 referred to not Appendix 6.10.2. All existing and new planting falling within Works No. 2, No.4 and No.5 will be maintained throughout the operational lifetime of the Converter Station. Paragraph 1.4.5.1 bullet point 2 of the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy refers to maintaining existing hedgerows / hedgerow trees within the Order Limits. To give greater clarity throughout the document the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy has been revised.</p> <p>Section 1.6.1.4 has been amended to include reference to management areas for Section 10 Landfall and Appendix 2 not Appendix 6.10.2.</p> <p>Section 1.6.2.12 has been revised to read: “[R]efer to strategy management plans (included within Appendix 2 (Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy Management Plans) of this document for location of named hedgerows; and to the Appendix 16.3 (Arboriculture Report) (APP-411) for species composition and quality”.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
MG1.1.19	The Applicant	At 1.4.5 of the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy [APP-506], habitat enhancements are proposed at the Converter Station site. Can the Applicant confirm these to be enhancements rather than the mitigation of identified impacts of the Proposed Development, and detail what rights and powers are sought through any DCO to implement and maintain them?	<p>It is confirmed that these are enhancements, though the enhancements would incidentally provide a mitigation screening function. Habitat at the Converter Station site is currently of limited ecological value, being under the heavy influence of agricultural use. The proposals will lead to changes in habitat that will lead to enhancement in biodiversity value above what is currently present.</p> <p>Draft DCO (APP-019) Requirement 8 requires planting that is removed or dies within 5 years to be replaced, and for the landscaping associated with Works No.2 to be maintained for the lifetime of the Proposed Development. Rights and restrictions in relation to land are sought over all relevant areas to allow for the landscaping works to be carried out and retained/maintained for the lifetime of the Proposed Development, as is identified on the Land Plans (APP-008) and in the Book of Reference (APP-024).</p>
MG1.1.20	The Applicant	In the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy [APP-506], please could the Applicant identify by cross-reference where the drawings mentioned in 1.6.1.12 can be seen?	<p>The drawings mentioned in 1.6.1.12 can be seen at Appendix 2 of the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (APP-506). This has been corrected and made clear in the updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (APP-506 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.</p>
MG1.1.21	The Applicant	With reference to section 1.6.2 of the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy [APP-506], could the Applicant confirm that the proposed management prescriptions for the Converter Station area are intended to run for the full duration of the life of the Proposed Development.	<p>The proposed management prescriptions for existing, new and replacement planting are to run for the full duration of the operational life of the Proposed Development. This is confirmed in the revisions to dDCO (APP-019) Requirement 8.</p> <p>The Applicant is in discussions with a number of landowners in the vicinity of the Converter Station Area to agree the acquisition of land and easements to provide the rights required for the long term management of the land, including hedgerows, to enable the implementation and maintenance of the measures set out in the updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (APP-506 Rev002).</p> <p>The rights and restrictions sought are set out in Appendix A of the Statement of Reasons (APP-022) in the section titled New Landscaping Rights. The Book of Reference (APP-024) provides further granularity to show which plots the relevant rights are sought over.</p> <p>As the Applicant is intending to either acquire the land in question or secure the rights by easement there will be sufficient access arrangements in place to implement the proposed management prescriptions set out in the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy for the full duration of the operational life of the Proposed Development.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
MG1.1.22	The Applicant Portsmouth City Council	Does Portsmouth City Council accept that it would take responsibility for the maintenance of the proposed landscape planting at the landfall after 5 years of establishment, as suggested at 1.6.4.1 of the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy [APP-506]? Does the Applicant have a fallback proposal if agreement was not reached?	The Applicant will be responsible for the maintenance of the landscaping to be provided in connection with the optical regeneration stations, as is confirmed in the revisions to dDCO (APP-019) Requirement 8.
MG1.1.23	The Applicant	Could the Applicant review entry 28.3 of the Mitigation Schedule [APP-489] and make any amendments that may be necessary. It is unclear if the information referred to is found within the Onshore Outline CEMP [APP-505] as suggested, and thus where and how the measure is secured.	Entry 28.3 of the Mitigation Schedule (APP-489 Rev 002) relates to sustainable sourcing of rock for rock protection for the Marine Cables. The Mitigation Schedule incorrectly identifies the Onshore Outline CEMP as the controlling document. This entry is included and secured in the Marine Outline CEMP (APP-488) in paragraph 5.4.1.2 and therefore this should have been the cross reference used. The cross reference will be amended within the updated Mitigation Schedule to be submitted at Deadline 2.
MG1.1.24	The Applicant	Could the Applicant review entry 28.6 of the Mitigation Schedule [APP-489] and make any amendments that may be necessary. Text appears to be	In response to question DCO1.5.43 below, a detailed review of the Mitigation Schedule has been undertaken and an updated Mitigation Schedule will be submitted at Deadline 2. It is acknowledged that entry 28.6 was an error in the original Mitigation Schedule. For 28.6 in the 'ES Source (Para)' column it should state 'Table 28.19' and not 'Table 28.17'. In the 'Subject/ Potential Impact' column it should state ' <i>Embedded mitigation within the Converter Station design</i> ' and not ' <i>within the of the Converter Station design Embedded mitigation</i> '. 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 ' <i>The mitigation measures listed at Table 28.15 which are embedded within the design of the Converter Station</i> '. Entry 28.6 will be corrected in the updated Mitigation Schedule to be submitted at Deadline 2.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		missing or misplaced.	
MG1.1.25	The Applicant	The Indicative Converter Station Area Layout Plans appear to lack scale bars and it is not clear on the face of the drawings what scale they should be printed or viewed at. Could the Applicant please check each of the submitted plans to ensure a scale bar is included.	<p>The Applicant has reviewed all submitted plans to ensure that a scale bar is included in all instances when required. The Applicant can confirm that the following plans have had scale bars added and are submitted alongside these responses at Deadline 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicative Telecommunications Buildings Elevations and Floor Plans (APP-015 Rev02); • Indicative Converter Station Area Layout Plans (APP-013 Rev02); • Indicative Optical Regeneration Station(s) Elevations and Floor Plans (APP-016 Rev02); • Optical Regeneration Station(s) Parameter Plan (APP-017 Rev02).
MG1.1.26	The Applicant Environment Agency Portsmouth City Council	The proposed cable route includes a number of areas with known contamination issues, especially at Milton Common. Has the Applicant provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that, should the cable be installed at these locations, contamination could be dealt with appropriately and in such a way that there would be no significant adverse effects on human health, the water environment or biodiversity?	<p>The ground investigation campaign provided a general coverage of the Onshore Cable Route as well as targeted areas which included suspected historical areas of contamination. The scoping for the ground investigation was informed by a robust dataset which included publicly available data, purchased Envirocheck reports, site walkover findings and a consultation feedback. On site additional exploratory locations were scoped to target any other areas of contamination which was not evident or present during the initial scoping.</p> <p>The geo-environmental and geo-chemical testing was comprehensively scheduled to inform design to construction, confirmation testing will be required during construction. The investigation identified no areas of contamination outside of industry standard design, mitigation or management techniques and guidance.</p> <p>The ground investigation findings, coupled with the assessments of EIA specialists, support the feasibility of the project for successful construction, operation and decommissioning with no significant adverse effects on human health, the water environment or biodiversity. Mitigation measures specifically required for works through Milton Common are outlined in Section 6.9.2 of the updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002), compliance with which is secured within Requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p>
MG1.1.27	The Applicant	A number of Relevant Representations have raised the issue of the need for the Proposed Development in the context of the UK's withdrawal from the European Union. Could	<p>The national need for the Proposed Development is fully considered in the Needs and Benefits Report (APP-115) and the Needs and Benefits Report Addendum (document reference 7.7.7) submitted alongside these responses to the ExA written questions. The implications of Brexit on the continued operation of <u>all</u> interconnectors in the UK is discussed in Section 3.6 of the Needs and Benefits Report (APP-115)*, and in this regard the ExA should note that, whilst the position following the transition period continues to be negotiated, there will be still fundamental need for more interconnection between GB and France irrespectively of Brexit.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		the Applicant please outline any implications of this for the Proposed Development in terms of national policy and need.	<p>The national need for interconnectors is not diminished in any way by Brexit, with increased interconnection capacity continuing to be essential, so as to ensure energy security, affordability, achieve carbon emissions reductions, replace fossil fuel energy generating capacity, support increased supply from renewables and cater for future increases in electricity demand.</p> <p>National policy in relation to electricity interconnectors remains the same at the current time and is not affected by Brexit and is that which is discussed in the previously referred to documents. In context of the need to achieve decarbonisation, it is expected that electricity interconnectors will continue to benefit from positive policy support to assist with achieving net zero carbon emissions by 2050 as is required by the Climate Change Act 2008.</p> <p>The ExA should be aware of the draft working text for an agreement on energy between the United Kingdom and the EU, which sets out the negotiating position of the UK in relation to the continued electricity interconnection between the UK and EU. Whilst the Applicant cannot be expected to predict the outcome of the negotiations, the content of the draft agreement (available here - https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/886014/DRAFT_Energy_Agreement.pdf) clearly envisages continued unrestricted electricity interconnection between the UK and the EU (in particular see draft Article 15 - minimising restrictions on the use of electricity interconnectors).</p> <p>*Note that the figures quoted in Section 3.6 of the Needs and Benefits Report (APP-115) in Euros have been provided in sterling in response to question CA1.3.58.</p>
MG1.1.28	The Applicant	The UK has left the European Union since the submission of the Application. Does Brexit have any implications for the nature or funding of the Proposed Development or for the economic and environmental assessments that are set out in the application documents?	<p>The regulatory requirements in relation to the assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development remains unchanged by the occurrence of Brexit, and therefore Brexit has no implications for the environmental assessment of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Given the knowledge that Brexit would occur for some time prior to the submission of the Application, the economic uncertainties caused by Brexit have been fully considered and modelled in the Applicant's economic assessments for AQUIND Interconnector. Section 3.6 of the Needs and Benefits Report (APP-115) is relevant, and the ExA will note the conclusions provided at paragraph 3.6.1.5 that "the risks of reduced efficiency of AQUIND Interconnector trading its capacity outside of the Internal Energy Market are not prohibitive and the Project remains highly attractive even in a very conservative scenario".</p> <p>Noting the position already explained regarding the economic implications of Brexit, the Applicant is satisfied that the occurrence of Brexit will have no material impacts on the ability to obtain funding for the Project post-consent, or the nature of the likely funding to be available.</p>
MG1.1.29	The Applicant	In relation to carbon and climate change, and with respect to ES paragraphs 28.12.1, 28.12.2, 28.12.2.3, 28.12.25, 28.14.1 and 28.14.2 [APP-143], please could the Applicant clarify how and where each of the 'embedded' mitigation measures (and	<p>The marine design considerations listed in Table 28.23 are secured through pre-construction documentation requiring approval by the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) prior to the commencement of works or directly through the dDCO (APP-019):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cable specifications and cable burial depth will be secured through the Cable Burial and Installation Plan (dDCO, Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 4(1)(c)). This Plan will be submitted to the MMO for approval at least four months prior to the commencement of licensed activities as secured through dDCO, Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 5. • Pre-construction surveys to inform the presence and location of sensitive habitats, final cable routes and installation methodologies including the need for seabed preparation is secured through dDCO, Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 3. • Methods for dredge and disposal (as described in paragraph 5.5.1.4 of the Outline Marine CEMP [APP-488]) will be produced prior to the commencement of licensable activities to identify the methods of seabed preparation relating to mobile sediments and disposal locations. These methods will be secured through the Cable Burial and Installation Plan (dDCO, Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 4(1)(c)(i)). Disposal locations have been secured through designation of disposal sites with

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>'features') listed in Tables 28.17, 28.19, 28.21, 28.23 and 28.25 and in 28.14.2.1 are secured through the dDCO [APP-019].</p> <p>Where measures would be reliant on the further development and approval of the Onshore and Marine Outline CEMPs ([APP-505] and [APP-488]) following any making of a DCO, please identify how and where the outline documents ensure that such measures would be included in the final versions.</p>	<p>reference codes WI048 and WI049 which will be secured through dDCO, Schedule 15, Part 1, Paragraph 4 (3) and Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 8 (3) and (4).</p> <p>The mitigations and design considerations listed in Tables 28.17, 28.19, 28.21, 28.25 and paragraph 28.14.2.1 are mostly relevant for onshore construction.</p> <p>The embedded mitigation measures and design features that have been considered in the climate resilience assessment are secured through the updated Onshore Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) (APP-505 Rev002) and the Marine Outline CEMP (APP-488), compliance with which is secured by Requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019) and Condition 4 of the Deemed Marine Licence respectively.</p> <p>The resilience measures specified in paragraph 28.14.2.1 of Chapter 28 of the ES (APP-143) are good practice measures which were identified to further increase the resilience of the Proposed Development during operation. The updated Mitigation Schedule to be submitted at Deadline 2 will provide clarification on how these are secured.</p>
MG1.1.30	The Applicant	<p>How has the loss of best and most versatile land been minimised and justified (paragraph 7.5.1.4 of the Planning Statement [APP-108] refers)?</p>	<p>Paragraph 7.5.1.4 of the Planning Statement (APP-108) states '<i>The anticipated loss of agricultural land as part of the operational stage is fully justified in line with Paragraph 5.10.15 of EN-1 as the loss of BMV land has been minimised and justified.</i>'</p> <p>The ES considered permanent land-take as a construction effect, whereas para 7.5.1.4 of the Planning Statement (APP-108) described permanent land-take as 'part of the operational stage'. The permanent loss of agricultural land comprises 24.9 ha, of which 5 ha (20%) is BMV in Subgrade 3a. The only permanent loss of BMV land is within Section 1 of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Para 5.10.15 of EN-1 states that the Secretary of State should ensure that schemes are not sited on BMV land without justification. Approximately 80% of the agricultural land required permanently is poorer quality land which para 5.10.15 says should be given little weight.</p> <p>Following the identification of Lovedean substation as the grid connection point, a Converter Station location was sought within 2 km of the Lovedean substation site. The reasoning for the defined search area is included in section 3.2.1.2 of the updated DAS (APP-114 Rev002) and is discussed in response to ExA WQ MG1.1.1.</p> <p>The Converter Station options have been sited within Grade 3b and 4 agricultural land to seek to reduce the impacts on areas of BMV land. However, small areas of BMV are subject to permanent loss to provide the vehicular access to the Converter Station from Broadway Lane, and for essential landscaping - this land occurs in a block to the south and south-west of the Converter Station and there are no other options available to meet these requirements on poorer quality land.</p>
MG1.1.31	The Applicant	<p>It is noted in the operational assessments for Sections 2, 3 and 4 to 10 in Chapter 17 of the ES [APP-132], soils that</p>	<p>Paragraph 17.6.3.7 of the ES Chapter 17 (Soils and Agricultural Land Use) (APP-132) indicates that the restored soil profile in Section 2 would be reduced by 300mm from 1200mm to 900mm over the buried cable but that this is not anticipated to affect the quality of agricultural land. This is because the quality of agricultural land in Section 2 is determined by a soil wetness limitation, which depends on the depth to the slowly permeable layer. This occurs at the base of the upper subsoil/top of the lower subsoil and will be the same depth pre- and post-installation. The slowly permeable layer is deeper in the best and most versatile land but</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		are excavated and subsequently replaced to facilitate the installation of the infrastructure may deteriorate in quality and thus not retain their pre-existing ALC classification. How has the assessment addressed this possibility when reaching conclusions, particularly in respect of pre-existing best and most versatile agricultural land?	<p>still well above 900mm below ground level. Therefore, the grading in terms of the ALC guidelines will be unaltered for the restored soil profile.</p> <p>Paragraph 17.6.3.8 of ES Chapter 17 acknowledges that some minor deterioration is likely to occur following disturbance of the in-situ soil - this refers to the disturbance to the soil structure as a result of excavating the trenches and the time required for the soil to re-establish its structure once it has been restored. However, as indicated above, this is not the determining factor of ALC grading, and so the grading of the land would therefore not be affected.</p> <p>These comments also apply to the relevant paragraphs for Sections 3 (17.6.4.9 and 17.6.4.10) and Sections 4-10 (17.6.5.6 and 17.6.5.7) of ES Chapter 17.</p>
MG1.1.32	The Applicant	The proposal is subject to the TEN-E Regulations. At the time of submission there was no agreement or otherwise in place from the French authorities in this regard. Could the Applicant please provide an update on the situation.	<p>AQUIND Interconnector was not included in the 4th PCI list, established by the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/389 dated 31 October 2019 (available here https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg_del/2020/389/oj), which came into effect on 31st March 2020. Article 5(9) to the TEN-E Regulations provides that “<i>Projects which are no longer on the Union list shall lose all rights and obligations linked to the status of project of common interest arising from this Regulation. However, a project which is no longer on the Union list but for which an application file has been accepted for examination by the competent authority shall maintain the rights and obligations arising from Chapter III, except where the project is no longer on the list for the reasons set out in paragraph 8</i>”.</p> <p>Article 5(8) provides a project may be removed from the Union list if its inclusion was based on incorrect information which was a determining factor for that inclusion, or the project does not comply with union. The Applicant confirms AQUIND Interconnector was not removed from the Union List pursuant to Article 5(8).</p> <p>As application files for AQUIND Interconnector were accepted for examination in both the UK and France before 1 April 2020, the rights and obligations arising from Chapter III are required to be maintained by the competent authority in each country.</p> <p>It is noted that Article 7 of Chapter III which continues to be applicable identifies the necessity of AQUIND Interconnector from an energy policy perspective, and acknowledges the requirement for AQUIND Interconnector to be allocated the status of the highest national significance possible and be treated as such in permit granting processes.</p>
MG1.1.33	The Applicant	Arrangements for various types of monitoring are said to be set out and secured through the Onshore Outline CEMP [APP-505] and dDCO [APP-019], including, <i>inter alia</i> , landscape planting,	A review of the various types of monitoring to be secured through the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) and dDCO (APP-019) has been undertaken. Remedial measures taken, should non-compliance occur, including the triggers for such measures are set out in Table 7.1 of the updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002).

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		ancient woodland, badger setts, soils and waste management, contamination, archaeology and air quality. In each case where monitoring is offered and secured, please can the Applicant explain what remedial measures would be taken should non-compliance occur and what the triggers would be for such remedial measures to require implementation.	

Table 1.2 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Air Quality

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
AQ1.2.1	The Applicant	Paragraph 23.2.3.2 of ES Chapter 23 [APP-138] appears to suggest that NPS EN-1 is not relevant to the air quality assessments of the Proposed Development. Could the Applicant review this assertion and comment on whether any additional evaluation may be necessary. In doing so, please take account of the Direction from the Secretary of State to treat this project as an NSIP (using the same thresholds applicable to energy generation) and the detail of sections 4 in relation to human health and 5 in relation to air quality impacts (including generated traffic) of NPS EN-1 in particular.	The Air Quality Chapter has been updated (APP-138 Rev002) and is included with the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) submitted at Deadline 1. Section 23.2.3.2 of the updated Air Quality chapter has been expanded to include references to NPS EN-1, and to better reflect the assessment of back-up power emissions from the Optical Regeneration Stations and Converter Station, and the inclusion of the Langstone Harbour designated site and ancient woodlands.
AQ1.2.2	Portsmouth City Council	In relation to the Air Pollution SPD referred to by the Applicant in paragraph 23.2.3.7 of the ES [APP-138], what is expected of developments and against what criteria should a scheme be assessed? Has an independent assessment been made against the SPD? The ES [APP-138] states that the effect on air quality would be ‘negligible beneficial’. It reaches this conclusion by weighing totalled receptor deteriorations against totalled receptor improvements. Does Portsmouth City Council believe that this is a suitable approach and conclusion?	

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		Has the Applicant demonstrated through evidence that the Proposed Development would not adversely affect air quality or cause a failure to meet air quality objectives in the City?	
AQ1.2.3	Hampshire County Council	Are there any updates or results emerging from the Inquiry commissioned into air quality at this stage or will findings be available to the ExA during the Examination period? (Paragraph 23.2.3.14 of the ES [APP-138] refers.)	
AQ1.2.4	The Applicant	<p>Can you fully explain the requirements of the air quality Ministerial Directives relating to parts of the Portsmouth City Council area in terms of levels, timescales, and so on?</p> <p>Can you explain the mitigation measures that are being pursued by the Council at present to achieve these aims, and comment on any implications of the Proposed Development for the Directives and for the Council's proposed measures?</p>	<p>The Ministerial Direction states that a "Class B clean air zone should be operational from November 2021. A daily charge for non-complaint HGVs, buses, coaches and taxis and public hire vehicles would be charged to those travelling in the zone to the south west of the city." Technical modelling to inform the full business case is currently being completed by PCC, following which it is anticipated they will present their proposals to the Government for approval in November 2020.</p> <p>The mitigation measures being followed by PCC are described in the Outline Business Case for the Air Quality Action plan to improve air quality and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class B Charging Clean Air Zone (CAZ); • Changes to parking capacity and pricing south of the city centre; • Improvements to strategic cycling routes; • Changes to Alfred Road traffic signals; • Progressive tightening of taxi licensing rules; • Rapid charging points at taxi ranks; • Reduced fee/ free residents parking permits for low emission vehicles; • Travel planning and behaviour change measures; • Targeted communications and marketing initiatives; <p>Given the negligible impacts at receptors and the concentrations recorded in the Do-Minimum scenario, and the temporary short-term nature of the impacts, the Proposed Development has no material impact in terms of potential delay to compliance with the Ministerial Direction. A description of these aspects is included in the updated ES Addendum Chapter 23 (APP-138 Rev 002).</p>
AQ1.2.5	The Applicant	Please provide a separate assessment of effects for each of the relevant Air Quality Management Areas (paragraph 23.4.3.7 of the ES [APP-138]) and conclude whether, and to what extent, air quality would deteriorate or improve within each.	<p>The separate effects on each of the AQMA covered by the affected road network have been included in the updated ES Chapter 23 (APP-138 Rev 002). In summary these are as follows.</p> <p>AQMA N° 6</p> <p>DS1 – negligible adverse impact and no significant effect; and</p> <p>DS2 – negligible adverse impact and no significant effect.</p> <p>AQMA N° 7</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>DS1 – negligible adverse impact and no significant effect; and DS2 – negligible adverse impact and no significant effect.</p> <p>AQMA N° 9</p> <p>DS1 – slight beneficial impact with significant effects; and DS2 – slight beneficial impact with significant effects.</p> <p>AQMA N° 11</p> <p>DS1 – slight adverse impact with significant effects; and DS2 – negligible adverse impact with significant effects.</p> <p>AQMA N° 12 was outside of the affected road network having not met the screening criteria for assessment and therefore was not considered.</p>
AQ1.2.6	The Applicant	<p>Why is sulphur hexafluoride referenced in Table 23.3 of the ES [APP-138] under odour emissions?</p> <p>Table 23.3 states that emissions of sulphur hexafluoride (SF6), used in gas insulated switchgear, are addressed in Chapter 28 Carbon and Climate Change [APP-143]. This does not appear to be the case. Could the Applicant please clarify.</p> <p>Given the requirement of Government policy and the EIA Regulations to address the impact of any emissions of greenhouse gases on climate change, could the Applicant please provide a robust assessment of the likely effect of the use of sulphur hexafluoride in the proposed gas insulated switchgear.</p>	<p>As sulphur hexafluoride is odourless, this has been corrected in the updated ES Chapter 23 (APP-138 Rev 002).</p> <p>Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6) is discussed in Chapter 28 Carbon and Climate Change (APP-143) as a fugitive gas emission in section 28.4.2.2 and is quantified in Table 28.9. The predicted worse-case leak rate has been set out in that assessment and is considered to be robust.</p>
AQ1.2.7	The Applicant	<p>What assumptions have been made in the ES [APP-138] when re-assigning traffic during construction works in Air Quality Management Area 9 at Eastern Road?</p> <p>How were construction emissions factored into the NO₂ equation?</p>	<p>The impact of traffic management being installed on the highway network has been assessed using the Solent Sub-Regional Transport Model (SRTM). The original transport modelling used in the Transport Assessment (APP-448) included the following scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2026 Do-Minimum: the base future year as modelled with no traffic management interventions. • 2026 Do-Something 1 ('DS1') which incorporates cable works at six locations and lane closures on the southbound carriageway of the A2030 Eastern Road; and • 2026 Do-Something 2 ('DS2') which incorporates cable works at six locations and lane closures on the northbound carriageway of the A2030 Eastern Road. <p>An important part of the functionality of the SRTM is that it makes routing choices for vehicles between origin and destination on the basis of the generalised cost of each available route, in line with guidance set out by WebTAG Unit 3.1 Highway Assignment Modelling (Department for Transport, 2020). These generalised</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>costs applied within the SRTM differ according to journey purposes with, for example, business trips attracting a higher cost (based on value of time and vehicle operating costs) than leisure trips. Thus delays due to congestion are incorporated into drivers' route choice. Route choice is then calculated such that no vehicle can reduce their generalised cost of travel without increasing the cost of travel for another vehicle. This is known as equilibrium.</p> <p>Assumptions made in the SRTM regarding the modelled traffic management locations were included within the SRTM Coding Note, provided at Appendix B of the Transport Assessment (APP-448). These assumptions were agreed with Portsmouth City Council prior to running of the SRTM as shown in email correspondence provided in Appendix 1 of the Eastern Road Further Traffic Assessments Technical Note. This Technical Note is also provided at Appendix E of the Supplementary Transport Assessment. The SRTM included six traffic management locations, which is the maximum number of construction locations that will occur simultaneously on the public highway as defined within Section 2.3 of the updated Framework Traffic Management Strategy (FTMS) (APP-449 Rev-002). As the traffic modelling undertaken allows for the maximum number of traffic management locations that would be permitted, this approach has allowed for a worse case assessment of the effects of traffic reassignment.</p> <p>When the traffic management locations are introduced within the 2026 DS scenarios, the resultant changes in capacity and journey time along the Onshore Cable Route change generalised costs for all trips using that road, meaning that the optimum route between origin and destination may change. Where this occurs, vehicles reassign across alternative routes for every relevant origin and destination pair until a new equilibrium is found. This therefore shows how the SRTM has robustly considered the reassignment effects of traffic management required to facilitate construction of the Onshore Cable Route, including in the vicinity of AQMA 9 on Eastern Road.</p> <p>In addition to the Transport Assessment further transport modelling has been undertaken with respect to the impacts on the A2300 Eastern Road between Tangier Road and Eastern Avenue and is presented in the Eastern Road Further Traffic Assessments Technical Note included in Appendix E of the Supplementary TA (document reference 7.8.1.11). This further modelling has been completed in response to comments made as part of Portsmouth City Council's Relevant Representation regarding use of the SRTM within the Transport Assessment (APP-448) specifically to demonstrate that a robust assessment of the effects of the construction of the Proposed Development has been undertaken.</p> <p>Given that there will only ever be a single instance of traffic management on the A2030 Eastern Road at any one time (as secured via the programme restrictions contained within the updated FTMS (APP-449 Rev 002) which will be secured by the dDCO (APP-019)), there will not be greater cumulative effects of more than one traffic management location. The further assessment undertaken in Eastern</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>Road Further Traffic Assessments Technical Note included in Appendix E of the Supplementary TA (document reference 7.8.1.11) confirms that the assessment of the A2030 Eastern Road completed in the Transport Assessment and using the Solent Sub Regional Transport Model (SRTM) is robust and representative of anticipated conditions.</p> <p>Emissions from construction related traffic on the public highway have been modelled as detailed in section 23.6.2 of the Air Quality Assessment (APP-138 Rev 002). In accordance with the IAQM Construction dust risk assessment guidance, construction emissions from non-road mobile machinery are considered to be minimal given their use will be temporary and will vary both spatially and temporally throughout the construction phase. As such, they are not considered to have a significant effect on local air quality.</p>
<p>AQ1.2.8</p>	<p>The Applicant Portsmouth City Council</p>	<p>In relation to the assumptions made when re-assigning traffic during construction works in Air Quality Management Area 9 at Eastern Road [APP-138], is it likely that vehicles would not divert but would instead wait at the traffic lights operating for the single lane closures with engines idling, leading to a deterioration in air quality rather than improving it as suggested in the ES?</p>	<p>Please see the response to AQ1.2.7 for details of assumptions on traffic reassignment.</p> <p>Further examination of the transport modelling has been undertaken with respect to the impacts on the A2300 Eastern Road between Tangier Road and Eastern Avenue, and also north to Airport Service Road in the Eastern Road Further Traffic Assessments Technical Note included in Appendix E of the Supplementary TA. This includes a sensitivity test of the impacts of traffic management being installed at the A2030 Eastern Road / Tangier Road traffic signal junction. As part of this sensitivity test traffic flows were calculated from the SRTM DM and DS scenarios used to assess temporary impacts of traffic management within the Transport Assessment. These traffic flows were then combined with local junction capacity model at the A2030 Eastern road / Tangier Road traffic signal junction to consider the implications of the SRTM modelling at a greater detail.</p> <p>Whilst the results of this sensitivity test have demonstrated a worsening of results at the Eastern Road / Tangier Road traffic signal junction when compared to that reported in the TA. The temporary closure of a northbound or southbound lane on Eastern Road at the junction with Tangier Road will result in the junction operating over its theoretical capacity with significant queues forecast as a result in the southbound direction in the PM peak where traffic management is located on the southbound lane (DS1), and in the northbound direction in the AM peak where traffic management is located on the northbound lane (DS2)</p> <p>In the DS1 scenario (southbound closures) the delays experienced in the southbound direction in the PM peak hour, where the junction is predicted to operate over capacity, are not uncommon for PM peak hour conditions along the A2030 Eastern Road as a result of the merge of the southbound carriageway from two lanes to one lane south of the A2030 Eastern Road / Tangier Road traffic signal junction. The driver experience is therefore likely to be similar to the existing conditions where some degree of traffic congestion is present along much of the A2030 Eastern Road southbound corridor, due to the TM replicating and relocating</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>the existing merge from two lanes to one lane.</p> <p>In the DS2 scenario in the AM peak, the localised modelling shows the junction operating over capacity and an increase in delay and queues in comparison with the DM scenario for the A2030 Eastern Road northbound approach. These queues, however, can be accommodated without having a detrimental impact on the wider highway network because there are no major upstream junctions that would be impacted by this temporary congestion. Reported delays are similar to those journey times increases highlighted by the SRTM in DS2 scenario.</p> <p>These impacts are however to be expected because the use of local junction capacity assessment represents a limited and fixed assessment, which while it includes assumptions on traffic flow reductions resulting from redistribution of traffic away from the works, is not designed to fully represent the equilibrium position that would occur between traffic queues / delays and use of alternative routes as demonstrated within the SRTM. This sensitivity test should therefore be viewed as a forecast of worst-case queueing that may occur at the A2030 Eastern Road / Tangier Road traffic signal junction towards AQMA N°9, while noting that in such an event, traffic would most likely divert onto alternative routes to avoid the works.</p> <p>The resulting worst-case predictions for air pollutant concentrations show only negligible predicted deteriorations in concentrations of NO₂ at receptor locations along the route within AQMA N°9 and at the A2030 Velder Road/Milton Road junction as shown in Appendix 23.8 of Chapter 23 (Air Quality).</p> <p>The Eastern Road Further Traffic Assessments Technical Note included in Appendix E of the Supplementary TA (Appendix E of the Supplementary Transport Assessment (document reference 7.8.1.11) considers this appropriate for the assessment of construction works for the Onshore Cable Route, which, while temporary, will be in place for a number of weeks. It has been determined that drivers will therefore be able to consider the impacts of traffic management on their whole journeys prior to commencement, allowing them to plan accordingly.</p> <p>This is reflected in the reassignment of traffic forecasts by the SRTM.</p>
AQ1.2.9	The Applicant	Could the Applicant please properly reference the guidance that is referred to in ES 23.2.4.1 [APP-138] and ensure that all necessary documents are included in the reference list for ES Chapter 23.	<p>References have been reviewed and updated in the updated ES Chapter 23 (APP-138 Rev002). These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PINS Advice Note Six: Preparation and submission of application documents (Planning Inspectorate, 2016). • Guidance on the assessment of dust from construction and demolition v1.1 (Institute of Air Quality Management, 2016). The guidance provides an advised procedure for a semi-quantitative dust risk assessment and screening criteria for the activities undertaken on-site. Mitigation measures are suggested based on the assessed risk, and these should be added to a Dust Management Plan, for which content is also suggested.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance on Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites v1.1 (Moorcroft, et al., 2018). This guidance from Environmental Protection UK and the IAQM provides on the appropriate level of monitoring relevant to the specific site characteristics and the assessed dust risk of the works. Different types of monitor are discussed along with advised levels of action in respect of monitored concentrations. • Land Use Planning and Development Control: Planning for Air Quality (Moorcroft, et al., 2017). The guidance from the IAQM provides screening criteria and content advice for detailed assessments. The guidance also provides criteria for the measurement of significance of impacts from based on baseline air quality, pollutant limit values and predicted changes in concentrations. • A guide to the assessment of air quality impacts on designated nature conservation sites v1.0 (Holman, et al., 2019). The guidance from the IAQM clearly separates the roles of the air quality specialist and ecologist in the activities involved during the assessment of impacts and effects of air quality on designated sites. Screening criteria for different types of assessment are outlined, along with the steps to be taken at each stage of the assessment. Whilst the precautionary approach is advised, assessments should also be appropriate to the risk involved. • Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance (TG16) (Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs, 2018). This Defra guidance covers all aspects of Local Air Quality Management and includes technical details on management, manipulation of input and output data and processing model results. • Technical Guidance on detailed modelling approach for an appropriate assessment for emissions to air (AQTAG06) (Environment Agency, 2006). The guidance from the Environment Agency contains details on the calculation of nutrient deposition from airborne pollutants. <p>Air emissions risk assessment for your environmental permit (Environment Agency, 2019) The Environment Agency guidance provides screening criteria with reference to short-term impacts, i.e. those of less than one day.</p>
AQ1.2.10	The Applicant	ES Chapter 23 [APP-138] includes numerous technical terms and acronyms that are not included in the glossary. Please could these be explained for the benefit of the lay reader.	This has been reviewed and the technical terms and acronyms previously missing are included in the updated ES Chapter 23 (APP-138 Rev 002) and updated Glossary (APP-006 Rev 002).
AQ1.2.11	The Applicant	It is unclear throughout ES Chapter 23 [APP-138] what metrics have been used to describe the predicted emissions data (in respect of whether the figures are hourly, weekly or annual; means or maxima; for example), or whether these are appropriate. Please could the Applicant elaborate on the approach taken, and in doing so comment on whether the measurements used are appropriate in relation to the application of guidance used,	Where concentrations are reported in the document they are presented as annual means unless otherwise stated, e.g. short-, 1-hour, 8-hour. The IAQM guidance matrix for impact shown in Table 23.6 is indeed based on the annual mean, however the guidance also provides terminology for short term impacts. Where appropriate, this terminology has been used in the updated ES Chapter 23 (APP-138 Rev 002) and the significance section has been updated to explain these.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		especially the IAQM risk assessment methodology, which <i>'is only designed to be used with annual mean concentrations.'</i>	
AQ1.2.12	The Applicant	In relation to ES 23.4.3.14 [APP-138], please explain and provide evidence for the conclusion that at <i>'this stage it is not considered that the smaller drilling operations would constitute a significant change in local air pollutant concentrations, and therefore this approach to the assessment is considered robust. Therefore, two locations were not assessed.'</i>	In order to maintain consistency throughout, the smaller drilling locations that were previously excluded have now been included in the updated ES Chapter 23 (APP-138 Rev 002) as described in Section 23.4.3 and reported in Section 23.6.2.
AQ1.2.13	The Applicant	At ES 23.4.6.6 [APP-138], the list of receptors and their allocated sensitivity values does not seem to include ecological receptors. The bases of the following risk and impact assessments in respect of these receptors are therefore unclear. Please explain.	The updated ES Chapter 23 (APP-138 Rev002) has been updated to include risk and impact assessments for deposition on SSSI and woodland sites (Appendix 23.7) (document reference 6.3.23.7) of the updated Chapter). Where receptors are present in the relevant cable section, ecological sites are listed as receptors in Section 23.5.5 and reported in Section 23.6.2 of the updated ES Chapter 23 (APP-138 Rev 002).
AQ1.2.14	The Applicant	Please can the Applicant explain why ecological receptors are not considered in relation to temporary non-construction related traffic effects, and construction stage local power generation (ES 23.6.4 and 23.6.6 [APP-138]).	The temporal and spatial impacts due to diverted traffic are highly transitory in nature such that they are unlikely to have an effect on ecological receptors. Deposition as calculated from air quality modelling is intended to be considered over an extended timeframe commensurate with decades (Cape, van der Erden, Sheppard, Leith, & Sutton, 2009).
AQ1.2.15	The Applicant	This summary of effects in ES Table 23.79 [APP-138] does not seem to include consideration of any ecological receptors. Could the Applicant please explain why.	Since submission, the assessment provided by Chapter 23 (Air Quality) has been revised and expanded, providing newly available detail on air quality changes associated with back-up diesel generators proposed to be located at the Converter Station. As detail relating to the back-up generators did not form part of Chapter 23 (Air Quality) at submission, impacts associated with air quality changes in the Operational Stage did not inform the Chapter 16 (Onshore Ecology) assessment. With the new detail available and the updated ES Chapter 23 (APP-138 Rev 002) to include operational air quality changes as a result of the back-up generators, reconsideration of Operational Stage impacts on ecological features has been undertaken. This is reflected in Table 23.116 and Appendix 23.7 (Air Quality Ecological Impacts) of the updated ES Chapter 23 (APP-138 Rev 002).
AQ1.2.16	The Applicant	The derivation of significance of effect for the construction stage local power generation and for the operational stage back-up power generation does not seem to include an appraisal of receptor sensitivity in accordance with the methodology set out in Table 23.9. Could the Applicant please explain. (ES 23.6.6.16 and 23.6.7.16 [APP-138] refer.)	The sensitivity of all receptors for all assessments, including for construction stage local power generation and for the operational stage back-up power generation, is explained in section 23.4.7 of the updated Chapter 23 (APP-138 Rev002). All receptors are considered to have high sensitivity.
AQ1.2.17	The Applicant	With reference to ES 23.7 [APP-138], have the potential intra-project cumulative effects associated with all sources of emissions to air	Intra-project air quality effects have been included in Section 23.6.2 of the updated ES Chapter 23 (APP-138 Rev 002). They are referred to in the updated Chapter as "Amalgamated Effects" in order to avoid confusion where the term

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		associated with the proposals been addressed, and if so where is the assessment set out for the identified sensitive receptors?	“Intra-project” is used elsewhere in the ES. A summary of the results is presented in Table 23.115.
AQ1.2.18	The Applicant	Please check paragraph 23.3.7.3 of the ES [APP-138] for typos and clarify as necessary.	This has been corrected in updated ES Chapter 23 (APP-138 Rev 002).

Table 1.3 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Compulsory Acquisition

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
CA1.3.1	The Applicant	<p>The Funding Statement [APP-023] suggests the scheme is ‘bankable’ and there is ‘strong interest.’ Can the Applicant provide updates and reassurances that funding would be available, in accordance with the Planning Act 2008 requirements, and provide evidence to the ExA of any funding commitments made by any party to bankroll the Proposed Development and any agreements in place that provide security for the funding.</p> <p>Could the Applicant also comment on whether the Coronavirus pandemic has had any impact on the availability of funding.</p>	<p>The Applicant has secured from its current investors financing sufficient to support the Project until the completion of the development stage, which includes obtaining all necessary permissions and authorisations, including the DCO. The Applicant has invested approximately £35m in the development of the Project as of 30 June 2020. The residual cost of completing the pre-construction stage of the Project is forecasted at £7m.</p> <p>The Applicant has been engaging with a number of potential investors since the start of the Project directly, including British and international investment funds and international energy companies. The engagement with a group of debt providers and equity investors completed for the Applicant by KPMG in 2019 showed that subject to obtaining necessary approvals investors consider interconnectors to be an attractive type of future investment.</p> <p>The Applicant expects that the financing will be arranged on the basis of project finance debt with the tenure of 15 to 25 years constituting circa 70% of the total capital costs of the Project, with the remainder to be financed with equity. Possibilities of export financing by export agencies of the countries of origin of key components of the Project are also being considered as part of the public tender process.</p> <p>The Applicant and its advisors are continuing to assess the impact of COVID-19 pandemic on the financial markets. While the activity in the area of financing large infrastructure project has expectedly slowed down during the months of the stricter lockdown in key markets, infrastructure financing with the focus on infrastructure that enables the green transition will become one of the key drivers of recovery and it is therefore expected the slow-down will be temporary in nature only.</p> <p>Noting the above regarding the finance secured for the Project to date and the expected appetite for future investment in interconnectors as part of the green transition, and that it is not unusual for the securing of funding in connection with the delivery of a project to be dependent on the securing of a development consent order, it is considered the Applicant has demonstrated that funding for the Project is likely to be available to enable the compulsory acquisition within</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			the 7-year period provided for in the dDCO (APP-019) for the exercise of such powers following the Order being made.
CA1.3.2	The Applicant	<p>The Relevant Representation from Judith Clementson [RR-048] raises the following:</p> <p><i>'Aquind Limited applied for an "exemption" under Article 17(1) of Regulation (EC) No 714/2009. Ofgem and France's Commission de Regulation de L'energie (CRE) could not agree and it was passed to the Agency for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators (ACER) for a decision. They agreed with the CRE and it was refused. Aquind Limited had indicated "without an exemption, the Aquind interconnector cannot progress through construction and to commercial operation" because "a regulated regime with financial underpinning is not available to Aquind in France". I am therefore concerned that the project may commence, the costs escalate (as have those for HS2) and Aquind will be unable to complete the project through lack of funding.'</i></p> <p>Could the Applicant please provide detailed information as to the process that AQUIND went through in this regard, the results of the process, and the implications for the current DCO application. Please also provide an update or clarification of the position on this matter and confirm the mid- and longer-term status of the project and its deliverability.</p>	<p>The Relevant Representation RR-048 provides an incorrect interpretation of the decision by ACER. In its decision No 05 dated 19 June 2018,⁴ ACER recognised the benefits of AQUIND Interconnector, concluding that "it is socially beneficial to build interconnection capacity from 8 to 9GW on the GB – French border (paragraphs 119 - 120). ACER also concluded that AQUIND Interconnector meets all the criteria of Article 17(1) of Regulation (EC) 714/2009, except one. ACER further concluded in paragraphs (135) and (149), that since Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2018/540 dated 23 November 2017⁵ establishing the new, 3rd list of Projects of Common Interest, which included AQUIND Interconnector under number 1.7.4, came into force in April 2018, the Project did not any more meet the requirement of Article 17(1)(b) of Regulation 714/2009. Specifically, criterion (b) which states that "the level of risk attached to the investment is such that the investment would not take place unless an exemption is granted". ACER considered that since AQUIND Interconnector acquired PCI status, an exemption is not the only route to implement the project under Regulation (EU) 347/2013. The Board of Appeal of ACER supported that opinion of the Director of ACER.⁶ The Applicant further contested the conclusions of ACER and its Board of Appeal in respect of its interpretation of Article 17(1)(b) of Regulation (EC) 714/2009 and Regulation (EU) 347/2013 in the General Court of the European Court of Justice. The decision in this regard is pending.</p> <p>Irrespective of that, AQUIND Interconnector was not included in the currently effective 4th list of PCIs, established by Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/389 dated 31 October 2019.⁷ As soon as the restrictions related to the COVID-19 pandemic started being relaxed the Applicant made a new proposal for an exemption to CRE and Ofgem in June 2020 in accordance with Article 63 of Regulation (EU) 2019/943 dated 5 June 2019, which replaces Regulation (EC) 714/2009. The Applicant is currently in discussion with both regulators, who have been provided with detailed assessments of benefits and the Project's financial modelling and at the current stage these discussions are very commercially sensitive and therefore are confidential.</p>

⁴ Available here https://www.acer.europa.eu/Official_documents/Acts_of_the_Agency/Individual%20decisions/ACER%20Decision%2005-2018%20on%20AQUIND.pdf .

⁵ Available here <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32018R0540> .

⁶ The Decision of the Board of Appeal of the ACER, 17 October 2019, available here https://acer.europa.eu/en/The_agency/Organisation/Board_of_Appeal/Decisions/Case%20A-001-2018%20-%20BoA%20decision.pdf.

⁷ Available here https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg_del/2020/389/oj.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
CA1.3.3	The Applicant	The Needs and Benefits Assessment [APP-115] makes no reference at all to the use (or otherwise) of fibre optic cables. Can the need and benefits of the fibre optic cables be explained in greater detail and whether the commercial use of the operational fibre optic cables is part of revenue stream taken into account within the Funding Statement.	<p>As set out in the Statement in Relation to Development Associated with AQUIND Interconnector submitted alongside these responses, (document reference 7.7.1) the fibre optic cables (FOC) have up to 192 fibres but the number of fibres required for cable protection purposes is less than this. There will therefore be spare capacity. Whilst it would be possible to install a cable with a lesser multiple of fibres, this would not reduce the impacts to any degree and would not realise the full benefits of the design capacity of the Project.</p> <p>It is highly beneficial to utilise this opportunity of spare capacity through the proposed commercial use. The Needs and Benefits Report Addendum (section 5) (document reference 7.7.7) provides further detail on the benefits of providing commercial FOC. In summary this includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting future UK and global demand for fibre capacity – additional fibre capacity will almost certainly be required between France and the UK over the next decade and beyond, as a result of improvements in national telecoms infrastructure and increases in the volumes of data consumed and transmitted by individuals and organisations as we become increasingly reliant on data-intensive technologies and services. • Helping the UK to achieve its telecoms infrastructure policy and strategy – making the spare fibre capacity within the Proposed Development available will support the ambitious targets which the UK Government has set for rollout of gigabit fibre-to-the-premises broadband and 5G networks, all of which will rely to some extent on there being sufficient cross-Channel fibre capacity to transmit data between the UK and the rest of Europe. • Cost efficiency – leasing out the spare capacity within the Proposed Development will provide potential customers with a scalable, secure and cost-efficient alternative to laying additional fibre cables to meet future capacity (which is costly, risky and disruptive). <p>The delivery of AQUIND Interconnector is not reliant on the revenue from the commercial use of FOC.</p>
CA1.3.4	The Applicant	The Funding Statement [APP-023] makes an assumption that there would not be any claims made in respect of blight and does not apportion funds to manage this. Can explanation be given as to why this assumption is made?	The Applicant has assessed the impacts of the Proposed Development and considers there are suitable measures proposed to mitigate the impacts (including reinstatement of land as defined in the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy) (APP-506)) and that there would not be any depreciation in value of land not directly impacted by the Proposed Development. This is the basis for the informed assumption that there would not be any claims made in respect of blight.
CA1.3.5	The Applicant	The Statement of Reasons [APP-022] states there would be direct acquisition of subsoil beneath the highway without negotiation and without compensation. Is there sufficient legal justification for not negotiating or	Please refer to the 'Statement in Relation to Highway Subsoil Acquisition' (document reference 7.7.2) for the response to this question.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
CA1.3.6	The Applicant	<p>contacting landowners whose rights extend to the subsoil beneath the highway? Is there precedent for this?</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the Rochdale Envelope approach allows flexibility, the onshore cable routing includes a number of options at several stages, requiring various pieces of land to be subject to Compulsory Acquisition provisions (for example Milton Common and Hillcrest Children Services Ltd land). Can you explain how these varying routes are compatible with the requirements of section 122(2) and 122(3) of PA2008?</p> <p>At what point during the Examination will information be available to the ExA to confirm the 'option' that is being taken forward in the dDCO?</p>	<p>A separate statement is produced in response to this WQ and ExA WQ 1.3.20 (document reference 7.7.5) submitted alongside these responses.</p> <p>Following receipt of the ExA WQ and in response to ExA WQ CA1.3.20 the Applicant has further considered the options provided for within the Application as submitted. As a consequence of the review further to the ExA WQ, the Order Limits have been revised, removing options where this is now possible. In this regard, please refer to the Position Statement in relation to the refinement of the Order Limits (document reference 7.7.4).</p> <p>As is set out in the Position Statement in relation to the refinement of the Order Limits (document reference 7.7.4), all land included within the Order is considered to meet the test of being required for the development to which the development consent relates and there is a compelling case in the public for the land to be acquired compulsorily to ensure the deliverability of the Proposed Development. Where optionality remains, this is because of there being a need for it, for instance at Milton Common where it is preferable to lay the Onshore Cables across the common, but where feasibility from a technical perspective cannot be unequivocally confirmed due to the historic landfill nature of Milton Common.</p>
CA1.3.7	The Applicant	<p>At various junctures on the Lands Plans [APP-008] (for example plot 7-06), there are isolated pockets of land included within the Order limits. Can each of these be explained as to its purpose, need and why it is in the public interest to acquire such land?</p>	<p>Plot 7-06 had originally been included within the Order Limits as a potential location for a temporary storage area to facilitate the construction of the Proposed Development. These powers were intended to ensure sufficient flexibility, however since submission of the Application and ongoing liaison with the landowners, it is practicable to no longer seek the temporary use of land over plot 7-06 without compromising the Applicant's ability to secure the effective construction and operation of the Project. As such, the removal of temporary powers sought over this land is reflected on the updated Land Plans (APP-008 Rev002) and Book of Reference (APP-024 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>The other plots that make up the remainder of the isolated pockets of land included within the Order Limits are: 1-01, 1-02, 1-03, 1-06, 1-07, 1-10, 1-11, 1-12, 1-13, 1-14, 1-16, 1-18, 1-21, 1-82 and 2-01. The Applicant is seeking new landscaping rights classes a, b and c (as defined in the Statement of Reasons (APP-022 Rev 002) and Book of Reference (APP-024) in order to provide landscape mitigation to minimise the landscape and visual impact of the Converter Station, as shown on the indicative landscape mitigation plans (APP-281 and APP-282). All of the isolated pockets listed above would be subject to these new landscaping rights, ensuring the landscaping to be provided is</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			retained and maintained for the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development. The Applicant understands that this is the full extent of the isolated pockets of land referred to.
CA1.3.8	The Applicant	There is no mention in the Funding Statement [APP-023] of any European grants or funding being allocated to the Proposed Development. Is there a reason for this?	No European grants or other funding of that nature is proposed to be sought, in connection with the delivery of the Proposed Development.
CA1.3.9	The Applicant	Please provide the ExA with a copy of the audited accounts for the previous year said to be available from March 2020 (at paragraph 4.7 of the Funding Statement [APP-023]), together with any update to the funding position following the publication of these accounts.	A copy of the audited accounts for AQUIND Limited for the year ended 30 June 2019 is provided with these written question responses (see Appendix 4 to this document (document reference 7.4.1.4)).
CA1.3.10	The Applicant	The Funding Statement [APP-023] states that the development would be paid for in part through operational profits during the early lifetime of the Proposed Development. What levels of revenue are to be generated from the project? Can the revenue (operational profits) generated by the project be explained, given numerical clarity and a timeline shown for when such funds would be available? How are these profits derived and how much annual profit is arising? When would the Proposed Development stop using its operational profit to pay off debt?	<p>Interconnectors typically have the following streams of revenues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion charges - up to 75% of total revenues. Congestion charges are charges collected by the interconnector operator for access to the interconnector's capacity from parties wishing to transmit electricity from one country to another.⁸ • Capacity market payments – up to 20% of total revenues. GB interconnectors have been able to participate in the GB capacity market since 2018. These are the payments for interconnectors providing a security of supply services at the time of high demand and/or low supply as a stand-by capacity.⁹ • Ancillary services – up to 5% of total revenues. These revenues arise from provision of various services to National Grid and RTE, which they require in order to ensure the stability of national transmission systems.¹⁰ <p>In addition, the revenues from the commercial use of the FOC within the Project may contribute further around 5% of total revenues.</p> <p>The cost of regular operation and maintenance of the Project are very low comparing to most of other types of energy infrastructure and are expected to be at the level of around 1% of the capital costs, or nearly 2% of capital costs if business rates in England and local land-related taxes in France are included. Accordingly, it is expected to leave sufficient cash flows available to repay project finance debt and provide adequate returns to investors.</p>

⁸ Baringa, February 2014, New electricity interconnection to GB – operation and revenues, for Department of Energy and Climate Change, available here https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/322005/new_electricity_interconnection_to_gb_operation_and_revenues_baringa.pdf.

⁹ Ibid, also BEIS, Capacity Market, Five-year Review (2014-2019), available here https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/819760/cm-five-year-review-report.pdf.

¹⁰ National Grid SO Submission to Cap and Floor, June 2017, available here https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/system/files/docs/2018/01/nget_report_to_ofgem_-_quantified_interconnector_impacts.pdf.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>Further information on project revenues and profits has been provided to national regulatory authorities in accordance with relevant regulations, where it is treated as confidential and commercially sensitive information. Making such information available in public domain would significantly prejudice the Applicant's commercial interests, and for that reason more specific information will not be made available in a public forum.</p>
CA1.3.11	The Applicant	<p>Has an agreement been made and signed with regards to the Atlantic Crossing cable crossing? Can the ExA be provided with a copy of said agreement and details provided of any financial implications of doing this work.</p>	<p>Discussions started with CenturyLink, the owner / operator of the Atlantic Crossing cable, in May 2018 and continue. The Crossing Agreement will be based on an industry standard template - either that of the International Cable Protection Committee (ICPC) or of the Europeans Subsea Cable Association (ESCA).</p> <p>There is no 'licence fee' type cost, because these are essentially mutual co-operation agreements. However, there are financial implications relating to the work and activities required.</p> <p>The final version used, and any amendments, will be subject to negotiation between Aquind and the third-party asset owner / operator.</p>
CA1.3.12	The Applicant	<p>Why do the Order limits shown on the Land Plans [APP-008] extend to include a large proportion of best and most versatile agricultural land (49% of the agricultural land implicated by the Order)? What would the actual effects on availability and productivity on such land be taking a realistic approach to cable routing and Compulsory Acquisition?</p>	<p>The Applicant has been in discussions with the relevant landowners and their agents since late 2016 and has been attempting to acquire the land and land rights required for the Proposed Development by voluntary agreement.</p> <p>This has included numerous face-to-face meetings as the plans for the Proposed Development have evolved, including sessions to take the landowners and their agents through the materials used for both the non-statutory and statutory consultation events (e.g. Consultation Document, Order Limits etc.). Engagement has also taken place with both the landowners and their agents in relation to the Applicant's programme of surveys including a justification for why respective surveys were being undertaken and how they could impact the design of the Proposed Development. The Applicant's agent has also used meetings with the landowners and their agents to provide them with an overview of the DCO process.</p> <p>As the plans for the Proposed Development have evolved, the heads of terms offered by the Applicant in relation to both properties have been refined, reflecting increased certainty in the amount of land over which rights are required. Updates to the landowners and their agents have also reflected changes as a result of feedback from the statutory consultation event and statutory consultees, such as in relation to the extent of landscaping required in the vicinity of the Converter Station location.</p> <p>Where possible, the Applicant has changed the amount of land over which rights are sought for the Proposed Development to take feedback from the owners into account. As an example, following feedback received at a meeting</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>with the owners of Little Denmead Farm and their agent in early 2019, the Order Limits were reduced to remove the northern part of the field at the south-west corner of Little Denmead Farm (i.e. south of plot 1-58 in the Land Plans [APP-008]). A further change was made to remove the area immediately south of the eastern end of Stoneacre Copse (i.e. north of plot 1-51 in the Land Plans [APP-008]). However, the Applicant is now at a stage where the amount of land left within the Order Limits is such that it is not possible to remove any further land without jeopardising the Applicant's ability to construction, operate and maintain the project.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the need and justification for the extent of the compulsory acquisition sought is explained within the Statement of Reasons (APP-022). The reasonable alternatives assessed for the Proposed Development taking into account technical, cost and environmental considerations are explained in Chapter 2 (Consideration of Alternatives) of the ES (APP-117) and the Supplementary Alternatives Chapter submitted as part of the Environmental Statement Addendum (document reference 7.8.1).</p> <p>With regards to the impacts on farming as raised in both relevant representations, the Applicant is aware that Mr. Peter Carpenter carries out the farming activities across both properties. The Applicant has been engaged with Mr. Peter Carpenter for almost four years as the project has developed and has had regular meetings with him and his respective agents as well as taking numerous calls from Mr. Carpenter with queries about the Proposed Development.</p> <p>With regards to the claim that the Proposed Development is preventing Mr & Mrs Carpenter re-introducing their herd of 80 cows and the owners will no longer be able to make a living from farming due to a lack of land; through engagement with Mr. Carpenter over the past number of years the Applicant is aware that livestock numbers at Little Denmead Farm have been at much lower levels than the land available at Little Denmead Farm and Mr. & Mrs. Carpenter's adjacent landholding is capable of supporting. Indeed, it is now the case that the land in question is used solely for keeping a small number of horses and Mr. Carpenter has installed new stables in the past two years to reflect this.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that a Planning Statement and Agricultural Appraisal submitted in 2008 on behalf of Mr. Carpenter in support of an application for planning permission (ref. 08/02058/FUL) for the 'Temporary siting of mobile home for agricultural worker (RETROSPECTIVE)' at Little Denmead Farm in 2008 set out plans for an expansion of Mr. Carpenter's agricultural undertaking. An updated Planning Statement and Agricultural Appraisal submitted in 2012 on behalf of Mr. Carpenter in support of application (ref. 12/02536/FUL) for the 'Extension to existing temporary siting of mobile home for agricultural worker (RETROSPECTIVE) (RESUBMISSION)' at Little Denmead Farm set out similar plans for a substantial expansion of Mr Carpenter's undertaking.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>Both appraisals, at Section 6, set out that the expansion plans would be subject to securing planning consent for an additional livestock barn at the property. The Applicant is not aware of planning consent being secured for a second livestock barn or the plans set out in the appraisals coming to fruition. As such, whilst the Applicant recognises the loss of land would have a significant impact on the farm should it have been used for intensive beef or dairy farming, or even arable farming, the same impacts would not pertain to the use of the land for keeping a small number of horses, as is currently the case.</p> <p>With regards to the queries in relation to the extent and location of landscaping proposed by the Applicant, this reflects feedback received from the statutory consultation event as well as specific feedback received from statutory consultees in relation to landscape and visual impact mitigation measures.</p> <p>In relation to rights to cross the access road, the Applicant has previously confirmed to the owners of Little Denmead Farm that rights to cross the access road can be provided.</p> <p>The landowners also raise concerns in relation to noise and vibrations and dust. These are adequately dealt with in the Noise and Vibration Chapter (APP-139) and the Air Quality Chapter (APP-138) of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>RR-055 claims the Applicant has failed to acknowledge or respond to requests from the landowners for site meetings to discuss the proposals. We are not aware of any such requests which have not been acknowledged or accommodated.</p> <p>RR-055 also claims many elements of the scheme had not been finalised until the submission of the DCO application and the submission of the Application was the first time our clients have been able to review many of the proposals and comment on them. The Applicant notes that many of the elements of the scheme have still not been finalised, reflecting the Rochdale Envelope approach. The Applicant further notes that it would have been impractical to share the numerous documents with the landowners prior to submission but that foresight of indicative landscaping plans providing an overview of the scheme were provided as the proposals evolved pre-submission.</p> <p>In conclusion, the Applicant recognises the Proposed Development will have an impact on the landowners and their farming activities but does not agree with the scale of the impact set out in the landowner's relevant representations given the type of farming taking place.</p> <p>The Applicant disagrees strongly with the concerns raised by the landowners in relation to limited consultation and engagement. Indeed, the Applicant would contend that the opposite is the case as the Applicant's agent has provided regular and detailed updated updates to the landowners.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			The Applicant continues to engage with the landowners via their respective agents with the aim of securing a voluntary agreement for the land and land rights required for the Proposed Development.
CA1.3.13	The Applicant Statutory Undertakers	<p>The Book of Reference (BoR) [AS-011] includes a number of Statutory Undertakers with interests in land.</p> <p>i) Provide a progress report on negotiations with each of the Statutory Undertakers listed in the Book of Reference, with an estimate of the timescale for securing agreement from them.</p> <p>ii) State whether there are any envisaged impediments to the securing of such agreements.</p> <p>iii) State whether any additional Statutory Undertakers have been identified since the submission of the Book of Reference as an Application document.</p>	<p>A progress report on negotiations with each of the Statutory Undertakers listed in the Book of Reference (APP-024 Rev002) is included within the updated Statement of Reasons (APP-022 Rev002) Appendix B.</p> <p>There are no envisaged impediments and we are continuing to progress protective provisions as necessary.</p> <p>No new statutory undertakers have been identified post-submission. Where new statutory undertaker interests are identified the Applicant will update the Book of Reference as necessary for issue to the Examining Authority.</p>
CA1.3.14	The Applicant	<p>The Relevant Representations from Mr and Mrs Carpenter [RR-054] and Little Denmead Farm [RR-055] raise significant objections with regards to Compulsory Acquisition of farmland and the rights for landscaping around the Converter Station. Notwithstanding the response to Relevant Representations required at Deadline 1, please provide detailed justification as to the approach to Compulsory Acquisition with respect these landholdings and respond to the Compulsory Acquisition concerns raised by the landowners, including the concerns of limited consultation and engagement with them despite their land appearing critical to the success of the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>The Applicant has been in discussions with the relevant landowners, and their agents, since late 2016. This has included a number of face-to-face meetings as the plans for the Proposed Development have evolved, including sessions to take the landowners and their agents through the materials used for both the non-statutory and statutory consultation events (e.g. Consultation Document, Order Limits). Further engagement has taken place with both the landowners and their agents in relation to the Applicant's programme of surveys including a justification for why respective surveys were being undertaken. The Applicant has issued version 5 of the Heads of Terms to the landowner's agent.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant's agent has taken numerous phone calls from Mr. Carpenter, who has an interest in both of the properties in question, to answer his specific queries as the project has evolved. As such, the Applicant does not agree with the concerns raised by the landowners in relation to limited consultation and engagement.</p> <p>It should also be noted that, where possible, the Applicant has changed the Order Limits for the Proposed Development to take feedback from the owners into account.</p> <p>The Applicant continues to engage with the landowners via their respective agents and is confident a voluntary agreement can be negotiated to the satisfaction of both parties.</p> <p>With regards to the Relevant Representation made by Mr and Mrs Carpenter (RR-054).</p>
CA1.3.15	The Applicant	<p>In the context of s127 of the Planning Act 2008 and the submitted Relevant Representations from these affected Statutory Undertakers, how would each of these Statutory Undertakers avoid serious detriment to the carrying on of</p>	<p>No acquisition of land is proposed which could be considered to seriously detriment the carrying out of any undertaking by a Statutory Undertaker and protective provisions relevant to all utilities within the Order limits with the</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		their undertakings? [Refer to paragraph 1.5.6 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-022].)	potential to be affected as to be included in the DCO. The protective provisions within the dDCO (APP-019) are continuing to be negotiated.
CA1.3.16	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 1.5.7 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-022], please provide details of discussions with any other bodies, apart from the Crown Estate Commissioners and the Ministry of Defence, regarding land subject to Crown Interests.	The Applicant has corresponded with the Government Legal Department Bona Vacantia Division in relation to Plot 1-67 and Plot 3-21. These Plots were previously vested in the Government Legal Department Bona Vacantia Division prior to being transferred to the Crown Estate by escheat.
CA1.3.17	The Applicant	Provide details of any DCO precedents in terms of the width and extent of the 'onshore cable corridor' within the application. (Refer to paragraph 5.2.2 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-022].)	<p>Similar approaches have been used in the Hinkley Point C Connection DCO (granted on 19/01/2016) and the Riverside Energy Park DCO (granted on 09/04/2020) and the Applicant considers that the approach taken to the width and extent of the Onshore Cable Corridor within this application follows the approach taken in the previous DCOs.</p> <p>As part of both applications, the Applicants sought consent to lay underground cables within defined corridors or lateral limits of deviation because the precise alignment of the cable routes were not yet determined at the time of the Examinations.</p> <p>The Hinkley Point C Connection corridor was largely located in rural landscapes and across open fields. The corridor width varied depending on the nature of the proposed work in various locations and the need to take account of existing environmental constraints. However, the typical width was for the underground sections was 100 metres, to provide a necessary and proportionate degree of flexibility as to the final alignment of the works.</p> <p>The Riverside Energy Park's corridor followed existing highways infrastructure and the width of the corridor was determined by the width of the highway in which the cable would be installed. However, in some places the corridor was wider where the Applicant required further flexibility. This includes situations where it was not possible to accommodate the electrical connection within the highway, to accommodate crossings, temporary construction compounds and access points.</p>
CA1.3.18	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 5.2.3 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-022], how is the remaining 'uncertainty' as to the suitability of the preferred cable route through Milton Common for cable installation addressed in the application?	<p>The Applicant in response to feedback received before submission of the Application has taken every opportunity to minimise disruption to traffic by including land off the road, where it is considered practicable, by including the land within the highway boundary (footpaths and verges) and land adjacent to roads, such as Milton Common.</p> <p>The ground investigations undertaken and the data provided regarding areas of pollution, indicate that it would be practicable to construct a route across Milton Common, removing contaminated materials and replacing them with thermally and mechanically stable materials (usually cement-bound sand), but additional survey work, performed at contract stage, may lead to the conclusion that the route to the west of Milton Common is not feasible for technical or economic reasons.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>The Applicant is aware that the ground conditions at Milton Common present significant challenges, due to the historical formation of Milton Common by land reclamation notably landfill Made Ground.</p> <p>To assess the ground conditions twelve exploratory locations were completed within Milton Common during the ground investigation. The southern, western and northern perimeter of Milton Common was found to have shallower Made Ground than the centre. The investigation identified contamination, ground obstructions, variable ground potentially vulnerable to differential settlement, soft ground potentially vulnerable to adverse total settlement and potential ground gas. The contractor would have to balance the risk and cost (mostly of safely handling and disposing of contaminated material) of crossing Milton Common, and the Applicant wishes to retain the option of installing in the Eastern Road in case the contractor cannot establish an acceptable solution for crossing Milton Common.</p> <p>The installation of the cable trenches across Milton Common is considered by the Applicant to be technically feasible. Milton Common is not as spatially confined as other options and therefore allows for micro-siting of the cable route within the Order limits to overcome some of the engineering challenges. Where micro-siting is not feasible there are multiple engineering solutions which are suitable to mitigate and manage the ground conditions. Some examples of settlement control include pre-surcharging the ground or lightweight backfill, the backfill is to compose of thermally and mechanically stable materials (usually cement-bound sand).</p> <p>There are multiple techniques for controlling contamination within the trench, which include geomembranes or clay lining. Excavation of the Made Ground, ground gas and contamination during construction would be managed to standard brownfield construction working procedures. Exporting and disposal of contaminated material would be conducted to industry standard procedures. Approved methods will be adhered to during construction to mitigate and manage the creation of potential contamination pathways. Mitigation measures specifically required for works through Milton Common are outlined in Section 6.9.2.1 and measures for the management of waste are outlined in Section 5.13 of the updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002), compliance with which is secured within Requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019)</p>
CA1.3.19	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 5.2.4 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-022], please provide details of any made DCO precedents in terms of the number of alternative route options within the application.	<p>In terms of made DCO's, the Applicant is aware that the Hinkley Point C Connection Project had two route options:</p> <p>https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/south-west/hinkley-point-c-connection/</p> <p>The M20 Junction 10A had a junction with or without a connection to a development site which did not have planning permission at the time of submission and therefore no guarantee the slip road would be required:</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/south-east/m20-10a/</p> <p>The A1 Birtley to Coal House DCO is not yet determined but includes three different bridge design options with Highways England wanting the flexibility to choose an option (and not wanting the ExA to express a preference).</p> <p>https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/north-east/a1-birtley-to-coal-house-improvement-scheme/</p>
CA1.3.20	The Applicant	<p>Provide details and a full justification as to why the choice of cable route options in the vicinity of each of the following locations cannot be made at the present time:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Anmore Road (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.5); ii) Portsdown Hill Road (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.8); iii) Farlington Avenue (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.9); iv) Zetland Field (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.10); v) the Baffins Milton Rovers FC (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.1 - paragraph numbering out of sequence); vi) Milton Common (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.4 - paragraph numbering out of sequence); vii) Moorings Way and Eastern Avenue (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.5 - paragraph numbering out of sequence); viii) the University of Portsmouth Langstone Campus (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.6 - paragraph numbering out of sequence); and ix) Bransbury Park (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.2 - paragraph numbering out of sequence). <p>The response must refer to the different characteristics of each of the alternative routes at each location which would be relevant to such a future choice and the 'flexibility' sought. The response must also refer to relevant aspects of detailed design and construction at each location.</p> <p>For each location, which of the alternative routes would be preferable over the other and how do the alternatives relate to each other in terms of the importance of their availability to the Proposed Development?</p> <p>Is the mutual exclusivity of works on one or other of each of the alternative routes secured under the dDCO [APP-019]?</p> <p>If not, why not.</p> <p>If so, how?</p>	<p>A separate statement is produced, the Position Statement in relation to the refinement of the Order Limits, (document reference 7.7.4) submitted alongside these responses which fully responds to this question.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>If the ExA wished to recommend one of the alternative cable routes in its report, how, in principle, would the dDCO [APP-019] need to be amended?</p> <p>Could the Applicant please provide a view on the following document extracts from the Thanet Extension Offshore Wind Farm Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project Examination, and any relevant matters surrounding these extracts, in relation to each of the above locations where the application includes alternative cable routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft DCO Article 19(5) and Schedule 1 Part 3 Requirement 12 from Appendix D of the Examining Authority's Recommendation Report; <p>https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010084/EN010084-002100-D8_Appendix7_TEOW_DCO_RevI.pdf</p> <p>https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010084/EN010084-003108-TEOW%20%E2%80%93%20Final%20Recommendation%20Report.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanatory Memorandum paragraph 4.17 onwards from Examination document [REP8-015]. <p>https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010084/EN010084-002107-D8_Appendix8_TEOW_EM_RevH.pdf</p>	
CA1.3.21	The Applicant	<p>Provide details and a full justification as to why the choice of location for a southern compound in Section 3 cannot be made at the present time (refer to Statement of Reasons [APP-022], paragraph 5.3.7). The response must refer to the different characteristics of each of the two locations that would be relevant to such a future choice. The response must also refer to relevant aspects of detailed design and construction.</p> <p>Which of the alternative locations would be preferable over the other?</p> <p>How do the alternatives relate to each other in terms of the importance of their availability to the Proposed Development?</p> <p>Is the mutual exclusivity of works on one or other of each of the alternative routes secured under the dDCO [APP-019]?</p> <p>If so, how?</p> <p>If not, why not.</p>	<p>The Applicant maintained the optionality for the southern HDD compound at Denmead Meadows/Kings Pond to the south of Hambledon Road whilst discussions were ongoing with Natural England. Whilst supportive of the proposal to HDD under the meadows, Natural England had raised concerns regarding the potential impacts on a priority habitat (the meadow) if the southern compound was to be located to the north of Hambledon Road. If located to the south of Hambledon Road, the Applicant considers that the requirement for an increased drill profile for the HDD to avoid Hambledon Road would present an increased risk to groundwater, with the area comprising Source Protection Zone 1.</p> <p>Discussions remain ongoing with Natural England with regards to the Applicant's preference to locate the southern compound to the north of Hambledon Road, considered to be the most appropriate location for the HDD.</p> <p>The parties are in discussion regarding proposed mitigation measures. A draft strategy (expanding on the mitigation identified in sections 16.8.2 to 16.8.4 of ES Chapter 16 Onshore Ecology (APP-131)) to avoid potential effects through controlling working practices has been discussed at the most recent conference call with Natural England on 29 July 2020 and is now under further update by the Applicant. Whilst discussions are ongoing, it is hoped that agreement to the proposed mitigation which includes:</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoidance and general measures • Timing of work • Seed harvesting • Turve stripping and preservation • Soil structure protection • Habitat restoration; and • Monitoring and management <p>will be agreed during the early stages of the Examination and confirmed in the Statement of Common Ground with Natural England, included an associated update to the Order limits.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that it is necessary to retain the compound option south of Hambledon Road to ensure that if agreement cannot be reached with Natural England regarding the Applicant's preferred compound location to the north of Hambledon Road, the Proposed Development remains deliverable.</p> <p>The detailed design for the works is required to be confirmed in accordance with dDCO (APP-019) Requirement 6, and the works as designed are required to be carried out in accordance with the requirements of the applicable construction environmental management plan, as per dDCO Requirement 15. This secures the extent of the works to be carried out, including the location in which they will be carried out.</p>
CA1.3.22	The Applicant	Why is, what appears to be, the grass track within the Milton Piece Allotment Gardens included within the Order limits when other accesses would appear to be available within other parts of Plot 10-13 (Land Plans Sheet 10 of 10 Plot 10-13 [APP-008])?	The Works Plans (APP-002 rev002) and Land Plans (APP-008 Rev 002) have been updated to remove the individual allotment plots and are submitted at Deadline 1. The allotment paths that provide access to Plot 10-14 have been retained to allow access to monitor the HDD works to be carried out in this location.
CA1.3.23	The Applicant	Why is part of the rear gardens of Kingsley Court on Kingsley Road included within the Order limits (Land Plans Sheet 10 of 10 Plot 10-20 [APP-008])?	<p>The Order Limits do not encompass any part of the rear gardens to Kingsley Court.</p> <p>Plot 10-20 comprises a public footway from Kingsley Road, and a public footway within Bransbury Park (within the ownership of Portsmouth City Council. It is a separate plot with no distinct boundary to that of Bransbury Park itself (Plot 10-21), with both parcels included as part of the New Connection Works Rights.</p>
CA1.3.24	The Applicant	<p>Why are two separate Optical Regeneration Station buildings required in the car park to the south of Fort Cumberland Road? (Refer to the Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.6 - paragraph numbering out of sequence.)</p> <p>Was a single building explored, and if so, what comparative design benefits and disbenefits were determined from the technical and aesthetic perspectives?</p>	<p>The separation distance is required to maintain the independence of the fibre optic cables in each HVDC circuit, and to provide greater resilience in the event of equipment failure, fire, adverse weather, vandalism and/or accidents. The two ORS buildings will be located 10 metres apart within the same compound</p> <p>For these reasons, two separate ORS buildings are necessary.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
CA1.3.25	The Applicant	What are the particular 'complexity and scale' aspects of the Proposed Development that justify a 7-year period for the exercise of compulsory acquisition powers and temporary use? (Sections 6.5 and 6.2.2 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-022] refer).	<p>The modification of the model provision extending the time limit from 5 years to 7 years is required due to the scale and complexity of the Project, which involves the building out of a linear scheme of works with an Onshore Cable Route of approximately 20km in length and in relation to which it is necessary to route around existing constraints within the necessary flexibility provided by the limits of deviation, set by the Order limits.</p> <p>The Undertaker will wish to be able to confirm the final location of the Authorised Development following construction before any required permanent easement in relation to operation and maintenance of the Authorised Development is confirmed, so as to ensure only so much land as is necessary for that purpose is burdened by the rights to be granted by the Order.</p> <p>It will naturally take time to obtain the approvals required by the Requirements before works can be constructed, which of course will be undertaken over a longer period because of the linear nature of the Proposed Development and the sequenced build out to mitigate environmental impacts, and it is also relevant that the Proposed Development will require significant supply chain engagement.</p> <p>Taking these factors into account, it is considered that the extension of the 5-year period to 7 years is reasonable in relation to this development. It allows necessary time for all pre-construction matters to be dealt with, and for the Proposed Development, particularly the Onshore Cable Route, to be constructed in sequence within the constraints provided to mitigate environmental impacts, and subsequently the permanent easement width to be confirmed, therefore ensuring the rights to be acquired are the minimum amount required in connection with the operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development.</p>
CA1.3.26	The Applicant	Why is the land subject to dDCO [APP-019] Article 32 not subject to the Compulsory Acquisition of a right to occupy the land and how can a permanent power to occupy and exclude others such as this be classed as temporary? (Refer to the Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 6.2.3.)	<p>Article 32(5) of the dDCO (APP-019) provides that the undertaker may only remain in possession of land under this article for so long as is necessary to carry out maintenance of the part of the Authorised Development for which possession of the land is taken, and Article 32(12) confirms the maintenance period for the purposes of this Article, which is the period for which is effective, is the period of 5 years beginning with the date on which the Proposed Development is brought in operational use.</p> <p>Taking into account the need for restrictions to be imposed proportionately, and that the extent of the rights to be acquired and restrictions to be imposed on a permanent basis have been identified taking a proportional approach, the Applicant considers the inclusion of Article 32 provides the ability to utilise land in the infrequent circumstances where necessary for that 5 year period, whilst not otherwise affecting the relevant land. As is clearly set out at paragraph 6.2.4 to the Statement of Reasons (APP-022) “<i>This enables the Applicant to</i></p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<i>compulsorily acquire the minimum amount of land and rights over land required to construct, operate and maintain the Proposed Development</i> '.
CA1.3.27	The Applicant	To what parts of the table at paragraph 6.3.1 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-022] does the sub-heading 'Work No. 2 (converter station)' relate and why are there no other headings in the table?	The table included in the Statement of Reasons (APP-022) included errors. The revised version of the Statement of Reasons (APP-022 Rev 002) submitted alongside this document corrects this error and references all plots which the acquisition of land or rights is sought in relation to, the Works No. relevant to those plots and the specific rights sought, as detailed in the updated Book of Reference (APP-024 Rev 002) submitted alongside this document.
CA1.3.28	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 6.4.1 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-022], how does Article 23 of the dDCO [APP-019] ensure that the proposed powers to impose restrictive covenants are proportional to the impact that they could have on landowners or occupiers?	<p>The rights sought to be acquired and restriction to be imposed in relation to individual plots of land are only those rights which are necessary in connection with the construction, operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development. The categories and sub-categories of rights necessary to be acquired in relation to all relevant plots are detailed in the updated Book of Reference (APP-024 Rev 002). By seeking to acquire rights and impose restrictive covenants, rather than seeking to acquire land outright, a proportional approach is taken, limiting the impact on land in so far as is possible whilst also securing the necessary rights required in relation to nationally significant Proposed Development.</p> <p>Notably, Article 28(2) of the dDCO (APP-019) provides that where the undertaker acquires a right over land or imposes a restriction, the undertaker shall not be required to acquire a greater interest in that land. This provides proportionality, allowing for the acquisition of rights and imposition of restrictions over no more of the land than is necessary in connection with the Proposed Development.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the Applicant has sought to limit the extent of private land over which rights are to be acquired and restrictions imposed. By taking this approach, which inherently considers alternatives to compulsory acquisition of private land as a consequence of the starting position being that private land and rights over it should not be acquired unless there is a clear justification for why this is required taking into account all relevant factors, such as the need to minimise the extent of the likely significant environmental effects, the Applicant has further ensured a proportional approach has been taken.</p>
CA1.3.29	The Applicant	How does the power to impose restrictions over 'so much of the Order land described in the Book of Reference' in dDCO [APP-019] Article 23 follow the guidance in paragraph 24.3 of the Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 15 relating to such DCO provisions not being broadly drafted and identifying the related land and the nature of the covenant? (Refer to paragraph 6.4.3 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-022].)	The Book of Reference (APP-024) clearly identifies the land over which such restrictions may be imposed, and in turn the restrictions which may be imposed over such land. Article 23 of the dDCO (APP-019) in referring to so much of the Order land as described in the Book of Reference directly relates to the certainty provided by that document and does not extend beyond this. Accordingly, the Article is not considered by the Applicant to be drafted broadly, as the Book of Reference clearly identifies the affected land and the nature of the restrictions proposed in relation to it. The Article does not provide any power to impose

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			restrictions beyond those which are identified in the Book of Reference, and in turn necessary in connection with the Proposed Development.
CA1.3.30	The Applicant	Please could the Applicant provide direction to evidence of the 'careful consideration' of the onshore land required to 'take the minimum amount of land possible' mentioned in paragraph 7.2.3 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-022]?	<p>The Applicant has submitted a Statement in response to ExA Written Questions CA1.3.6 and CA1.3.20 which provides an overview of changes made to the Order Limits submitted as part of the application for Development Consent in November 2019 and how these changes relate to the options and required flexibility included with the Application.</p> <p>Since the inception of the Proposed Development, the Applicant has undertaken numerous studies, environmental assessments and engineering appraisals to determine the most suitable location for the Proposed Development, including the converter station, the landfall and the onshore cable route.</p> <p>The Supplementary Alternatives Chapter (document reference 7.8.1.3) in the ES Addendum provides further explanation on the refinement of proposals and the considerations assessed by the Applicant in relation to land to be affected (alongside the environmental and engineering considerations). This includes additional clarification on the chosen alternatives which have reduced the land required for the Proposed Development, with the two most significant being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grid Connection - the selection of Lovedean substation over Bramley, with shorter onshore cable length of almost 70 km. • Landfall – Eastney over East Wittering, with a shorter onshore cable length to Lovedean of almost 17 km. <p>Between these two points the onshore cable route has been carefully considered and designed to optimise the route, to cause as little disruption and take the minimum amount of land possible whilst also avoiding unnecessary sterilisation of land in the future where possible. This has been achieved through regular internal change control meetings where changes to the Order Limits were proposed, evaluated in a multi-disciplinary forum and either agreed or rejected by the Applicant's project team taking the relative merits of each proposed change into account. Whilst the change control process could result in either additions or removals from the Order Limits, the process was primarily focussed on removals and on refinement of the Order Limits in response to feedback received during both rounds of public consultation on the proposals, as well as environmental considerations.</p> <p>The key changes to the Order Limits since the January 2018 Consultation have been set out below on a section by section basis, with the sections corresponding to those set out in the Environmental Statement - Volume 1 - Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development [APP-118]. The description first focusses on the key changes between the 'Site Boundaries' used for the January 2018 Consultation and the February 2019 Consultation and then on the key changes between the February 2019 Consultation 'Site Boundary' and Order Limits as submitted at Deadline 1.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>The Site Boundaries for the January 2018 and February 2019 Consultations are shown on Page 13 of Report - Appendix 1.5A Statutory Consultation - Consultation Document [APP-088] and the Site Boundary and options for the February 2019 consultation are described from pages 54-89 of the same document.</p> <p>Significant changes between January 2018 Consultation Site Boundary and the February 2019 Consultation Site Boundary.</p> <p>Section 1 – Lovedean (Converter Station Area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of cable route option via Lovedean Lane. • Removal of Option 1 converter station site. <p>Section 2 – Anmore</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of the amount of land required for the cable routing, noting the removal of the Option 1 converter station site. <p>Section 3 – Denmead/Kings Pond Meadow</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of the options for cable routes via Edneys Lane/Anmore Road and via a combination of Mill Lane and/or Martin Avenue. • Additional land for cable route included in the area south of Hambleton Road. <p>Section 4 – Hambleton Road to Farlington Avenue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of land for cable route option via Forest End. • Addition of land for cable route options between London Road, Boundary Way and Portsdown Hill Road. <p>Section 5 – Farlington</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of land for cable route options east of Farlington Avenue, in response to feedback regarding potential impacts of installation in Farlington Avenue. <p>Section 6 – Zetland Field and Sainsbury’s Car Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of land for cable route at Zetland Field and Sainsburys Car Park, in response to feedback regarding the utilisation of Eastern Road. <p>Section 7 – Farlington Junction to Airport Service Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of land for cable route at Farlington Playing Fields and Holiday Inn, in connection with proposed HDD to minimise environmental impacts. • Addition of land for cable route at Kendall’s Wharf and Langstone playing fields, in connection with proposed HDD to minimise environmental impacts. • Removal of land for cable route west of Eastern Road.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>Section 8 – Eastern Road (adjacent to Great Salterns Golf Course) to Moorings Way</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of option for cable route through Milton Common, in response to feedback regarding the use of Eastern Road for the laying of the onshore cable route. • Addition of options for cable route at Eastern Avenue, Salterns Avenue and Shore Way, in connection with proposals to utilise Milton Common. • Addition of option for cable route via Moorings Way, in connection with proposals to utilise Milton Common. <p>Section 9 – Moorings Way to Bransbury Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of land for cable route options at Furze Lane and University of Portsmouth in response to feedback received. • Addition of land for cable route options at the Thatched House. • Addition of land for cable route options at the Allotments, and further refinement to include HDD in this location to minimise environmental impacts. • Addition of land for cable route options at Locksway Road, Longshore Avenue, Waterloo Gardens, Meryl Road, Ironbridge Lane, Tideway Gardens, Yeo Court and Bransbury Park. <p>Section 10 – Eastney (Landfall)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refinement of the amount of land required at the Landfall <p>Significant changes between the February 2019 Consultation Site Boundary and the Order Limits submitted at Deadline 1</p> <p>Section 1 – Lovedean (Converter Station Area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of land north of Lovedean Substation. • Removal of land south of Crabden’s Copse Ancient Woodland. • Addition of land for landscaping north and north-west of the substation. <p>Section 2 – Anmore</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of cable route via Edney’s Lane and the area in the south west of Section 2. • Removal of option across Anmore Road via plot 3-05 and removal of land from plots 3-03 and 3-04. <p>Section 3 – Denmead/Kings Pond Meadow</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of the options for cable routes via Edneys Lane/Anmore Road and via a combination of Mill Lane and/or Martin Avenue. • Refinement of land for cable route in the area south of Hambledon Road.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>Section 4 – Hambledon Road to Farlington Avenue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of land for cable route option via Forest End. • Refinement of land for cable route options between London Road and Portsdown Hill Road. <p>Section 5 – Farlington</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of Portsdown Hill Road west of the entrance to the car park and east of the junction with Farlington Avenue. • Removal of land for cable route options east of Farlington Avenue, except for the option via Eveleigh Road which is retained. <p>Section 6 – Zetland Field and Sainsbury’s Car Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refinement of land for cable route at Zetland Field and Sainsburys Car Park. • Removal of section of Eastern Road. <p>Section 7 – Farlington Junction to Airport Service Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of land for cable route at Farlington Playing Fields and Holiday Inn. • Removal of land at for cable route at Kendall’s Wharf, Langstone Harbour and Langstone playing fields. • Removal of large section of Eastern Road. • Addition of land at Baffins Milton Rovers FC football pitch. <p>Section 8 – Eastern Road (adjacent to Great Salterns Golf Course) to Moorings Way</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refinement of land required at north-east corner of Milton Common. • Removal of options for cable route via Salterns Avenue and Shore Way • Addition of option for cable route via Moorings Way. <p>Section 9 – Moorings Way to Bransbury Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of land for cable route option via Furze Lane and Locksway Road. • Refinement of land required for cable route at University of Portsmouth. • Refinement of land for cable route options at the Allotments. • Removal of options for cable route options at Locksway Road, Waterloo Gardens, Meryl Road, Ironbridge Lane, Tideway Gardens. • Refinement of the amount of land required at Bransbury Park. • Removal of Velder Aveune, Milton Road and section of Bransbury Road. <p>Section 10 – Eastney (Landfall)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refinement of the amount of land required at the Landfall

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>Whilst the Order Limits retain a degree of flexibility in a number of areas (e.g. Farlington Avenue, Milton Common, Kingsley Road), the reasons for this are well explained in the statement in response to ExA Written Questions CA1.3.6 and CA1.3.20 and we would respectfully refer the Examining Authority to that Statement rather than duplicating the justifications in this answer. In addition, the Applicant has sought from the outset, where possible to route the onshore cable within the highway, avoiding the impact of potentially needing to acquire rights over privately owned land, and has made significant efforts to avoid the acquisition of any land which could be described as a dwelling.</p> <p>By being located in highways to minimise the impacts associated with the Proposed Development, the onshore cable will be laid through a congested environment, and whilst information has been obtained to confirm the location of services in the highway and studies undertaken to determine the feasibility of the onshore cable route in the highway, this information is often not completely accurate. Accordingly, it is absolutely necessary for the flexibility within the limited limits of deviation provided by the Order limits to be retained so as not to undermine the delivery of the Proposed Development and in turn the delivery of the significant benefits which it will provide. Furthermore, it is not the case that all land within the Order limits associated with the onshore cable route and over which rights are sought is to be subject to the acquisition of rights in connection with the Proposed Development. The permanent easement width, typically 11m in respect of both cable circuits where laid in trenches, will be confirmed following installation of the onshore cables. Control in this regard is provided by Article 23 to the dDCO (APP-019), which provides power for the acquisition over so much of the Order land described in the book of reference and shown on the land plans as is required for the construction, operation or maintenance of the authorised development or to facilitate it, or as is incidental to it. In doing so, it provides a test of necessity which needs to be satisfied for the sub-classes of rights to be acquired.</p> <p>Further, most of the land within the Order Limits is not proposed to be subject to permanent acquisition. Instead, sub-classes of rights are proposed to be acquired. The Applicant has taken a very granular and proportionate approach to the identification of the class of rights and the sub-classes of rights that are applicable to individual plots of land as described in the Book of Reference (APP-024).</p> <p>As such, the Applicant is wholly satisfied the extent of land within the Order Limits takes 'the minimum amount of land possible' mentioned in paragraph 7.2.3 of the Statement of Reasons, and that the extent of the land within the now further refined Order Limits is no more than is reasonably necessary to ensure there is no impediment to the construction, operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
CA1.3.31	The Applicant	Where and how in the dDCO [APP-019] is the payment of compensation excluded from highway subsoil? (Refer to paragraphs 7.5.4 and 7.5.5 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-022].)	<p>The subsoil of the highway (i.e. the subsoil beneath the extent of land which forms the highway and land required to support that structure) is not recognised to have any market value, as is stated at paragraph 7.5.4 of the Statement of Reasons (APP-022).</p> <p>As any nominal value for the highway subsoil would be negligible at best, no compensation for the acquisition of rights over it is therefore proposed, and it is not considered to be proportionate or in anyone's interest for there to be negotiation for those rights where there is not compensation payable in relation to their acquisition.</p> <p>The Applicant cannot lawfully exclude the payment of compensation, and it has not sought to do so.</p>
CA1.3.32	The Applicant	What is the latest position on the unknown interest relating to a path, noted in the Statement of Reasons [APP-022] at paragraph 7.7?	<p>Ongoing land referencing exercises are being undertaken to confirm the freehold interest relating to the path noted in the Statement of Reasons (APP-022), specifically plot 1-66. The Applicant is liaising with adjacent landowners to further inquire and confirm the ownership. It is believed that this unregistered plot of land is the outcome of a mapping inaccuracy / discrepancy in the HM Land Registry data. When resolved, the Applicant will update the Statement of Reasons (APP-022) and Book of Reference (APP-024) as necessary.</p>
CA1.3.33	The Applicant	How would construction and any maintenance be regulated in order that any impact on those entitled to rights over Special Category Land remain in a 'no less advantageous' position 'when burdened with the Order right', including construction, in respect of the land? (Refer to paragraph 8.1.3 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-022].) The response should include any restrictions secured in the dDCO [APP-019] that would limit the impact of construction and other impacts.	<p>During the construction of the Proposed Development on the Special Category Land, the Special Category Land will be affected for that temporary period and in so far as areas are required for construction will not be able to be used. However, this will only be for the limited period of construction in the particular location, with the land to be restored following construction, as is required in accordance with Article 30(4) and also in accordance with Requirement 22 of the dDCO (APP-019 Rev 002). Article 30(3) is also relevant, noting that the rights which may be acquired over the Special Category Land will relate to land beneath the surface only, and therefore no acquisition of the surface of the land would be authorised by the Order and in turn the period of surface occupation for this purpose is finite. Ultimately it is also not in the interest of the undertaker for the construction to continue and be in situ for any longer than is necessary, noting that the longer the period of construction generally the higher the cost payable in relation to it.</p> <p>The impacts of construction are also limited via the application of construction environment management plans, the requirement for which in relation to all aspects of the Proposed Development onshore is proposed to be secured via Requirement 15. Other Requirements are also of relevance to how construction activities are carried out, however it is not considered necessary to list all of these, as the ExA will have knowledge from their review of the dDCO (APP-019).</p> <p>Article 32(5) is relevant in relation to maintenance, which provides that the undertaker may only remain in possession of land under that article (which</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>provides for the temporary use of land for maintaining the authorised development and would be relied upon for that purpose) for so long as may be reasonably necessary to carry out the maintenance of the part of the authorised development for which possession of the land was taken. Taking into account the limited expected maintenance requirements and that no physical infrastructure and/or joint bays/link boxes (used for testing and maintenance purposes) is proposed to be placed on the surface of any Special Category Land, the extent of any maintenance activities on this land would be very minimal (if required at all) and only for so long as is necessary in all circumstances. Accordingly, those who enjoy the Special Category Land will be in no less advantageous a position when burdened with the Order rights in this regard.</p>
<p>CA1.3.34</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Does the absence of physical infrastructure on the surface of Special Category Land mean that the proposed development would be constructed by a sub-surface method, such as horizontal directional drilling, within the Special Category Land (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 8.1.4)?</p> <p>If so, how is the use of such a construction method secured by the dDCO [APP-019]?</p> <p>If not, how would construction take place without anything on the surface of the Special Category Land?</p> <p>Are rights sought over the surface of the Special Category Land? If so: what are they for; over what period of time are they envisaged to be required; and is such a period of time regulated under the dDCO [APP-019]?</p> <p>If so, how.</p> <p>If not, why not.</p>	<p>No. Construction of the Proposed Development within Special Category Land will vary (comprising trenched installation and/or HDD) depending on the location within the Order limits. The location and methods are secured within the Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (APP-505) and Requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019). The ground will be reinstated post-installation with no restriction to the access of Special Category Land, secured in the same place.</p> <p>Rights are sought during the operational period for maintenance in the event of an emergency. The period of any presence on the surface of the land would be temporary for so long as it would take to repair the cable with the ground subsequently reinstated. Normal maintenance would be undertaken from link boxes and link pillars, and where necessary via the covered joint bays, which are not to be located on special category unless unavoidable, and even in those circumstances will not be noticeable in any way during day to day operation (as mentioned above, because they are covered with the surface restored to its former condition).</p>
<p>CA1.3.35</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>With reference to paragraph 8.2.1 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-022], why is the Environment Agency not listed in the text, but is included in Appendix B?</p>	<p>The Environment Agency are now listed in the text following the update to the Statement of Reasons (APP-022 Rev 002) submitted at Deadline 1.</p>
<p>CA1.3.36</p>	<p>The Applicant The Crown Estate Commissioners</p>	<p>What are the current positions of the Applicant and the Crown Estate Commissioners in respect of discussions relating to s135 of the Planning Act 2008 (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraphs 1.5.7 and 8.3.3)? Please provide details of any such discussions.</p> <p>In the context of Planning Act 2008 guidance related to procedures for the Compulsory Acquisition of land (September 2013) Annex B Paragraph 2, when does the Applicant expect to receive any relevant consent?</p>	<p>In relation to s.135 of the Planning Act 2008, the Applicant continues to engage with the Crown Estate and negotiations to agree the land rights required for the construction, operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development are at an advanced stage. The negotiations are summarised in more detail (i.e. on a plot by plot basis) in Appendix D of the updated Statement of Reasons (APP-022 Rev-002). The Applicant expects to complete the relevant negotiations and agree the relevant consents before the end of the Examination.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>If the relevant consent is not received, would the project be able to proceed and, if so, in what form?</p> <p>Would a reassessment of environmental effects be necessary?</p>	<p>The Applicant has no reason to expect the relevant consents will not be received.</p> <p>The Proposed Development as applied for could not be constructed without the use of this land to which these interests relate, though as stated above, it is not expected this situation will come to pass with it being expected all relevant consents will be received.</p>
<p>CA1.3.37</p>	<p>The Applicant The Ministry of Defence</p>	<p>What are the current positions of the Applicant and the Ministry of Defence in respect of discussions relating to s135 of the Planning Act 2008 (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraphs 1.5.7 and 8.3.3)? Provide details of any such discussions.</p> <p>In the context of Planning Act 2008 guidance related to procedures for the Compulsory Acquisition of land (September 2013), Annex B Paragraph 2, when does the Applicant expect to receive any relevant consent?</p> <p>Are there other bodies that should be the subject of such discussions?</p> <p>If the relevant consent is not received, would the project be able to proceed and, if so, in what form?</p> <p>Would a reassessment of environmental effects be necessary?</p>	<p>In relation to s.135 of the Planning Act 2008, the Applicant continues to engage with the Ministry of Defence and negotiations to agree the land rights required for the construction, operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development are at an advanced stage. The negotiations are summarised in more detail (i.e. on a plot by plot basis) in Appendix D of the updated Statement of Reasons (APP-022 Rev-002). The Applicant expects to complete the relevant negotiations and agree the relevant consents before the end of the Examination.</p> <p>The Applicant has no reason to expect the relevant consents will not be received.</p> <p>The Proposed Development as applied for could not be constructed without the use of this land to which these interests relate, though as stated above, it is not expected this situation will come to pass with it being expected all relevant consents will be received.</p>
<p>CA1.3.38</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Over what corridor width would restrictions be sought within land coloured blue, purple and green in the Book of Reference [APP-024]? (Refer to Appendix A of the Statement of Reasons [APP-022].)</p>	<p>Appendix A of the Statement of Reasons (APP-022) sets out the restrictions that are being sought within the New Connection Works Rights (blue), New Access Rights (purple) and New Landscaping Rights (green) categories. The updated Book of Reference (APP-024 Rev-002) identifies the specific rights and restrictions that are being sought within these categories on a plot by plot basis. Therefore, it can now be seen that restrictions are sought over all plots that are listed as required for New Connection Works Rights class (h), or New Access Rights class (f), or New Landscaping Rights class (c).</p> <p>Restrictions will only be sought over as much land as is necessary to ensure implementation of the Proposed Development and for it be capable of operation without impediment thereafter. It is also necessary to impose restrictive covenants in relation to the new rights, to provide sufficient protections for the uninterrupted construction, operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development, including to ensure it remains adequately visually screened by existing and/or newly planted vegetation.</p> <p>For New Connection Works Rights (blue), the proposed restrictions are required to protect the infrastructure from becoming exposed, damaged or built over;</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>preventing operations which may obstruct, interrupt or interfere with the infrastructure and the exercise of the new rights granted over the land; ensuring that access for future maintenance can be facilitated. In open land where the Onshore Cable Route is to be constructed using open trenching, it is expected the typical width over which restrictions will be sought is 11m. Where HDD is to be used this will increase and will be determined by the route of the HDDs.</p> <p>For New Access Rights (purple), the proposed restrictions are required to ensure the Applicant can access the areas where New Connection Works Rights are sought without impediment during the construction of the Proposed Development as well as during operation of the Proposed Development for maintenance purposes. These will be sought over the width necessary to ensure access can be taken.</p> <p>For New Landscaping Rights (green), the proposed restrictions are included to ensure the Proposed Development remains adequately visually screened by existing and/or newly planted vegetation. The land shaded green shows the extent of the area over which it is anticipated the rights will be sought and restrictions imposed.</p>
CA1.3.39	The Applicant	Could the Applicant please provide an update to the summary and status of negotiations tables in Appendices B, C and D to the application Statement of Reasons [APP-022], with both a clean and track changed version.	The Applicant has submitted an updated Statement of Reasons (APP-022 Rev-002) which includes an update to the summary and status of negotiations tables in Appendices B, C and D with both a clean and tracked changes version.
CA1.3.40	The Applicant	<p>Does the dDCO [APP-019] include powers to extinguish any rights belonging to the following Statutory Undertakers (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] Appendix B)?</p> <p>If so, why are these powers included, as it is not envisaged that they would be required?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) ESP Utilities Group Ltd. ii) GTC Infrastructure Ltd (GTC Electricity). iii) GTC Infrastructure Ltd (GTC Gas). iv) Hampshire County Council. v) the Environment Agency. vi) National Grid Electricity Transmission plc. vii) Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd. viii) Portsmouth City Council. ix) Portsmouth Water Ltd. x) Southern Gas Network PLC. xi) Southern Water Services Ltd. 	<p>Article 33 (statutory undertakers) to the dDCO (APP-019) provides the Applicant with the ability to extinguish rights and remove or relocate apparatus belonging to Statutory Undertakers and to construct the Proposed Development in such a way as to cross underneath or over the apparatus. The powers to do so are essential to ensuring the Proposed Development can be constructed, particularly in areas congested with apparatus and are subject to the operation of the protective provisions for the benefit of the various Statutory Undertakers and any third party agreements entered into or to be entered into between the Applicant and any Statutory Undertakers.</p> <p>It is not considered the construction of the Proposed Development will unfairly prejudice or impact any Statutory Undertaker or have a detrimental impact on their undertaking.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>xii) SSE PLC (Gas).</p> <p>xiii) SSE PLC (High Voltage).</p> <p>xiv) SSE PLC (Low Voltage).</p>	
CA1.3.41	The Applicant Statutory Undertakers	<p>Has any contact been made with the following Statutory Undertakers to consult over and agree protective provisions? (Appendix B of the Statement of Reasons [APP-022] refers.)</p> <p>If so, what are the current positions of the Applicant and each of the following.</p> <p>If not, why not?</p> <p>If agreement has not been reached on protective provisions, what is the envisaged timescale for such an agreement?</p> <p>i) ESP Utilities Group Ltd.</p> <p>ii) GTC Infrastructure Ltd (GTC Electricity).</p> <p>iii) GTC Infrastructure Ltd (GTC Gas).</p> <p>iv) Hampshire County Council.</p> <p>v) National Grid Electricity Transmission plc.</p> <p>vi) Portsmouth City Council.</p> <p>vii) Southern Water Services Ltd – Sewers.</p> <p>viii) SSE PLC (Gas).</p>	<p>Yes, the Applicant has made contact and held initial meetings with all the Statutory Undertakers listed in question CA1.3.41 in order to consult with and agree protective provisions.</p> <p>The Applicant will work to secure the protective provisions before the end of the Examination.</p>
CA1.3.42	The Applicant Environment Agency	<p>What are the current positions of the Applicant and the Environment Agency in terms of its rights relating to watercourses? (Appendix B to the Statement of Reasons [APP-022] refers.)</p>	<p>Permits have not been applied for as part of the consent process and will be required prior to works under, over or adjacent to the watercourses for which the principles for construction have been agreed with the EA as secured within the Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (APP-505) and will be included within the Statement of Common Ground with the EA (document reference 7.5.14), to be submitted at Deadline 1.</p>
CA1.3.43	The Applicant Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd Portsmouth Water Ltd Southern Gas Network PLC SSE PLC (High Voltage)	<p>What are the current positions of the Applicant and the following Statutory Undertakers in terms of protective provisions? (Appendix B of the Statement of Reasons [APP-022] refers.)</p> <p>If agreement has not been reached on protective provisions, what is the envisaged timescale for such an agreement?</p> <p>i) Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd.</p> <p>ii) Portsmouth Water Ltd.</p> <p>iii) SGN - Southern Gas Network PLC.</p> <p>iv) SSE PLC (High Voltage).</p>	<p>The Applicant is progressing the negotiation of protective provisions with Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd and Southern Gas Networks PLC, and it is hoped that agreement will be reached in relation to these shortly. Once further progressed, update versions of the protective provisions will be included in the draft Order (APP-019)</p> <p>The Applicant's technical teams are engaged with Portsmouth Water and SEE to confirm any relevant technical requirements which will affect the protective provisions for their benefit. It is intended to review the standard form protective provisions included in the dDCO (APP-019) to confirm their acceptability as discussions progress. From discussions to date, it is not expected that it will be necessary to deviate to a material degree from the standard form protective</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
	SSE PLC (Low Voltage)	v) SSE PLC (Low Voltage).	provisions used in DCO's to ensure there is no serious detriment to the carrying on of the respective undertakings of SSE and Portsmouth Water.
CA1.3.44	The Applicant	Could the Applicant please provide an updated version of Appendix C to the application Statement of Reasons [APP-022], with both a clean and track changed version.	An update to the Statement of Reasons (APP-022 Rev002), including a comparison showing the changes made, is submitted alongside this document. This includes an updated version of Appendix C.
CA1.3.45	The Applicant CityFiber Holdings Ltd Openreach (BT) Virgin Media Ltd Vodafone Ltd	Has any contact been made with the following apparatus owners to consult with and agree protective provisions? (Appendix C to the Statement of Reasons [APP-022] refers.) If so, what are the current positions of the Applicant and each of the following. If not, why not? If agreement has not been reached on protective provisions, what is the envisaged timescale for such an agreement? i) CityFiber Holdings Ltd. ii) Openreach Ltd (BT). iii) Virgin Media Ltd. iv) Vodafone Ltd.	The Applicant can confirm that there has been engagement with the listed apparatus owners and that discussions are progressing and follow up meetings are being scheduled. The Applicant anticipates that all protective provisions will be progressed, agreed and signed before the end of the Examination. Based on discussions to date, it is also anticipated that SoCGs will not be required with these undertakers as this will be addressed by Protective Provisions.
CA1.3.46	The Applicant Highways England	What are the current positions of the Applicant and Highways England in terms of protective provisions and National Roads Telecommunications Services? (Appendix B to the Statement of Reasons [APP-022] refers.) If agreement has not been reached on protective provisions, what is the envisaged timescale for such an agreement?	The Applicant is engaged with Highways England in relation to the required protective provisions, which are required to address the works beneath the Highways England assets in connection with HDD5 beneath the A27. This includes engagement in respect of National Roads Telecommunications Services assets. The Applicant anticipates that the protective provisions will be progressed as necessary, and where required agreed and signed before the end of 2020.
CA1.3.47	The Applicant	Please provide a Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession Objection Schedule in the form appended to the ExA's Procedural Decision dated 26 March 2020. This document should be updated in accordance with the Examination timetable, and both a clean and track changed version, showing the updates following the previous submission, should be submitted at the requisite times.	A Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession Objection Schedule has been submitted for Deadline 1 in the form appended to the ExA's Procedural Decision dated 26 March 2020 (document reference 7.6.3). The Applicant confirms the Schedule will be updated in accordance with the Examination timetable, and both a clean and track changed version, showing the updates following the previous submission, should be submitted at the requisite times.
CA1.3.48	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 2.3.1.6 of the Book of Reference [APP-024], what limits have been used to identify Category 3 persons?	Category 3 persons have been identified as those persons that either have a relevant claim under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, Section 10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965 and/or section 152(3) of the Planning Act 2008.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			For Statutory Consultation a 500-metre buffer was applied around the converter station design to identify local landowners in order to ensure that they had the opportunity to participate in the consultation event. This was because the Environmental Impact Assessment was still ongoing and as such, a cautious approach was applied to ensure that all potential Category 3 persons were consulted. During the pre-Application stage as more information came to light as a result of various assessments and following advice from Avison Young and WSP, it was determined that all Category 3 persons which should be listed in Part 2 of the Book of Reference (APP-024) were within the Order Limits and the Applicant does not expect that any person will be able to make a successful claim beyond this area.
CA1.3.49	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 2.3.1.6 of the Book of Reference [APP-024], why does the Applicant <i>'not expect that any person will be able to make a successful claim under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1972 in respect of the operation of the Proposed Development'</i> ?	<p>The Applicant sought the advice of Avison Young and WSP, to advise on whether or not any parties might be entitled to make a potential claim under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973.</p> <p>The methodology applied was to establish whether the Scheme may give rise to relevant and sustainable claims for compensation. The physical factors which may give rise to a claim under Part 1, provided in the Land Compensation Act 1973 are noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, artificial lighting and discharge of solid or liquid substances onto the land. The Applicant considered each of these in turn and determined that none would have an impact that could result in a relevant compensation claim with the exception of noise as a result of the operation of the interconnector. Once further work had been undertaken as part of the noise assessment outlined in Chapter 24 of the Environmental Statement (APP-139), it was concluded that with the inclusion of embedded and additional noise mitigation measures, the noise effects from the operation of the Proposed Development would be negligible (not significant). The assessment has taken into account the current legislation, policy and guidance in relation to noise and vibration. As such, the Applicant does not expect that any person will be able to make a successful claim under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973.</p>
CA1.3.50	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 4.3 of the Funding Statement [APP-023], please could the Applicant provide details of the shareholder's commitment and any security in respect of the funding of the Proposed Development.	Please see the response provided to WQ CA1.3.1 in this regard.
CA1.3.51	The Applicant	What date has been given to the cost estimate for the project? (Refer to paragraph 5.2 of the Funding Statement [APP-023].)	The cost estimate as presented was undertaken at beginning of 2019 following a round of market engagement with potential contractors in respect of the design, engineering, supply and installation of converters and cables.
CA1.3.52	The Applicant	Has any allowance been made for inflation in the cost estimate for the project? [Refer to paragraph 5.2 of the Funding Statement [APP-023].]	The project's costs and revenues have been forecasted in both real and nominal terms. The inflation for future periods is taken at the rate of 2%, which is broadly

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>If so, what is it?</p> <p>If not, please provide an estimate of such an allowance.</p>	<p>considered a target inflation rate by the modern monetary policy.¹¹ Ofgem notes that electricity prices frequently increase ahead of inflation.¹² The Applicant is confident that the inflation rates will not significantly affect the feasibility of the Project either in the case of lower inflation or higher inflation than the target inflation of 2%.</p>
CA1.3.53	The Applicant	In paragraph 7.2.1 of the Funding Statement [APP-023], should the reference to paragraph 7.4.3 be to 7.2.3?	<p>Yes, the reference should be to paragraph 7.2.3.</p> <p>An update to the Funding Statement (APP-023) has not been provided to address this given the minor nature of the error and this written response confirming the position which is a public document related to the Application, however please can the ExA confirm where they consider an updated Funding Statement is required to address this error.</p>
CA1.3.54	The Applicant	What is the estimated cost of the Crown Estate seabed licence? (Refer to paragraph 7.2.3 of the Funding Statement [APP-023].)	<p>The content of the Crown Estate seabed licence entered into between the Crown Estate Commissioners and the Applicant, and the cost of licensing the seabed in connection with the Proposed Development, is confidential commercial information. The release of this confidential commercial information in a public forum would prejudice the Crown Estate Commissioners, who will negotiate similar licences on a case by case basis, and the negotiation of which would be prejudiced by the release of the information requested.</p>
CA1.3.55	The Applicant	Relating to the Executive Summary of the Needs and Benefits Report [APP-115], briefly describe the Cap and Floor regulatory arrangements and explain what elements of them would be relevant to the Proposed Development.	<p>The reference to the cap and floor regime in the Executive Summary of the Needs and Benefits Report (APP-115) was to indicate the support for further interconnector capacity.</p> <p>The cap and floor regime was introduced by Ofgem in 2014 to encourage investment in electricity interconnectors – given the recognised benefits of interconnection between the UK and Europe (as identified by Ofgem interconnectors “reduce the need to curtail intermittent generation, reducing the cost of renewables to the electricity system and the price of electricity for consumers. Interconnectors also enable imports which can improve energy security by providing access to a wider market”.</p> <p>The main features of the cap and floor regime are a limit on the revenue that can be earned by the developer (the cap) and a minimum level of revenue a developer is guaranteed to receive (the floor). The floor reducing project risks by providing a guarantee of a minimum revenue.</p> <p>Since its introduction for the Nemo interconnector project in 2014 nine projects have been awarded a cap and floor regime.</p>

¹¹ <https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/monetary-policy>

¹² <https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications-and-updates/state-energy-market-2019>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>Ofgem guidance on the Cap and Floor regime can be found at: https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/system/files/docs/2016/05/cap_and_floor_brochure.pdf and https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications-and-updates/consultation-proposed-changes-our-electricity-interconnector-cap-and-floor-regime-enable-project-finance-solutions</p> <p>Currently, Ofgem is performing a policy review¹³ in response to calls to open a new cap and floor window.</p>
CA1.3.56	The Applicant	Relating to the Executive Summary of the Needs and Benefits Report [APP-115], briefly describe the Cross-Border Cost Allocation process and explain what elements of it would be relevant to the Proposed Development.	A cross border cost allocation is not being applied for and therefore is not relevant to the Proposed Development.
CA1.3.57	The Applicant	Relating to the Executive Summary of the Needs and Benefits Report [APP-115], briefly describe the Connecting Europe Facility, and explain what elements of it would be relevant to the Proposed Development.	<p>Information on the connecting Europe facility can be obtained here - https://ec.europa.eu/inea/en/connecting-europe-facility</p> <p>No funding through the Connecting Europe Facility is proposed to be sought in connection with the Proposed Development, and therefore this is not of relevance to it. As with reference to the cap and floor regime, the inclusion of reference to the Connecting Europe Facility was to evidence the general level of policy support, in this instance at the EU level.</p>
CA1.3.58	The Applicant	Provide a table or tables to show what all of the Euro figures in the Needs and Benefits Report [APP-115] and the Planning Statement [APP-108] represent in Pounds Sterling in the context of the text that they relate to.	Please refer to the Appendix 11 to this document (document reference 7.4.1.11) which provides converted figures adopting an exchange rate of 1.13 Euros to the Pound. As well as currency conversions some of the figures have been subject to updated calculations and/or corrections. The Pounds Sterling figures in the table are not therefore always simply a conversion from Euros. The Notes column in the table provides relevant commentary and reference to the Needs and Benefits Report Addendum (document reference 7.7.7) submitted at Deadline 1 where relevant.
CA1.3.59	The Applicant	<p>Has the AQUIND interconnector been submitted for inclusion the Cap and Floor regime (paragraph 2.2.1.2 of the Needs and Benefits Report [APP-115] refers)?</p> <p>If so, at what stage is the project at, and why is Ofgem minded not to make a Cap and Floor award to the AQUIND interconnector?</p>	As above, Ofgem is performing a policy review ¹⁴ in response to calls to open a new cap and floor window. A decision on whether to make a Cap and Floor award in relation to the Project has not yet been made.

¹³ Available here https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/system/files/docs/2020/08/open_letter_-_interconnector_policy_review.pdf . It is our understanding that the start of the review might have been affected by the need of Ofgem and other regulatory and Government bodies to focus on COVID-19 response.

¹⁴ Available here https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/system/files/docs/2020/08/open_letter_-_interconnector_policy_review.pdf . It is our understanding that the start of the review might have been affected by the need of Ofgem and other regulatory and Government bodies to focus on COVID-19 response.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response												
CA1.3.60	The Applicant	In relation to paragraph 2.3.2.7 of the Needs and Benefits Report [APP-115], how much of the existing interconnector capacity and target capacity has and will have this Voltage Sourced Converter ('VSC') technology?	<p>Currently, operational projects comprise 30% VSC and 70% LCC.</p> <p>The table below confirms that, where known, the majority of the planned interconnector projects connecting with the UK will utilise VSC technology, comprising 100% VSC (12,900 MW).</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Voltage Sourced Converter</th> <th>Line Commutated Converter</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Operational projects</td> <td>East-West Interconnector (Ireland) – 500MW Nemo Link (Belgium) – 1,000MW</td> <td>IFA 2000 (France) – 2,000MW Britned (Netherlands) – 1,000MW Moyle (Northern Ireland) 500MW</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Planned projects (where known)</td> <td>AQUIND Interconnector (France) – 2,000MW Eleclink (France) – 1,000MW FAB Link (France) – 1,400MW GreenLink (Ireland) – 500MW GridLink (France) – 1,400MW IFA 2 (France) – 1,000MW NeuConnect (Germany) – 1,400MW NorthConnect (Norway) – 1,400MW North Sea Link (Norway) – 1,400MW Viking Link (Denmark) – 1,400MW</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL CAPACITY</td> <td>Operational – 1,500MW Planned – 12,900MW</td> <td>Operational – 3,500MW</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Voltage Sourced Converter	Line Commutated Converter	Operational projects	East-West Interconnector (Ireland) – 500MW Nemo Link (Belgium) – 1,000MW	IFA 2000 (France) – 2,000MW Britned (Netherlands) – 1,000MW Moyle (Northern Ireland) 500MW	Planned projects (where known)	AQUIND Interconnector (France) – 2,000MW Eleclink (France) – 1,000MW FAB Link (France) – 1,400MW GreenLink (Ireland) – 500MW GridLink (France) – 1,400MW IFA 2 (France) – 1,000MW NeuConnect (Germany) – 1,400MW NorthConnect (Norway) – 1,400MW North Sea Link (Norway) – 1,400MW Viking Link (Denmark) – 1,400MW		TOTAL CAPACITY	Operational – 1,500MW Planned – 12,900MW	Operational – 3,500MW
	Voltage Sourced Converter	Line Commutated Converter													
Operational projects	East-West Interconnector (Ireland) – 500MW Nemo Link (Belgium) – 1,000MW	IFA 2000 (France) – 2,000MW Britned (Netherlands) – 1,000MW Moyle (Northern Ireland) 500MW													
Planned projects (where known)	AQUIND Interconnector (France) – 2,000MW Eleclink (France) – 1,000MW FAB Link (France) – 1,400MW GreenLink (Ireland) – 500MW GridLink (France) – 1,400MW IFA 2 (France) – 1,000MW NeuConnect (Germany) – 1,400MW NorthConnect (Norway) – 1,400MW North Sea Link (Norway) – 1,400MW Viking Link (Denmark) – 1,400MW														
TOTAL CAPACITY	Operational – 1,500MW Planned – 12,900MW	Operational – 3,500MW													
CA1.3.61	The Applicant	Please explain the Vision 3 and Vision 4 scenarios mentioned in paragraph 2.3.4.4 of the Needs and Benefits Report [APP-115].	<p>Ten Year Network Development Plan 2016 (TYNDP 2016) scenarios developed by ENTSO-E are based on four contrasting “Visions”. Each “Vision” presents different potential pathways of the development of pan-European energy market up-to 2030.</p> <p>The European Commission, which is responsible for the development of the EU energy policies, decided that Visions 3 and 4 most closely match with the EU policy objectives for 2020, 2030 and 2050, and therefore these Visions are presented in the Needs and Benefits Report (APP-115).</p> <p>The TYNDP 2016 scenario report which includes the explanation of Visions 3 and 4 can be viewed here - https://eepublicdownloads.blob.core.windows.net/public-cdn-container/clean-documents/tyndp-</p>												

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			documents/TYNDP%202016/rqips/TYNDP2016%20Scenario%20Development%20Report%20-%20Final.pdf In particular, see pages 1617 which details Visions 3 and 4.

<p>CA1.3.62</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>How does the 15.5GW (10.5 plus 5) total capacity of existing and planned GB interconnectors relate to the optimal and socially beneficial capacities of 6.8 and 8.8GW to France and the December 2018 15% of generation target of 12.4GW (4 plus 8.4) in respect of the sufficiency of existing and planned capacity outside of AQUIND at 2030? (Paragraph 2.2.1.3 and Appendix 1 of the Needs and Benefits Report [APP-115] refer.)</p>	<p>This response addresses each of the figures referred to in the question in turn.</p> <p><u>15.5GW capacity of existing and proposed GB interconnectors (Appendix 1 of the Needs and Benefits Report (APP115)):</u></p> <p>There is 8.8GW of operational and planned interconnector capacity (including AQUIND Interconnector) at GB – France border. Out of this 8.8GW, 2GW (IFA) is operational, 2GW (ElecLink and IFA2) is under construction and 4.8GW is in development (AQUIND Interconnector, (2GW), Fab Link (1.4GW) and GridLink). (1.4GW)). All these projects, except AQUIND Interconnector, (i.e. a total capacity of 6.8GW) are accounted for in the 15.5GW figure derived from the tables at Appendix 1 of the Needs and Benefits Report [APP-115]. This figure merely represents the total capacity of the projects in the pipeline. While the Applicant does not want to comment on the current status of other projects, it is worth noting that RTE, which owns the French part of FAB Link suspended (https://www.rte-france.com/actualites/deliberations-de-la-cre) the development of the project in France in the end of 2017 following the decision of the French energy regulator. Other projects may have other risks and uncertainties.</p> <p><u>6.8GW optimal level of interconnection from GB to France (paragraph 2.2.1.2 of the Needs and Benefits Report (APP115)):</u></p> <p>National Grid ESO, in its National Options Assessment (NOA) 2018/19 identified the optimal and socially beneficial capacity of 6.8GW between GB and France. However, this assessment is project agnostic. This is stated in the document as follows: <i>“What NOA IC is not: It does not assess the viability of actual current or future projects: the final insights are largely independent of specific projects. It does not provide any project specific information”</i>.</p> <p>As noted in the Needs and Benefits Report Addendum (document reference 7.7.7) the latest NOA 2019/20 (published in January 2020 following the DCO submission) revised this figure upwards to up to 9GW. As stated above, the current operational level is only 2GW.</p> <p><u>8.8GW level of interconnection from GB to France that would be socially beneficial (paragraph 2.2.1.2 of the Needs and Benefits Report (APP115)):</u></p> <p>The optimal and socially beneficial capacity of 8.8GW between GB and France referred to at paragraph 2.2.1.2 of the Needs and Benefits Report) was identified by a report from Pöyry to Ofgem on a near term interconnector cost-benefit analysis for Cap & Floor Window 2. As explained in the Needs and Benefits Report, the report from Pöyry, while not assessing AQUIND Interconnector directly, assumed that it will be commissioned alongside FAB Link and GridLink, which together with projects in operation and under construction make 8.8GW as explained above.</p> <p><u>12.4GW target level for GB interconnector capacity (paragraph 2.2.1.3 of the Needs and Benefits Report (APP115)):</u></p> <p>The reference to the 12.4GW installed capacity target by 2030, at paragraph 2.2.1.3 of the Needs and Benefits Report, (APP-115), refers to the level of</p>
------------------------	----------------------	---	---

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>interconnections that would be required to achieve the 15% of installed generator capacity by 2030 based on the power generation capacity present on December 2018. This is included to demonstrate that with only 5GW of currently installed capacity the UK is significantly behind the curve and therefore the Proposed Development would represent a positive contribution to interconnector capacity and GB energy supply. The figure of 12.4GW is GB wide and does not represent any particular projects. Moreover, that target was proposed before the increased commitments to decarbonisation in the view of the Net-Zero 2050 targets.</p> <p>The Needs and Benefits Report Addendum (document reference 7.7.7) provides an update on optimal GB interconnector capacity having regard to the latest analysis from National Grid ESO in the January 2020 Network Options Assessment (NOA), which identified an optimal capacity between GB and European markets in the range of 18.1 to 23.1GW by 2032. The Needs and Benefits Report Addendum also provides a further update following the July 2020 Future Energy Scenarios (which updates the scenarios to reflect the 2050 net zero targets) which identifies comparable projections of interconnector capacity increases across the new scenarios reaching between 16-21.5 GW by 2030. Again, the existing interconnector capacity between GB and European markets stands at only 5.0 GW.</p>
CA1.3.63	The Applicant	Since the application, what progress has been made on obtaining the other necessary consents, licences or permits that are necessary for the Proposed Development, as identified in paragraph 1.1.1.5 of the Other Consents and Licences report [APP-106]?	<p>The Applicant has updated the Other Consents and Licences Document which is submitted at Deadline 1 (APP-106 Rev002).</p> <p>No further progress has been made in obtaining the other marine consents and licences as those that will be required the soonest will be applied for once the Principal Contractor/s is commissioned for pre-construction surveys. The other permissions and notifications will take place prior to the commencement of works or towards the end of the life of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>A separate Marine Licence for safe removal/detonation of UXO is likely to be required as part of pre-installation works following the undertaking of pre-construction investigation surveys. This approach has been discussed with the MMO and Natural England who agreed that as the UXO investigation surveys will not be undertaken for some time that they are content with this approach.</p> <p>A separate Marine Licence for decommissioning of the marine cable will be applied for towards the end of the life of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>An EPS risk assessment will be undertaken and submitted to the MMO at least 28 days prior to works that may create disturbance when undertaken. Where the EPS risk assessment highlights the need for an EPS licence this will be applied for, otherwise voluntary notifications will be submitted to the MMO ahead of commencement of geophysical surveys, or other relevant activities.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>A notification of commencement of exempt activities will be submitted for the HDD works under Langstone Harbour.</p> <p>The approach taken for the above licences has been itemised within the Statements of Common Ground ('SoCG') with Natural England and Joint Nature Conservation Committee ('JNCC') and the MMO (document references 7.5.12 and 7.5.16 respectively) which demonstrate agreement with consultees that the other consents and licences to be obtained relevant to the marine aspects of the Proposed Development are considered to be appropriate and no likely impediments to the granting of such consents are anticipated.</p> <p>While most other consents and licences required in the UK are post consent, the French consents have or are in the process of being submitted as set out in the updated Other Consents and Licences Document (APP-106 Rev 002) and are progressing well, although it should be noted that as a result of Covid-19, all French instructions (similar to applications) were suspended between the 12 March - 24 June 2020.</p>
CA1.3.64	Environment Agency Relevant local authorities	At section 20.9.2 [APP-135] and elsewhere, the ES notes that the contractor appointed to undertake the construction works would need to apply for various environmental permits, discharge and other consents once detailed design is complete. Given that such applications have not been made, the Examining Authority and Secretary of State cannot be sure from the information provided if adequate avoidance or mitigation of environmental effects are possible, and therefore if all of these consents are achievable. Could the Environment Agency and the relevant local authorities with responsibilities in this area please provide an opinion on the likelihood of all such permits and consents being achieved.	
CA1.3.65	The Applicant	For the other consents, licences and permits required for the Proposed Development (Table 2-1 of the Other Consents and Licences report [APP-106]), what is the Applicant's view on the likelihood of each of them being obtained, including evidenced reference to any discussions with the relevant body concerned (in addition to the details already provided)?	<p>As per the updated Other Consents and Licences document submitted at Deadline 1 (APP-106 Rev002), it is not anticipated that there will be any impediment to the grant of any other consent or licence identified to be required. In some instances, discussions remain ongoing, for example with Highways England, and this will be reflected in the Statements of Common Ground submitted at Deadline 1 alongside these responses.</p> <p>The other consents and licences identified for marine aspects (APP-106; Nos. 15-18 in Table 2-1) have been discussed with the relevant bodies who have expressed that they are content with the approach being taken and do not expect any impediments to the consents being obtained. Evidence of this can be found in the SoCGs with Natural England and JNCC and the MMO (document references 7.5.12 and 7.5.16 respectively).</p>
CA1.3.66	The Applicant	On the basis that the draft Order would include the Compulsory Acquisition of a right over Special Category Land where the right would include the ability to undertake construction activities, would this right, and any	The Special Category Land which the Order seeks to acquire rights over is identified on the Land Plans (APP-008) and in Part 5 of the Book of Reference (APP-024).

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>subsequent maintenance rights, burden each plot of the relevant land in any way, including by construction or maintenance? (Paragraph 3.4.1.3 of the Planning Statement [APP-108] refers.)</p> <p>If so, how would this land be burdened, and how would this be <i>'no less advantageous than it was before'</i> to those concerned?</p> <p>If not, why would it not?</p>	<p>There will be no physical infrastructure on the surface of the Special Category Land which is to be subject to the compulsory acquisition of such rights, and the acquisition of those rights over that land will not affect the character of the land in any way following construction of the Proposed Development as the surface of the land will be restored to its former state in accordance with Requirement 22 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p> <p>There may following the construction of the Proposed Development be a need for future maintenance activities associated with the HVDC cable onshore on the Special Category Land in very limited circumstances (monitoring and maintenance is typically undertaken from link boxes/link pillars which would not be located on Special Category Land), which would be temporary in nature, or in the event of a cable failure or emergency.</p> <p>The Applicant therefore considers that the Special Category Land when burdened with the rights sought in the Order will be no less advantageous to any person or the public than it was before, and therefore the test provided for at section 132(3) of the Act is satisfied.</p>
CA1.3.67	The Applicant	<p>Could the Applicant please provide direction to the evidence that demonstrates that all of the <i>'reasonable alternatives to acquisition'</i> have been explored, as asserted in paragraph 2.3.1.2 of ES Chapter 2, Alternatives [APP-117].</p>	<p>The Applicant is only seeking to acquire the freehold of land where necessary. Paragraph 6.1.4 of the updated Statement of Reasons (APP-022 Rev-002) sets out that Applicant considers that it is necessary to acquire all freehold and leasehold interests in respect of only a limited number of plots. These are summarised below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Converter Station - plots 1-20, 1-23, 1-27, 1-29 and 1-32. • Works to potentially widen the existing public highway and junction at the proposed access to the converter station - plots 1-35, 1-49 and 1-52. • Optical Regeneration Stations - plot 10-30. <p>All of the other rights necessary for the construction, operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development are to be secured via the acquisition of rights rather than freehold acquisition.</p> <p>A key approach of the Applicant was and continues to be to utilise the highway in so far as possible, with a reason for this being to minimise the amount of land over which rights are required to be acquired, where it is proposed the onshore cables will be laid pursuant to statutory authority in accordance with the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991, thereby avoiding any acquisition of land along much of the route and in consequence minimising the amount of acquisition. Where the onshore cables are laid at a depth which is beyond the vertical plane of the highway and presumed to be owned <i>ad medium filum</i>, acquisition is proposed by compulsion without negotiation. The reasons for that approach and why it is appropriate in accordance with the guidance related to Compulsory Purchase issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government is clearly explained in the Statement in relation to Highway Subsoil</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>Acquisition (document reference 7.7.2) submitted in response to ExA WQ CA1.3.5.</p> <p>Recognising the need to explore alternatives to avoid environmental impacts and also to respond to feedback received, the Applicant has in a number of locations proposed to route the onshore cables in locations other than the highway, and in many instances opting to choose a route which involves the use of HDD methods, which add cost and complexity to the Proposed Development but which is deemed to be reasonable and appropriate by the Applicant when balancing the relevant environmental, technical and cost factors. Further information to supplement that provided within Chapter 2 to the ES is provided for in the Supplementary Alternatives Chapter (document reference 7.8.1.3) in the ES Addendum, which provides further explanation on the refinement of proposals and the considerations assessed by the Applicant in relation to land to be affected (alongside the environmental and technical engineering considerations that must also be taken into account).</p> <p>The process of refining the Order Limits as part of the consideration of the reasonable alternative locations for the Proposed Development is also summarised in the response to ExA WQ 1.3.30, evidencing how careful consideration has been undertaken in relation to all land proposed to be included within the Order limits, including the consideration of alternative options.</p>
CA1.3.68	The Applicant	What maintenance disruption is envisaged along the onshore cable route? (Table 2.1 of the ES Chapter 2, Alternatives [APP-117], refers.)	<p>Minimal maintenance is required on the HVDC cable system. This is anticipated to comprise Vantage Point Surveys which are observational checks at designated points along the route with no physical disruption.</p> <p>During outages for maintenance of the Converter Station, the integrity of the cable sheaths may be tested, requiring access to the link boxes or link pillars along the Onshore Cable Route.</p> <p>In the unexpected event of a cable or joint failure the first action, having located the fault, is to excavate it, and, in the case of a cable, remove a section of duct. After a repair, a split duct is typically placed around the cables and the trench reinstated. Should a failure occur within a section of HDD, the failed cable would be pulled out and replaced. This could require the construction of a new joint bay, for a single cable, hence the need for a permanent cable easement.</p>
CA1.3.69	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 2.4.2.7 of ES Chapter 2, Alternatives [APP-117], where are the 'wider network reinforcements' required for Chickerell substation option?	<p>Had the AQUIND connection been proposed at Chickerell, National Grid had indicated that wider network reinforcements would be required. This would principally involve two engineering activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replacement of the conductors on the overhead transmission lines between Chickerell and adjacent substations on the south coast, with up-

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>graded conductors which could accommodate the higher power flow from the AQUIND Interconnector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The installation of additional reactive power compensation banks at Chickerell and other adjacent substations to support the network voltage, which otherwise may fall below acceptable levels, due to the higher power flows from the AQUIND Interconnector. <p>Additional information is included within the Supplementary Alternatives Chapter (document reference 7.8.1.3), Appendix 3 to the ES Addendum submitted at Deadline 1.</p>
CA1.3.70	The Applicant	<p>In relation to the Chickerell substation option that was considered, was the option of building a new and larger substation alongside the existing substation explored to reduce the 'significant disruption to the existing network' (ES Chapter 2 Alternatives [APP-117], paragraph 2.4.2.7)?</p> <p>If so, what was the outcome?</p> <p>If not, why not?</p>	<p>The AQUIND Interconnector would have required two additional connection bays in the Chickerell substation as no spare bays were available. It was National Grid's view that the substation would need to be substantially re-designed and modernised to accommodate the connections. This would have caused significant disruption to National Grid's transmission network and any new substation may have presented new environmental impacts and therefore was not considered by National Grid to be acceptable.</p> <p>High voltage transmission lines enter Chickerell substation on its northern boundary, while to the east, south and west the station is close to urban development. There would have been insufficient space close to the existing substation to construct a new and larger substation, with the required number of connection bays. Due to these site constraints, amongst other considerations, Chickerell was not pursued as a viable connection solution.</p> <p>Additional information is included within the Supplementary Alternatives Chapter (document reference 7.8.1.3), Appendix 3 to the ES Addendum submitted at Deadline 1.</p>
CA1.3.71	The Applicant	<p>The construction of the Proposed Development requires a number of facilities that are mentioned throughout the application documents. Could the Applicant please provide plans to indicate and explain the locations and envisaged extent of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the 'primary contractor compound' at the Lovedean Converter Station (ES Appendix 22.2 [APP-450], paragraph 2.4.1.1); each of the 'satellite contractor's compounds along the Onshore Cable Corridor' (ES Appendix 22.2 [APP-450], paragraph 2.4.1.2); each of the 'laydown areas' for the storage of materials (paragraph 2.4.1.3 of ES Appendix 22.2 [APP-450] and ES 3.6.3.50 [APP-118]); each of the envisaged joint bays along the Onshore Cable Corridor (ES Appendix 22.2 [APP-450], paragraph 2.4.1.5). <p>Please indicate how is each of these controlled through the dDCO [APP-019] and outline management plans, and how and where are their effects set out in the ES?</p>	<p>The primary contractor compound and laydown area is shown in the Indicative Converter Station Layout Plans (APP-013).</p> <p>The Order limits encompass land at Kendall's Wharf and Fort Cumberland Road for the HDD compounds and include additional space within those compounds for storage of materials. The Applicant has produced an HDD Position Statement (document reference 7.7.3) which confirms the HDD compound locations and details of their operation. In addition, HDD Compound Location drawing (Appendix 2 to the HDD Position Statement) shows the indicative cable laydown areas submitted alongside this document. The HDD Position Statement has been added as an appendix to the updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002), and the locations subsequently secured by virtue of requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p> <p>Each of the compound and laydown areas have been assessed as part of the ES.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			The Applicant's contractor will seek to locate the joint bays off the roads, (e.g. in verges, parks) where practicable with this secured in the updated Onshore Outline CEMP and secured by requirement 15 of the dDCO.
CA1.3.72	The Applicant	Plate 2 of ES Appendix 22.2 [APP-450] shows two permanent land take widths of 3.0m at jointing bays. How do these widths relate to the envisaged permanent land take widths along the Onshore Cable Corridor?	<p>The expected dimensions of the permanent joint bay, the cast slab that provides the safe working environment for jointing works and provides a stable support for the joints, are 6m long and 3m wide.</p> <p>The Applicant anticipates the excavation to be 15m long and 3m wide, to allow for cable handling during the pulling and jointing processes. The additional space shown in blue on Plate 2 of ES Appendix 22.2 (APP-450) is for cable drums and/or cable pulling equipment. This space, and approximately 20m x 6m for a jointing compound, would only be required during the construction of the Interconnector.</p> <p>The permanent land take, often referred to as the permanent easement, is typically 1m either side of the trench, or, in this case, the joint bay, so the easement would be 5m wide at each joint bay. Although two joint bays are shown side-by-side in plate 2 of ES Appendix 22.2 (APP-450), this may not be the arrangement selected following detailed design. If the joint bays were to be close together, then a single easement may apply, otherwise it will be two separate easements, typically each 5m wide, whereas above the rest of the onshore cable route 3m is more likely.</p>
CA1.3.73	The Applicant	How do the widths on Plate 3 of ES Appendix 22.2 [APP-450] relate to the envisaged permanent land take?	The permanent land take, often referred to as the permanent easement, is typically 1m either side of the trench (so typically a width of approximately 3m). If the trenches were to be installed close together, e.g. where space is limited, a single easement may cover both trenches, but the Applicant anticipates that for most of the route there would be two separate easements of approximately 3m in width.
CA1.3.74	The Applicant	On Plate 3 of ES Appendix 22.2 [APP-450], where are the fibre optic cables situated?	The Plate has been updated in section 3.4 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) submitted at Deadline 1 and now includes clarification of the fibre optic cables and associated duct.
CA1.3.75	The Applicant	<p>Plate 4 of ES Appendix 22.2 [APP-450] shows a permanent easement width of 11m and a construction corridor of 23m '<i>within fields and open land</i>'. Would such a construction corridor be the extent of rights sought '<i>within fields and open land</i>' outside compounds and access areas?</p> <p>If not, what would be sought, and why and how is this regulated under the dDCO [APP-019]?</p> <p>What is the envisaged extent of construction and permanent rights sought elsewhere?</p>	<p>The 23m construction cable corridor will not be the full extent of rights sought. In addition to the construction cable corridor there will be additional compound, laydown and access areas associated with the works, all located within the Order limits.</p> <p>The final width of the construction corridor will be defined by the local constraints e.g. highway/lane width, confirmed by the detailed route design to be developed by the Applicant's contractor, and confirmed in accordance with requirement 6 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p> <p>As stated above in response to question CA1.3.38, the permanent easement is provided for repair, and is typically 1m beyond the trench or joint bay, if they are</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>close together a single easement may be sought that encompasses both trenches.</p> <p>The powers of acquisition of rights, which are applicable in relation to the Onshore Cable Route where permanent land acquisition is not sought as it is not necessary and would not be proportionate, are limited to the acquisition of rights over so much of the land as is required for the construction, operation or maintenance of the authorised development or to facilitate it, or as is incidental to it (Article 23 of dDCO (APP-019 Rev 002)). As such, a test of necessity applies in relation to the extent of the land over which rights and restrictions in connection with the Onshore Cables may be acquired or imposed respectively.</p> <p>The extent of land acquisition elsewhere is shown on the Land Plans (APP-008). Further information on the sub classes of rights sought over the plots of land shown on the Land Plans can be found in the Book of Reference (APP-024).</p>
CA1.3.76	The Applicant	Are the construction elements required in France and the UK similar in nature and complexity? Would the construction costs be less, more or equivalent?	<p>In France, the Project consists of the elements similar in nature to those described in paragraph 3.3.1.8 of Chapter 3 of the ES (APP-118). Any cost difference is based on the specifics of locations and commercial considerations. The publication of detailed cost estimates in the public domain will seriously prejudice the Applicant's commercial interests as the Applicant prepares to commence the 'invitation to tender' stage of the public procurement process.</p> <p>In France, the Project will connect to the French electrical transmission network at RTE's Barnabos switching station. The converter station will be located within 500m from the Barnabos switching station and the connections between the two will be made using relatively short lengths of HVAC underground cables. The French converter station will be similar in complexity to the corresponding element of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The HVDC underground cables (and associated fibre optic cables) will be installed from the converter station to the landfall at Pourville-sur-Mer, using HDD, predominantly under the existing roads mostly in a rural environment, with the total cable corridor length of approximately 36km (as compared to 20km in the UK). The French onshore cables will also require only one more HDD in addition to the landfall. Thus, overall construction of the onshore cable route in France will be of a lower complexity (due to the lower number of existing utilities, less traffic, number of HDDs and other factors) than the corresponding element of the Proposed Development in the UK. Taking into account the above factors, the costs for each of the French and UK onshore cable routes are broadly equivalent.</p> <p>The HVDC marine cables in France will consist of the two HVDC Circuits, similar to the Proposed Development and will be installed from the landfall at Pourville-sur-Mer to the French EEZ for a total distance of approximately 73km. At the landfall marine cables will be installed via HDD. On the basis of the average per</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>kilometre cost of marine cable, the cost of the marine cables within the French EEZ may appear lower.</p> <p>The final cost will be known once the Contractors are appointed following the completion of the ongoing public tender.</p> <p>Providing any further details in respect of the costs of the part of the Project outside of the UK does not have any significance for the purposes of the examination of this Application. The Applicant is content with the approximate cost distribution stated in the Funding Statement at this stage (APP-023)</p>
CA1.3.77	Southern Gas Networks	Is the SGN Relevant Representation [RR-012] made in relation to s127 or s138 of the Planning Act 2008, or both?	
CA1.3.78	RWE Renewables UK Limited	Is the RWE Renewables UK Limited Relevant Representation [RR-018] made in relation to s127 or s138 of the Planning Act 2008?	
CA1.3.79	The Applicant	<p>What is the landward limit of the ‘<i>Option Agreement from The Crown Estate</i>’ mentioned in [RR-037]?</p> <p>Does this agreement relate to the ‘<i>lease to the Aquind Limited for the construction of the project</i>’?</p> <p>If so, how?</p> <p>If there are no limits in this agreement, what is the envisaged landward limit of the ‘lease’?</p>	<p>The landward limit of the Marine Option Agreement will be where the relevant portion of English territorial waters reach the English foreshore, as will be more specifically determined by the territorial limit at the time.</p> <p>The agreed form licence to be granted pursuant to the Marine Option Agreement will provide Aquind Limited with the rights to lay and bury the relevant cables during the construction phase of the project whilst also permitting the ongoing right to occupy the seabed for the ongoing use of the project.</p>
CA1.3.80	Blake Morgan LLP on behalf of The Owners of Little Denmead Farm	Who are the owners of Little Denmead Farm who are represented? ([RR-055] refers.)	
CA1.3.81	Savills on behalf of West Waterlooville Development Ltd/Grainger Plc	<p>Does the Savills Relevant Representation [RR-141] include any concerns in relation to the seeking of rights within the areas of adopted highway?</p> <p>What are the Land Plan [APP-008] plots, or parts of plots, referred to in the Relevant Representation that lie outside the adopted highway?</p>	
CA1.3.82	Ian Judd and Partners on behalf of Peter and Geoffery Carpenter,	In Relevant Representation [RR-168], should Mr Carpenter be ‘Geoffrey’ and not ‘Geoffery’, should ‘Hill Crest’ be ‘Hillcrest’ and should ‘Mill Farm’ be ‘Mill View Farm’?	

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
	Michael and Sandra Jefferies, Robin Jefferies and Joe Tee		
CA1.3.83	Ian Judd and Partners on behalf of Peter and Geoffery Carpenter, Michael and Sandra Jefferies, Robin Jefferies and Joe Tee	To what Land Plan [APP-008] plot numbers does Relevant Representation [RR-168] refer?	
CA1.3.84	Ian Judd and Partners on behalf of Peter and Geoffery Carpenter, Michael and Sandra Jefferies, Robin Jefferies and Joe Tee	What land interest does Joe Tee have in respect of Relevant Representation [RR-168]?	
CA1.3.85	Ian Judd and Partners on behalf of The Landowners of land at Kings Pond, Denmead being Julie Elliott, Robin Elliott, Richard Elliott and Phillip Elliot	In respect of Relevant Representation [RR-194], do the parties listed make any representation in respect of Land Plans [APP-008] Plots 3-06 and 3-11?	
CA1.3.86	Ian Judd and Partners on behalf of Peter and Geoffery Carpenter, Michael and Sandra Jefferies,	Peter and Geoffery Carpenter appear to be represented by both yourselves and Blake Morgan LLP ([RR-168] and [RR-055]). Is this the case? If so, should these Relevant Representations be taken as one. If not, what are the differences between the Relevant Representations?	

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
	Robin Jefferies and Joe Tee		
CA1.3.87	Blake Morgan LLP on behalf of The Owners of Little Denmead Farm	Peter and Geoffrey Carpenter appear to be represented by both yourselves and Ian Judd and Partners ([RR-055] and [RR-168]). Is this the case? If so, should these Relevant Representations be taken as one. If not, what are the differences between the Relevant Representations?	
CA1.3.88	Ian Judd and Partners on behalf of Peter and Geoffery Carpenter, Michael and Sandra Jefferies, Robin Jefferies and Joe Tee	Michael Edwin and Sandra Helen Jefferies appear to be represented by both yourselves and Blake Morgan LLP ([RR-168] and [RR-070]). Is this the case? If so, should these Relevant Representations be taken as one? If not, what are the differences between the Relevant Representations?	
CA1.3.89	Blake Morgan LLP on behalf of The Owners of Hillcrest	Michael Edwin and Sandra Helen Jefferies appear to be represented by both yourselves and Ian Judd and Partners ([RR-168] and [RR-070]). Is this the case? If so, should these Relevant Representations be taken as one. If not, what are the differences between the Relevant Representations?	
CA1.3.90	Ian Judd and Partners on behalf of Peter and Geoffery Carpenter, Michael and Sandra Jefferies, Robin Jefferies and Joe Tee	Robin Jefferies appears to be represented by both yourselves and Blake Morgan LLP ([RR-168] and [RR-067]). Is this the case? If so, should these Relevant Representations be taken as one. If not, what are the differences between the Relevant Representations?	
CA1.3.91	Blake Morgan LLP on behalf of Robin Jefferies	Robin Jefferies appears to be represented by both yourselves and Ian Judd and Partners ([RR-168] and [RR-067]). Is this the case? If so, should these Relevant Representations be taken as one. If not, what are the differences between the Relevant Representations?	
CA1.3.92	Stantec on behalf of Investin	Does Investin Portsmouth Limited have any specific land interest, including any rights, over the car park (Land Plans Plots 10-30 and 10-32) [APP-008] referred to in its Relevant Representation [RR-098]?	

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
	Portsmouth Limited):		
CA1.3.93	The Applicant	<p>For each of the areas of Special Land within the Order land, why is no replacement land being offered under s132 of the Planning Act 2008 (refer to paragraph 2.7 of [RR-185])?</p> <p>The response should include reference to any relevant provisions in the Growth and Infrastructure Act 2013.</p>	<p>The Order seeks to authorise the compulsory acquisition of rights over land forming open space and allotments (as those terms are defined at section 132(12) of the Planning Act 2008), known as special category land. In all circumstances where the compulsory acquisition of rights over special category land is sought, the right will authorise the laying and operation of the HVDC onshore cable circuits in the land, beneath its surface.</p> <p>The special category land which the Order seeks to acquire rights over is identified on the Land Plans (APP-008) and in Part 5 of the Book of Reference (APP-024).</p> <p>There will be no physical infrastructure on the surface of the special category land which is to be subject to the compulsory acquisition of such rights, and the acquisition of those rights over that land will not affect the character of the land following construction of the Proposed Development as the surface of the land will be restored to its former state in accordance with the Order.</p> <p>There may following the construction of the Proposed Development be a need for future maintenance activities associated with the HVDC cable onshore on the special category land in rare circumstances, which would be very temporary in nature, such as in the event of a cable failure or emergency.</p> <p>The Applicant therefore considers that the special category land when burdened with the rights sought in the Order will be no less advantageous to any person or the public than it was before, and therefore no replacement land is required as the test provided for at section 132(3) of the Planning Act 2008 is satisfied.</p>
CA1.3.94	The Applicant	<p>Why are Compulsory Acquisition powers being sought over and above the statutory framework that exists in the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991, and why does the dDCO [APP-019] not include protective provisions to protect highway interests? (Refer to paragraph 2.10 of [RR-185].)</p>	<p>The statutory framework which exists in the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 relates to land forming part of the highway. Not all land beneath the surface of the highway forms part of the highway. This is explained at paragraph 7.5.2 to the Statement of Reasons (APP-020). The position regarding the acquisition of land beneath the highway is fully explained in the Statement in relation to the acquisition of highway subsoil, submitted with these written question responses (document reference 7.7.2).</p> <p>Where the Proposed Development is situated at a depth which is below the area which is vested in the Highway Authority, it is necessary to acquire rights over such land to ensure the position is legally documented and there is not impediment to the delivery of the Proposed Development. It is for this reason rights to acquire the subsoil beneath the highway are sought. Where the Proposed Development is situated in land which is known to be vested in the Highway Authority, the statutory framework provided by the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 is to be relied upon, as per Articles 11 and 12 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			A draft form of protective provisions for the protection of the highway has been provided to Hampshire County Council and Portsmouth City Council for discussion and the draft form of those protective provisions is included within the updated version of the dDCO submitted alongside these written question responses (APP-019 Rev 002), who are the highway authorities for the highways where works are proposed. Separately, protective provisions are being discussed with Highways England. Those protective provisions will relate to the protection of Highway England structures above where the Proposed Development is proposed to be located only. None of the Proposed Development is proposed to be located in land for which Highways England is the highway authority.
CA1.3.95	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 10.4 of [RR-185] and paragraph 6.3 of the Funding Statement [APP-023], what 'Market engagement has been undertaken'?	The Applicant engaged KPMG in 2019 to assess and discuss with potential project finance lenders and equity capital providers the bankability and investment attractiveness of the Project. KPMG reviewed rates of return required by investors in comparable infrastructure projects, possible forms of lending arrangements and conditions and positively assessed the feasibility of financing the Project subject to the Project securing necessary and appropriate consents, permissions and approvals. The report was made available to national regulatory authorities of the UK and France under confidential conditions, as it contains commercially sensitive information. A strategic advisor was engaged earlier this year by the Applicant to manage further engagement with investors.
CA1.3.96	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 10.4 of Portsmouth City Council's Relevant Representation [RR-185] and paragraph 6.4 of the Funding Statement [APP-023], what evidence is there 'that there is a strong interest in the provision of finance for the Project' and what level of finance would this evidenced 'strong interest' provide?	Based on the previous engagement with investors as outlined in responses to WQ CA1.3.1 and CA1.3.95, extensive economic and financial modelling undertaken by the Project since its initiation in 2014, the Applicant has sufficient grounds to believe that all financing necessary to deliver the Project will be secured in due course.
CA1.3.97	The Applicant	How has the Proposed Development been found to be viable (paragraph 10.13 of [RR-185] and Funding Statement [APP-023])? Provide details of the most recent of any appraisals undertaken.	The economic and technical feasibility of the Project was confirmed in the initial Feasibility Study performed by Parson Brinckerhoff in 2014. Following that AQUIND engaged Baringa Partners in 2015 to perform economic analysis of the social economic benefits of the Project and its potential profitability over a range of scenarios. The results of that analysis were submitted along with the exemption request referred to in C1.3.2 and the conclusions of ACER, taking that analysis into account, confirmed the social economic need for AQUIND Interconnector on the French – GB border as was the conclusion of Baringa's analysis as well. The most recent analysis of the Project's profitability and its social economic benefits was presented to national regulatory authorities this year and is under consideration under the conditions of confidentiality. The social economic benefits of the Project net of its revenues are presented in the Needs and Benefits Report Addendum (document reference 7.7.7). The Project's revenues

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			depend on demand for electricity transmission capacity between GB and French markets. It is sufficiently shown in the Needs and Benefits Report APP-115) and the Needs and Benefits Report Addendum (document reference 7.7.7) which factors and trends create demand for the transmission of electricity between these two markets for the reasonably foreseeable future (25 years from the expected date of the start of the Project's commercial operation). Accordingly, the demand for transmission capacity explains the viability of the Project.
CA1.3.98	The Applicant	What interaction between the Authorised Development and apparatus belonging to statutory undertakers would require the removal or repositioning of such apparatus? (Paragraph 9.32 of the Explanatory Memorandum [APP-020] refers.)	<p>In the event that the proposed cable route crosses an existing service/apparatus, subject to the detailed design, the apparatus of the statutory undertaker may need to be removed or repositioned.</p> <p>The interaction with regards to statutory undertakers repositioning or removal of apparatus will be outlined in the relevant Statements of Common Ground and/or all the information requested for the HDD regarding the locations is detailed in the HDD position statement note. Discussions are ongoing with statutory undertakers with regards to the agreement of protective provisions.</p>
CA1.3.99	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 11.2 of the Explanatory Memorandum [APP-020], why is Article 39 required in this particular dDCO [APP-019]?	Article 39 of the dDCO (APP-019) is required so as to ensure any leases entered into in connection with the construction, maintenance, operation or use of the Proposed Development are known to set out the relevant terms, and that such terms will be not affected by any enactment or rule of law which may prejudice them, thereby ensuring the Proposed Development can be constructed, operated and maintained as intended, and that in certain circumstances (such as where leases are agreed in relation to the retention of landscaping) the mitigation required in connection with the Proposed Development can be ensured to be provided for the duration of the life of the Proposed Development.
CA1.3.100	The Applicant	The s51 meeting note dated 9/8/19 (available on the Planning Inspectorate's National Infrastructure project web page at https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/south-east/aquind-interconnector/?ipcsection=advice&ipcadvic=329e4c36ae records that the Applicant's approach for highway subsoil interests (being not to negotiate the private acquisition for the rights or pay compensation because the owner has no use or enjoyment of it, its use is not prejudiced by the proposed development and the highway subsoil has no market value) has precedent in relation to High Speed Two. Provide details of this precedent and the relationship of the Applicant's approach with Government guidance on Compulsory Acquisition. This guidance includes Planning Act 2008, Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land, dated September 2013.	<p>Please refer to the Statement in relation to highway subsoil acquisition appended to this document (document reference 7.7.2).</p> <p>Where the Proposed Development is located in land which is known to be vested in the highway authority, the statutory framework provided by the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 is to be relied upon. The ExA will note that Article 11 and 12 of the dDCO (APP-019) are relevant in this regard.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>The response should also refer to any potential for provisions under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 to be used for works in the highway. (Point 2.10 in [RR-185] refers.)</p>	
<p>CA1.3.101</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Provide an explanation of how the application Book of Reference [APP-024] accords with the Government guidance, Planning Act 2008, Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land, dated September 2013, particularly Annex D paragraph 10.</p>	<p>The updated Book of Reference (APP-024 Rev002) now specifies which specific sub-class of rights and restrictions are being sought against each plot, listed within the 'Extent of acquisition or use column'. These sub-classes of rights listed under the 'Extent of acquisition or use column' should be cross-referred to Appendix A of the Statement of Reasons which sets out the sub-classes of rights and restrictions sought.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.1.1.6 of the Book of Reference has been updated to cross-refer to the relevant articles contained within the dDCO (APP-019) under Part 5. For example, paragraph 1.1.1.6 of the Book of Reference now states: "<i>land which may be required permanently under the compulsory acquisition powers, pursuant to Article 20 of the DCO.</i>" Article 20 of the dDCO relates to the compulsory acquisition of land and states as follows:</p> <p>"(1) The undertaker may –</p> <p>(a) acquire compulsorily so much of the Order land within the permanent limits and described in the book of reference as is required for the construction, operation or maintenance of the authorised development or to facilitate it, or as is incidental to it; and</p> <p>(b) use any land so acquired for the purposes authorised by this Order or for any other purposes in connection with or ancillary to the undertaking.</p> <p>(2) This article is subject to article 22 (Time limit for the exercise of the Order, article 23 (Compulsory acquisition of rights and the imposition of restrictive covenants), article 27 (Acquisition of subsoil and airspace only), article 29 (Rights under or over streets), article 30 (Temporary use of land for carrying out authorised development) and article 47 (Crown rights)."</p>
<p>CA1.3.102</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Has the use of a power under a separate article which would allow the Applicant to exclude a particular private right from the blanket extinguishment power included in Article 24 been considered (see paragraph 9.13 of the Explanatory Memorandum [APP-020])?</p> <p>If so, how has this been considered?</p> <p>If not, why not?</p> <p>The response should include reference to Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 15 Drafting Development Consent Orders dated July 2018, especially paragraph 23.4.</p>	<p>Paragraph 23.4 of PINS Advice note 15 states: "<i>Where an applicant is seeking powers in the DCO to acquire land compulsorily, the drafting of the Article containing the powers should make it clear whether or not the Applicant is also seeking a power to clear the title of the land of all private rights. The Applicant should consider whether the Article should be subject to a power under a separate Article which would allow the Applicant to exclude a particular private right from the blanket extinguishment power.</i>"</p> <p>The Applicant has not in fact included a blanket extinguishment provision in its DCO. Draft Article 24 of the dDCO (APP-019) relates only to private rights of way and will not apply in the event that the Applicant serves a notice or agrees otherwise with the landowner before entering etc the land.</p> <p>It is recognised that in recent DCOs, a number of applicants have sought and been granted a power to extinguish all 'private rights' from land with the Order</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>limits. An example would be Article 24 of the recently granted Manston Airport DCO.</p> <p>This sort of drafting appears to be an expansion by promoters of the traditional drafting found in a number of Acts and Orders which provides for the extinguishment or suspension of private rights of way upon the undertaker acquiring or using land within the Order limits for the relevant project. The drafting in the dDCO at Article 24, dealing only with rights of way, was also set out in the model provisions for DCOs (see model Article 22).</p> <p>In our view, the more traditional drafting, providing only for the extinguishment or suspension of private rights of way, is sufficient and far less draconian than the expanded drafting which has become popular with promoters more recently.</p> <p>In the event that other types of private rights (such as other easements or restrictive covenants) must be breached or interfered with by the undertaker in order to carry out the project, we will rely upon the position, long established by case law, that acts carried out by virtue of statutory authority will not be liable to be stopped through injunctive relief for nuisance.</p> <p>The Planning Act 2008 (s158) expressly confers statutory authority in respect of the carrying out of development authorised by a DCO for the purpose of providing a defence to civil nuisance, unless the DCO provides otherwise.</p> <p>Article 21 of the dDCO (APP-019) (Statutory authority to override easements and other rights) confirms that statutory authority is conferred by the Order.</p> <p>The Planning Act 2008 also provides for any persons whose rights are so interfered with by a promoter implementing a DCO in exercise of statutory powers to claim compensation, in lieu of the right they would otherwise have under the law to take an action for nuisance.</p> <p>For these reasons we consider that the approach taken by the Applicant is proportionate and less draconian with respect to the rights of landowners than that taken by many other promoters who have adopted the type of drafting adopted in the Manston Airport DCO among others. In our view it is excessive and unnecessary to provide for the extinguishment of all private rights in land, when very many of them will be entirely compatible with use of the land by the promoter for the project. For this reason we are content simply to provide for the extinguishment of private rights of way (subject to service of notice or agreement otherwise) as utilised in earlier DCOs such as The Hinkley Point C (Nuclear Generating Station) Order 2013 and in the model provisions.</p>
CA1.3.103	The Applicant	Provide a breakdown of the ' <i>Land acquisition costs</i> ' (refer to paragraph 5.4 of the Funding Statement [APP-023]). The response could include reference to land acquisition, land rights, disturbance compensation, injurious affection or professional fees.	Please refer to the table below which provides a breakdown of the estimated land acquisition costs in line with the categories suggested by the ExA.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response												
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Land Acquisition</td> <td>£1,277,000.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Land Rights</td> <td>£1,973,775.21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disturbance Compensation</td> <td>£664,980.33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Injurious Affection</td> <td>£645,000.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Professional Fees</td> <td>£410,000.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>£4,970,755.54</td> </tr> </table>	Land Acquisition	£1,277,000.00	Land Rights	£1,973,775.21	Disturbance Compensation	£664,980.33	Injurious Affection	£645,000.00	Professional Fees	£410,000.00	Total	£4,970,755.54
Land Acquisition	£1,277,000.00														
Land Rights	£1,973,775.21														
Disturbance Compensation	£664,980.33														
Injurious Affection	£645,000.00														
Professional Fees	£410,000.00														
Total	£4,970,755.54														
CA1.3.104	The Applicant	Provide details of the envisaged levels of interest, 'other debt servicing' and 'revenues generated' referred to in paragraph 5.5 of the Funding Statement [APP-023].	The details of the Project's revenue forecasts are confidential commercially sensitive information and their publication would materially prejudice the Applicant's commercial interests. The Applicant's financial modelling shows that the Project will generate sufficient operating profits to ensure that Debt Service Cover Ratio and Interest Cover Ratio are at an acceptable level. In addition, generally low interest rates have been a feature of the economic situation over the past decade, ¹⁵ which creates favourable conditions for securing infrastructure financing. Other debt servicing costs, in addition to interest, typically include a commitment fee of around 2% of the respective debt facility and a reserve fee between 0.5% and 1%.												
CA1.3.105	Winchester City Council	For the alternative cable routes shown in the application at Anmore Road (Paragraph 5.3.5 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-022]), which route would the Council prefer to see utilised, or have the least objection to, and why?													
CA1.3.106	Portsmouth City Council	For each of the alternative cable routes shown in the application at the locations listed below, which route would the Council prefer to see utilised, or have the least objection to, and why? i) Portsdown Hill Road (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.8); ii) Farlington Avenue (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.9); iii) Zetland Field (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.10); iv) the Baffins Milton Rovers FC pitch (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.1 - paragraph numbering out of sequence); v) Milton Common (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.4 - paragraph numbering out of sequence);													

¹⁵ The history of Bank of England official rates is available here <https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/boeapps/database/Bank-Rate.asp>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		vi) Moorings Way and Eastern Avenue (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.5 - paragraph numbering out of sequence); vii) the University of Portsmouth Langstone Campus (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.6 - paragraph numbering out of sequence); and viii) Bransbury Park (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.2 - paragraph numbering out of sequence).	
CA1.3.107	Winchester City Council	For the alternative cable routes shown in the application at Anmore Road (Paragraph 5.3.5 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-022]), what are the Council's views on whether the regulation provided by dDCO [APP-019] Requirement 6(2), together with the addition of an article similar to Article 19(5) and a requirement similar to Schedule 1 Part 3 Requirement 12 at Appendix D of the Examining Authority's Recommendation Report for the Thanet Extension Offshore Wind Farm Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010084/EN010084-003108-TEOW%20%E2%80%93%20Final%20Recommendation%20Report.pdf would provide sufficient clarity at an appropriate time in respect of the chosen cable route, notwithstanding any other concerns that the Council may have?	
CA1.3.108	Portsmouth City Council	For each of the alternative cable routes shown in the application at the locations listed below, what are the Council's views on whether the regulation provided by dDCO [APP-019] Requirement 6(2), together with the addition of an article similar to Article 19(5) and a requirement similar to Schedule 1 Part 3 Requirement 12 at Appendix D of the Examining Authority's Recommendation Report for the Thanet Extension Offshore Wind Farm Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project Examination document [REP8-013] https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010084/EN010084-003108-TEOW%20%E2%80%93%20Final%20Recommendation%20Report.pdf would provide sufficient clarity at an appropriate time in respect of the chosen cable route, notwithstanding any other concerns that the Council may have? i) Portsdown Hill Road (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.8); ii) Farlington Avenue (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.9); iii) Zetland Field (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.10);	

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>iv) the Baffins Milton Rovers FC pitch (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.1 – paragraph numbering out of sequence);</p> <p>v) Milton Common (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.4 - paragraph numbering out of sequence);</p> <p>vi) Moorings Way and Eastern Avenue (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.5 - paragraph numbering out of sequence);</p> <p>vii) the University of Portsmouth Langstone Campus (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.6 - paragraph numbering out of sequence); and</p> <p>viii) Bransbury Park (Statement of Reasons [APP-022] paragraph 5.3.2 - paragraph numbering out of sequence).</p> <p>¹ https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010084/EN010084-002100-D8_Appendix7_TEOW_DCO_Rev1.pdf</p>	

Table 1.4 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Cultural Heritage

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
CH1.4.1	The Applicant	Please detail which assets were surveyed using Google Streetview rather than a site visit by the expert. (ES 21.4.3.4 [APP-136] refers.)	<p>A site visit was carried out on the 14 May 2018 for the purposes of scoping designated heritage assets for an assessment of their settings. Google Earth mapping and Streetview was used as a supplementary tool in support of the site visit settings assessment for all assets within the Section 1 (Converter Station) setting study area, including those which were accessible from public right of ways.</p> <p>Three heritage assets were not directly accessed or surveyed from a close distance and were only surveyed using Google Streetview and Satellite imagery. This was due to the assets being on private land with no public access. Where such assets were not directly visible on streetview photography, satellite imagery was used to consider intervening vegetation and distance to the Proposed Development and supported by field survey observations from nearby public rights of way. The assets comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scotland (Cottage) (National Heritage Listing Entry 1095552), located 2km to the north on a private road, • Rockwood (NHLE 1350642) and Granary 5 Meters West of Rockwood (NHLE 1095565), located 1.8km to the west and set back within a wooded private estate. <p>Although these three assets were not directly accessed, the surveyors assessed nearby views of the Proposed Development from the closest publicly accessible areas. The assessment was supplemented using available existing</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>information listed above, applying professional judgement and in accordance with Historic England guidance on setting (see ES Chapter 21 (APP-136, paragraph 21.4.2.9) and is therefore considered robust. The conclusions of the ES Chapter 21 (APP-136) in respect of these three assets remain valid.</p>
<p>CH1.4.2</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>From ES section 21.6.2 [APP-136], the hierarchy of headings is confusing, and it is unclear what paragraphs 21.6.2.1 to 21.6.2.44 refer to. Please clarify.</p> <p>Please confirm if these paragraphs refer only to the soil strip stage across the proposals.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 21.6.2.1 to 21.6.2.44 of the ES Chapter 21 (APP-136) all fall under the heading 21.6.2: “Elements of the Proposed Development Relevant to the Assessment.”</p> <p>The paragraphs set out all elements of the Proposed Development which are relevant to the impact assessment. Paragraphs 21.6.2.1 and 21.6.2.2 provide introductory text and the underlined subheadings set out each element of the proposals which could lead to a heritage impact.</p> <p>These elements are not limited to the soil strip stage (covered in paragraphs 21.6.2.3 to 21.6.2.5) but include proposed earthworks, foundations, cable trenches etc.</p> <p>The subsequent section, 21.6.3: “Construction Stage Effects”, then reports the collective impact on known or possible archaeological remains of those elements of the Proposed Development specific to the construction stage (summarised by route Section and chronological period).</p>
<p>CH1.4.3</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>With reference to ES paragraph 21.6.2.42 [APP-136], what assumptions have been made when making this assessment in relation to the local and size of fencing, hoarding, site compounds and welfare facilities?</p> <p>How and where do the dDCO [APP-019] and ES ensure that these would be worst-case assessments?</p>	<p>As stated in ES Chapter 21 paragraph 21.6.2.42, there may be further localised impacts from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Heras type” fencing, 2 m high secured in place with plastic or concrete feet, with no penetration into the ground; • A 50 m x 50 m HDD construction compound. • Up to 4 site cabins (welfare, changing rooms, office and toilet). • Ecological mitigation works (i.e. existing Badger Sett Excavation). <p>The precise locations and extent of construction compounds and fencing/hoarding are not yet confirmed, but they will be within the Order limits and follow typical layouts for the HDD compounds, including fencing. Illustrative layouts are as shown on the Appendix 2 to the HDD Position Statement (document reference 7.7.3).</p> <p>Works involved with the construction of fencing, hoarding, site compounds and welfare facilities would be undertaken after the preliminary works/enabling works/topsoil strip which will expose any archaeological remains ahead of such works commencing (ES Chapter 21, Paragraphs 21.6.2.3 to 21.6.2.5). Therefore, the ES presents a worst-case scenario as the preliminary works/enabling works/topsoil strip activities are likely to have the greatest potential archaeological impact on any remains within proposed construction compounds, fencing and ecology mitigation areas.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>ES Chapter 21, paragraph 21.6.2.43 also states that the depth of construction activities relating to fencing, hoarding, site compounds and welfare facilities is assumed to be 0.5–1.0m below ground level, subsequent to the preliminary strip). This is considered a worse-case scenario as specified in paragraph 4.4.2.3 of Chapter 4 of the ES, Methodology (APP-119).</p> <p>Therefore, the assumptions set out in ES Chapter 21 (APP-136) paragraphs 21.6.2.42 to 21.6.2.44 present a worst-case scenario, and as such the conclusions of the assessment in relation to potential archaeological impact are considered valid and robust.</p>
<p>CH1.4.4</p>	<p>The Applicant Historic England Relevant local authorities</p>	<p>For Section 1 of the Proposed Development (from ES paragraph 21.6.4.5 [APP-136]), the assessment of effects on the settings of assets appears to focus exclusively on views, and relies, in some cases, on established or proposed planting to mitigate effects. Could the Applicant, Historic England and the relevant local authorities comment on the adequacy of this, or whether other factors that contribute to setting should have been considered.</p> <p>To what extent should the ExA and Secretary of State take established vegetation and proposed mitigation planting into account in the assessment of setting?</p>	<p>The assessment of the Proposed Development on the setting of designated heritage assets (from paragraph 21.6.4.5 of Chapter 21 of the ES (APP-136)) has considered elements beyond views, in line with Historic England’s GPA3 The Setting of Heritage Assets (HE 2017). It included historical and visual relationships to other heritage assets, to the surrounding landscape, established vegetation, and to existing noise levels. However, in respect of Section 1 of the Proposed Development, all of the heritage assets within the 2.0km study area scoped in for an assessment of setting effects are at a distance beyond 0.8km and no significant historical links between the land within Section 1 of the Proposed Development and the heritage assets scoped in for settings assessment was identified.</p> <p>As such, the potential setting impact is therefore restricted to visual impacts and views to and from the asset (as set out in Step 2 of Historic England guidance on setting, see ES Chapter 21 (APP-136, paragraph 21.4.2.8))The impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of assets has taken into account ‘embedded landscape mitigation’ since this forms part of the Proposed Development. This includes proposed mitigation design comprising native woodland (up to 25 m high) along the northern edge of Order Limits along with a line of native hedgerow approximately 80m north of the proposed Converter Station (see 1.6.2.5 to 1.6.2.9 of the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (APP-506). As this embedded landscape mitigation forms part of the Proposed Development it should not be disregarded by the ExA and the Secretary of State.</p>
<p>CH1.4.5</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>In relation to paragraphs 21.6.4.30 to 21.6.4.31 of the ES [APP-136], could the Applicant please clarify the locations and geographical interrelationship between Fort Cumberland and the historic ravelin, and the associated ‘fields of fire’.</p> <p>How do the proposed Optical Regeneration Station buildings relate to this?</p>	<p>As discussed in paragraph 21.5.11.8 of the ES (APP-136), the position of the fort is crucial to understanding how it would have defended Langstone Harbour. The fort structure has direct lines out to sea but is also protected by a ‘ravelin’ on its western side (triangular structure inside the main ditch of the fort), which would have defended landward approaches. The open land to the west of the fort lies within the historic ‘fields of fire’ from the ravelin to Fort Cumberland Road.</p> <p>The key view of concern is the historic sightline along Fort Cumberland road (which extends north-west of the carpark), as specified by Historic England</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>during consultation following their written representation [RR-199]. The proposed Optical Regeneration Station (ORS) structures would lie within the existing car-park. The surrounding urban fabric, which comprises a housing estate (15m to the north of the ORS) and a holiday park bounded by tall trees to the south-west is considered to have eroded the fields of fire to some extent and detract from the asset's setting. It is also likely that views of the ORS buildings from the Western Ravelin itself will be obscured by the presence of an existing late 20th-century motor shed within the boundary of the monument, as indicated by Historic England. This will be confirmed if the Applicant can access Fort Cumberland, which is currently prevented by Covid-19 restrictions.,</p> <p>Further visualisation work has been carried out at the request of Historic England (Heritage Visualisation Note) and is contained within the ES Addendum, to provide further support of the assessment in relation to Fort Cumberland (document reference 7.8.1). It is concluded that the environmental effect would remain negligible, for both siting options (not significant), based on the negligible magnitude of change (see Table 21.5 of Chapter 21 (Heritage and Archaeology) of the ES (APP-136)).As such, the additional visualisation work has not altered the conclusions of the ES (APP-136) and that assessment remains valid.</p>
CH1.4.6	The Applicant	Given the constraints on the final finished floor level in the design principles and parameter plans and tables, how would the potential mitigation described in paragraph 21.8.1.6 of the ES [APP-136] in relation to the location and formation levels for the Converter Station be achievable?	The geophysical survey carried out for the ES (APP-136) showed limited potential for extensive archaeological remains within the area of the Converter Station which would warrant preservation <i>in situ</i> . As such it is considered highly unlikely that such remains are present. The Archaeological Advisor for Winchester City Council has indicated that a programme of archaeological strip, map and sample would be suitable; suggesting such remains are not anticipated. As stated in the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) paragraph 5.8.1.8, in the highly unlikely event that remains are uncovered which require preservation <i>in situ</i> preservation – the assumption is that design changes would need to accommodate (i.e. through adjustment of formation levels in the final design), but only where this is feasible and warranted. This is secured as part of Requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019).
CH1.4.7	The Applicant	Please could the Applicant clarify the assessment of effects on Scotland (Cottage). The preliminary assessment at ES paragraph 21.6.4.21 [APP-136] would seem to take into account 'embedded' mitigation planting (see paragraphs 21.6.4.4 and 21.6.4.20). The finding is of an ' <i>effect on the significance of Scotland (Cottage) of minor adverse significance prior to the implementation of additional mitigation measures</i> ' (ES paragraph 21.6.4.33) [APP-136]. At paragraph 21.8.2.2, the same mitigation is used again, and is said to offset the minor effect. Does 'offset' actually mean reduce, but the effect remains significant?	The reported effect taking into account embedded mitigation planting at ES paragraph 21.6.4.21 is not significant in EIA terms. There will be 'harm' but this is considered a minor adverse effect (not significant). The term 'Offset' is a typographical error at paragraph 21.8.2.2. This should read 'reduced'. These corrections are included in the Errata Sheet (document reference 7.8.1.1) submitted as part of the ES Addendum alongside these responses.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		How should this be interpreted by the Examining Authority and the Secretary of State in terms of NPS 'harm'?	
CH1.4.8	The Applicant	Is the '<' symbol in ES paragraph 21.4.1.4 [APP-136] a typo?	This is a typographical error and is addressed in the Errata Sheet (document reference 7.8.1.1) submitted as part of the ES Addendum alongside these responses.

Table 1.5 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Draft Development Consent Order

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
DCO1.5.1	The Applicant	<p>Explain in greater detail the technical and environmental reasons why Hayling Island was discounted as an alternative landfall and cable route option for the Proposed Development when it appears to share largely similar natural constraints with the selected route to Eastney (paragraph 2.4.11.14 of ES Chapter 2, Consideration of Alternatives [APP-117]).</p> <p>With reference to paragraph 2.4.3.8 and Table 2.3 of ES Chapter 2 [APP-117], please explain in more detail how the decision to choose Eastney as the landfall was reached on the basis of a site visit. What factors made Eastney a more viable option than the other beaches studied?</p> <p>Were impacts on the human population and traffic flows part of the optioneering process, including the discounting of Hayling Island during the assessment of alternatives?</p> <p>If so, please provide evidence.</p> <p>In paragraph 2.4.11.14 of the ES [APP-117], a number of reasons for excluding the cable route option through Hayling Island are listed. Expand on each of these reasons giving comparative explanation as to why such factors were or were not considered prohibitive.</p> <p>Was a comparison made between the ability to HDD between the two islands (Portsea and Hayling) and the mainland?</p> <p>If so, what was the comparative outcome.</p> <p>If not, why not?</p>	<p>The Applicant has produced a Supplementary Alternatives Chapter (document reference 7.8.1.3) which forms part of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>Further information on the reasons for discounting Hayling Island, including the ability to HDD between the two islands is included within Section 6 of the Supplementary Alternatives Chapter.</p> <p>Section 7 of the Supplementary Chapter provides additional detail on the selection of the Onshore Cable Corridor, which is relevant to the decision of whether to pursue a Landfall at Eastney or East Wittering.</p> <p>Those options associated with Hayling Island were not feasible from an engineering perspective. They were also considered likely to result in adverse impacts to the surrounding sensitive and heavily designated environment and subsequently discounted.</p>
DCO1.5.2	The Applicant	<p>The application Planning Statement [APP-108 para 1.3.6.2] suggests that the fibre optic cable and associated infrastructure constitutes Associated Development, including the spare capacity that would be used for commercial telecommunications purposes. Please provide a more detailed explanation as to why the Applicant thinks that this would be the case.</p>	<p>The Applicant has produced a Position Statement in relation to Associated Development (document reference 7.7.1) in relation to the proposed commercial use of the spare capacity in the fibre optic infrastructure required to be provided as part of the Proposed Development and why this constitutes associated development in accordance with the relevant law and guidance in response to this ExA written question.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>Please detail the envisaged degree of spare capacity in the cables and the corresponding proportion of associated buildings, cubicles and other infrastructure related to the surplus that would be used for commercial telecommunications purposes.</p> <p>Would the separate Telecommunications Building at the Converter Station site be necessary if there were no commercial usage of the surplus fibre optic cable capacity, and thus no requirement for access by third parties? (i.e. could the interconnector monitoring functions be accommodated within the main Converter Station buildings?)</p> <p>Is the ORS at the landfall needed if the fibre optic cable is required only for interconnector monitoring and not commercial data usage?</p> <p>If the Optical Regeneration Station is required nevertheless, what difference to building dimensions would the removal of commercial surplus capacity make?</p> <p>The more detailed explanation must include reference to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the guidance that Associated Development should be subordinate to the NSIP, but necessary for the Proposed Development to operate effectively to its design capacity, in paragraph 2.9 of The Planning Inspectorate’s Advice Note 13: Preparation of a draft order granting development consent and explanatory memorandum, February 2019, Version 3; • s115 of the Planning Act 2008 together with paragraph 199 of the Explanatory Notes; • the Department for Communities and Local Government Guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects April 2013, particularly paragraph 5; <p>any case law that the Applicant wishes to reply upon in support of its position.</p>	<p>The statement (“Statement in relation to development associated with AQUIND Interconnector”) is provided at document reference 7.7.1</p>
<p>DCO1.5.3</p>	<p>The Applicant MMO (HSF)</p>	<p>Given that there is some uncertainty about whether the surplus capacity in the proposed fibre-optic cable that would be used for commercial telecommunications purposes can constitute Associated Development, would the Secretary of State be able lawfully to include the fibre-optic cable or this surplus capacity in a Deemed Marine Licence in this DCO?</p>	<p>Section 115 (1) of Planning Act 2008 provides that development consent may be granted for development for which development consent is required and associated development. Section 115 (2) of Planning Act 2008 details what is associated development, which confirms associated development must be within subsection 3. Subsection 3 to Section 115 of Planning Act 2008 confirms the development is within subsection 3 if it is to be carried out wholly in one of more of the following areas, being England and waters adjacent to England up to the seaward limits of the territorial sea. Subsection 120(3) of Planning Act 2008 provides that an order granting development consent may make provision relating to, or to matters ancillary to, the development for which consent is granted. In accordance with subsection 120(4), which refers to the matters listed in Part 1 of Schedule 5 to the Planning Act 2008, an Order may ‘deem’ consent for a Marine Licence under Part 4 of the Marine and</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>Coastal Access Act 2009 (MCAA2009), subject to specified conditions, which will relate to the development for which development consent may be granted, which as has already been confirmed may be development for which development consent is required and associated development. Accordingly, where the use of the fibre-optic cable for commercial telecommunications purposes is development for which development consent is required or associated development, there is no legal impediment to this being included within the Deemed Marine Licence included within the Order.</p>
<p>DCO1.5.4</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Paragraphs 3.6.3.21 of the ES [APP-118] and 3.4.1.20 of the HRA report [APP-491] report that fibre-optic cables are needed between the two converter stations. Paragraph 3.6.2.8 of the ES [APP-118] states that fibre-optic cables are included in the HVAC section beyond the converter station (i.e. between the converter station and the existing substation). Which is correct, and if they are included with both the HVDC and HVAC cables, is there a difference in design, function and use?</p>	<p>The statements in Paragraphs 3.6.3.21 of the ES (APP-118) and 3.4.1.20 of the HRA report (APP-491) are correct and state that fibre optic cables are needed for HVAC and HVDC cables for communications between the French and UK Converter Stations in connection with the control and protection systems. Paragraph 3.6.2.8 of the ES (APP-118) is also correct but only mentions HVAC cables.</p> <p>Both of the statements are correct as HVAC cables between the existing substation and the Converter Station and HVDC cables between the two Converter Stations both require fibre-optic cables to enable the communication for control and information exchange purposes between AQUIND Interconnector and the national transmission system.</p>
<p>DCO1.5.5</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Please provide the following information with reference to the ('up to 6') locations where ducts would be installed by horizontal directional drilling (HDD) or a similar trenchless technique, and the definition of HDD given on page 6 of the dDCO [APP-019]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Explain the maximum possible technical length that a trenchless section or crossing can be. ii) Explain the circumstances that would prevent or restrict the use of trenchless sections or crossings. iii) Explain the longest length of trenchless section or crossing currently proposed and where it is, and also provide the length of the crossing proposed at Farlington Marshes. iv) How large do the HDD compounds need to be for successful operation? v) To enable 24-hour operation, what lighting is needed at the HDD compounds and how would such lighting be perceived by human and ecological receptors? vi) In Schedule 1, Works No. 4, 5 and 6 all include the term 'up to 4' HDD pits (total of 12 across all three works). However, the ES discusses the possibility of up to six HDD areas. Why and what flexibility is sought in respect of 'HDD usage'? Can the ExA be reassured that the locations the technique is proposed and assessed for would indeed be carried through 	<p>The Applicant has produced a HDD Position Statement (document reference 7.7.3). This Statement provides clarification on each of the questions and the proposed HDD/trenchless crossing location and operation.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>into the construction? Is this secured through the dDCO [APP-019]? If so, where and how? If not, why not?</p> <p>vii) Identify on a plan the 'adjacent land within the Order Limits' which is 'proposed to be used to facilitate the HDD' or trenchless construction works (paragraph 2.8.3.2 of ES Appendix 22.2 [APP-450] refers). The response must include a diagrammatic representation of the envisaged construction-related use of this land that has led to the identification of the scope of the land sought within the Order limits together with images of the envisaged type of construction plant to be used at these locations.</p> <p>viii) Indicate on a plan the envisaged points at which the proposed stretches and crossings of HDD or trenchless technique would start and end. (Paragraph 2.8.3.1 of ES Appendix 22.2 [APP-450] refers.)</p> <p>ix) Noting that the use of HDD or trenchless techniques in particular locations is critical to mitigation relied on in the EIA and HRA, are the specific locations and approach secured through the dDCO [APP-019]? If so, where? If not, why not?</p>	
DCO1.5.6	The Applicant	<p>Table WN2 of the dDCO [APP-019] (parameters) sets a maximum length of 3.4m for the security perimeter fence – should this be maximum height?</p> <p>Where are the dDCO parameters for the security perimeter fence at the Optical Regeneration Station (Table WN6 of the dDCO [APP-019])?</p> <p>Where in the dDCO [APP-019] are controls over temporary and permanent fencing around other buildings, compounds and other above-ground structures?</p>	<p>Yes, 3.4m should be the maximum height (not length) of the security perimeter fence and this has been corrected in the dDCO (APP-019), as updated and submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>Parameters for the security perimeter fence for the telecommunications building have been included in the updated dDCO submitted at Deadline 1. The height of this fence is 2.45m as outlined in APP-015.</p> <p>The parameters for the security perimeter fence for the ORS have also been included in the updated dDCO submitted at Deadline 1. The height of this fence is 2.45m as outlined in APP-017.</p> <p>No other permanent fencing is proposed.</p> <p>Requirement 11 at Schedule 2 to the dDCO (APP-019) provides requirements in relation to fencing to be provided in connection with the construction of the Proposed Development. No additional controls in relation to permanent fencing are considered by the Applicant to be required.</p>
DCO1.5.7	The Applicant	<p>In the dDCO [APP-019], no parameters are provided for buildings or structures at the converter station site other than the converter halls and lighting columns. Why?</p> <p>What are the implications for visual prominence and massing of structures?</p>	<p>Parameters for the control building and spares building have been included in the updated dDCO submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>Parameters were already provided for the telecommunications building and lightning masts in addition to those structures mentioned in the question. All other structures are equipment, and it is not considered necessary for parameters to be provided given the size is driven by the standard industry requirements and that overarching height parameters apply by virtue of the parameter plan zone within which they are located. Further information regarding the anticipated size of the equipment to be located at the converter</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>station is provided within the updates made to the Design and Access Statement, submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>The max parameters are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Control Building: 26m by 50m, by 15m high Spares Building: 27m by 25m, by 15m high <p>Noting that parameters have been provided for all buildings and that overarching height parameters apply to all equipment by virtue of the parameter plan zone within which they are located and that in any event the components are driven by standard industry requirements, there are not considered to be any implications for visual prominence and the massing of structures. The assessment of visual impact carried out has fully considered the likely significant effects in that regard.</p> <p>The LVIA has assessed all buildings and equipment taking into account the relevant parameters.</p>
DCO1.5.8	The Applicant	<p>The dDCO [APP-019] aims to disapply the Hedgerows Regulations 1997 and protected hedges, trees and other trees that are of sufficient quality for protection are affected by the Proposed Development. Please could the Applicant update the application documentation as necessary to ensure that the dDCO [APP-019] and Explanatory Memorandum [APP-020] fully comply with the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 15, section 22 (<i>'hedgerows and trees'</i>), including the full and detailed identification of the specific trees and hedgerows.</p> <p>Please properly quantify the numbers and extent to which hedgerows and trees are affected and advise whether the assessment needs to be updated.</p>	<p>A review of trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders within the Order limits has been undertaken to identify those which may be affected and confirmation of those which are not. This review has extended to any trees within designated conservation areas and a suitable plan and schedule of trees provided. Appended to this WQ are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated Tree Constraints Plans (document reference 7.4.1.10); and Updated Tree Survey Schedule which now also identifies the individual trees, areas of groups woodland and hedges that have been discounted from our impact as a result of updated Order Limits (document reference 7.4.1.10).
DCO1.5.9	The Applicant Local planning authorities	<p>In Article 42 of the dDCO [APP-019], is the precision around TPOs sufficient? (TPO plans [APP-018] and Schedule 11 refer.)</p> <p>The Applicant seeks powers over any tree in the Order limits rather than providing a schedule (as per model provisions and as is usual in other recently made DCOs). Schedule 11 of the dDCO [APP-019] (TPO trees) only lists <i>'potential removal'</i> and <i>'indicative works to be carried out'</i>. How can this be specific enough to understand the impact of the Proposed Development on trees?</p> <p>If this remains unchanged, should the ExA in weighing the benefits and disbenefits of the Proposed Development therefore assume the loss all of the trees within the Order limits during construction and throughout the lifetime of the Proposed Development, given that 42(2)(b) of the dDCO [APP-018] removes any duty to replace lost trees?</p>	<p>See response to DCO1.5.8 and Appendices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated Tree Constraints Plans (document reference 7.4.1.10); and Updated Tree Survey Schedule (document reference 7.4.1.10). <p>This exercise has further refined the trees identified at risk and those to be retained.</p>
DCO1.5.10	The Applicant	Paragraph 3.6.4.57 of the ES [APP-118] suggests that the two cable circuits may be laid at different times by different contractors. How can the	The predicted impacts presented in Section 24.6 of ES Chapter 24 (Noise and Vibration) (APP-139) for the trenching, cable duct installation and joint bay

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		programme and therefore the period of disruption and noise be controlled? How was this variability assessed in the EIA?	works are for each individual cable circuit, to account for the assumption that each cable circuit could be laid at different times by different contractors. The temporal gap between the works for each circuit at any given location could be of sufficient duration (several months) such that the two sets of works are separate. However, it is also the case that both circuits could be installed successively, therefore, only requiring one period of works in each area but of longer duration than assumed in the ES. Section 17 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) presents updated predicted impacts for noise and vibration during the trenching and cable duct installation and joint bay works. This includes the potential for successive installation of both circuits in each area, if required. In terms of control, requirement 18 of the draft DCO (APP-019) restricts the construction hours of the proposed development, with further mitigation measures for when works are undertaken when sensitive receptors are highly sensitive to noise contained in section 5.11 of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) and secured under requirement 15.
DCO1.5.11	The Applicant	In relation to paragraphs 7.20, 7.37 and 8.20-8.24 of the MMO Relevant Representation [RR-179] and the description of authorised development at Schedule 1, paragraph 2 of the dDCO [APP-019] (further Associated Development for marine works (Works 6&7)), when will the dredged sediment disposal site be defined and submitted into the Examination?	Further engagement with the MMO has clarified that the information provided within the ES is sufficient for the purposes of designating a disposal site (email received 05 June 2020). The site/s are defined within the Disposal Site Characterisation Report presented in the ES (APP-371) and both sites have been registered by the MMO with reference codes WI048 and WI049. The dDCO (APP-019 Rev 002) has been updated to reflect the designation of the disposal sites including these reference codes.
DCO1.5.12	The Applicant	In relation to the authorised development in Schedule 1 of the dDCO [APP-019], future references to the lists set out in paragraph 2 will be confusing as there are duplicates of (a) to (e). Does the Applicant think that the paragraph needs to be split into two, or alternatively should the list continue sequentially from Works 1-5 to Works 6-7 (i.e. the second set of (a) to (e) should be changed to (l) to (p))?	Noted and updated so that the second set is identified as (l) to (p) within the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.13	The Applicant	In draft requirement 7 of the dDCO [APP-019], why is the requirement for landscape scheme approval restricted to Works 2 and part of Works 5? Why are works 1, 3, 4 and the rest of 5 not included?	For the Onshore Cable Corridor, the flexibility required for design and construction meant that it was more appropriate to develop any necessary mitigation in detail once the final alignment and construction areas have been decided and actual impacts can be understood. Assumptions and mitigation measures informing the detailed design are covered in Section 1.4 of the updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (APP-506 Rev002).
DCO1.5.14	The Applicant	In relation to dDCO [APP-019] draft Requirement 7: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2a - what is the relevance of the Hedgerow Regulations here? • Delete 'and' in line (a); Should finished ground levels for the landscape areas be specified?	The “and” has been deleted in the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1. The OLBS outlines the requirements regarding landscaping and in turn provides the controls in relation to it. It is not therefore considered appropriate

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			to state specific details in this Requirement also, for instance in relation to finished ground levels. Reference to the Hedgerow Regulations has been deleted.
DCO1.5.15	The Applicant	In dDCO [APP-019] draft Requirement 9: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why is Works 3 excluded? Should 'biodiversity management strategy' (lines 1-2) be 'biodiversity management plan'? 	Requirement 9 has been amended to state ' <i>biodiversity management plan</i> ' in the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002), submitted at Deadline 1. Works 3 is excluded because it includes temporary construction works only.
DCO1.5.16	The Applicant Environment Agency MMO	With reference to draft Requirement 13 in the dDCO [APP-019], should works halt in the circumstances where contamination is discovered pending the approval and implementation of the remediation scheme? Should this be written into the Requirement?	Requirement 13 has been updated in the latest dDCO (APP-019 Rev002), submitted at Deadline 1. Requirement 13 has been updated to require such part of the authorised development as is to be carried out in the area where the contamination has been identified to halt whilst the remediation scheme is submitted and approved. Requirement 13 (4) then requires the remediation to be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.
DCO1.5.17	The Applicant Local planning authorities	In dDCO [APP-019] draft Requirement 14, a Written Scheme of Investigation is needed for activities prior to commencement of works including onshore site preparation works, but the definition of 'commence' in Article 2 does not identify this exclusion. Is this satisfactory or is an amendment required?	The drafting of Requirement 14 is clear, and no amendments are considered to be required. This Requirement confirms the position in relation to it, with Article 2 providing the general definitions which apply. Any amendment to Article 2 in this regard is unnecessary and in itself would create confusing drafting.
DCO1.5.18	The Applicant MMO Natural England	In dDCO [APP-019] Schedule 15, the Deemed Marine Licence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the definition of cable protection acceptable, especially the reference to 'unlikely'? 4(a) should be MMO Head Office not 'Local Office'? 4(f) is the contact address for Natural England in Exeter correct? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of the wording 'unlikely' is used as it reflects the wording used in the statutory scheme for assessment provided by the EIA (IP) Regs, which require the identification of 'likely' significant environmental effects. Accordingly, the same test applies, i.e. whether any effects would likely, or rather in the negative unlikely. Where any effects could be seen to be 'likely' such physical measures will not be permissible pursuant to the DML. This could state not likely, but the position would remain the same irrespective of such a change. Given the identification of 'likely' significant environmental effects is sufficient for the purpose of assessing projects, the use of wording aligning with that statutory scheme within the Order in this manner is considered to be entirely appropriate. 4(a) Correct. This will be changed to (head office) in the updated dDCO (APP-019, Rev 002). 4(f) This address was previously provided by Natural England, but a new case officer has been assigned by Natural England since, therefore, the Applicant will seek confirmation from Natural England on this and the address will be updated as required.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
DCO1.5.19	The Applicant MMO	<p>In the Deemed Marine Licence in the dDCO [APP-019], at Part 1, 10 'Details of Licensed Marine Activities', does the inclusion of the modifier 'likely' add a subjective test and room for argument? Should it be deleted, or the wording changed to make it more precise?</p> <p>The corresponding paragraphs for the authorised development section of the dDCO [APP-019] at Schedule 1 (2) (e) says 'such other works as may be necessary or expedient for the purpose of or in connection with the construction or use of the authorised development and which do not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects from those assessed as set out in the environmental statement.' Would this wording be preferable in the Deemed Marine Licence?</p>	<p>The ExA will be aware that the EIA (IP) Regs require the reporting of 'likely' significant effects on the environment. The wording used reflects the statutory scheme to identify effects, and is drafted as it is on that basis, providing the same level of certainty as the regulations which govern assessment.</p> <p>Part 1 10 of the DML and Schedule 1 (2) (e) (now (p)) are not corresponding paragraphs. One relates to works, whereas the other relates to amendments and variations of details to be submitted for approval.</p> <p>The ExA will note the corresponding wording is that which is provided at Part 1, paragraph 4 (5) to the DML, with both sets of wording being identical.</p> <p>The ExA will also note the wording in Requirement 25 (2) uses the same wording as is used in Part 1 10 of the DML (and corresponds to it).</p>
DCO1.5.20	The Applicant MMO	<p>With reference to the Deemed Marine Licence Part 2 conditions in the dDCO [APP-019]:</p> <p>2(b) this is usually 28 days rather than the 20 days included here – what is the justification and is MMO content?</p> <p>5(2) Is this wording acceptable to the MMO? Could it permit damaging works not in accordance with the EIA?</p> <p>8. Is the MMO happy with the extent of Construction Monitoring proposals and the ability to secure them?</p>	<p>With regard to 2(1)(b), the Applicant highlights that 20 <u>working days</u> is 28 days (or more where there are public holidays within the period).</p> <p>The draft DML has been discussed with the MMO at length and no amendment has been requested to condition 5(2).</p> <p>Condition 8 relates to chemicals, drilling and debris. Nonetheless, the requirements for construction monitoring have been discussed with the MMO, along with all other aspects of the DML, and are understood to be acceptable.</p>
DCO1.5.21	The Applicant MMO	<p>The location of the HDD exit (marine) (Work 7b) is shown as parameter box on Figure 3.3 of the ES [APP-148], and some aspects of the EIA and HRA were carried out on this basis, including those in respect of the interest features of the Solent Maritime SAC (for example, on Table 7.1, HRA Report [APP-491]). Where and how are this location and these parameters secured?</p> <p>Does the MMO believe that the reference in dDCO [APP-019] draft condition 4(1)(a) is sufficient to ensure that the detailed design falls within the assessed scheme?</p> <p>The Deemed Marine Licence at paragraph 6 suggests that the extent of Works 6 and 7 are shown on the Land Plans [APP-008]. This does not appear to be the case, so could the Applicant clarify this reference.</p>	<p>The HDD (marine) with up to 4 entry/exit pits is secured in relation to Works Plans as stated at Schedule 1, Paragraph 1, Work. No. 7 (b) and Schedule 15, Part 1, Paragraph 3 (b).</p> <p>The location of the HDD entry/exit pits is required to be confirmed in accordance with Schedule 15, Part 2, condition 4(1)(a)(ii), which is to accord with the Outline marine construction environmental management plan which includes information regarding the location of the HDD entry/exit pit within Table 1.</p> <p>The extent of Works 6 and 7 are shown on the Works Plans. The draft Order has been updated to reflect this.</p> <p>The HDD Work Area is also shown within Appendix 2 of the HDD Position Statement (document reference 7.7.3).</p>
DCO1.5.22	The Applicant	<p>Could the Applicant please correct the inconsistency at various points in the dDCO [APP-019] between 'Order Limits' and 'Order limits', noting that the convention is the more recently made DCOs such as the Cleve Hill Solar Park Order 2020 is 'Order limits'.</p>	<p>This has been corrected, with all times the term is used now stating 'Order limits' within the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
DCO1.5.23	The Applicant	Could the Applicant rectify the typographical error in the dDCO [APP-019] definition of MHWS. (...springs "or...")	This has been corrected in the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.24	The Applicant	The Office of the Parliamentary Counsel Drafting Guidance document advises against the use of 'shall' in statutory drafting (see paragraph 1.2.9). The draft Order [APP-019] uses 'shall' in numerous locations. Could these occurrences be reworded as per the guidance?	Noted and the dDCO (APP-019 Rev 002) has been amended to remove the word 'shall' throughout.
DCO1.5.25	The Applicant	In dDCO [APP-019] Article 16(4)(a), is the reference to Schedule 12 correct? Please clarify.	Reference to Schedule 12 has been removed in the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.26	The Applicant	In dDCO [APP-019] Schedule 1, 3, please rectify the typographical error by deletion of the second 'is'.	This has been corrected in the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.27	The Applicant	In dDCO [APP-019] Schedule 2: 1(1), please rearrange the entries into alphabetical order.	This has been corrected in the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.28	The Applicant	dDCO [APP-019] Requirement 1(2)(6)(b) states that, for the purposes of Requirement 5, the height of the Converter Station (and other buildings) is to be measured as the vertical dimension from existing ground level to the top of the highest part of the structure. Could the Applicant advise if this is accurate?	This has been corrected to remove reference to 'existing' in the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.29	The Applicant	Please check dDCO [APP-019] Requirement 20 and advise if words are missing.	Requirement 20 has been updated in the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.30	The Applicant	In the Explanatory Memorandum [APP-020] 11.4, should 'article 41' be 'article 42' in the last line?	Yes. This has been amended in the updated Explanatory Memorandum (APP-020 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.31	The Applicant	Paragraph 2.3.15 of the Planning Inspectorate's scoping opinion [APP-366] raises concerns about the parameters of the development being 'wide-ranging' and encourages every attempt to narrow the options. However, significant parameters and routing options are present in the application. Why are there still broad parameters, numerous options and outstanding uncertainties at this Examination stage?	<p>The Applicant has sought to design the Proposed Development to provide solutions that are innovative, efficient and mitigate disruption as far as is practicable, whilst limiting the extent of the Order limits. Further detail on the optionality and the reasons these have (or were retained) is provided in the response to CA1.3.20.</p> <p>The Applicant has further refined the options proposed where possible as a result of further evidence and discussions held with interested parties post the submission of the Application. This clarification is also included in the Applicant's response to CA1.3.20.</p>
DCO1.5.32	The Applicant	The Land Plans [APP-008] and the Works Plans [APP-009] provided with the application are quite broad in terms of scale and the composition of the Order limits. Taking account of above-ground and known underground	Given the information obtained during the feasibility process (ground investigations, service data) the Applicant has prepared a representative route

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		constraints, can the Applicant provide a set of detailed plans that covers the entire onshore cable route, to show an actual corridor for the cable (as opposed to whole fields and highways) and to narrow down the extent of the Order sought. The construction limits to either side of the cable should also be shown, as on the example cross sections, such as those on Plate 4 of ES Appendix 22.2 [APP-450].	(cable alignment and suitable joint bay locations) for each HVDC circuit, which has been used for the environmental, noise and traffic assessments. However, the responsibility for defining the route, having performed additional surveys and an assessment against their own capabilities and practices, will lay with the appointed contractor, and thus the full width of the highway boundary and where applicable, other land, has been retained to ensure the most appropriate cable route can be accommodated within the Order limits.
DCO1.5.33	The Applicant	Article 2(3) of the dDCO [APP-019] relates to distances and dimensions but does not explicitly reference deviation limits in a horizontal or vertical plane for the laying of the cable. Please explain whether the dDCO [APP-019] includes limits of deviation in either the vertical or horizontal plane (dDCO [APP-019] Article 6(5))? If so, where? If not, why not? If the cable burial depth is not set in the parameters, what was the worst case assessed for the purposes of the EIA in relation to timescales, noise, waste, disruption, and so on?	Appendix 3.5 Additional Supporting Information for Onshore Works (APP-359) in Table 1 – Onshore Component Parameters provides the assumption that the Maximum Onshore Cable burial depth to be 3000 mm, though typically excavations are expected to be between 1250 mm and 1500 mm. This parameter was used throughout the Environmental Statement to ensure a robust assessment of the likely environmental effects. As the depth of the trenches will vary to respond to specific constraints encountered along the Onshore Cable Route, to ensure adequate flexibility and no impediment to delivery for in any unexpected and rare circumstances where it could be the case that excavations are needed to be slightly deeper than 3000mm so as to respond to existing constraints posed by existing utility services, the maximum excavation depth is not confirmed in the dDCO.
DCO1.5.34	The Applicant	In Articles 10 and 11 of the dDCO [APP-019], please explain what is meant by ‘ <i>whether or not within the Order Limits</i> ’? Does this imply powers to the applicant extending beyond the extent of the Order limits?	Article 10 of the dDCO expressly states that the power applies outside of the Order limits. This is not a novel approach, with many made DCOs containing this wording, with it being necessary to ensure certainty of delivery and subject to appropriate controls.
DCO1.5.35	Portsmouth City Council Hampshire County Council	Across Articles 10, 11 and 13 (in particular) of the dDCO [APP-019], numerous provisions are made in respect of highway works. Are the Highway Authorities content with the scope and level of rights empowered to the applicant by the dDCO [APP-019]? Are these Articles (and the full scope of powers sought within them) necessary for the type of development proposed?	
DCO1.5.36	The Applicant	Schedule 2 Article 4 of the dDCO [APP-019] raises the prospect of further rooftop equipment and paraphernalia, which would potentially raise the development higher than its maximum parameter (height) and could give rise to different visual effects. Has the worst-case scenario (i.e. the converter station plus rooftop apparatus) been considered in the assessment and if not, why not?	It is the view of the Applicant that likely significant visual impacts have been adequately assessed, including where any minor rooftop equipment and paraphernalia is provided (as such equipment and paraphernalia would not alter the likely significant effects). Schedule 2, paragraph 1(4) has been amended to remove reference to solar panels.
DCO1.5.37	The Applicant National Grid	Schedule 2 of the dDCO [APP-019] provides two options for the siting of the Converter Station, dependent upon negotiations with National Grid around the Lovedean substation. Can the ExA be updated as to the current position	Heads of terms were first sent to the landowner on 13 December 2018.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		of the negotiations and if such discussions could be concluded during the Examination period, thus confirming an actual location for the Proposed Development.	<p>Revised heads of terms were sent to the landowner on 21 November 2019 and 17 July 2020 and a number of meetings have taken place between the Applicant and the landowner to progress matters.</p> <p>The Applicant is confident that the necessary land and rights can be acquired by voluntary agreement and anticipates this can be concluded in the near future.</p>
DCO1.5.38	The Applicant	<p>In some of the draft Requirements in the dDCO, in respect of several assessments cited within the dDCO [APP-019] (flood risk etc), the Proposed Development must be '<i>substantially in accordance with...</i>' What is meant by this and why should the development not be carried out '<i>wholly</i>' in accordance with?</p> <p>Should the word '<i>substantially</i>' be removed in each case?</p> <p>If not, why not?</p> <p>Some clauses in the dDCO [APP-019] have a '<i>reasonable satisfaction of</i>' tailpiece written into them. Please could these be removed, and more appropriate wording used?</p>	<p>The word '<i>substantially</i>' has been removed from the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>Reasonable satisfaction wording is considered to be appropriate where used, as the party to be satisfied will need to act reasonably when confirming whether they are so satisfied.</p>
DCO1.5.39	The Applicant	How would the dDCO [APP-019] secure appropriate noise control, management and mitigation across the Proposed Development? Should the reference to Work No.2 in Article 20 of Schedule 2 be extended to other Works to ensure effective noise management?	The dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) has been updated, including an update to Requirement 20 to relate to Work No. 2 and the optical regeneration stations. No other elements of the Authorised Development will cause audible noise when in operation, therefore Requirement 20 does not need to extend any further.
DCO1.5.40	Statutory Undertakers	Please comment on whether the suite of protective provisions written into the dDCO [APP-019] would be sufficient to ensure respective undertakers are able to meet their statutory obligations and ensure that any development does not impact in any adverse way upon those statutory obligations.	
DCO1.5.41	The Applicant	<p>Explain why the anticipated 40-year service life of the development has not been used as a benchmark across the ES (for example, 25 years is cited in [APP-115] paragraphs 2.3.3.6 and 2.3.4.7).</p> <p>What does the difference between 25 and 40 years represent?</p> <p>How have these differences affected the EIA and HRA?</p> <p>Are the powers that would be provided by any DCO intended to be time limited?</p> <p>If not, why not?</p>	<p>A 25-year projection is a standard timeframe for a cost benefit analysis of an interconnector project used by Ofgem, and other regulatory bodies. The 25-year projection was therefore cited in the Needs and Benefits Report (APP-115).</p> <p>However, this has no correlation with the assessment period of 40 years for the purposes of the ES.</p> <p>The powers in the dDCO (APP-019) are not generally time limited, as whilst 40 years is the expected operational lifetime the Proposed Development could be operational for longer than this, and the powers in the DCO are required for so long as the Proposed Development is operational. As is explained in the application documentation, consents for decommissioning will be sought at the time.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
DCO1.5.42	Local planning authorities	A number of Articles in the dDCO [APP-019] contain provisions deeming consent to have been granted in the absence of a response from the consenting authority. Are the local planning authorities' content with the provisions and the responsibilities on them as the relevant consenting authority?	
DCO1.5.43	The Applicant	<p>A large proportion of the mitigation measures in the ES and the HRA Report [APP-491] that are needed to avoid adverse effects would not be secured directly through the draft DCO [APP-019]. Instead, reliance would be placed on the further development and securing through DCO Requirements (e.g. draft Requirements 12, 13, 14, 17 and 19) of final versions of a series of outline and framework management plans such as the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy [APP-506] and the Onshore and Marine Outline CEMPs ([APP-505] and [APP-488]).</p> <p>Could the Applicant review the proposals for such outline plans and frameworks, the dDCO, and corresponding detailed management plans and demonstrate that the ExA and Secretary of State can be confident that all necessary mitigation measures relied on in the EIA and HRA can be properly secured through this mechanism and provide adequate certainty that adverse effects on the integrity of European sites would be avoided?</p> <p>Please identify how and where the outline documents ensure that the necessary measures would be included in the final versions, especially where the framework or strategy is brief and does not include a full 'contents' list for the detailed plan.</p> <p>In order to provide a clearer audit trail for the ExA, the Secretary of State and the authorities that would have the responsibility for approving the final versions of any such plans, does the Applicant believe it would be useful to provide cross reference entries from the Mitigation Schedule [APP-489] to the specific relevant sections of the outline plans?</p> <p>Could the Applicant also provide some further clarity in relation to Schedule 14 of the dDCO [APP-019]. There appear to be more outline management plans mentioned in the Application documents than those listed in Schedule 14, so could the Applicant explain why not all are intended to be certified?</p> <p>In doing so, could the Applicant check the names of plans mentioned in the dDCO and elsewhere against the titles on their covers. Any differences may explain some of the lack of clarity. For example, are the following the same:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soils and Materials Handling Plan, Outline Materials Management Plan (appended to CEMP [APP-505]) and Outline Soils Resources Plan (appended to CEMP [APP-505])? 	<p>A review has been completed of all mitigation measures required for the Proposed Development as outlined in the ES and HRA. How all measures are secured will be outlined in the updated Mitigation Schedule to be submitted at Deadline 2. In addition, an updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002) and Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (APP-506 Rev002) have been produced.</p> <p>The updated Mitigation Schedule will outline the mitigation required, which document secures the measure and under which Requirement of the dDCO. Cross References will also be added.</p> <p>A chart illustrating the Relationship of the Onshore Details Secured by Requirements has been attached to this document as Appendix 5 (document reference 7.4.1.5). This illustrates all the outline Plans that have been produced and where the Final Plans require approval in the future.</p> <p>Schedule 14 did not list the Marine Archaeology Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) (APP-397) which is now included in the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002).</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy (draft Requirement 12) and the Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy [APP-360]? <p>Please check the list of outline plans and allied control documents set out in Schedule 14 of the dDCO and clarify if all of the documents that are mentioned in the ES and relied upon for mitigation and are therefore require to be certified and subsequently approved in a final version, are listed.</p> <p>If not, please update.</p> <p>If any are mentioned in the ES that do not require to be listed in Schedule 14, please explain why (for example, if they are appended to, or an inherent part of a broader document that is listed).</p> <p>Would any plans that are relied on in the EIA or HRA to secure mitigation not be secured through a dDCO Requirement?</p> <p>Please demonstrate how the written schemes set out in draft Requirements 13 and 14 are led by an outline or framework plan, and how and where these are secured.</p> <p>Explain the level of confidence that the ExA and host local authorities can have that secured measures would be capable of adequately mitigating the relevant matters. If necessary, provide outline documents listing measures that would be secured, drawings that would be prepared, and consultations that would be undertaken.</p>	
DCO1.5.44	The Applicant Relevant local planning authorities	<p>Could the Applicant and the local planning authorities please review the definitions of ‘commence’ and ‘onshore site preparation works’ set out In Article 2(1) of the dDCO [APP-019]? A number of site preparations are listed to be excluded from the definition of commencement.</p> <p>Does the Applicant believe that these definitions in Article 2 of the dDCO would allow such site preparation works to be carried out in advance of the choice of Converter Station option, and the discharge of Requirements, including approval of the CEMP, the landscape and biodiversity mitigation schemes and the surface water drainage system? On what basis does the Applicant believe this is acceptable?</p> <p>Does the Applicant believe that the onshore site preparation works include the creation of site accesses, and, if so, would this conflict with the need for design approval of ‘vehicular access, parking and circulation areas’ for Works 2 and 5 in Article 6 and Requirement 10?</p> <p>The definition of ‘onshore site preparation works includes ‘diversion or laying of services’, while Requirement 13 (contaminated land and groundwater) does not include an exclusion from the preparation works similar to the one in Requirement 14(2). Does the Applicant believe that intrusive works such</p>	<p>Requirement 4 has been amended to confirm no onshore site preparation works in respect of the area where the converter station is to be located may be carried out until the converter station perimeter option has been confirmed.</p> <p>Requirement 15 clearly already requires a CEMP to be approved before works in a phase are carried out, including any works forming part of the onshore site preparation works.</p> <p>No landscaping may be removed which is required to be retained in accordance with the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (APP-506), as that would not be permitted, so it is not problematic that onshore site preparation works (which will need to be in accordance with the development for which development consent is granted) may be carried out before this is approved. The same applies to biodiversity measures.</p> <p>It is not considered any of the onshore site preparation works are such that they would impact surface and foul water management.</p> <p>The creation of site accesses has been removed from the list of the onshore site preparation works, as has the laying and diversion of services.</p> <p>The Applicant considers the approach is acceptable as the onshore site preparation works are not works of a scale where further controls are required</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>as the laying of services could be carried out on any contaminated land before a management scheme has been agreed?</p> <p>If so, is this acceptable?</p> <p>Should Requirement 13 include similar wording to Requirement 14(2)?</p> <p>Also, could the Applicant provide a detailed explanation as to why each of the elements of onshore site preparations works are excluded from the definition of commence, notwithstanding any commencement control through a Construction Environment Management Plan (Explanatory Memorandum [APP-020] paragraph 5.3.2)? The response must include details of the benefits implied in paragraph 5.3.7 of the Explanatory Memorandum.</p> <p>Could the local authorities comment on whether they are agreeable to these exclusions?</p>	<p>in relation to them, as is confirmed by virtue of no specific mitigations being identified by the Environmental Assessment as being required in connection with them.</p> <p>Similar wording to that included at Requirement 14(2) has been included at Requirement 13(2).</p> <p>With regard to each exclusion, the Applicant comments as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) pre-construction archaeological investigations are included within Requirement 14. It is not necessary for all other Requirements to be discharged before they may be carried out, and to require this would unnecessarily delay those investigations where needed and the delivery of the authorised development generally. b) environmental surveys and monitoring are not activities for which mitigation controls are considered to be necessary and may be carried out without development consent in any event. c) site clearance is appropriate to be carried out without the need for all other pre-commencement requirements to be discharged, noting a CEMP will be required before those works are carried out. They will not generate effects that require other mitigation. d) the removal of hedgerows and trees is otherwise controlled by the Order, and the activity of undertaking those works, where permissible, would not require additional mitigations. e) The position with regards to the investigation of ground conditions is the same as for environmental surveys and monitoring. f) remedial works for contamination is discussed above, and the position is the same as for archaeological investigations. g) the ability to receive plant and equipment allows for activities which are not development (and for which development consent is not therefore required) but may otherwise unnecessarily be seen to be controlled. h) the temporary display of site notices and advertisements is not development. Its inclusion is for clarity. i) the erection of temporary structures and buildings required in connection with the authorised development will need to be in accordance with the CEMP approved for the relevant phase of works, are it is therefore not considered such works have the potential to give rise to environmental effects which are not appropriately required to be controlled. <p>The benefit for the undertaker is principally one of time. It will take time to discharge all Requirements in co-operation with the relevant authority responsible for and /or involved in discharge. Where development consent has been granted, it is not necessary to restrict the onshore site preparation works until all pre-commencement Requirements have been discharged. To do so would be unnecessarily restrictive.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
DCO1.5.45	Hampshire County Council	In respect of Article 8(3) of the dDCO [APP-019], please explain the relevance of the Traffic Management (Hampshire County Council) Permit Scheme Order 2019 and is it acceptable to disapply its terms in respect of this Proposed Development?	
DCO1.5.46	The Applicant	In Schedule 2 of the dDCO [APP-019], Article 1(4) lists of a number of items not included within the proposed parameter plans. This list of exclusions includes reference to solar panels. Is there an intention to have solar panels or other renewable energy apparatus on or at the Converter Station or Optical Regeneration Station? If yes, can it be evidenced where this has been assessed under the worst-case principles of the ES?	No solar panels or other renewable energy apparatus is proposed, accordingly, reference to solar panels has been deleted from Schedule 2, paragraph 1 (4) in the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.47	The Applicant	The Explanatory Memorandum [APP-020] refers extensively to Model Provisions. These are now out of date. Please update the Explanatory Memorandum including Schedule 1, so that, in each case, it refers to the source of the provision by reference to a previous made DCO or Transport and Works Act Order or states clearly whether it is a novel provision. Review the explanation provided in the Explanatory Memorandum [APP-020] so that it sets out why the wording from other made DCOs is relevant, detailing what is factually similar for both the relevant consented NSIP and the proposed development. This should include any divergence in wording from the consented DCO drafting.	That the model provisions in the Explanatory Memorandum (APP-020) are “out of date” does not mean they do not continue to be of relevance, having formed the basis and therefore providing rationale for provisions included in made DCOs. The Explanatory Memorandum has been reviewed and updated (APP-020 Rev002) where considered necessary in relation to use of reference to the model provisions.
DCO1.5.48	The Applicant	The dDCO [APP-019] Article 2 definition of ‘ <i>onshore preparation works</i> ’ list starts c, d, e... Why not a, b, c..?	This was an error and has been corrected in the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev 002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.49	The Applicant	The ExA wants to be assured that dDCO [APP-019] Article 23 would not enable the creation of undefined new rights or restrictive covenants and must ensure that either a Schedule detailing each of these rights or restrictions is included in the draft DCO, or the description of each right and restriction is clearly set out in the Book of Reference [APP-024]. Provide this reassurance or amend accordingly.	The Applicant has updated the Book of Reference (APP-024 Rev002), setting out specifically which sub-classes of new rights and restrictive covenants are sought against each of the plots respectively. The sub-classes of rights are referenced within the ‘Extent of acquisition or use’ column and should be cross-referenced with Appendix A of the Statement of Reasons (APP-022) which defines each of the sub-classes of rights. The updated Book of Reference (APP-024 Rev002) and Land Plans (APP-008 Rev02) have been submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.50	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 6.12 of the Explanatory Memorandum [APP-020], how is the absence of Secretary of State consent ‘ <i>important for the delivery and use of the Authorised Development</i> ’ and how would this absence specifically ensure its ‘ <i>timely delivery and operation</i> ’?	Given the limited extent of transfers to which consent is proposed to not be required for, which is in relation to other statutory undertakers who already have responsibility for apparatus of the type which the benefit of the Order relates to, it is simply unnecessary for the Secretary of State to be required to provide consent after the Order has been made for these transfers. It would cause unnecessary delay in relation to a transfer which is already known to be

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			acceptable. The Secretary of State may consider the acceptability of the proposed transfers as part of the determination of the Application.
DCO1.5.51	The Applicant	<p>For each of the locations along the entire route of the Proposed Development in Sections 2 to 10 of the onshore components where the Order limits would be wider than the envisaged width of permanent rights to be sought, which is shown as 11m for non-highway situations on Plate 4 of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan ES Appendix 22.2 [APP-450], please explain in detail why this greater width would be required and how this is regulated under the dDCO [APP-019]. (Explanatory Memorandum [APP-020] paragraph 9.1 refers.)</p> <p>The response must include reference to the envisaged construction methodology if relevant to the width of the Order limits. In particular, the response must explain what specific operations or circumstances have led to the need for the full extent of this width and what specific rights are envisaged to be sought. The response must give evidence of the thought that has already gone into this process, in addition to that which is described in the application.</p> <p>The level of detail sought by this question arises from the conditions in s122(2) of the Planning Act 2008 that the full extent of each plot is required for the said purposes. It also arises from the need to demonstrate necessity and proportionality in terms of interference with the rights of those with an interest in the land and the demonstration of a clear idea of the intended use of the land concerned, as set out in paras 8 and 9 of the DCLG Planning Act 2008 Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land September 2013. It also arises from the need to avoid any <i>'unnecessary degree of flexibility and hence uncertainty'</i>, as set out on page 4 of the Planning Inspectorate's <i>Advice Note nine: Rochdale Envelope</i>.</p>	<p>The detailed design of the Onshore Cable Route is required to be confirmed in accordance with dDCO Requirement 6. The Proposed Development must be constructed in accordance with those approved details. The powers of acquisition of rights, which are applicable in relation to the Onshore Cable Route where permanent land acquisition is not sought as it is not necessary and would not be proportionate, is limited to the acquisition of rights over so much of the land as is required for the construction, operation or maintenance of the authorised development or to facilitate it, or as is incidental to it (Article 23 of dDCO (APP-019 Rev 002)). As such, a test of necessity applies in relation to the extent of the land over which rights and restrictions in connection with the Onshore Cables may be acquired or imposed respectively.</p>
DCO1.5.52	The Applicant	<p>What matters of <i>'complexity and scale'</i> have led to the extension of the 5-year model time limit to 7 years for the exercise of authority to acquire land compulsorily in dDCO [APP-019] Article 22 (Explanatory Memorandum [APP-020] paragraph 9.7 refers)?</p>	<p>Please see the response to ExA WQ CA 1.3.25, which this question repeats. The Explanatory Memorandum has also been updated to include relevant information in this regard (APP-020), and is submitted at Deadline 1.</p>
DCO1.5.53	The Applicant	<p>Is the power of the temporary use of land for maintaining the Authorised Development, as provided by Article 32 of the dDCO [APP-019], only available during the maintenance period of 5 years not during the entire period that it is operational? (Paragraph 9.27 of the Explanatory Memorandum [APP-020] refers.)</p>	<p>As set out at Paragraph 9.27 of the Explanatory Memorandum, the power of the temporary use of land for maintaining the Authorised Development is not restricted to the 5 year period and applies for the operational period.</p> <p>The Applicant's response to WQ CA1.3.26 (above) is relevant as to the appropriateness of the power.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
DCO1.5.54	The Applicant	Why has the maintenance period in dDCO [APP-019] Article 32(12) been amended to 5 years from that given in the model provisions (Explanatory Memorandum [APP-020] paragraph 9.30)?	Paragraph 9.30 of Explanatory Memorandum (APP-020) was included in error, with Article 32 of the dDCO applying for the operational period. The Explanatory Memorandum has been updated (APP-020 Rev002) to remove this paragraph.
DCO1.5.55	The Applicant	Would the power given by dDCO [APP-019] Article 33(1)(c) be available under Article 33(1)(a)? (Refer to paragraph 9.31.1 of the Explanatory Memorandum [APP-020].)	No, it would not. Article 33(1)(a) relates to the acquisition of rights. Article 33(1)(c) relates to constructing in proximity to apparatus and does not relate to the acquisition of rights. They are separate matters, and both are required.
DCO1.5.56	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 11.11 of the Explanatory Memorandum [APP-020], why, and in which Order land plots, is Article 48 necessary?	It is not expected Article 48 of the dDCO will need to be relied upon in relation to any particular plot within the Order Limits, however experience from other DCO's has shown it is necessary to include this for in the event it is in unexpected circumstances required. Its inclusion without the need to rely on it is not an issue where the form of the Article is appropriate, however it will be an issue should it need to be included by way of a modification of the DCO once made in the future where it is not included now. That in itself provides sufficient necessity for this Article to be included, despite there not being a specific known need for its use.
DCO1.5.57	The Applicant Relevant local authorities	Are the relevant planning and highway discharging authorities and other relevant bodies content with their roles in the discharge of Requirements? (Refer to paragraph 12.4 of the Explanatory Memorandum [APP-020].)	The Applicant is content with how this is dealt with and considers the appropriate persons are referenced.
DCO1.5.58	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 12.6.4 of the Explanatory Memorandum [APP-020], to whom would the undertaker confirm the selected option for the Converter Station under Requirement 4 of the dDCO [APP-019]?	The selected option for the Converter Station will be confirmed to all relevant local planning authorities for the area where the Converter Station is to be located (so Winchester City Council and East Hampshire District Council). Requirement 4 has been updated to confirm this in the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.59	The Applicant	In table WN2 of the dDCO [APP-019], it is stated that the maximum parameters of the telecommunications buildings would be 10x4x3 (m). However, throughout the ES, the maximum dimensions are cited as 10x4x4 (m) ([APP-118], paragraph 3.6.5.6). Can the Applicant explain the reason for this difference and the implications for the EIA?	The dDCO (APP-019) is correct and the difference in the Environmental Statement is addressed in the Errata Sheet (document reference 7.8.1.1) provided as Appendix 1 to the Environmental Statement Addendum.
DCO1.5.60	The Applicant	Should the definition of ' <i>relevant highway authority</i> ' ([APP-019], Interpretation) be amended to include Highways England in view of works in the vicinity of the strategic road network?	No. There are no works proposed on highways for which Highways England is the highway authority and therefore requires responsibility for discharging Requirements.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
DCO1.5.61	Highways England	What protective provisions are requested to be incorporated within the dDCO [APP-019]?	
DCO1.5.62	The Applicant	dDCO [APP-019] Article 8(3) contains ' <i>in relation to of the works</i> ' – the ' <i>of</i> ' is erroneous. Please amend.	Noted and corrected in the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.63	The Applicant	The time period by which a discharging authority (for example in dDCO [APP-019] Articles 11(4) and 13(8)) must respond to approve submitted details is shorter than the time periods used in other DCOs relied upon as precedent. Explain why this is the case.	Both refer to working days, rather than days, which explains why the number used is less. The Applicant considers the timescales to be appropriate and in line with other made DCO's.
DCO1.5.64	The Applicant	Why is dDCO [APP-019] Article 11(5) required given the general definition of apparatus?	dDCO (APP-019) Article 11(5) is required to confirm the position in relation to how that term is defined in the New Roads and Street Works Act, which the Article relates to and which therefore is relevant.
DCO1.5.65	The Applicant	The use of the phrase ' <i>reasonable time</i> ' is ambiguous in Article 13(1) of the dDCO [APP-019]. Who would decide what is a reasonable time, and would not such a period be dictated by 'weekly' timetable set out in the Framework Traffic Management Strategy?	This wording is included in many made DCOs and is considered entirely appropriate. The period of time will be what is reasonable in the circumstances. Whilst the Framework Traffic Management Strategy and the detailed Traffic Management Strategies will be of relevance to how long is reasonable, given those controls are otherwise provided for it is not necessary to complicate the Article by directly including reference to this.
DCO1.5.66	The Applicant	The implication of Schedule 8 of the dDCO [APP-019] is that the listed streets would be temporarily stopped up, although in most cases only one half of the carriageway would be affected. Can some clarity be given as to what streets would be fully stopped up (temporarily) and thus a diversion put in place, and where one half of the carriageway would remain open for the duration of the works?	<p>The highways (footways and roadways), footpaths and permissive paths listed in Schedule 8 to the dDCO (APP-019 Rev 002) are those that are to be temporarily stopped up (i.e. the full width of the way will be restricted at a single time). The placing of traffic management in the highway which would prevent traffic from passing along, for example, a lane of a carriageway does not constitute stopping up, as the relevant way is still (in part) able to be used by traffic to which it is subject. In such circumstances the provision of traffic management on the highway will be authorised pursuant to Article 16 (Traffic regulation measures), with the details of the traffic management measures to be confirmed via the submission of traffic management strategies to the relevant highway authority in accordance with paragraph 4 of Part 5 of Schedule 13 to the dDCO.</p> <p>Further information regarding the temporary stopping up of public rights of way proposed to be authorised and the diversions to be provided in connection with them is provided within an explanatory note relating to diversions of the public rights of way located at Appendix 14 to the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1.14).</p>
DCO1.5.67	The Applicant	Notwithstanding the answer to DCO1.5.66, should dDCO [APP-019] Article 13(5) be amended to include reference to 13(4) as well as 13(1) so that	The Applicant does not consider it necessary to amend Article 13(5) to refer to Article 13(4). The extent of the stopping up of those highways is known now and detailed in the dDCO at Schedule 8 and on the corresponding plans so as to authorise the temporary stopping up of those highways without the need to

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		adequate notice and consultation with the relevant street authority takes place?	go through the additional process provided for at Article 13(5). Should any relevant street authority have any reasonable conditions that they wish to see imposed in relation to the temporary stopping up of public rights of way identified in Schedule 8 and shown on the corresponding plans, they are able to raise these during the examination.
DCO1.5.68	The Applicant	In respect of Article 14 of the dDCO [APP-019], provide a detailed description of the intentions at each of the access points shown in the Access and Rights of Way Plans (Sheets 1 to 10) [APP-011] stating the purpose, whether a new or altered access is being formed and by what arrangement, and, specifically in relation to AC/1/a, can a plan be provided detailing site specific remodelling and access formation.	<p>The Applicant has produced an Access and Rights of Way: Explanatory Document, included as Appendix 6 to this document (document reference 7.4.1.6). The Appendix provides further explanatory information regarding the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature of the proposed access; and • The purpose of the proposed access. <p>Whether the proposed access is new or comprises of and an alteration of an existing access point.</p>
DCO1.5.69	The Applicant	Where strategies are referred to in dDCO [APP-019] Articles (for example Article 12(2)), please can the relevant requirement be cross-referenced for clarity?	No strategies are referred to in the Articles to the Order.
DCO1.5.70	The Applicant	Should dDCO [APP-019] Requirement 10 reference the Access and Rights of Way Plans [APP-011]?	This is not necessary as the power to provide an access is contained at Article 14, which does refer to those plans as necessary. The Requirement is a control, not a power, and is therefore subordinate to Article 14.
DCO1.5.71	The Applicant	The dDCO [APP-019], (at page 43, Interpretation) refers to 'phases' and these are to be defined by the Applicant, along with accompanying Construction Environmental Management Plans. How are these phases likely to be determined and how would consultation on them be co-ordinated?	<p>In accordance with Requirement 3, the Applicant would determine the phases of the Authorised Development and would submit a written scheme setting out all the phases to the relevant planning authority. The Authorised Development would be carried out in accordance with the submitted and approved written scheme.</p> <p>The CEMPs will relate to all works in the relevant phase in accordance with the Outline Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (as updated) (APP-505 Rev002).</p>
DCO1.5.72	The Applicant	<p>In Schedule 2 of the dDCO, draft Requirement 21 [APP-019] secures a 'travel plan' but does not state that it should be in accordance with a framework travel plan. The need for travel plans for each contractor is outlined in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-449] in Appendix 7 and secured via Requirement 17, where it states the plan must be in accordance with the framework plan. Explain the relationship between the travel plans in Requirements 21 and 17 and how the process to finalise and approve the travel plans would work in practice.</p> <p>Further, draft Requirement 17 refers to the approval of a construction traffic plan in the singular, whereas the Framework Construction Traffic</p>	Requirement 17 states " <i>No phase of the authorised development landwards of MHWS may commence until a construction traffic management plan (in accordance with the framework construction traffic management plan) relating to that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant highway authority</i> ", therefore requiring a single plan for each phase. All contractors working on a phase would be required to comply with the approved plan in relation to that phase.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>Management Plan [APP-450] at 1.3.1.1 suggests that there would be multiple plans needed for each phase, one for each contractor: '<i>Individual CTMP documents will be provided to each contractor with further detail relating to their relevant work site locations. These will be prepared and agreed with the relevant Local Highway Authority ahead of works commencing.</i>'</p> <p>Can the Applicant also confirm if a separate Construction Traffic Management Plan would be produced for each of the 10 sections described in the ES?</p> <p>Does the Applicant believe that the wording of draft Requirement 17 is adequate in this respect?</p>	<p>A separate Construction Traffic Management Plan would be produced for each phase. The sections used for assessment purposes do not necessarily reflect future phasing to be used for the delivery of the Authorised Development.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that a Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan is included within Appendix 7 of the updated CTMP (APP-450 Rev002), as secured by Requirement 17 of the dDCO (APP-019). Therefore, the Applicant considers Requirement 17 to be adequate and clearly reflect how these activities in connection with the Proposed Development will be properly controlled.</p> <p>(The Applicant notes in question DCO1.5.72, the ExA refer to the CTMP as (APP-449) but can confirm it should be APP-450).</p>
DCO1.5.73	The Applicant	<p>How does dDCO [APP-019] Requirement 18(1) relate operationally to Requirement 18(3)? Where should authorities look to ascertain the hours of working permitted bearing in mind the outline CEMP is prepared without reference to phases?</p>	<p>Requirement 18(1) provides the standard position, whereas 18(3) provides for deviations from this. The authorities should refer to Section 2.3.1 of the Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan ('CEMP') (APP-505), which sets out the works forming part of the Proposed Development in relation to which hours may be different from the standard position stated at Requirement 18(1).</p> <p>The Onshore Outline CEMP covers the whole of the onshore element of the Proposed Development and the works within a phase forming part of the Proposed Development will be required to comply with the information stated in relation to them in the Onshore Outline CEMP. The drafting of the Requirement and the supporting control document are considered to be adequate and appropriate to explain the position and to sufficiently control the carrying out of the Proposed Development.</p>
DCO1.5.74	The Applicant	<p>dDCO [APP-019] Requirement 18 (5) (c) states: '<i>discernible light, noise or vibration outside the Order limits.</i>' In order to be non-intrusive, should that also cover '<i>within</i>' the Order limits?</p>	<p>No, it should refer to outside the Order Limits, as that is where the receptors who may be affected by intrusive works and for whom the controls and protections are provided are located. There are no receptors within the Order limits.</p>
DCO1.5.75	The Applicant	<p>The Framework Traffic Management Strategy [APP-449] sets out mitigation measures for Section 10, which includes construction works between the junction of Henderson Road and Bransbury Road, and the landfall in the car park off Fort Cumberland Road. Construction works in this area fall under Works 4 and 5 in Schedule 1 of the DCO [APP-019]. However, draft Requirement 19 of the dDCO (Schedule 2) refers only to Works 4, and not Works 5. Please explain this apparent discrepancy between the two contiguous Works, one of which would be prevented from commencement until the Traffic Management Strategy is approved by the relevant highway authorities, while the other apparently would not.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged Work No. 5 does need to be referred to. Please note that draft protective provisions for the protection of highways are included within the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev 002) and replace what was Requirement 19.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
DCO1.5.76	The Applicant	In securing land restoration under dDCO [APP-019] Requirement 22, would there be a requirement on the applicant to inform the relevant local authorities that the development has been completed? If so, how would such notice be served?	Requirement 22 has been amended to include a requirement for the undertaker to inform the relevant local planning authorities of the date of the completion of the construction of the authorised development. The revised Requirement 22 has been included in the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.77	The Applicant	Does dDCO [APP-019] Requirement 23 need to be expanded to include lighting at the Optical Regeneration Stations near Fort Cumberland?	As set out in the updated DAS (APP-114 Rev002) there is no lighting (other than emergency lighting) at the ORS. On this basis, the Applicant does not consider that Requirement 23 needs to be expanded to include lighting at the Optical Regeneration Stations.
DCO1.5.78	The Applicant	Should dDCO [APP-019] Articles 11 and 13 follow the general drafting of Article 10 in that the works specified are for ' <i>the purpose of constructing and maintaining</i> ' the Proposed Development?	Yes, Article 11 and 13 have been updated to follow the drafting of Article 10. This amendment has been included in the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.79	The Applicant	Please explain whether or not the proposed approach to the use of ' <i>temporary stopping up</i> ' provisions by the Applicant is acceptable with regard to current policies and practices of Highways England in this regard in relation to its own recent DCO applications.	No part of the Proposed Development is located on land for which Highways England are the highway authority. The proposed approach is considered to be acceptable in the context of the Proposed Development and by reference to other made DCOs which include corresponding provisions in like form.
DCO1.5.80	The Applicant	dDCO [APP-019] Article 10 relates to a very specific list of works, rather than conveying a general power to be an undertaker working in the highway. Please amend this to ensure only engineering works applicable and appropriate to the actual works intended are covered.	All of the activities provided for in Article 10(1)(a) of the dDCO (APP-019) are considered to be necessary in connection with the carrying out and maintenance of the Proposed Development. The extent to which any such activities are carried out in reliance on those powers will be determined by the detailed approvals required to be obtained in relation to the relevant works. When considering the Article in context of the Order as whole, the drafting is considered to be entirely appropriate and no works listed should be removed. It is also noted that Article 10(1) is a general power. See drafting " <i>without limiting the scope of this paragraph</i> ".
DCO1.5.81	The Applicant	Measures to identify and protect retained trees under dDCO [APP-019] Requirement 7 only apply to Works No.2 and No.5 for the Converter Station and Optical Regeneration Station. Why are these controls not in place for Work No.4?	The Applicant has not confirmed the final onshore cable route for Works No.4 and as such it has not been possible for the Applicant to confirm which trees are to be removed or retained. This clarification will be provided by the Applicant's contractor during detailed design / construction stage. However, the Applicant can confirm that tree constraints plans contained within the Arboriculture Report (APP-411) clearly define the root protection areas for all tree features recorded within and adjacent to the Order limits. As a starting point, the Applicant will accord with protective measures in accordance with British Standard 5837: 2012 "Trees in relation to Demolition Design and Construction – recommendations" which would be installed at the periphery of the root protection areas of trees identified for retention as secured in paragraph 6.2.3.1 of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002), and requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019). Tree / site specific protection measures will be detailed in an Arboriculture Method Statement and

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>tree protection plan (drawing) for all retained trees once the onshore cable route is confirmed in detailed design, and the extent of retained trees and neighbouring works understood in detail.</p> <p>Draft DCO Requirement 7 has been revised to include reference to Work No.4 so as to secure the measures relating to Work No.4 in the updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (APP-506 Rev002) and the Detailed Strategy.</p>
DCO1.5.82	The Applicant	dDCO [APP-019] Articles 41 and 42 both use the phrase ' <i>it reasonably believes it to be necessary.</i> ' Can the applicant elaborate on the process for fair and impartial assessment of whether an action to lop or fell a tree is ' <i>reasonable</i> ', ' <i>necessary</i> ' and based on technical expertise, to reassure the ExA that such works would not be carried out following an arbitrary judgment.	<p>The Applicant will seek to avoid all impacts on trees where possible as identified within paragraph 6.3.2.1 of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002) and requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019). Where this is not possible, all pruning and felling works will be specified by a suitably trained and experienced Arboriculture consult and will be carried out by a suitably trained and experienced arboriculture contractor, in accordance with the updated OLBS (APP-506 Rev002) at Section 1.3.4, secured by requirement 15 of the dDCO.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that for the purposes of the Proposed Development "lopping" is taken to be any pruning requirement to the tree but excludes felling. Pruning will only be prescribed in accordance with British Standard 3998: 2010 "Tree Works – Recommendations" and industry best practice. Pruning works will only be prescribed where there is a statutory obligation to do so (such as vegetation impeding a vision splay at a road junction) or where not to prune would be to the detriment of the tree (a typical example of this would be to carry out minor pruning to allow root protection measures to be installed).</p>
DCO1.5.83	The Applicant	dDCO [APP-019] Article 42 (2)(b) disapplies the duty to replace trees (in the case of TPO trees), with Articles 41 and 42 only seeking to pay compensation to the tree owners in each individual case. Why is the Applicant not seeking a landscape restoration programme whereby trees removed are replaced in commensurate scale, kind or location?	The updated OBLBS (APP-506 Rev002) requires that all trees will be replaced if lost in accordance with the Arboriculture Report (APP- 411) and paragraph 1.4.4.10 of the OLBS, regardless of TPO designation.
DCO1.5.84	The Applicant	In dDCO [APP-019] Article 41, what is meant by ' <i>near any part of the authorised development</i> '? Does this mean the Order limits?	Article 41 of the dDCO has been amended to refer to Order limits. This amendment has been included in the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.85	The Applicant	Does the Applicant believe that Article 45 of the dDCO [APP-019] should be amended in the light of a recent made Order (The Cleve Hill Solar Park Order 2020), in which the Secretary of State deleted the clause that proposed referral to the Centre for Effective Dispute Resolution should the Secretary of State fail to make an appointment of an Arbitrator within 14 days?	Articles 7 and 45 of the dDCO have been updated and reflect the position in the Cleve Hill Solar Park Order 2020 as made by the Secretary of State. These amendments have been included in the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
DCO1.5.86	The Applicant	Please provide an index of where the dDCO [APP-019] has set out specified maximum and minimum parameters in relation to extent of the works [Planning Inspectorate <i>Advice Note 9 - Rochdale Envelope</i> , April 2012, page 10].	Please see the Order limits as identified on the Works Plans and Requirement 5 to the Order, which provides the parameter restrictions so as to ensure the Proposed Development complies with the assessment of it undertaken and reported within the Environmental Statement. Figures included within the Work No. and detailed within Schedule 1 are also relevant to identify what may be constructed as part of the Proposed Development.
DCO1.5.87	The Applicant	Notwithstanding ongoing discussions, the Applicant does not yet have any Crown Estate s135 consent. On that basis what is the Applicant's view about the inclusion of the following in the dDCO: <i>'The undertaker may exercise any right under this Order to acquire compulsorily an interest in any land which is Crown land (as defined in the 2008 Act) forming part of The Crown Estate, provided that the interest to be acquired is—</i> <i>(a) identified in the book of reference;</i> <i>(b) for the time being held otherwise than by or on behalf of the Crown; and</i> <i>(c) in a plot that is expressly referred to in the letter provided by the Crown Estate Commissioners with regard to section 135 of the 2008 Act dated [xx].'</i>	The Applicant is not aware of any standard precedent for the wording proposed, and there is no justification for it having regard to the provisions already provided for at Article 47 of the draft Order relating to crown rights.
DCO1.5.88	The Applicant	In accordance with convention in recently made Orders, would the definition of 'watercourse' in the dDCO [APP-019] benefit from the addition of 'has the meaning given in the Land Drainage Act 1991(a)' with '(a) 1991 c.59, section 72(1)' as a referenced footnote?	The Applicant refers to the recently made Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm Order 2020 which includes the same definition of watercourse as is included in the draft Order.
DCO1.5.89	The Applicant	Please check all references to 'Order' in the dDCO [APP-019] and ensure they begin with an upper case 'O'.	Reviewed and confirmed in all instances where the defined term is used the word is capitalised. Amendments have been included in the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.90	The Applicant	In accordance with convention in recently made Orders, would draft Article 5 of the dDCO [APP-019] benefit from the addition of: <i>'(3) This article only authorises the carrying out of maintenance works within the Order limits'</i>	The Applicant refers to the recently made Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm Order 2020 which includes the same wording as is included in the draft Order.
DCO1.5.91	The Applicant	In accordance with convention in recently made Orders, would draft Article 7 of the dDCO [APP-019] benefit from the addition of the following clause at its outset: <i>'7.—(1) Except as otherwise provided in this Order, the provisions of this Order have effect solely for the benefit of the undertaker.'</i>	No, it is considered the position in this regard is clear by virtue of how the Order has been drafted without the need for such text clarifying the position.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
DCO1.5.92	The Applicant	In accordance with convention in recently made Orders, would draft Article 18(4)(b) of the dDCO [APP-019] benefit from the addition of the following terminal wording: ‘... within the Order limits’?	This addition has been included within the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.93	The Applicant	In accordance with convention in recently made Orders, should all relevant references in the dDCO [APP-019] to Part 1 of the 1961 Act be to ‘Part 1 (determination of questions of disputed compensation) of the 1961 Act’?	This addition has been included within the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.94	The Applicant	In accordance with convention in recently made Orders, should Part 6 of the dDCO [APP-019] read: ‘37.—(1) The deemed marine licence set out in Schedule 15 (deemed marine licence under the 2009 Act) is deemed to be granted on the date this Order comes into force to the undertaker under Part 4 (marine licensing) of the 2009 Act for the licensed marine activities set out in Part 1, and subject to the conditions set out in Part 2 of that Schedule’?	This amendment to Article 37 has been included within the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.95	The Applicant	In accordance with recently made Orders, should Article 47 of the dDCO [APP-019] be amended to include ‘take possession of’ in the list of exclusions in 47(1)? (For example, ‘to take possession of, use, enter upon or in any manner interfere with any land or rights of any description’.) (Explanatory Memorandum [APP-020] paragraph 11.10 also refers.)	No, and the Applicant refers to the recently made Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm Order 2020 which includes the same wording to that included within the draft Order and which does not refer to ‘take possession of’. Including the words ‘take possession of’ narrows the effect of the drafting, for instance one could take ownership of land without also taking possession of it, which the Crown would not be agreeable to, so it is not clear that the narrower wording suggested would be acceptable to the Crown, or on what basis it has been appropriately included in any recently made Orders.
DCO1.5.96	The Applicant	Please correct the typographical error at the start of Article 48(1) of the dDCO [APP-019].	This amendment has been included within the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
DCO1.5.97	The Applicant	There are various uncertainties in relation to the parameters set out in the dDCO and assessed in the ES, as highlighted in other questions, and it is noted that the maximum parameters presented in Schedule 1 of the dDCO (APP-019) do not appear to fully align with some of the maximum parameters set out at a wide variety of locations in the ES. Therefore, please can the Applicant provide a reconciliation document to aid understanding of where maximum parameters assessed in the ES are secured in the dDCO to ensure that what is permitted in the dDCO is not outside the scope of the assessment reported in the ES and HRA report.	A review of the maximum parameters assessed in the ES has been undertaken in parallel with those presented in Schedule 1 of the dDCO (APP-019). The maximum parameters presented in the dDCO that relate to the marine aspects of the Proposed Development are listed in Schedule 1 and also in Schedule 15, Part 1 of the dDCO. The Applicant has produced a reconciliation document ((document reference 7.7.5) submitted at Deadline 1) that demonstrates where maximum parameters assessed in the ES are secured in the dDCO .
DCO1.5.98	The Applicant	In Article 7(7)(a) of the dDCO [APP-019], is the terminal ‘or’ necessary? If not, please delete.	This amendment has been included within the updated dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
DCO1.5.99	The Applicant (HSF)	Paragraphs 3.6.2.4 and 3.6.2.5 of the ES [APP-118] state that the HVAC cables between Lovedean and the Converter Station (Works 1) would be up to 1km in length. However, this is not reflected in the dDCO, which states that they would be up to 800m (Works 1; dDCO Schedule 1, part 1(a)). Can the Applicant explain this apparent discrepancy and any implications for the EIA?	The discrepancy was an error and the dDCO (APP-019 Rev002) (submitted at Deadline 1) has been amended to refer to 1km lengths.

Table 1.6 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Environmental Impact Assessment and Environmental Statement

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
EIA1.6.1	The Applicant	Were any alternative locations or designs considered for the Optical Regeneration Station? If not, why not? If so, where are the relative environmental effects set out?	The Applicant did consider a number of alternative locations for the siting of the Optical Regeneration Station (ORS). This was initially undertaken by the Applicant’s Land Agent. The siting was also considered as part of the Sequential Test (see the Sequential and Exception Test Addendum (document reference 7.8.1.9) which assesses the 14 locations identified, including those from the initial search by the Land Agent, by their physical and environmental constraints. The proposed location was assessed to be the only suitable location for the ORS. As identified in the updated DAS (APP-114 Rev002), and in the Applicant’s response to ExA’s Written Question MG1.1.4, has confirmed that the ORS is a functional structure with limited opportunity to alter the aesthetics.
EIA1.6.2	South Downs National Park Authority NGET	In its Relevant Representation [RR-049], the South Downs National Park Authority drew attention to National Grid’s duties under s62 of the Environment Act as a Statutory Undertaker to have regard to the purposes of the South Downs National Park. It suggested that there is only limited evidence of how National Grid met these duties and that it would be seeking further information from National Grid: <i>‘National Grid is a Statutory Undertaker and therefore, as per section 62 of the Environment Act 1995, they are required to have regard to the purposes of the National Park in their decision making. It is not clear whether the assessment of alternatives (set out in the Environmental Statement Chapter 2: Consideration of Alternatives) by National Grid when preparing the NGET feasibility study in 2014 took into account the impact of the various options on the National Park. There is only limited information on how that duty has been met and the SDNPA will be seeking further information on this from National Grid.’</i> Have negotiations continued and is there any update to report?	

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>Could the South Downs National Park Authority explain if, in its view, the Proposed Development would affect the statutory purposes for which the National Park was designated?</p> <p>Further, does it believe that there any distinction between the effects of Option B (i) and B(ii) in relation to their effects on the statutory purposes of the National Park?</p> <p>Please could NGET explain if and how you had regard to the statutory purposes of the South Downs National Park designation in preparing the 2014 feasibility study referred to in Chapter 2 of the ES [APP-117].</p>	
EIA1.6.3	The Applicant	<p>The Proposed Development includes the provision of services to the Converter Station, including water and electricity supply works and foul drainage provision (dDCO [APP-019] Schedule 1(2)(d) refers). These are said to '<i>fall within the scope of the work assessed by the environmental statement</i>'. Where are the impacts of these set out in the ES?</p>	<p>Whilst a new water supply connection is proposed at the Converter Station for temporary and permanent works there are no proposed connections to foul and/or combined water sewer network during operation as part of Proposed Development. Accordingly, impacts on foul water and combined sewer capacity and combined sewer quality have been scoped out of the assessment as Water Supply and Drainage Infrastructure (Quantity) (APP-135) is assessed in section 20.7.3.</p> <p>Potential increased demand and/or pressure due to construction activities with impacts on public foul and surface water and combined sewer networks are assessed in sections 20.7.3.6 to 20.7.3.10, section 20.7.4.20 and sections 20.7.4.33 to 20.7.4.39 of APP-135.</p> <p>Section 20.7.3.3 of APP-135 notes that an in-principle connection agreement with Portsmouth Water (PW) has been obtained for the proposed permanent connection for the Converter Station Area with agreement for temporary use during construction, if required, subject to detailed design and to be determined by the appointed contractor. This in-principle agreement is for a connection point at Broadway Lane, and has been obtained from PW for an assumed demand requirement of 105 'loading units' based on PW's application for water supply calculations</p> <p>Foul water drainage is discussed in further detail in Appendix 3.6 Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy (APP-360).</p> <p>Emissions from operational electricity consumption and operational fuel consumption are presented in Table 28.7 (Electricity and Fuel use) of Chapter 28 (Carbon and Climate Change (APP-143).</p>
EIA1.6.4	The Applicant	<p>In relation to ES 3.5.5.2 [APP-118], if UXO clearance or detonation was required, this would be subject to a separate Marine Licence application. Has this been considered in the assessment of cumulative effects (for example, for marine mammals) and if so, where?</p>	<p>Yes, UXO work for the AQUIND Interconnector was included within the cumulative matrices (under Major Projects) presented as appendices to each marine chapter and underwent a Stage 1 and 2 cumulative effects assessment (as outlined by PINS Advice Note Seventeen). None of the topic/chapter-based assessments carried the project through to Stage 3 or 4 assessment.</p> <p>However, as it is currently expected that should the works be required, i.e. UXOs are identified in the Marine Cable Corridor and cannot be micro-sited around,</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>then these works will be undertaken prior to the commencement of the construction phase of the Proposed Development. As such, there is no potential for overlap in temporal scope (because the UXO clearance work will precede all other preparation and construction works for the Proposed Development by a number of months).</p> <p>This approach and rationale has been consulted upon with relevant consultees (JNCC, Natural England and MMO) and they are content with this approach as evidenced within the SoCGs (document references 7.5.12 and 7.5.16).</p>
EIA1.6.5	The Applicant	ES plate 3.23 [APP-118] seems to show the two cable circuits at different depths with a different depth of cement-bound sand covering. Is this accurate?	This is an error, and the plate has been updated to show the same depth of cement bound covering within section 3.4 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) submitted at Deadline 1.
EIA1.6.6	The Applicant	In relation to ES table 3.7 [APP-118], working hours, what times does the 12hr shift for landfall installation correspond to?	The onshore working hours for Landfall installation (HDD-1, TJB and ORS) are likely to be 07:00-19:00.
EIA1.6.7	The Applicant	<p>In ES Chapter 4 [APP-119], the approach to EIA and the determination of significance of effects, effects deemed to be significant for the purposes of the assessment are said to be those of moderate, moderate/ major and major significance. Noting that the EIA Regulations require the identification of all significant effects, and that effects of 'minor' significance are inherently significant, please explain 'In EIA terms, a moderate or major effect is considered significant'.</p> <p>What weight should the ExA give to the significant effects that are said to be not significant?</p> <p>Paragraph 4.7.13 of the ES [APP-119] notes that mitigation measures have been identified to deal with any significant adverse effect. Does this include the effects that are classified as being of minor significance?</p> <p>If not, why not?</p> <p>Have effects found to be of major and moderate significance been dealt with more comprehensively than those found to be of minor significance?</p>	<p>The determination of whether an effect is considered to be significant is outlined in Chapter 4 EIA Methodology (APP-119) and states those effects described as moderate, moderate/ major and major significance are considered significant on the basis of a qualitative analysis of the environmental impact that is identified. There is no text in Chapter 4 that states 'In EIA terms, a moderate or major effect is significant' and we would not wish to use such terminology. As stated in The State of EIA Practice in the UK, IEMA (2011):</p> <p><i>"Given that the EIA regulations do not set out terms for evaluating whether the assessment's findings are significant or not, the phrase [in EIA terms] could also be seen to be misleading as those considering an EIA's findings may assume that the results have not reached a specified legal threshold."</i></p> <p>It is acknowledged that the EIA Regulations require the identification of all likely significant effects. In addition, as already mentioned, whilst it is also important to understand the level of significance attributed to a receptor it is recognised that there are no specified legal thresholds for significance. Although in some of the assessments, thresholds have been set (e.g. Chapters 6, 12 and 14), these are employed to provide a clear narrative as well as to direct a proportionate approach to prevent, reduce or possibly offset 'significant' effects (Shaping Quality Development, IEMA 2015). This does not mean however, that in these chapters, effects of minor significance are given any less weight by the assessor than moderate or major effects considered to be 'significant' as demonstrated in Tables 12.11 (APP-127) and 14.7 (APP-129) where mitigation has been applied for effects of minor significance as well as for effects that might be considered of greater significance.</p> <p>For Chapters 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 (APP-122 to 126), these marine topics have used guidance from the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) 2019 Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine when undertaking these assessments. Employment of this methodology was consulted upon at Scoping as well as during the Section 42 consultation on the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report and the relevant consultees (i.e. Natural England, JNCC, Environment Agency and the MMO) agreed with this approach. It is important to note that it is common in our experience that ecological assessments follow a different approach than the matrix approach described in Chapter 4 (APP-119) to impact assessments and the identification of significant effects compared to many other of the EIA topics. This is substantially a reflection of the more detailed, nationally recognised and tested, guidance available through the CIEEM and a desire for a consistent approach to be followed by the practice in all its ecological assessment.</p> <p>Whilst there may be perceived benefits in maintaining a standard correlation matrix and determination of levels of significance through the matrix system, for ecological assessment, it is considered that this standard approach could impose an unhelpful and unreasonable constraint upon the implementation of tried and tested significance thresholds. CIEEM do not advocate the use of the matrix-based approach and the methodology which results in either 'significant' or 'not significant' effects. It is also deemed unrealistic to expect that such topics, which rely upon considerable professional judgement, should be shoe-horned into an assessment framework that is more suited to other disciplines where, for example, measured readings are then taken and set against an established technical threshold in order to determine whether they are 'significant' or not.</p>
<p>EIA1.6.8</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Does the approach to the classification of mitigation measures used in the EIA and set out in the ES [APP-119] (notably 'embedded' mitigation) accord with IEMA guidance, especially <i>Shaping Quality Development</i>, IEMA, November 2015?</p> <p>Have all primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures (as defined in the IEMA guidance) been dealt with in accordance with that guidance?</p>	<p>The approach aligns with the IEMA guidance in terms of how the Applicant has applied the general principles, however the terminology for mitigation measures with respect to primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures has not been adopted.</p> <p>The use of the terms 'embedded' and 'additional' mitigation has been used to identify whether a measure is inherent within the design or construction measures (embedded) or is considered additional and not incorporated into the design or construction measures of the Proposed Development (additional). Further descriptions of what constitutes embedded and additional mitigation are provided in sections 4.7.2 and 4.7.3, respectively, of ES Chapter 4 (EIA Methodology) (APP-119).</p>
<p>EIA1.6.9</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>At 20.7.5.16, the ES [APP-135] raises the unlikely possibility of the works causing a 'catastrophic failure' in coastal flood defences and blocked watercourses (fluvial). It is unclear from the ES if this is considered significant and how the requirements of Schedule 4 (parts 5 and 8) of the EIA Regulations have been addressed. Could the Applicant please clarify.</p>	<p>Sections 4.2.2.6 to 4.2.2.9 of Chapter 4 (Methodology) of the 2019 ES (APP-119) addresses the requirement to consider major accidents and/or disasters. The Screening for Major Accidents and Disasters (APP-363) addresses the potential vulnerability of the Proposed Development to major accidents and/or disasters. In addition to where the development may give rise to significant effects as a result of major accidents and/or disasters, as required by the EIA Regulations (Schedule 4, Part 8). The Screening exercise identifies where there is potential for significant effects Schedule 4 (Part 5) of the EIA Regulations and identifies</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>which Chapter of the ES assesses the effect under Schedule 4(Part 8). In this case the effect is assessed in Chapter 20 of the ES, Surface Water Resources and Flood Risk (APP-135).</p> <p>Section 20.7.5.16 of APP-135 considers potential worst-case impacts prior to the implementation of mitigation and enhancement measures, including the potential for damage to flood defences causing catastrophic failure. Section 20.9 of APP-135 details construction principles and the requirement to obtain relevant consents and permits for works within the isolated flood risk areas throughout the Cable Corridor which is included within section 5.7 of the original Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (APP-505) and retained in the updated Onshore Outline CEMP, notably:</p> <p><i>“Appointed Contractor (and any sub-contractors) will need to ensure any works over, under or directly adjacent to watercourses/watercourse structures (culvert/sewer) and flood defences are subject to approval or exemption of environmental permits (flood risk activities permit/ordinary watercourse consent), where the contractor will need to develop appropriate design and construction methodologies to ensure that flood risk is not increased, the integrity of these features are not negatively impacted, flow conveyance is not impacted and there is suitable pollution prevention measures in place during the Construction and Operational Stages.”</i> and</p> <p><i>“The Appointed Contractor (and any sub-contractors) for works within flood zone 2 or 3, or directly adjacent to, should ensure a flood warning/ evacuation plan with appropriate training to staff as deemed appropriate will be in place to ensure staff are aware of the potential risk and able to adopt suitable procedures in relation to flood risk (e.g. halt works if there is an immediate risk of flooding and evacuate to safe place).”</i></p> <p>Requirement 15 (Construction environmental management plan) of the draft DCO (APP-019) requires the submission of a construction environment management plan, in accordance with the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505), therefore securing the measures for works adjacent to watercourse, watercourse crossings, works adjacent to flood defences and works within Flood Zone 2 and 3.</p> <p>Table 20.12 of APP-135 summarises the pre-mitigation significance for the potential effect on ‘construction workers’ and ‘residents, users and associated infrastructure of the surrounding area’ and reassesses the potential impacts with consideration and implementation of the measures set out within 20.9 and 5.7 of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505). For both receptors this considers the potential for failure in the flood defences and based on the proposed mitigation the residual effect is considered by the Applicant to be negligible for ‘residents, users and associated infrastructure of the surrounding area’ and minor for ‘construction workers’. This is because it is envisaged that proportionate protection will be obtained through environmental permits that must be approved by the Environment Agency prior to commencement of works. Those will include</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>detail of construction methodologies and safe system of works that shall be followed during construction to subsequently reduce the pre-mitigation risk and where it would be unacceptable for works to progress in these locations without prior approval of such permits.</p>
<p>EIA1.6.10</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Please respond to RWE Renewables' Relevant Representation [RR-018]. How would the Proposed Development interact with or affect plans for the Rampion Extension offshore wind farm? Are there likely to be any cumulative construction or operation effects that would have a significant adverse effect on the marine environment?</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to RWER's Relevant Representation (RR-018) within Section 6.2 of the Responses to Relevant Representation (document reference 7.8.2).</p> <p>It is important to note that that the Rampion Extension (Rampion 2) project was not known when the UK Marine Cable Corridor for the Proposed Development was being investigated. The Rampion 2 project only passed a plan-level HRA undertaken by The Crown Estate in August 2019, and the Applicant is aware that the project is still at early stages of development which is made evident from information contained within the Rampion 2 Scoping Report (EN010117-000006) submitted by Rampion Extension Development Ltd.(RED) very recently. Given that Rampion 2 is considerably further behind in the application stage than AQUIND Interconnector and that start and finish dates of the indicative construction programme for Rampion 2 are not yet determined, it is not yet clear whether construction of the two schemes will coincide. As such, based upon the available information to date it is not possible to undertake a meaningful cumulative assessment at this time.</p> <p>However, the Applicant is keen to ensure that RED adequately considers AQUIND Interconnector when designing and refining the proposals for Rampion 2, including any potential interactions during the construction and operational periods of both projects, as well as ensuring there is adequate consideration of how the proposals for Rampion 2 may give rise to cumulative effects in connection with AQUIND Interconnector within the cumulative effects assessment for the Rampion 2 project. These matters will be better dealt with through further direct engagement between RED and AQUIND project teams as the proposals for Rampion 2 are developed.</p> <p>The Applicant is already engaging directly with project team for Rampion 2 about the respective projects and the queries that have been raised within the Relevant Representation (RR-018). It has been agreed with RWER/RED that a SoCG is not required between themselves and the Applicant. In addition, the Applicant recently provided a consultation response on the Rampion 2 Scoping Report as a Consultation Body. In meeting the requirements of the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017 and in accordance with the requirements of PINS Advice Note Seventeen, the Applicant expects that RED will provide a comprehensive analysis of the potential direct and indirect cumulative environmental effects resulting from Rampion 2. RED are welcome to employ the detailed information provided within the AQUIND Application documentation to inform their assessments and baseline reporting where relevant, and AQUIND Ltd., in meeting their duty under Regulation 11 (3) of the Infrastructure Planning (EIA)</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>Regulations 2017 are happy to continue engagement with RED at their request to assist in their information gathering exercise relating to their design evolution and impact assessments relevant to the preparation of their ES.</p>
<p>EIA1.6.11</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>In relation to the cumulative assessment in the ES [APP-144], additional mitigation (over and above that proposed for the proposed project's impact alone) is identified as necessary in Table 29.14 in relation to the following inter-project cumulative effects. Please can the Applicant identify how and where these measures are secured through the dDCO [APP-019]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ID 67/ Landscape character/ construction; • ID 67/ Land use and infrastructure/ construction; • ID 67/ Tranquillity/ construction; • ID 67/ Visual amenity/ construction; • ID 68/ Landscape character/ construction; • ID 68/ Land use and infrastructure/ construction; • ID 68/ Tranquillity/ construction; • ID 68/ Visual amenity/ construction; • ID 68/ Loss of calcareous grassland/ construction; • ID 68/ Landscape character/ operation; • ID 68/ Visual amenity/ operation. 	<p>The Mitigation Schedule (APP-489 Rev002) will be updated to include the additional mitigation measures identified in Table 29.14 and identifies the means by which those controls and measures will be secured. The updated Mitigation Schedule will be submitted at Deadline 2.</p>
<p>EIA1.6.12</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>In ES Table 29.17 [APP-144], the entry for benthic habitats/ physical processes/ marine water and sediment quality suggests that as one of the potentially additive or synergistic effects is '<i>not predicted to be significant</i>', no significant additive or synergistic effects are predicted. This approach seems to conflict with the generally accepted tenet (as acknowledged at ES 29.1.1.2 [APP-144]) that, while the environmental effects of a particular activity considered in isolation on a single resource or receptor may not be significant, when considered in combination with other non-significant effects, the resulting cumulative effect may be significant. Could the Applicant please clarify and explain which of these two approaches has been taken to cumulative effects in the EIA generally.</p> <p>Similarly, in relation to the HRA, the footnotes to the integrity matrices in Appendix 1 to the HRA Report (Planning Inspectorate Screening and Integrity Matrices) [APP-501] state that the Proposed Development would not give rise to adverse effects on integrity alone, and accordingly there is no possibility for adverse effects in-combination (for example footnotes a and b of Integrity Matrix 1B). This approach overlooks the potential for minor effects from the Proposed Development to interact with the effects from other plans or projects resulting in adverse effects on integrity overall. Can the Applicant</p>	<p>Cumulative/Synergistic effects assessments:</p> <p>Cumulative effects have been assessed within each chapter of the ES and accompanying appendices and synergistically between topic chapters in Table 29.17 in Chapter 29 (APP-144).</p> <p>The cumulative assessment(s) took into account all the potential effects (both significant and non-significant) in determination of whether significant cumulative effects were predicted to arise as a result of the Proposed Development with other relevant project and plans. Cumulative assessment was not undertaken in a pair-wise fashion with other plans and projects but cumulatively, in-combination with all others.</p> <p>Similarly, for synergistic effects between the receptors mentioned, the assessments took into account all potential effects (both significant and non-significant) in their determination however, the assessors were of the opinion that as all effects were of such low magnitude and limited in temporal and spatial extent, that there was no potential for significant effects to arise synergistically or additively.</p> <p>HRA Appendix 1 [APP-501]:</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>provide further justification in support of excluding the possibility that such effects could occur?</p> <p>Are any EIA or HRA reassessments necessary?</p>	<p>In relation to HRA, all significant and non-significant potential effects resulting from relevant plans or projects which have temporal and spatial overlap with the Proposed Development (Appendix 3; APP-503) were included for in-combination assessment.</p> <p>Upon review, the summary provided in Footnote a. [of Integrity Matrix 1B] which states '<i>...As no significant effects are predicted for the Proposed Development, there is no contribution to in combination displacement. Therefore, there is no adverse effect on site integrity in combination.</i>' Inaccurately records the process of assessment undertaken and will be amended. All significant and non-significant potential disturbance and displacement effects to little terns from the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA resulting from the plans or projects which have temporal and spatial overlap with the Proposed Development were considered for the in-combination assessment of this effect. As such, the methodology has not overlooked the potential for minor or non-significant effects from the Proposed Development to interact adversely with the effects of other projects and plans in-combination.</p> <p>The same need for revision applies to footnote b [of Integrity Matrix 1B] which states '<i>...As no significant effects are predicted for the Proposed Development, there is no contribution to in combination effects on prey species. Therefore, there is no adverse effect on site integrity in combination.</i>' All significant and non-significant potential indirect effects to little, common and Sandwich terns from the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA resulting from other plans or projects which have temporal and spatial overlap with the Proposed Development were considered for the in-combination assessment of this effect. Again, the methodology has not overlooked the potential for minor or non-significant effects from the Proposed Development to interact adversely with the effects of other projects and plans in-combination.</p> <p>The in combination HRA assessments were carried out correctly and no need for any reassessment is identified.</p> <p>Cumulative effects have been assessed within each chapter of the ES and accompanying appendices and synergistically between topic chapters in Table 29.17 in Chapter 29 (APP-144).</p>
EIA1.6.13	The Applicant	<p>In paragraph 30.2.21.3 of the [APP-145], the inclusion in this context of the beneficial effect on regional and national employment generation could be taken as an indication that it is significant. Could the Applicant please clarify if this is the case.</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that the effect on regional and national employment generation is not significant.</p> <p>This effect was omitted from the list of effects that were assessed as not significant in error (it also does not appear in the list of effects that were assessed as significant in APP-145 paragraph 30.2.21.2).</p>
EIA1.6.14	The Applicant	<p>ES Appendices 2.1 [APP-350] and 3.2 [APP-356] include acronyms/ abbreviations that are neither explained nor included in the glossary. Please</p>	<p>The acronyms/ abbreviations have been added to the Glossary (APP-006 Rev002).</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		could the Applicant provide clarification for the benefit of non-specialised readers.	
EIA1.6.15	The Applicant	At ES 2.4.5.2 [APP-117], bullet 1, sub-bullet 2, should 'appropriate' be 'inappropriate'?	This is a typo, sub-bullet two should read '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 is included in the Errata Sheet (document reference 7.8.1.1) submitted as Appendix 1 of the ES Addendum at Deadline 1.
EIA1.6.16	The Applicant	Chapter 3 of the ES [APP-118] states that the onshore trenches would be backfilled with thermal resistant material such as cement bound sand, although this would vary subject to the spacing of the trenches. What alternative techniques may be used for backfilling the onshore trenches, and where are the environmental effects of the alternatives considered?	<p>The Applicant can advise that the most likely alternative duct surround material to Cement Bound Sand (CBS), where the thermal conditions are particularly demanding (e.g. the cables have to be installed close together or at increased depth), or where loadings are high (e.g. at road junctions) is concrete, which, in the latter case, may be reinforced, usually with steel mesh. Concrete, similar to CBS, is not considered a source of contaminants. It is likely to be marginally less efficient in terms of consumption of resources. The Applicant can confirm that the adoption of this alternative does not change the conclusions of the ES.</p> <p>There are further alternatives to cement to bind the sand, however they provide insufficient thermal resistance rating for the cable performance which would need to be reviewed to ensure it is adequate. CBS is a well-known and widely used material for the layer around the ducts/cables as it's both thermally and mechanically stable and would indicate it is still used for the ducts/cables surround.</p>
EIA1.6.17	The Applicant	Please could the Applicant ensure that all sources of baseline data used in the ES are dated and provide the relevant information for any that are not. These may include, <i>inter alia</i> , data sets in Chapters 8, 9, 13, 19, 20 and 26 of the ES ([APP-124], [APP-128], [APP-134], [APP-135] and [APP-141]).	A review has been undertaken to ensure that all sources of baseline data contained in the ES, including surveys, are dated. Those that have not been included within the ES, are provided in Appendix 7 to this document (document reference 7.4.1.7). This comprises both onshore and marine assessment chapters.
EIA1.6.18	The Applicant	In Chapters 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 of the ES ([APP-122], [APP-123], [APP-124], [APP-125] and [APP-126]), a significant effect is determined as an impact that is likely to result in a ' <i>change in the ecosystem structure and function</i> '. Please can the Applicant describe what constitutes such a change and how this relates to the assessment of significant effects.	<p>The Chartered Institute for Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM, 2019) provides guidance for EIA practitioners in their Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) for terrestrial, freshwater, coastal and marine developments. These guidelines state (page 11, Box 3) that '<i>In broad terms, significant effects encompass impacts on structure and function of defined sites, habitats or ecosystems and the conservation status of habitats and species (including extent, abundance and distribution).</i>'</p> <p>In this context, significant effects would be categorised as those that cause a change in the receptor at a scale that alters the services that receptor provides to the wider ecosystem thereby changing the structure of the system and/or altering the functions of receptors in that system. For example, bottom-up effects such as loss of sufficient habitat which provides a key service to another species e.g. spawning/nursery grounds, at a scale that could affect population levels with potential knock on effects to food resource at higher trophic levels. Or</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>conversely, top-down ecosystem effects associated with mortality to or displacement of apex predators such as piscivorous bird species.</p>
<p>EIA1.6.19</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Both receptor sensitivity and magnitude of impact have been determined in Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-126], but how they combine to determine the significance of effect does not seem to have been described. Can the Applicant explain how sensitivity and magnitude of impact have been combined to determine significance?</p>	<p>As explained in Section 11.4.4 in Chapter 11 of the ES (APP-126), receptor importance and magnitude of impact have both been considered when determining impact significance. For the purpose of assessment, impact magnitude is considered to incorporate receptor sensitivity. As such, a given impact may be considered higher magnitude for particularly sensitive receptors and lower impact for less sensitive receptors.</p> <p>For example, little tern is considered as being of moderate sensitivity to disturbance from vessel traffic (Garthe & Hüppop, 2004; Bradbury <i>et al.</i>, 2014). Construction phase disturbance and displacement impacts are assessed to be of minor adverse magnitude and non-significant for this receptor. However, for the same impact, black-headed gull, which is considered to be amongst the least sensitive species to disturbance at sea (Garthe & Hüppop, 2004; Bradbury <i>et al.</i>, 2014), the equivalent impact magnitude is assessed as negligible and non-significant.</p>
<p>EIA1.6.20</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>In various parts of the ES, such as Chapters 8 [APP-123] and 22 [APP-137], there are suggestions that the maximum footprint of direct impacts from the Proposed Development would be confirmed during the final route design. Can the Applicant explain what assumptions were applied in the EIA when determining the worst-case scenario and the maximum potential effect on receptors within the Proposed Development's zone of impact?</p>	<p>Appendix 3.2 of the ES (APP-356) provides the worst-case design parameters for the different activities associated with the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The parameters approach presents the maximum envelope within which the development may be built, and an assessment of the full extent of parameters ensures the comprehensive 'worst case' assessment of the full area within which the Proposed Development could be brought forward. This ensures the assessment of environmental effects associated with the Proposed Development is of the worst case taking into account all optionality, and that the actual development to be carried out, within the parameters, could be no worse than the effects reported in the ES. The detailed design and construction methodology for the Proposed Development will be developed within these parameters without the need for further assessment, in line with PINS Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope.</p> <p>In the assessment presented in Chapter 22 (Traffic and Transport) (APP-137), a programme for construction of the Onshore Cable Route (as detailed in the FTMS (APP-449) works has not been included as part of the embedded mitigation, while the impacts of construction of the Converter Station have been based upon peak construction period. This means that the worst-case scenario has been assessed on the basis of disruptive works transpiring simultaneously. Such an approach ensures that the impacts are robustly identified and quantified. In terms of impacts such as noise on receptors, the initial noise prediction has followed a 'worst-case' assumption, by calculating the construction noise level based on the distance between a receptor and the closest point of construction works. Where this has resulted in a greater than negligible impact being identified, a 'typical-case' has also been calculated, which is based on the</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>distance between a receptor and the central point of the construction works. In each instance, the calculations follow the methodology set out BS 5228-1.</p> <p>From a marine perspective, Table 8.6 of Chapter 8 (APP-12) for example (and the similar tables within the other marine chapters) provides the worst-case design scenarios assessed for the particular receptors identified, as individual receptors will be impacted differently by different design parameters.</p> <p>The final route design and the resulting effects will fall within the design envelope described in Appendix 3.2 and the worst-case scenarios assessed in each chapter. For example, project engineers have calculated that the maximum amount of dredged material to be disposed of within the disposal sites is predicted to be up to 1,754,000 m³ as a worst case based on assumptions originating from the geophysical/geotechnical surveys, the cable burial risk assessment as well as previous project experience. This parameter was then employed for the sediment plume dispersion modelling undertaken and reported in Chapter 6 Physical Processes (APP-121) and Appendix 6.2 Modelling Technical Report (APP-368) which then informed the assessments within Chapter 8 (APP-123) Table. 8.6 and paragraph 8.6.4.31. The dDCO (APP-019) secures this maximum parameter in Schedule 15, Part 1, Paragraph 2(7) and 4(3) and the final route design will be constrained by this maximum parameter as this is what has been assessed within the ES.</p>

Table 1.7 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Flood Risk

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
FR1.7.1	Portsmouth City Council	<p>Given the schedule, nature and extent of planned improvement works to the coastal flood defences on Portsea Island, do you have any concerns that the Proposed Development could have adverse implications or threaten the effectiveness and efficiency of the works? If so, please provide specific, evidenced reasoning.</p> <p>While the proposed HDD works pass below the coastal defences and avoid direct effects, do you believe that there is any potential for sea water to use the HDD channels and bypass the coastal defences?</p> <p>The ExA would encourage Portsmouth City Council to liaise with the East Solent Coastal Partnership in the formulation of a response to this question.</p>	
FR1.7.2	Environment Agency	Is there any likely interaction between the Proposed Development and existing and proposed coastal flood defences on Portsea Island and do you envisage that the proposed works could compromise the integrity of the defences?	

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		Do you see any reason why you might not grant the relevant permits and consents for any of the proposed works over, under or adjacent to the coastal defences?	
FR1.7.3	The Applicant	The flood risk assessment [APP-439] refers to Flood Zone 3 and does not differentiate between Flood Zones 3a and 3b. Taking into account applicable policy (including that set out in NPS EN-1), does the Applicant believe that a more detailed map is necessary to show the distinction?	<p>Local planning authorities should identify in their Strategic Flood Risk Assessments areas of functional floodplain and its boundaries accordingly, in agreement with the Environment Agency where Flood Zone 3 is split into zones 3a and 3b, however the Environment Agency do not split the zone and as such the Flood Map for Planning only identifies Flood Zone 3.</p> <p>Flood Zone 3b is defined in NPPF 2019 as the functional floodplain and is classified as land where water has to flow or be stored in time of flooding. Functional floodplain usually applies to fluvial environments as the loss of these areas can result in the displacement of flood water and/ or reduce conveyance, both of which could increase flood risk elsewhere. This definition of Flood Zone 3b is not typically relevant to tidal/ coastal floodplains.</p> <p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) defines functional floodplain locations. The most recent joint SFRA commissioned by the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) (2016) indicates that coastal flooding is not considered functional floodplain and states: <i>“Modelling information to define the fluvial functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3b) is currently only available for the Wallington Stream and the Tadburn Lake Stream. For the remainder of the main rivers, the SFRA has assumed that the functional floodplain is the whole of the high probability flood area (Flood Zone 3). This is a conservative approach that should be updated in the future when modelling information becomes available.”</i></p> <p>It is noted that the joint PUSH SFRA (2016) for the region is currently being reviewed and this review/ update is not publicly available. The published guidance on PCC’s website refers the reader <i>“In the meantime, you can use the GOV.UK flood map for planning tool to find out which flood zone a location is in. If you’re planning a development, you may need to undertake a more detailed flood risk assessment depending on what zone it is located within.”</i></p> <p>Since the preparation of the Flood Risk Assessment (APP-439) new coastal modelling has been published by the Environment Agency which has resulted in an increase in the tidal flood extent. This new information has been considered within the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum (document reference 7.8.1.8) which forms Appendix 8 to the Environmental Statement Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) and a updated flood zone map (APP-309 Rev02) has also been prepared.</p> <p>The Applicant has consulted with the Environment Agency following the change in the Flood Map for Planning in January 2020. Correspondence with the Environment Agency (June 2020) confirmed that despite the building now being in Flood Zone 3, the EA is still comfortable with the building being located there</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>based on its usage (i.e. non-residential) and the approach outlined regarding in-built mitigation.</p> <p>The change in Flood Map for Planning and correspondence with the Environment Agency has informed the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum (document reference 7.8.1.8) and associated tidal/ coastal flood risk mitigation for the Proposed Development (e.g. ORS Buildings flood resilience measures).</p> <p>Functional floodplain is not considered to be of concern within the tidal/ coastal flood extent of the Proposed Development as it has not been raised by the Environment Agency, it is not included with the SFRA and there is no coastal/ tidal Flood Zone 3b shown on any publicly available mapping.</p> <p>If, however, this area becomes classified as functional floodplain, proportionate measures could be implemented to ensure compliance with NPPF and NPS EN-1 which states: “any energy projects proposed in Flood Zone 3b” [...] “should only be permitted if the development will not result in a net loss of floodplain storage and will not impede water flows”.</p> <p>Based on the above we do not consider differentiation between Flood Zone 3a and 3b to be required to inform this assessment.</p>
FR1.7.4	The Applicant Environment Agency	If the flood risk assessment [APP-439] allowed differentiation between Flood Zones 3a and 3b, would there need to be any changes to the Proposed Development’s approach to mitigation in the event that part of the development fell within Flood Zone 3b?	With reference to the applicant’s response to FR1.7.3 it is unlikely that the tidal environment would be classified as Flood Zone 3b. However, if the ORS area becomes classified as functional floodplain within Flood Zone 3b, following NPPF and NPS EN-1, proportionate measures (for example, localised re-grading and lowering of carpark finished levels) could be implemented to ensure the Proposed Development would not result in a reduction in conveyance or loss of floodplain volume.
FR1.7.5	The Applicant	In relation to flood risk assessment policy, would the Optical Regeneration Station fall within the definition of essential infrastructure if it is not of paramount importance for the operation of the interconnector?	The Optical Regeneration Station (ORS) is critical to the operation of the interconnector, required to amplify the signal of the fibre optic cable which is required for cable control, protection and monitoring purposes. As such the ORS is considered to be essential infrastructure.
FR1.7.6	The Applicant	ES Appendix 3.5 [APP-359] notes at 1.2.3 that the design of the Converter Station includes provision for the installation of a deluge system to deal with fires. Could the Applicant provide more detail on how the drainage design for the site would deal with the operation of this system and indicate how and where this has been accounted for in the FRA and surface water drainage and contamination strategy in terms of water quantity.	<p>The Applicant has explained the provision for the installation of a deluge system within Section 4.2.2 of the updated Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy (APP-360 Rev 002) that is submitted as Appendix 7 to the updated Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (APP-505 Rev 002), and in turn secured under requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019)</p> <p>The oil containment drainage is shown in solid red on drawing AQ_WSP-UK-CS-DR-Z-200807 Indicative Oil Containment layout in Appendix 2 of the Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy forming part of the updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002) and secured under requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
FR1.7.7	The Applicant	<p>How would surface water be managed and disposed of at HDD compounds?</p> <p>How would these compounds be protected from a flood risk event and would such protection give rise to the potential for increased flood risk elsewhere?</p>	<p>The content of the Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy, which forms Appendix 7 of the updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002), within section 9 includes details in relation to construction water management and earthworks. Following consultation with Portsmouth Water and the Environment Agency, the Applicant is preparing a Generic Method Statement to be submitted at Deadline 2, to cover outline construction water management and earthwork management plan in more detail, which will include the HDD compounds. The Generic method statement will set out the minimum technical requirement for the construction water management and earthworks to mitigate the contamination of the Aquifer and surface water flooding during the construction by the Applicant's contractor. The Applicant's Contractor will prepare their construction water management and earthwork management plan in full compliance with this document and will submit to statutory authorities and other stakeholders prior to commencement of the construction. The Generic Method Statement will, when finalised, form an Appendix to the Onshore Outline CEMP and will be secured via requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019). This document will be submitted at Deadline 2.</p> <p>If flood risk protection is required for the HDD sites it can be provided in the form of a raised earth bund surrounding the perimeter of each site. The bunds can be formed from the excavated topsoil removed during site setup. In addition, the landfall HDD could have an earth bund surrounding the point where the drill pipes enter the ground.</p> <p>To ensure Surface Water/Watercourse protection all work is required to be in compliance with the Onshore Outline CEMP and Appendix 7 of the Onshore Outline CEMP 'Surface Water and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy' (APP-505 Rev002).</p>
FR1.7.8	The Applicant	<p>With reference to paragraph 20.9.2.8 of Chapter 20 of the ES [APP-135], whilst the flood warning evacuation plan would be in place for trained staff, would such a plan be published locally so that affected residents and businesses are aware of road closures, blockages etc? What measures could be put in place to inform and ensure the public are not prejudiced in the event of a flood evacuation requirement? How could such measures be controlled through any DCO?</p>	<p>The measures detailed within 20.9.2.8 of ES Chapter 20 (APP-135) relate to measures specifically to protect site workers during construction who are being temporarily introduced to an area at risk of flooding in the event of a potential flood event with no causal relationship to the works being undertaken (i.e. caused by extreme weather conditions).</p> <p>All proposed road closures are located outside for the Flood Map for Planning Flood Zone 2 and 3 therefore emergency planning for fluvial and tidal flooding is not expected to be a concern.</p> <p>A number of road closures are in an area at risk of flooding from Farlington No. 9 reservoir, however these would not preclude evacuation in time of flood as alternative access/ egress routes exist. As detailed within the Framework Traffic Management Strategy (FTMS) (APP-449) Appendix 1 (Onshore Cable Route Construction Impacts on Access to Properties and Car Parking and Communication Strategy) Section 4.3 where there are full road closures, vehicular access will be unavailable for the entirety of the road closure, including</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>outside of construction working hours, except in emergencies. Road plates will be available at the point of work at all times, should emergency access be required. At the end of the working day road plates would be installed to allow for out of hours emergency access/ egress only. Out of hours emergency access will be provided by an onsite standby emergency team. In any case where appropriate where closures are in place, there will be diversion signs of alternative routes when an alternative route exists, and pedestrian access should also be maintained.</p> <p>Based on this is the applicant does not consider any prejudice to members of the public in the event of a flood evacuation being required (i.e. caused by extreme weather conditions).</p>

Table 1.8 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Habitats and Ecology (Onshore)

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
HAB1.8.1	The Applicant	Why does Figure 3.13 in Volume 2 of the ES [APP-158], the Environmental Constraints Map, not show the various SINCS and Local Wildlife Sites referred to elsewhere in the application documentation?	<p>The constraints map at Figure 3.13 has been updated (APP-158 Rev02) to include the SINCS, and the map submitted alongside the updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002), Appendix 1.</p> <p>WCC has requested inclusion of new Soake Farm Meadows SINC on 30 August 2020 and this has also been incorporated into the updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002), Appendix 1.</p>
HAB1.8.2	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 5.1.1.3 of the HRA Report [APP-491] states that all European sites within 10km of the onshore and intertidal Order limits were initially included within the Habitats Regulations Assessment. Could the Applicant explain why the distance of 10km was chosen?</p> <p>How does this distance relate to the zones of influence of the Proposed Development, including those set out in the ES?</p>	<p>A 10 km study area for European sites was detailed in both Chapter 16 of the ES (APP-131) and the HRA Report (APP-491). A study area, while related to and informed by a Zone of Influence, should also account for regional context of the assessment made. The selection of 10km for European sites is considered in the Applicant’s professional opinion to be a suitably precautionary distance to account for potential connectivity and therefore Zones of Influence with the Proposed Development through either hydrological or terrestrial habitat linkages and accounting for the mobility of qualifying features such as birds.</p> <p>The study area applied to the HRA has been detailed to Natural England throughout the consultation process for the Proposed Development. The agreement on its suitability will be outlined as an agreement between the two parties in the Statement of Common Ground (document reference 7.5.11) to be submitted alongside these responses at Deadline 1.</p>
HAB1.8.3	The Applicant Natural England	The ES reports some difficulties gaining access to land for surveys. To what extent does this mean that the knowledge of onshore ecology is not comprehensive, and are the assumptions that have been made in lieu of full survey results fair and reasonable for an informed assessment?	<p>Descriptions of survey access limitations have been included to be candid about difficulties faced when undertaking ecological field work. Two access limitations are highlighted in the Chapter 16 of the ES (APP-131):</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>1) Great crested newt Habitat Suitability Index surveys were limited where it was not safe for surveyors to approach waterbodies (see Table 16.1 in ES Chapter 16 (APP-131)). In these cases, the waterbodies could be scoped out of survey remotely as those in question were clearly saline and could not support this amphibian species.</p> <p>2) Badger surveys were limited as land access was not available to the north of the Order Limits (see paragraph 16.5.1.27). However, the badger sett within the Order limits has been adequately clarified with the survey data available. Consultation with NE on the data and proposed mitigation led to NE issuing a Letter of No Impediment (APP-490). Thus, the Applicant considers the badger survey data is robust.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that there are no gaps within the survey data and Natural England have confirmed the adequacy of surveys in the Statement of Common Ground (document reference 7.5.11) that will be submitted alongside these responses at Deadline 1.</p>
HAB1.8.4	Natural England	Is Natural England satisfied there is reasonable justification for the final scope of assessment of ecological receptors as set in Table 16.1 of the ES [APP-131]?	
HAB1.8.5	The Applicant	Many of the entries on Table 16.1 of the ES [APP-131] (which is said to list elements scoped out of the assessment) include references to surveys being undertaken and a conclusion of no likely significant effect. Many then occur in the 'scope of assessment' section (16.4.2) and the associated 16.3 (for example, great crested newt and hazel dormouse). Could the Applicant clarify if these matters have been scoped out of the assessment or not.	This is a consequence of the sequence of the document and not the logic of the assessment. Feature scoping (Table 16.1, APP-131) appears before the list of surveys undertaken that informed the baseline (Table 16.3). All features listed as scoped out are indeed scoped out of the assessment, regardless of whether they are covered by survey work listed in Table 16.3.
HAB1.8.6	The Applicant	Paragraph 18.1.1.3 of the ES [APP-133] and the Onshore Ecology Chapter (16) [APP-131] include references to the possibility of accidental spillages of materials and surface runoff during construction works, but it is not clear where potential impacts associated with the possible establishment of pathways between existing ground contamination and ecological receptors (i.e. those listed at 18.1.1.2) are addressed. Please clarify.	The only potential impacts from contamination to ecological features will be from accidental spillages during the construction phase with mitigating measures discussed in the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) and Section 16.6.1.2 of Chapter 16 (APP-131). Chapter 18 (Ground Conditions) of the ES (APP-133) has not discussed ecology as a receptor to contamination as there are no agricultural sources (pesticides and ammonia) next to sensitive surface water receptors.
HAB1.8.7	The Applicant Natural England	Should the ES include an assessment of potential effects of the EMF along the onshore cable route on terrestrial wildlife, and in particular protected species such as bats?	There are no known over ground EMF outputs from the Proposed Development that would affect ecological features and therefore an assessment of the potential effects of EMF on terrestrial wildlife along the cable route is not considered necessary. Advice on potentially sensitive species such as bats focuses on antennas and masts rather than underground cable operations ¹⁶ whereby lower

¹⁶ https://cdn.bats.org.uk/pdf/About%20Bats/Radiowaves_and_bats_2011.pdf?mtime=20190425112350

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			levels of EMF are not considered to significantly negatively impact bats in any case.
HAB1.8.8	The Applicant	<p>With reference to paragraph 16.6.2.20 of ES Chapter 16 [APP-131], were no alternative locations investigated for the HDD work compound proposed for the King's Pond Meadow SINC?</p> <p>If so, where are the results of the alternatives assessment set out?</p> <p>If not, why not?</p>	<p>No HDD work compounds are proposed within the boundaries of Kings Pond Meadows SINC. As explained at paragraphs 2.4.5.1 and 2.6.6.5 of ES Chapter 2 (Alternatives) (APP-117), alternative compound areas were considered by the Applicant, however, an HDD compound from the north of Anmore Road was not considered to be practicable as it would require HDD to pass below residential properties and posed risks to protected aquifers in the locality (see Table 2.8 in ES Chapter 2 (APP-117)). The proposed location for this compound is east of the Kings Pond Meadow SINC. Options for the location of the southern HDD compound at Denmead Meadows has been retained in the application for the Proposed Development (see ES Chapter 1 (Description of Proposed Development), paragraph 3.6.4.17 (APP-118), with discussions ongoing with Natural England in this regard with the Applicants preferred option to locate the southern HDD compound to the north of the road.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a HDD Position Statement (document reference 7.7.3) which provides additional information relating to the HDD proposed in the vicinity of Kings Pond/Denmead Meadows.</p>
HAB1.8.9	The Applicant	<p>Can the Applicant confirm that there are no additional mitigation measures relied on in the HRA that are not included in the ES and Mitigation Schedule [APP-489]?</p> <p>If there are, please can they be added to the mitigation schedule.</p>	<p>A review of mitigation applied across the ES (APP-116 – APP-506) and HRA Report (APP-491) has been undertaken and an updated Mitigation Schedule will be submitted at Deadline 2.</p> <p>Actual mitigation relied upon in the HRA is focused on the Winter Working Restriction for Features of Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA as outlined in ES Appendix 16.14 (APP-422) and updated in the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) and Appendix 18 of the ES Addendum 'Construction Noise Impacts on SWBGS Sites' (document reference 7.8.1.18). The updated HRA Report (APP-491 Rev002) is informed by the updated restrictions. No additional HRA mitigation is proposed.</p> <p>From a marine perspective, there are no mitigation measures for marine assessments relied on in the HRA (see Section 10.2.5 of APP-491) that are not also included in the ES (APP-116 – APP-506) and Mitigation Schedule (APP-490).</p>
HAB1.8.10	The Applicant MMO Natural England	<p>A 'worst-case' construction programme has been assumed in the HRA [APP-491] for both the marine and onshore works. Should this be secured through the DML in the dDCO [APP-019]? At present, the DML sets out the need for an agreed programme at condition 4(1)(b) but this is not referenced to the HRA assumption.</p> <p>Could the Applicant provide a parallel response in relation to the onshore works, referring to draft Requirement 3 of the dDCO [APP-019].</p>	<p>The HRA (APP-491) assesses the 'likely significant effects' as a consequence of the Proposed Development. The indicative programme is a tool used for the purpose of that assessment, being a reasonable estimate of the time it will take for the Proposed Development to be carried out. It is necessary for an indicative programme to be used to allow for the reporting of the 'likely significant effects' in an understandable manner. The HRA assessment is valid in respect of the works for any period within which they may commence in accordance with Requirement 2 to the dDCO (APP-019 Rev 002), having taken into account the likely evolution</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>of the environmental baseline for the period within which the works may be carried out.</p> <p>Necessary, controls are provided for within the dDCO in relation to time and seasonal sensitivities. For example, there are controls on the timing of works in the highway and also when works may be carried out in proximity to Solent Waders and Brent Geese Strategy Sites. The controls provided for are sufficient to mitigate the identified 'likely significant effects'.</p> <p>Noting the above, it is not necessary for further Requirements to be included in the Order or conditions included in the DML requiring the programme for the works to be in accordance with the indicative programme used for the purpose of the assessment. The worst-case likely significant effects have been assessed and controls included in the dDCO ensure the required mitigations apply.</p> <p>The purpose of submitting and approving a construction programme to the MMO is so that they are aware of when the works are proposed to be carried out and the timeframes for this. This is not required in any way to mitigate impacts.</p> <p>Requirement 3 to the dDCO is provided to allow for the works to be broken down into phases for the purpose of obtaining approvals in a manageable and clear manner only. This is required taking into account the linear nature of the Proposed Development. It is not included to confirm timings for the phases, and no part of Requirement 3 suggests this to be the case.</p>
HAB1.8.11	The Applicant	Goss-Custard <i>et al.</i> , 2019, is referenced at a number of places in the HRA Report [APP-491] (e.g. Table 7.10, page 662, lines 4, 5). It does not appear in the list of references at the end of the HRA Report [APP-491]. Please could this be rectified, and the full source be detailed.	The omitted reference refers to: Goss-Custard, J.D., Hoppe, C., Matt, H. and Stillman, R. A., 2020. Disturbance does not have a significant impact on waders in an estuary close to conurbations: importance of overlap between birds and people in time and space. <i>Ibis</i> , 162 (3), 845-862. This reference is included in the updated HRA Report (APP-491 Rev002) submitted at Deadline 1.
HAB1.8.12	The Applicant	Table 3.1 of the HRA Report [APP-491] and Table 1 of Appendix 3.8 to the ES [APP-362] both refer to indicative worst-case scenarios for the construction timetable. However, they do not appear to match. For example, Table 3.1 shows transition joint bay installation taking place in Quarter 3 2023 while Table 1 shows installation taking place in Quarters 2 and 3. The Applicant is requested to check and explain any discrepancies.	The updated HRA Report (APP-491) includes a corrected worst-case scenario for the construction timetable that is consistent with that presented in Appendix 3.8 of the ES (Onshore and Marine Programme) (APP-362), which has been used to inform the assessments carried out.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
HAB1.8.13	The Applicant	In their Relevant Representations, Portsmouth City Council [RR-185] and Natural England [RR-181] have raised concerns about the adequacy of the HRA in relation to in-combination effects on the integrity of the Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA, including effects on functionally linked land and the coastal flood defence works on Portsea Island and from Eastney to Old Portsmouth. The Applicant is requested to provide an updated in-combination assessment which responds to all of these concerns.	<p>An update to the ES Chapter 29 (Cumulative Effects) (APP-144), taking account of this additional application has been included in the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) submitted alongside these responses.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that Natural England requested the inclusion of the Fraser Range Fort Cumberland, Southsea application (19/00420/FUL). This development is considered to be adequately considered within ES Chapter 29 and in ES Appendix 16.15 – Onshore Ecology Cumulative Effects Matrix (Stage 1 & 2) (APP-423).</p> <p>The HRA Report (APP-491 Rev002) has also been updated to provide an updated in-combination assessment which responds to the points raised in this Written Question.</p>
HAB1.8.14	Natural England	In your Relevant Representation [RR-181], you indicate that you remain concerned about the effects on the Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA) and the Portsmouth Harbour SPA. Please could you explain your concerns in relation to the impacts on the Portsmouth Harbour SPA.	
HAB1.8.15	Natural England	Natural England is requested to confirm if it agrees with the Applicant's conclusion in the HRA Report [APP-491] that adverse effects on the integrity can be excluded in relation to the River Axe Special Area of Conservation?	
HAB1.8.16	Natural England Joint Committee for Nature Conservation	<p>Could Natural England and the Joint Committee for Nature Conservation confirm that they are satisfied with the scope of the Applicant's assessment of effects on European sites?</p> <p>Are there any other sites or site features that could be affected by the Proposed Development?</p>	
HAB1.8.17	Environment Agency Natural England	<p>The Environment Agency's Relevant Representation [RR-165] raises concerns about the effects of offshore cable installation on the migratory fish features of Special Areas of Conservation. Please could the Environment Agency explain its concerns in more detail.</p> <p>Natural England is requested to explain why it is satisfied that effects on the migratory fish features of the relevant Special Areas of Conservation would not lead to adverse effects on the integrity of these sites (Relevant Representation [RR-181] refers).</p>	
HAB1.8.18	Natural England	In your Relevant Representation [RR-181], you provide links to the conservation objectives for the two SPAs which are of concern to you but not for any of the other sites. To avoid any issues with interpretation or outdated links, please could you provide electronic copies of the conservation objectives and where relevant, the supplementary advice on conservation objectives for the European sites listed below:	

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solent and Dorset Coast SPA; • Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA; • Portsmouth Harbour SPA; • Solent and Southampton Water SPA; • Pagham Harbour SPA; • River Itchen SAC; • River Avon SAC; • River Axe SAC; • Plymouth Sound and Estuaries SAC; • Solent Maritime SAC; and • South Wight Maritime SAC. <p>Could you confirm if you think it appropriate to rely on the SPA conservation objectives for the assessment of effects on the Ramsar sites for which likely significant effects have been identified?</p>	
HAB1.8.19	The Applicant	<p>The principles that would inform the winter working restrictions designed to protect the integrity of the Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protections Area are set out in Appendix 16.14 to the ES [APP-422]. However, the wording of the principles in the Appendix appears to differ from the wording in the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy [APP-605], particularly in relation to Principle 3. The Applicant is requested to explain the apparent discrepancy.</p>	<p>Appendix 16.14 of the ES (APP-422) provides the definitive winter working restriction with respect to the application which is subject to updates presented in updated in the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) and Appendix 18 Construction Noise Impacts on SWBGS Sites (document reference 7.8.1.18).</p> <p>The updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (APP-506 Rev002) and Outline Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (APP-505 Rev002) address this discrepancy.</p>
HAB1.8.20	The Applicant	<p>Principle 2 of the winter working restriction principles listed in Appendix 16.14 to the ES [APP-422] states that no buffer zones would be applied to Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy sites and no working restrictions would apply to 'low use' sites. Could the Applicant explain:</p> <p>i) How would 'low use' Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy sites be defined?</p> <p>ii) The level of confidence the ExA can have in this approach and the findings reached in respect to adverse effects on the integrity of the Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area?</p>	<p>(i) 'Low use' SWBGS sites are defined by The Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy Steering Group as 'Sites that have records of birds but in low numbers.'</p> <p>(ii) The Applicant outlined to Natural England prior to submission that low use sites would be excluded from the Winter Working Principles Appendix 16.14 of the ES (APP-422) and this was agreed due to the low numbers of birds using these sites and the temporary impacts (if any) of the Proposed Development. Nevertheless, the Applicant is continuing dialogue with Natural England to provide further information on low use sites in order to confirm that they would be unaffected by the Proposed Development (and hence no adverse effects on integrity of Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area). The Applicant has continued consultation with Natural England in respect to impacts on SWBGS (including low use sites) and has provided the Construction Noise Impacts on SWBGS Sites in Appendix 18 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1.18). The Report includes an update to the Winter Working Principles and has informed both the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) and the updated HRA Report (APP-491 Rev002). The update to the principles is</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			captured in the revised Outline Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan submitted alongside this document (APP-505 Rev002).
HAB1.8.21	The Applicant	How would the Applicant seek to restore the Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy sites that overlap with the Order limits to their condition prior to construction? How is this secured in the dDCO [APP-019]?	The Applicant has provided Natural England a detailed overview of restoration proposals for Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy (SWBGS) sites that overlap with the Order limits. These proposals are fully detailed in the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) and inform the updated HRA Report (APP-491 Rev002) The proposals have been captured in the revised Outline Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (APP-505 Rev002) and would be secured by Requirement 15 of the dDCO.
HAB1.8.22	The Applicant	In its Relevant Representation [RR-181], Natural England has suggested amended wording in relation to Principle 7 of the winter working restriction principles. The Applicant is requested to comment on the amended wording. How can the ExA be confident that adverse effects on the integrity of the Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA would be avoided if Natural England's wording is not adopted?	The Applicant is continuing dialogue with Natural England on the implications, if any, of their suggested amendment to Principle 7. While the Applicant agrees that noise levels in excess of 69dbAmax have the potential to cause disturbance effects on waterbirds, it also notes the application of Principle 6 states that <i>'Construction works of 55 – 72 dB immediately adjacent to a major road and/or adjacent to industrial sites with notable levels of background noise can be undertaken unrestricted. It is considered that noise levels from the Proposed Development would be masked in these instances.'</i> Notwithstanding the above, the Applicant has continued consultation with Natural England respect to impacts on SWBGS (including low use sites) and has provided the Construction Noise Impacts on SWBGS Sites (document reference 7.8.1.18). The Report includes an update to the Winter Working Principles and has informed both the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) and the updated HRA Report (APP-491 Rev002). The report has fully considered the adoption of Natural England's suggested wording to Principle 7 and led to a revised list of principles that again determines that there are no adverse effects on integrity of Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area.
HAB1.8.23	The Applicant	The footnotes to the screening and integrity matrices [APP-501] do not explain the sources of the evidence used to support the conclusions presented in the footnotes. The Applicant is requested to provide updated versions of the matrices to include: i) footnotes that include cross-references to the relevant sections/ paragraphs of the ES chapters that contain the supporting evidence. ii) separate matrices for Ramsar and SPA sites. iii) the features listed in the Natural England conservation objectives or on the Ramsar information sheets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Appendix 1 of the HRA (APP-501 Rev002) has been updated to include cross references to the main HRA Report (APP-491) to provide clarity on evidence supporting the conclusions in the footnotes. ii) The HRA has been updated to include separate matrices for Ramsar sites which are now presented in Appendix 5 of the HRA (document reference 7.7.10). iii) Appendix 1 of the HRA has been updated to include the features for which sites were designated listed in the most recent Natural England conservation objectives and advice packages (March 2020) and in the Ramsar information sheets. <p>The HRA documents have been updated (APP-491 Rev 002 and APP-501 Rev 002).</p>
HAB1.8.24	The Applicant	An Additional Submission from Mrs Musson [AS-045] draws attention to a colony of stag beetles in a hedgerow that is said to be lost to the Proposed	The Applicant is aware of this Additional Submission. Stag beetle is primarily a woodland species found associated with dead wood namely fallen trees, and is

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		Development. Is the Applicant aware of this, should this be included in the EIA as a significant effect, and what measures are proposed to mitigate any effect?	<p>not known to live colonially, and hedgerows are managed to remove such materials. Thus, stag beetle are unlikely to breed at this location.</p> <p>Section 16.3.5.1 of ES Chapter 16 (APP-131) states that due to works being temporary and localised in nature and the majority being conducted within roads it was considered unlikely that invertebrate communities such as stag beetle would be affected, and they have been scoped out of the assessments. As such, the position within the ES adequately deals with the potential effects on this species.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, a hand searching method for reptiles is included within the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) to remove risks associated with any further incidental finds of stag beetle. Compliance with the Onshore Outline CEMP is secured by Requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p>

Table 1.9 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Landscape and Visual Amenity

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
LV1.9.1	South Downs National Park Authority Winchester City Council East Hampshire District Council Havant Borough Council	Do you agree with the selection of representative viewpoints used for the LVIA of the Converter Station and associated infrastructure [APP-250]? If not, why not? Do you have any comments on the presentation of baseline photographs and visualisations ([APP-251] to [APP-270])?	
LV1.9.2	South Downs National Park Authority Winchester City Council East Hampshire District Council Havant Borough Council	Do you have any comments on the appearance of the proposed 30m-high lighting columns as seen during daylight and at night-time from vantage points within the South Downs National Park and elsewhere, and should these columns have been considered in the modelling of the ZTVs?	
LV1.9.3	The Applicant	Paragraph 15.4.4.3 of the ES [APP-130] notes that the lighting columns and lightning masts have not been considered in the preparation of the ZTVs.	The lighting columns and lightning masts are narrow, slender features, small in relation to the overall massing of the Converter Station. The ZTVs show the area

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>Can the Applicant explain how lighting columns and lightning masts have been assessed in the LVIA, in relation to both daytime and night-time views?</p> <p>At what range does the Applicant consider the lighting columns and lighting masts would be visible?</p>	<p>from which there would be theoretical visibility of the main converter buildings as these are elements likely to give rise to significant adverse effects.</p> <p>It is difficult to state definitively the distance over which the lighting columns and lightning masts would be visible. Drawing on professional experience, it is considered that the lighting columns would only be likely to be noticed in immediate views whilst the lightning masts, which are very narrow structures, may be perceptible in some views from up to between one and two kilometres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) considered the Converter Station as a whole within the maximum parameter design envelope as defined on Converter Station and Telecommunications Building Parameter Plans Sheets 1 to 3 (APP-012). The Parameter Plan Sheets 1 to 3 refer to the height of the emergency lighting columns – up to 15 m high and that lightning protection masts will be located on site (within parameter zones 3 and 4), up to 30 m high. The LVIA did not disaggregate individual constituent parts of the building such as lighting columns or lightning masts. Individual constituent parts are referred to as part of the overall Proposed Development as described in Chapter 3 (Description of the Proposed Development) of the ES (APP-118) and the updated Design and Access Statement (APP-114 Rev 02). <p>In terms of night-time views during operation there will be no permanent lighting associated with the Converter Station. Chapter 3 (Description of the Proposed Development) of the ES (APP-118), paragraph 3.6.3.13 states that “[T]he Converter Station will be lit, when necessary, using energy efficient luminaires mounted atop mid-hinged columns to provide ease of maintenance. Lighting columns, up to 15 m high (see items 15 and 16 in Plate 3.7), 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”. As such, it is not anticipated the lighting columns or lightning masts would be visible during the hours of darkness in normal circumstances.</p>
<p>LV1.9.4</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Can the Applicant confirm how the visual impacts from the proposed exterior cooling systems and staircases were assessed?</p>	<p>The assessment considered the Converter Station as a whole within the maximum parameter design envelope as defined on Converter Station and Telecommunications Building Parameter Plans Sheets 1 to 3 (APP-012). It did not disaggregate individual constituent parts of the building such as staircases and exterior cooling systems.</p> <p>Individual constituent parts are referred to as part of the overall Proposed Development as described in Chapter 3 of the ES (APP-118) (referred to in paragraph 15.1.1.2 of Chapter 15 Landscape and Visual Amenity (APP-130)).</p> <p>It should be noted that the external stairs which provided safe and permanent access to the roof for regular maintenance of a hidden gutter behind the parapet</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>have been removed alongside the parapet. These revisions are reflected on updated drawings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicative Converter Station Area Layout Plans Sheet 1 of 3 (APP-013 Rev 02) • Indicative Converter Station Elevations Sheet 1 of 2 and Sheet 2 of 2 (APP-014 Rev 002)
LV1.9.5	<p>South Downs National Park Authority</p> <p>Winchester City Council</p> <p>East Hampshire District Council</p> <p>Havant Borough Council</p>	<p>With reference to the dDCO [APP-019], there would be potential for rooftop plant and machinery to be placed on the roof of the Converter Station and associated telecoms building. Do you have any comments on the landscape and visual effects of such equipment, if installed?</p>	
LV1.9.6	<p>South Downs National Park Authority</p>	<p>With reference to paragraph 15.8.4.7 of the ES [APP-130], does the South Downs National Park Authority agree that the '<i>sensitivity of the SDNP setting</i>' is medium for the purposes of the landscape assessment?</p>	
LV1.9.7	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>What was the rationale for the selection of the three study areas (8km, 3km, 1.2km)? (ES Chapter 15 [APP-130] refers.)</p> <p>Was the 1.2km study area agreed with stakeholders, and is there evidence of this in the Consultation report or elsewhere?</p> <p>Why is the 1.2km study area not shown as being scoped into the EIA at 15.3.6 [APP-130]?</p>	<p>The 8 km was agreed in consultation with the LPAs (including the SDNPA) as a conservative estimate of the distance beyond which no significant landscape and visual effects would be anticipated and was used 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.</p> <p>It was agreed with the LPAs and SDNPA that a smaller, more detailed 3 km study area was appropriate for the purposes of local, district and city landscape character and views from the nearest visual receptors around the Converter Station Area to focus the assessment on potentially significant effects. Appendix 15.1 of the ES Consultation Responses (APP-399) summarises the discussions over the 8 and 3 km study areas.</p> <p>During the consultation on the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) it was indicated that the radius could be widened from 1 to 1.2 km informed by future site assessment. Following further site visits to the study area the Applicant widened the study area to 1.2 km to reflect the distribution of surrounding properties as referred to in paragraph 15.1.2.5 and 15.4.3.4 Chapter 15 of the ES (APP-130).</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>The 1.2 km study area was not discussed but considered beneficial to inform the assessment and no comments were received following the PEIR on the 1 km study area see Appendix 15.1 of the ES Consultation Responses (APP-399).</p> <p>The need for a more detailed assessment of close-range views experienced by the nearest residential receptors was identified following the submission of Appendix 5.2 Scoping Report (APP-365) and further site visits prior to the completion of the PEIR and has therefore been completed.</p>
LV1.9.8	The Applicant	In terms of LVIA limitations, would the use of the updated LI guidance in TGN 06/19 'Visual representation of development proposals' have materially changed the approach and outcome of the LVIA (paragraph 15.4.72 of ES Chapter 15 [APP-130] refers)?	No. The visualisations were prepared based on TGN 02/17. Following TGN 06/19 would not materially change the approach or outcome of the LVIA. The photography was undertaken in July and October 2018, and February and April 2019. The visualisations were produced during August and September 2019 prior to the publication of TGN 06/19 (17 September 2019). The Landscape Institute advised that the new guidance should apply to new commissions undertaken from 17 September 2019, but a reasonable grace period would apply, and reasonable judgements made over the implications of the changeover. The presentation of the visualisations was developed in anticipation of TGN 06/19 and are generally in accordance with this standard. It should also be borne in mind that the images were used to inform the assessment but were not the sole basis on which the conclusions were drawn.
LV1.9.9	The Applicant	Please confirm if the 'Valve Halls' referred to in paragraph 15.4.4.3 of ES Chapter 15 [APP-130] are the 'converter halls'.	Yes, this is correct the valve halls are converter halls. This reference was based on the Indicative Converter Station Area Layout Plans Sheet 1 of 3 (APP-015).
LV1.9.10	The Applicant Portsmouth City Council	<p>Paragraph 15.4.4.6 of ES Chapter 15 [APP-130] tells us that the Applicant and the 'landscape representative for Portsmouth City Council' agreed that no ZTV was required for the Optical Regeneration Station buildings at Fort Cumberland. Given the existence of sensitive visual receptors locally (community and historical), what was the rationale for this decision?</p> <p>Would the clarity of the assessment be improved by the production and presentation of wirelines for viewpoints 19 and 22 [APP-286] and [APP-289]?</p> <p>The photography prepared to represent the views of the proposed Optical Regeneration Station buildings ([APP-285] to [APP-289]) is limited to summer views only. Does this represent an accurate and adequate worst case?</p> <p>How do these exclusions and matters sit with the Planning Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion [APP-366] at entry ID 14.13.2?</p> <p>Are there any relevant updates from the ongoing consultation that is being undertaken in this respect?</p>	<p>The distribution of buildings and vegetation around the Landfall and the Optical Regeneration Station (ORS) is such that the extent of visibility within the immediate 300 m study area was self-evident. The Applicant therefore considered a ZTV to be unnecessary.</p> <p>PCC's landscape officer requested five verified views and two wirelines, and an additional wireline was produced covering viewpoints 18, 20 and 21. It is considered that these wirelines show sufficient information to make a judgement on the impact of the ORS.</p> <p>The photography was taken in the summer and it was considered that this was sufficient to inform a worst-case judgement. This is due to the limited extent of vegetation which provides an immediate screening function; restricted to an over-mature coniferous trees/ hedgerow adjacent to the caravan park and occasional deciduous trees and scrub edging or forming part of Fort Cumberland SINC / open space.</p> <p>In terms of how these exclusions and matters sit with the Planning Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion at entry ID 4.13.2, the need to undertake an assessment of landscape and seascape character was discussed and agreed verbally with PCC. In order to focus on potentially significant effects, it was considered that a study area of 300 m was appropriate, and this should focus on landscape rather than</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>seascape 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. Chapter 15 of the ES (APP-130) therefore includes an assessment of the impacts of the ORS building(s) and cable route at the Landfall on landscape and visual amenity focusing on landscape rather than seascape character.</p> <p>Consultation is ongoing with PCC and Historic England, which includes the production of an additional wireline from viewpoint 22 (document reference 7.8.1.10), forming an agreed visualisation with Historic England from Viewpoint 22 which is considered to be a suitable representation of the view from the Western Ravelin at Fort Cumberland.</p>
LV1.9.11	The Applicant	Please could the Applicant provide evidence that the matters scoped out of the assessment in Table 15.1 [APP-130] were agreed with key stakeholders?	<p>Landscape and visual receptors beyond 8 km study area from the Converter Station: The study area was discussed at length with the LPAs and SDNPA and it was agreed that an 8 km study area was adequate. See Appendix 15.1 of the ES (Consultation Responses) (APP-399), Table 2.</p> <p>Specific landscape and visual receptors within 8 km study area from the Converter Station: Whilst WCC and EHDC felt a 3 km study area was adequate given the effects will be limited due to intervening vegetation and built form as well as the surrounding topography, SDNPA disagreed. On this basis the study area was widened to 8 km to inform initial baseline and long-distance views. See Appendix 15.1 Table 2 (APP-399).</p> <p>Onshore Cable Corridor: Operational Impacts: At no stage during scoping or the EIA process was this requested. No direct consultation took place with the LPAs on this element, however on the basis that it was scoped out of the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) and no comments were received requesting otherwise it was not considered further.</p> <p>Landfall: Landscape and Visual receptors beyond 300m: The extent of the study area was agreed with PCC's landscape officer, as referred to in Appendix 15.1 Table 4 (APP-399).</p> <p>Marine Component - Landscape and seascape assessment: No subsequent comments based on PEIR consultation identified the need for a seascape assessment and given the built-up nature of the area and limited visibility it was considered the resultant effects would be a negligible effect. The Planning Inspectorate agreed that given the nature of the Proposed Development, seascape could be scoped out of the ES (refer to 4.10 at Appendix 15.1 Table 1) (APP-399) and Appendix 5.3 (EIA Scoping Opinion) (APP-366) which states at ID 4.10.1 "[T]he Inspectorate agrees that given the nature of the Proposed Development, landscape and seascape visual effects can be scoped out of the ES."</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			A copy of the meeting notes/minutes referred to in Table 2 of Appendix 15.1 (APP-399) are submitted as Appendix 8 to this document (document reference 7.4.1.8).
LV1.9.12	The Applicant	Section 15.4.6 of the ES [APP-130] tells us that the assessment of the converter station was ' <i>principally based on a maximum parameter design envelope</i> '. Were any parts of the LVIA based on parameters outside the envelope, if so why, and what are the implications for the EIA, Rochdale envelope approach and dDCO powers?	<p>The parameter design envelope as shown in Converter Station and Telecommunications Buildings Parameter Plans Option B(i) and B(ii) Sheet 2 of 3 and 3 of 3 respectively (APP- 012) covers the built structures – the Converter Station Building, Telecommunications Buildings and the Access Road.</p> <p>Landscape mitigation (cut and fill, reprofiling, retention and management of existing planting and new planting) applies to land within Parameter Zone 1, outside the parameter design envelope but within the Order Limits.</p> <p>All elements were assessed taking into account the defined parameters for them.</p> <p>Other elements within the Order Limits but outside the parameter design envelope and considered as part of the LVIA included the Onshore Cable Route and Attenuation Ponds and associated maintenance tracks.</p> <p>All of these elements (the Onshore Cable Route, Attenuation Ponds and associated maintenance tracks to the Ponds) were fully assessed as part of the LVIA.</p>
LV1.9.13	The Applicant	Can the Applicant explain how and why the three local viewpoints were selected to represent the Converter Station area (Table 15.5 [APP-130])? Were these agreed with the relevant local authorities?	<p>WCC requested additional local viewpoints to represent the Converter Station Area and indicated the locations from where views could be taken. Further to site visits and a refinement of locations, viewpoints were agreed with the LPAs and SDNPA as referred to in Appendix 15.1 (Consultation Responses) Table 2 (APP-399).</p> <p>The baseline including the three local viewpoints is included within the Statements of Common Ground with the relevant authorities, to be submitted at Deadline 1 (document reference 7.5.4, 7.5.6, 7.5.7 and 7.5.8).</p>
LV1.9.14	The Applicant	Please confirm how the visual assessments relating to identified residential receptors referred to in ES Chapter 15 [APP-130] were undertaken. Was professional judgement and the nearest or the most representative publicly accessible location used, or were individual occupants contacted for access and assessment?	<p>The nearest / most representative publicly accessible location combined with professional judgement was used to determine the visual effects on residential receptors within a 1.2 m radius of the Converter Station. Appendix 15.3 (APP-401) (paragraph 1.11.1.7) states "<i>[W]hilst most of the properties can be viewed at close range from public roads and footpaths, some of these properties are accessed via private or gated roads and due to these access limitations, they have been assessed from the nearest public road or PRow which may be at greater distance from the property. The assessment, in this instance, should therefore be regarded as a 'best estimate' of the likely visual effects.</i>"</p> <p>No permission was requested for access to properties as this was not considered necessary. The assessment undertaken is adequate / proportionate and in line with the methodology outlined in Appendix 15.3 (APP-401) based on industry guidance.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>A full summary of the assessment methodology for reviewing the effects on the closest residential receptors is covered in Section 1.11 of Appendix 15.3 (APP-401) with further detail in Appendix 15.6 (Visual Amenity) Table 3 (APP-404).</p>
<p>LV1.9.15</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>The ES [APP-130] suggests that the worst-case scenario is used in the LVIA. For the assessment at the landfall and for the onshore cable corridor, where a range of views would be experienced, this is said to be the situation where receptors have direct, open views of the Proposed Development. Could the Applicant explain how this worst-case scenario was defined?</p> <p>How was it determined which receptors would experience direct, open views of the Proposed Development?</p>	<p>For the assessment at the landfall and for the Onshore Cable Route the Applicant's professional judgement (informed through site visits and supporting ordnance survey maps as well as online maps such as Google Earth and Bing) was used to determine where direct, open views would be experienced by visual receptors; defined as full in Appendix 15.3 (Landscape and Visual Assessment Methodology) (APP-401) with specific reference to the visual assessment in Section 1.7.</p> <p>Views which would be direct and uninterrupted of the Proposed Development during construction were considered to be the "worst case" as described in paragraph 15.8.2.9 of Chapter 15 (APP-130) which states "[T]he assessment also takes a worst-case scenario approach to the Onshore Cable Corridor and Landfall where there would be a range of views experienced by receptors, the "worst case" being those receptors likely to have direct open views of the Proposed Development."</p>
<p>LV1.9.16</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>ES paragraphs 15.4.7.2, 15.4.7.3 and 15.4.7.4 [APP-130] list 'assumptions and limitations.' It is unclear why bullets 2 to 7 of 15.4.7.2 (for example) are included as they do not appear to be either. Please clarify.</p> <p>Many would need to be secured through the dDCO [APP-019] and management plans, not simply assumed (e.g. bullets 4, 5, 6, 7 of 15.4.7.2). How can the ExA and Secretary of State be assured that all of the measures on which the LVIA is based would indeed be secured and implemented?</p>	<p>The lack of clarity is acknowledged. We have therefore reviewed Chapter 15 of the ES (APP-130) paragraphs 15.4.7.2, 15.4.7.3 and 15.4.7.4 and Appendix 19 (Landscape Assessment Assumption Clarification) ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1.19) takes the points listed in APP-130 as "assumptions and limitations," clarifies the terminology used, recategorizes them, and redistributes them across the relevant parts of the ES chapter.</p> <p>Items retained in Section 15.4 are now referred to as either "General points of reference" or "General overarching assumptions" depending on whether they are points for information or assumptions made for the purposes of the assessment.</p> <p>Items which could more accurately be described as mitigation measures have been moved to Section 15.7 Mitigation Measures.</p> <p>Items which could more accurately be described as 'detailed design guidance which must be implemented' have been moved to Section 15.8 Assessment.</p> <p>The mitigation measures are secured through the updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (APP-506 Rev002), the updated Onshore Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (APP-505 Rev002), Requirements 7 and 8 of the dDCO (APP-019), and Requirement 15 of the dDCO (as necessary).</p> <p>The items now referred to as 'detailed design guidance which must be implemented' now form part of the updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (APP-506 Rev002) which is secured through Requirements 7 and 8 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
LV1.9.17	The Applicant	<p>Amongst the assessment limitations set out in section 15.4.7 of the ES [APP-130] is that the micro-siting of embedded landscape mitigation measures would be subject to the results of archaeological trial trenching. Please could the Applicant explain when the results of the trial trenching will be completed?</p> <p>If it has been completed, what implications does this have in terms of the LVIA?</p>	<p>In consultation with Local Planning Authority Archaeological Officers it was agreed that archaeological trial trenching may be carried out post-DCO consent, should consent be granted. Whilst the precise scope is yet to be agreed, such investigation would take place prior to the main construction phase, to allow any further mitigation to be undertaken, if required, without causing delays to the construction programme. This will be addressed in the Statements of Common Ground with the relevant local planning authorities, submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>Based on the limited evidence of extensive archaeological remains suggested by the geophysical survey carried out within the site, it is considered highly unlikely that trial trenching will identify extensive or significant remains which might warrant preservation in situ. As such, micro-siting adjustments to the proposed embedded landscape mitigation measures to avoid previously unrecorded archaeological remains that are significant enough to warrant preservation are very unlikely. Consequently, there are unlikely to be any implications for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) (Chapter 15 of the ES) (APP-130).</p> <p>If trial trenching was to indicate that there are archaeological features of significance, then these would be mitigated through a programme of archaeological investigation and recording (i.e. targeted excavation / strip, map and sample), or a watching brief during construction. The Onshore Cable Corridor allows some flexibility in its routing, which can be utilised where necessary to avoid impacting on archaeological constraints and to accommodate landscape mitigation measures which would serve a visual screening function.</p>
LV1.9.18	The Applicant	<p>Could the Applicant please explain the 'offset' measures referred to in paragraph 15.5.3.46, incorporated to protect the ancient woodland? Is this the 15m buffer between the Proposed Development and the ancient woodland, referred to elsewhere in the ES?</p> <p>How is the delivery of these measures secured in the dDCO [APP-019]?</p> <p>Have these measures been agreed with Natural England and the relevant local authorities?</p>	<p>Yes, the reference to the offset in paragraph 15.5.3.46 relates to the 15m buffer between the Proposed Development and the ancient woodland. More detail is provided at paragraph 15.7.22 of Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) of the ES (APP-130), in the updated OLBS (APP-506 Rev002) and in the updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002).</p> <p>The 15m offset (along with other mitigation measures) is set out at section 1.6.4 of the updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (APP-506 Rev002) and paragraph 6.2.2.1 and 6.3.4.4, and Table 7.1 of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002) and is secured through Requirements 7 and 8 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p> <p>Offsets were discussed with the Local Planning Authorities and Natural England, and a minimum buffer of 15 m to ancient woodland defined. Natural England accept that this is a minimum but would like this to be extended where possible. Consultation with Natural England is ongoing and will include focus on offset measures in the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) (document reference 7.5.11). No specific comments have been received from the LPAs.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
LV1.9.19	The Applicant	<p>Did the LVIA [APP-130] include an assessment of sequential views, for instance relating to users of the Public Rights of Way network?</p> <p>If so, where is this set out?</p> <p>If not, why not?</p>	<p>No specific sequential assessment was carried out as might be considered for a wind farm. However, an assessment of the experience of a receptor (type of receptor) utilising the whole specified route was described for recreational receptors between 3 to 8 km of the Converter Station and within 3 km of the Converter Station. This included an explanation of any variance in effect and holistically local worst-case effects in either direction.</p> <p>The nature of effects is explained in Appendix 15.8 (Assessment of Landscape and Visual Effects) (APP-406).</p>
LV1.9.20	The Applicant	<p>In relation to the assessment methodology, can the Applicant explain why Tables 2 and 5 of Appendix 15.3 [APP-401] do not include 'negligible', despite the detailed description at 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>What are the implications of this for the assessment as set out?</p>	<p>This is an oversight and has been corrected in the Errata Sheet submitted as Appendix 1 to the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1.1) alongside this document. The assessment does not alter as a result of these clarifications.</p>
LV1.9.21	The Applicant	<p>Paragraphs 15.7.1.1 and 15.7.1.2 of the ES [APP-130] refer to 'embedded' mitigation and assumptions that 'standard mitigation measures' are in place 'in line with GLVIA'. However, guidance on mitigation from pages 57 to 68 of GLVIA suggests that there should be no such 'assumption' in relation to standard practice, indeed it requires evidence that it can be secured through a consent.</p> <p>Could the Applicant explain this apparent diversion from the guidance that is said to be followed.</p> <p>In doing so, does the Applicant believe that it would be useful to separate primary, standard and secondary mitigation in line with GLVIA, referring to how 'embedded' mitigation and best practice working methods are dealt with there?</p>	<p>"In line with GLVIA" is an error. This is now noted in the Errata Sheet (document reference 7.8.1.1) which revises paragraph 15.7.1.2 of ES Chapter 15 Landscape and Visual Amenity (APP-130) to state:</p> <p><i>15.7.1.2 The LVIA assumes the Onshore Outline CEMP is implemented and standard construction practice measures are in place in accordance with the Considerate Contractors Scheme in all Sections (1-10) to control impacts on landscape character and visual amenity including:</i></p> <p>(The bullet list is not changed)</p> <p>The bullet points listed in paragraph 15.7.1.2 of ES Chapter 15 Landscape and Visual Amenity (APP-130) will be secured through a Construction Environmental Management Plan as stated at paragraph 15.7.1.1.</p> <p>Primary mitigation measures (those developed through the iterative design process) and the construction and operational management practices (standard mitigation) were considered as "embedded mitigation." No secondary mitigation measures were proposed.</p> <p>Whilst the terminology used in Chapter 15 (APP-130) differs slightly from that given in GLVIA3, restructuring this section under the headings of primary, standard and secondary would not change the conclusions of the assessment.</p>
LV1.9.22	The Applicant	<p>Explain how the assumptions listed at ES 15.7.1.2 and 15.7.1.3 [APP-130] can be assured. The outline CEMP [APP-505] does not seem to include many of these measures that have been assumed in the assessment. Please undertake a rigorous check and provide any updates necessary, together with any implications for the LVIA outcome.</p>	<p>The assumptions listed in paragraph 15.7.1.1.2 of Chapter 15 (APP-130) cover general embedded mitigation measures and paragraph 15.7.1.3 outlines specific embedded mitigation (Converter Station) focusing on design and associated infrastructure, landform, drainage, retention of existing and new mitigation planting. The Outline Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>(CEMP) has been reviewed and updated (APP-505 Rev002) to ensure the above measures align.</p> <p>All assumptions in ES Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) (APP-130) paragraph 15.7.1.2 are referred to as general landscape and visual mitigation in the updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (OLBS) (APP-506 Rev002) section 1.5.1 general mitigation measures and updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-506 Rev002) paragraph 6.2.3.1, and related Requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p> <p>All references to embedded mitigation and enhancement measures (covering the design, landform and drainage and retention of existing planting and new mitigation planting) in ES Chapter 15 (APP-130) paragraph 15.7.1.3 are referred to in the updated OLBS (APP-506 Rev002) section 1.5.2 and related requirements 7 and 8 in the dDCO (APP-019).</p>
LV1.9.23	The Applicant	<p>Please could the Applicant reconcile ground level descriptions in the ES. At paragraph 15.5.3.3 [APP-130], the data given are 97-67m AOD. Paragraph 15.7.1.15 refers to 4.5m cut and 4.5m fill to give a finished level of 84.8m AOD. On the OS map, the proposed sites for the Converter Station would appear to be around the 80m to 90m AOD contours. What feature or area does paragraph 15.5.3.3 refer to?</p>	<p>Paragraph 15.5.3.3 of Chapter 15 of the ES (APP-130) describes the ground levels across the Converter Station Area (i.e. the whole of Section 1) not the finished level platform of the Converter Station or just the proposed sites for the Converter Station.</p>
LV1.9.24	The Applicant	<p>Did the LVIA include an assessment of the 'raw edges' associated with the cut and fill associated with the Converter Station platform and the access road?</p> <p>If so, where is this set out?</p> <p>If not, why not?</p>	<p>Yes, consideration was given to exposed earth relating to both the Converter Station and Access Road and this is referred to in ES Chapter 15 Landscape and Visual Amenity (APP-130) bullet point 9 <i>"Creation of new landscape landforms with bare earth visible until planted / seeded."</i></p> <p>Whilst the "raw edges" of the cut and fill associated with the Converter Station platform and Access Road were not mentioned specifically it was assessed under landform / infrastructure in ES Chapter 15 (APP-130) and described in more detail in Appendix 15.8 (Assessment of Landscape and Visual Effects (APP-406):</p> <p>Landform (Chapter 15):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 15.8.3.5 construction • Paragraph 15.8.4.8 year 1 • Paragraph 15.8.4.11 year 10 • Paragraph 15.8.4.16 year 20 <p>Access Road (covered under landform / infrastructure in Chapter 15):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 15.8.3.6 construction • Paragraph 15.8.4.9 year 1 • Paragraph 15.8.4.14 year 10 • Paragraph 15.8.4.19 year 20 <p>Note for clarity and in the Errata Sheet submitted as Appendix 1 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1.1), text in paragraph 15.8.3.6 has been</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			revised to include reference to the Access Road west of Broadway Lane stating “[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....”
LV1.9.25	The Applicant	Paragraph 3.6.3.51 of the ES [APP-130] states that there would be up to 20 telescopic cranes on site each day during construction of the Converter Station. Can the Applicant explain the dimensions of these and how and where they are taken into account in the LVIA?	<p>Specific dimensions of construction equipment were not available at the time of assessment. However, the landscape architect writing the assessment has substantial experience of working on large scale developments. Given the height and extent of the Converter Station buildings it was assumed that tall cranes would be required in the LVIA.</p> <p>It is now understood that the worst case scenario is that up to 10 cranes would be used at any one time and a maximum of two would be up to 84m in height. It is considered that the significance of construction stage effects would not change as a consequence of this information.</p>
LV1.9.26	The Applicant	ES Table 3.6 [APP-118] lists several locations for the siting of HDD compounds. Can the Applicant explain how landscape and visual impacts resulting from these, which would range in duration from two to 44 weeks, have been assessed?	<p>ES Chapter 15 Landscape and Visual Amenity (APP-130) did undertake an assessment for the siting of HDD compounds and this is clarified in the text below:</p> <p>Siting of HDD Compounds</p> <p>The location of the HDD compounds and the duration of activities within the compounds have been reviewed in the following sections of the Onshore Cable Route:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 3: Kings Pond HDD-5 (13 weeks) compound located to the northern side of Anmore Road • Section 7: Langstone Harbour HDD-3 (31 weeks) • Section 7: Farlington Railway Crossing HDD-4 (26 weeks) • Section 8: Milton Common HDD-6 (2 weeks) • Section 9: Eastney and Milton Allotments HDD-2 (12 weeks) • Section 10: Landfall HDD1 (44 weeks) <p>The landscape and visual effects as a consequence of the HDD compounds and the duration of activities are considered as part of the 2019 assessment and there is no change to the assessment.</p>
LV1.9.27	The Applicant	<p>Could the location, size, scale and nature of the proposed attenuation ponds please be shown on a scaled plan in the context of the wider development and receiving landscape.</p> <p>What is the design brief or concept for the attenuation ponds and how would their design and appearance be compatible with local landscape character?</p>	<p>Appendix 1 of the Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy (APP-360 Rev 002) that is submitted as Appendix 7 to the Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (APP-505 Rev 002) provides the location, size, scale and nature of proposed attenuation ponds.</p> <p>With regards to compatibility with local landscape character, ponds are not common in the local landscape, although there is one at Rushmere (to the west of the Converter Station Area) and it is possible that there were other farm and/or dew ponds in the area that have been lost over time. The attenuation ponds</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>would be a new feature in the landscape, but they are not anticipated to affect the landscape character more than very locally.</p> <p>The proposals for the attenuation ponds are a natural approach to managing drainage creating a new habitat within the landscape and opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. Whilst a degree of engineering will be required to create the ponds on this gently sloping site, a naturalistic approach will be taken in terms of both the plan shape and landform to ensure flowing curves rather than geometric engineering.</p> <p>Planting will be a mix of marshy grassland and marginal planting, with mixes referred to in Appendix 15.7 (Landscape Schedules, Planting Heights and Image Board) (Table 8 and 10) (APP-405), which is referred to and secured by the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (OLBS) (APP-506) and subsequent updated OLBS (APP-506 Rev002) and Requirement 7 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p> <p>Margins of the attenuation ponds will be allowed to regenerate through natural succession with minimal intervention where practicable as described in paragraph 1.6.2.34 to 1.6.2.37 of the OLBS (APP-506), section 1.7 of the updated OLBS (APP-506 Rev002) and Appendix 1 of that Strategy (Outline Landscape Specification Years 0-5).</p>
<p>LV1.9.28</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>From paragraph 15.7.1.24 of the ES [APP-130], there is a description of the proposed mitigation planting. This describes an intention to provide new woodland habitats, including at paragraph 15.7.1.36 the types of plants that would be introduced to the shrub and field layers of the woodland. Could the Applicant explain how this would be achieved in advance of a woodland canopy establishing.</p> <p>Assuming a reliance on a suitable seed mix for this proposal, how would the proposed ferns be introduced?</p> <p>Could the Applicant provide an opinion on the suitability of cleavers (<i>Galium aparine</i>), as suggested, and whether this could become rampant on recently disturbed, planted, unshaded ground and whether it would inhibit the establishment of trees, shrubs and other flora.</p>	<p>It is intended that variations will be created in the proposed woodland mix and structure to form glades and more open fringes as well as a more diverse habitat. This will be presented through the written detailed landscaping scheme (now referred to as the detailed landscaping scheme) which accords with and expands on the updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (OLBS) (APP-506 Rev002).</p> <p>The detailed landscaping scheme will include detailed landscape mitigation plans, monitoring and management plans as outlined in draft DCO requirement 7 and 8 (requiring approval by Local Planning Authorities in consultation with the South Downs National Park Authority).</p> <p>A calcareous grassland mix, as referred to in Table 9 of Appendix 15.7 (Landscape Schedules, Planting Heights and Image Board) (APP-405) and, where feasible, seed harvested from Section 3 Denmead / Kings Pond Meadow will be introduced throughout the Converter Station Area (see Indicative Landscape Mitigation Plans (APP-281 and APP-282)). Proposed ferns will be introduced within woodland fringes and allowed to regenerate naturally - Appendix 15.7 (Landscape Schedules, Planting Heights and Image Board) (APP-405). The exact location of where ferns would be introduced will be presented through the detailed landscaping scheme and accompanying plans. In the interim, revisions will be made to the OLBS outlining the location of ferns within woodland margins.</p> <p>Cleavers have been identified as part of the ground flora mix informed through ecology surveys, however it is agreed that they could become difficult to control</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>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 Appendix 15.7 (APP-405) and in paragraph 15.7.1.36 of ES Chapter 15 (APP-130). This will be reflected in the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1).</p>
<p>LV1.9.29</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>What is the rationale for including residential receptors in the visual assessment? [APP-130].</p> <p>How does this sit with guidance in GLVIA?</p> <p>What weight does the applicant think should be given to private views from residential properties in the Examination, in the ExA's considerations and in the Secretary of State's decision?</p>	<p>The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations) require the Applicant to consider effects on the "population" (Regulation 5(2)(a)), and so in the context of the LVIA it is important to consider the effects on people to inform overall effects. GLVIA 3 paragraph 2.20 states that "<i>[w]hen the interrelationship between people ('human beings' or 'population' in the language of the Directive and Regulations) and the landscape is considered, this introduces related but very different considerations, notably the views that people have and their visual amenity – meaning the overall pleasantness of the views they enjoy of their surroundings.</i>"</p> <p>Since the publication of GLVIA 3rd edition in 2013 new Landscape Institute guidance on Residential Visual Amenity has been issued, referred to as Residential Visual Amenity Assessment, Technical Advice Note, Landscape Institute, February 2019. This guidance goes a stage beyond GVLIA 3rd edition. It focuses on private views and private visual amenity and considers whether a proposed development would affect "living conditions" or residential amenity". Whilst individuals have "no right to a view" and that the outlook or view from a private property is a private interest, this does not mean that the residential receptors may not experience an adverse effect.</p> <p>On this basis and given the proximity of residential receptors to the Converter Station it was considered important to understand the impact on private residential receptors. The methodology for considering the impact and consequential visual effects is detailed in Appendix 15.3 (Landscape and Visual Amenity Methodology) (APP-401) and follows the new guidance, although as stated in paragraph 1.11.1.9 the assessment does not go as far as presenting a full Residential Visual Amenity Assessment.</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed the impacts on residential receptors and acknowledges that some will be subject to major adverse effects. However, whilst these are major, it is not concluded that the effect of the development would be such as to make the receptor location unattractive and thus unsatisfactory as a place to live in terms of the "Lavender test". This is referred to in the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment, Technical Advice Note, Landscape Institute, February 2019 and relates to appeal decisions made by Inspector Lavender in connection with Enifer Downs Windfarm and Carland Cross Windfarm.</p> <p>EN-1, which is the primary policy basis for the decision maker recognises that all proposed energy infrastructure is likely to have visual effects for many receptors around proposed sites.</p> <p>The design of the Converter Station and proposed planting seek to soften this impact through the varied use of autumnal colours and curved corners on the</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>cladding, reprofiling of landform and the introduction of woodland planting in the foreground. Whilst significant visual effects will remain, after 20 years, for three out of the six residential receptors which have been found to still be significantly affected, the effect is judged to be neutral. There would be a change in the depth and composition of the view because of the mitigation planting: it would be a different view, but one that whilst not necessarily a beneficial change is equally not judged to be adverse.</p> <p>In the Applicant's opinion the ExA should give limited weight to the significant effects given the very small number of receptors affected, the fact that they are private views, and that for most the change is neutral in character not adverse.</p>
<p>LV1.9.30</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>With reference to section 15.8.3 of the ES (and generally in the LVIA) [APP-130], can the Applicant confirm if the definition and use of 'indirect' effects are in line with GLVIA guidance, noting that GLVIA says (at 3.22) that an <i>'indirect effect is a consequential change...'</i> A number of the 'indirect' effects described in the LVIA appear to be direct effects, but on receptors outside the main area of study (e.g. in paragraph 15.8.3.4, the setting of the South Downs National Park).</p> <p>If not, is there any implication for the findings of the LVIA in the ES?</p>	<p>The words 'direct' and 'indirect' have been used in Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) of the ES (APP-130) as plain English reflecting the spatial relationship, rather than the consequential change referred to in GLVIA3.</p> <p>The difference between "direct" and "indirect" as used in the LVIA is given in paragraph 15.4.1.4: "[D]evelopment may have a direct (physical) effect on the landscape in which it is located as well as an indirect or perceived (intangible) effect from landscape character areas surrounding it".</p> <p>Paragraph 1.6.1.3 in Appendix 15.3 (Landscape and Visual Assessment Methodology) (APP-401) expands on this as follows:</p> <p><i>"Direct effects upon the landscape fabric (specific features and elements that make up the landscape), through the addition of new elements, or the removal of existing elements, such as trees, vegetation and buildings and other characteristic elements of the landscape character type;</i></p> <p><i>Indirect effects on the overall patterns of elements and on the perceptual and aesthetic aspects (referred to as intangible) that give rise to landscape character and regional and local distinctiveness. These changes to the landscape 'qualities', through the degradation / erosion of landscape elements and patterns, and perceptual characteristics, particularly those that form key characteristic elements of landscape character types or contribute to landscape value."</i></p> <p>In the context of the EIA Regulations all effects are direct. 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"> • Landscape character area SDNPA D2 • Setting of the SDNP • Tranquillity • Openness <p>Section 3: Denmead / Kings Pond Meadow</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Gap

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>Section 4: Hambledon Road to Farlington Avenue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local designated open spaces – sense of openness <p>Section 5: Farlington / Section 9 Moorings Way to Bransbury Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tranquillity <p>Section 8: Eastern Road (Adjacent to Great Saltern Golf Course) to Moorings Way</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape Character Area PCC UCA17 Sense of openness <p>Section 10: Eastney (Landfall)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tranquillity Sense of openness <p>Whether an effect has been described as direct or indirect does not alter the findings of significance in this LVIA. It is considered that changing the description of effect from indirect to direct would not alter the conclusions of significance in the LVIA.</p> <p>This difference in definitions is clarified in the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1).</p>
LV1.9.31	The Applicant	<p>Could the Applicant please provide further clarity in relation to section 15.8.6 of the ES [APP-130], the onshore cable route. Was the LVIA ‘worst-case’ in relation to the ‘assumptions’? Where something is ‘where practicable or uncertain’, how can the ExA and Secretary of State rely on the assumption being implemented, and what would the implication be of such measures being not ‘practicable’ or incorrect in practice?</p> <p>Is it possible that the actual impacts could be greater than the assessed impacts in such cases?</p> <p>Similarly, could the Applicant comment on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ‘works should be avoided’ (e.g. 15.8.9.2) – how can these instances be assured and secured? ‘opportunities would be reviewed at detailed design stage’ (15.8.10.2) – what implications would there be if it turns out differently than expected? ‘loss, or partial loss’ (15.8.11.2) – these are quite different outcomes to an assessment, how should the ExA judge this? 15.8.14.2, first bullet: ‘consideration should be given to whether works in these locations should be avoided’; how can the ExA make a judgement on this when the outcome of the consideration is unknown? 	<p>The LVIA (APP-130) was based on a “worst-case” in relation to the assumptions. If there was any doubt that a given ‘assumption’ could be met, for example in the first bullet of para 15.8.13.2 “where practicable consideration should be given to whether works in those locations can be avoid[ed],” the LVIA took the view that the assumption was not guaranteed, and that impacts would occur. In doing the worst case (and more likely an overly worst case) has been assessed.</p> <p>The assumptions have been reviewed and tightened in the updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (OLBS) (APP-506 Rev002) which also gives greater controls over the installation of the onshore cables near existing trees. This is reflected in Appendix 10 of this document (document reference 7.4.1.10) which show trees to be retained, trees to be lost and trees which would be at risk of loss or partial loss.</p> <p>References to “where practicable” or “uncertain” have been reviewed and removed where feasible in the updated OLBS which carries across the Onshore Cable Corridor assumptions, now redefined as “detailed design guidance which must be implemented”.</p> <p>Assumptions for the whole of the onshore cable route in Section 15.8 of the Assessment have been verified as part of the Applicant’s response to ExA Written Question LV1.9.16 and the differences between the 2019 ES Chapter assumptions and the now referred to “detailed design guidance which must be implemented” are reflected in the Appendix 19 (Landscape Assessment</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>Assumption Clarification) ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1.19) and the updated OLBS (APP-506).</p> <p>The detailed design guidance is secured through the updated OLBS (APP-506 Rev002), the updated Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (APP-505 Rev002), Requirements 7 and 8 of the dDCO (APP-019), and Requirement 15 of the dDCO (as necessary).</p> <p>The updated OLBS addresses the various uncertainties raised by the Ex A Question. For example, “[W]orks should be avoided” at paragraph 15.8.9.2. Section 15.8 of ES Chapter 15 and the updated OLBS state “[W]orks would not be permitted in the footway or verge where there are mature trees (Category A/B) except where technical constraints make this unavoidable. Works would only take place in the road surface and sub-base. All excavations would follow an arboricultural method statement which will be within the Contractor’s Onshore CEMP to minimise risk to root protection areas.”</p> <p>Similarly, “opportunities would be reviewed at detailed design stage” at paragraph 15.8.10.2 is now addressed at Section 15.8 of ES Chapter 15 and the updated OLBS as follows “[C]able works would run close to the edge of a partially pollarded poplar and hedgerow (H896 and T925) which are subject to a TPO (TPO – 201). Opportunities would be reviewed at detailed design to minimise impacts considering Onshore Cable Micrositing with a slight variation in the route to avoid the TPOs (within the Order Limits).” The extent of loss of vegetation as a consequence of the cable route installation would generate a small impact on the LVIA and would not change the assessment. The cable route will avoid the TPO’d tree resulting in the loss of some trees edging along Havant Road which would be replaced.</p> <p>The same approach applies to give greater clarity over “loss or partial loss”. For example at paragraph 15.8.11.2 the text has been revised in Section 15.8 of the ES Chapter and the updated OLBS to state “[T]he Onshore Cable Corridor would result in the partial loss of some Category A trees within group (G720) and Category B tree groups (G660 and G910) as well as the loss of one Category B tree T73 and Category C trees T71, 771 and T74 within Zetland Field. The installation works would avoid impacting on a willow, Category B T924. Trees and shrubs would be replaced with like for like species of a similar size where practicable and, trees repositioned at least 5 m away from the Onshore Cable Route.”</p> <p>Similarly, the reference to “consideration should be given to whether works in these locations should be avoided” has been revised at Section 15.8 of the ES Chapter 15 and the updated OLBS to state “[W]orks will not be permitted in the footway or verge where there are mature trees except where technical constraints make this unavoidable. Works would only take place in the road surface and sub-base. All excavations would follow an arboricultural method</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>statement included within the Contractor's Onshore CEMP to minimise risk to root protection areas."</p> <p>These uncertainties are as far as possible now addressed in the updated OLBS and the result of this will likely be that the outcome in reality is less than the effects outlined in the ES LVIA (Chapter 15 (APP-130)) and will not be worse.</p>
LV1.9.32	The Applicant	In its Adequacy of Consultation response [A0C-010], the South Downs National Park Authority drew attention to a Gypsy and Traveller community in close proximity to the Converter Station site. Has the effect of the Proposed Development on the visual amenity of this receptor been assessed, and if so, where?	This point has been discussed with SDNPA previously and the Applicant understands this was an error and there is no gypsy and traveller community but relates to two single storey properties within the same grounds and referred to as the Haven off Old Mill Lane see Table 3 of Appendix 15.6 (Visual Amenity) (APP-404).
LV1.9.33	The Applicant	<p>Table 15.3 of the ES [APP-130] and Appendix 15.3 [APP-401] explain how the assessment of the visual effects of the Converter Station and associated infrastructure was repeated for future years as the proposed mitigation planting matures. Can the Applicant confirm if this assessment related only to the summer position when the deciduous planting is in leaf?</p> <p>If so, how effective would this screening be in the winter months when trees are not in leaf?</p> <p>How has this been accounted for in the assessment of effects?</p>	<p>The assessment for year 0, 10 and 20 was based on winter views informed by the wirelines presented in Figures 15.18 to 15.34 (APP-251 - APP-267) and using experience and professional judgement. Summer views were also considered, informed by the photomontages from local viewpoints A to C presented in Figure 15.35 to Figure 15.37 (APP-268 to APP-270).</p> <p>New mitigation planting combined with existing planting will provide a depth and a layering of planting in different locations enough to provide a partial to full screen in winter months.</p> <p>As described above, the assessment was undertaken at year 0 operation, year 10 and year 20. Whilst the indicative photomontages presented summer views, the assessment considered as a worst-case winter views when planting was not in leaf.</p> <p>It should be noted that planting during early years will serve a limited function. Discussions are ongoing with the LPAs over the introduction of advanced nursery stock (such as extra heavy and heavy trees) in specific locations to improve the screening function from specific locations in year 0.</p>
LV1.9.34	The Applicant	In the details of mitigation planting set out in Appendix 15.7 [APP-405], could the Applicant please advise the meaning of the asterisks used after the following tree species in Table 13: pedunculate oak, wych elm, alder, birch, whitebeam, rowan.	The asterisks used to follow the listed tree species should have been removed in editing and are addressed within the Errata Sheet (Appendix 1 of ES Addendum) (document reference 7.8.1.1).
LV1.9.35	South Downs National Park Authority	<p>Your Relevant Representation [RR-049] notes that you are still reviewing the landscape and visual mitigation proposals for the Converter Station. Could you please confirm your updated position?</p> <p>Are you satisfied with the Applicant's proposals [APP-130]?</p>	
LV1.9.36	Winchester City Council	Does Winchester City Council believe that the proposed landscape and visual mitigation measures [APP-130] are adequate, and, if not, what further measures might be considered?	

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
LV1.9.37	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 15.7.1.39 of the ES [APP-130] explains that monitoring would take place to ensure that mitigation planting is successful and that this would take place over the life span of the Converter Station.</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy [APP-506] notes that this monitoring would take place for the first five years after the completion of landscaping works. Can the Applicant clarify the period of monitoring to ensure successfully establishment?</p> <p>For how long would any replacement planting itself be similarly monitored?</p> <p>Could the Applicant explain how these landscape planting monitoring arrangements are secured in the dDCO [APP-019]?</p>	<p>Monitoring and management of mitigation planting will take place throughout the operational lifetime of the Converter Station, referred to in the updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (OLBS) (APP-506 Rev002) section 1.8.2 and 1.8.3.</p> <p>Replacement planting for existing vegetation within the Order Limits would be monitored throughout the lifetime of the Converter Station. New planting will also be subject to a five-year establishment maintenance period as part of the landscape or construction contract and monitored thereafter throughout the operational lifetime of the Converter Station alongside existing planting. The need for replacement planting will be reviewed as part of the maintenance, management and monitoring plans which will be included within the detailed landscaping scheme prepared post consent and submitted for approval to the relevant discharging authority in consultation with the South Downs National Park Authority.</p> <p>Further details of the nature of the monitoring and management programme will be provided in the detailed landscaping scheme which will be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and SDNPA for approval under Requirements 7 and 8 of the dDCO (APP-019). The detailed landscaping scheme will include detailed landscape mitigation plans with management, maintenance and monitoring plans as well as confirmed management responsibilities.</p>
LV1.9.38	The Applicant	<p>Chapter 15 of the ES [APP-130] states that opportunities to maximise biodiversity have been incorporated in the indicative landscape mitigation plans. The Applicant is requested to provide a list of these opportunities.</p> <p>Given that the landscape mitigation plans are indicative, what confidence can the ExA and Secretary of State have that these proposals would be delivered and what weight should they therefore be given?</p>	<p>Opportunities to maximise biodiversity as identified in the indicative landscape mitigation plans (APP-281 – 283) include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension / reinforcement of ancient woodland • Management / extension of existing woodlands and linear tree belts – this will have benefits for breeding birds and improve habitat connectivity for example commuting and foraging bats • New native woodland belts and copses - again this will benefit several ecological features • Native scrub planting • Areas set aside for natural regeneration • New native hedgerows • Management and retention of existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees • Calcareous and marshy grassland – the latter associated with the attenuation ponds and swales • Marginal planting for attenuation ponds and swales <p>Management, extension and establishment of woodland belts, copses and scrub will have benefits to several ecological features. It will support invertebrate and breeding birds in addition to protected species such as badger. In addition, it is considered that improved connectivity of woodland habitat will benefit commuting and foraging bat species. Native hedgerow planting will also assist these species, particularly red listed bird species such as yellowhammer and linnet.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>Management of grassland and swales, while providing higher quality botanical value, will also support or allow colonisation by protected species. Further details are provided in section 1.6.5 of the updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (OLBS).</p> <p>The requirement to produce landscape mitigation plans and associated proposals are secured through the updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (OLBS) (paragraph 1.3.5 to 1.3.7 and section 1.5 mitigation) (APP-506 Rev002) and Requirements 7 and 8 of the dDCO (APP-019). A detailed landscaping scheme in accordance with the OLBS has to be submitted to and approved by Local Planning Authorities in consultation with the South Downs National Park for any phase of Works No 2 (Converter Station Area) prior to commencement of works.</p>
LV1.9.39	The Applicant	<p>Please can you clarify the information provided in Table 15.3 of ES Chapter 15 [APP-130]? This appears to suggest that the proposed visual mitigation reduces the extent of visibility of the Converter Station by no more than 3% when compared to the existing visual envelope of the site, even after 20 years.</p> <p>If this is the case, and in the context of the need for Compulsory Acquisition in order to provide the landscape planting, why is the proposed landscape planting scheme considered beneficial?</p>	<p>The figure in this table is correct, with the extent of ZTV coverage of the 8 km and 3 km study areas dropping by no more than 3 percentage points even after 20 years.</p> <p>However, these figures, and indeed any ZTV, need to be treated with caution for a number of reasons.</p> <p>The ZTVs show the extent to which the high point of the building envelope may be visible. They do not differentiate between for, example the visibility of the entire building or visibility of just the top metre of the building with the remainder screened by mitigation planting. On a theoretical flat site therefore, mitigation planting 200 m from the building would have to reach over 24 m high before completely removing ZTV coverage from a receptor at 3km distance. The height of the proposed planting used in the ZTVs is given in Table 13 of Appendix 15.7 (Landscape Schedules, Planting Heights and Image Board) (APP-405) from which it can be seen that the tallest trees would only reach half the maximum height of the Converter Station after 20 years. This however would be sufficient to completely screen the building from a distance of 400 m.</p> <p>Added to that, the topography of the surrounding area is such that there are elevated views from much of the area, particularly to the north and south (from Ports Down), looking over the top of both existing vegetation and proposed mitigation.</p> <p>The visual function of the mitigation planting is to reduce the extent of visibility of the Converter Station and provide a more pleasant outlook, particularly for receptors closer to the Converter Station Area who, simply because of their proximity, are likely to be subject to the greatest effects.</p> <p>If you compare the year 0 and year 20 ZTVs it can be seen that the biggest changes are close to the site where the angle of view of a receptor at ground level is such that the planting would have the effect of completely removing visibility by 20 years.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>The proposed landscape planting scheme is considered beneficial in visual terms because it would provide a mixture of partial and full screening for many visual receptors, particularly in the immediate vicinity.</p> <p>Visual effects which are found to be significant in year 0 and which would reduce over time as mitigation planting matures to be non-significant by year 0 include:</p> <p>Residential receptors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North west No 3, 4, 5 and 6 • East No 17 • South east No 14, 15 and 23 • South No 10, 11 and 13 • South west No. 29 <p>Recreational receptors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monarchs Way (DC21 / HC06) • PRoW DC13 / D41 • PRoW DC16 / HC04 • PRoW DC19 / HC28 • PRoW DC17 / DC20 <p>For all other visual receptors subject to significant effects, the level of effect would be reduced over time as mitigation planting matures, albeit remain significant, with the exception of residents at No 21 which would remain moderate-major adverse, users of PRoW Hambledon 25a/b where at worst there would be a moderate adverse effect and cyclists and transport users of Broadway / Day Lanes where the localised effect would remain moderate adverse.</p> <p>Transport receptors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broadway Lane south / Crossways Road <p>Other benefits from the landscape planting scheme include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The integration of the Converter Station Area into its surroundings. • Improvements in connectivity in terms of biodiversity. • Tying the adjacent ancient woodland into its surroundings (as far as reasonably practicable given the location of the overhead lines, Access Road and associated easements); • Reinforcing and enhancing local landscape features. <p>Reinstatement of historic field boundaries in some locations.</p>

Table 1.10 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Marine Environment

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
ME1.10.1	The Applicant MMO	<p>Is there agreement between the Applicant and the MMO that the table in paragraph 6.6 of the MMO Relevant Representation [RR-179] represents an accurate summary of the works sought through the DML?</p> <p>What is the status of the Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and the MMO?</p>	<p>It is our understanding that the MMO is in agreement with the Works Nos. and descriptions as provided in Table 6.6. of the MMO Relevant Representation [RR-179].</p> <p>A draft SoCG was prepared and issued to the MMO on 28 April 2020. Feedback on the draft SoCG was provided by the MMO on 04 August 2020 and 27 August 2020 and this is undergoing review by the Applicant. Engagement is ongoing.</p>
ME1.10.2	The Applicant	<p>Could the Applicant provide detailed responses to the issues and questions raised by the MMO in its Relevant Representation [RR-179], including the following paragraphs: 6.7, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3/ 7.5/ 7.28/ 7.36, 7.4, 7.6, 7.7-7.9, 7.10-7.17, 7.18, 7.19, 7.20/ 7.37/ 8.20-8.24, 7.21, 7.22, 7.23/ 7.24, 7.25/ 7.26/ 7.27, 7.29, 7.30/ 7.39, 7.31, 7.32, 7.33, 7.34, 7.35, 7.38, 7.40, 7.41, 7.42, 7.43, 7.44, 7.45, 7.46, 7.47, 7.48, 7.49, 8.11, 8.17, 8.18, 8.19, 8.37, 8.38, 8.42-8.55/ 8.57-8.64, 8.68, 8.74, 8.77, 8.78, 8.79, 8.80, 8.81, 8.89, 8.91-8.95.</p>	<p>Detailed responses to all the issues and questions, including the paragraphs listed in the MMO Relevant Representation (APP-179) have been addressed within the Responses to the Relevant Representations (document reference 7.9.2) as well as the draft SoCG (document reference 7.5.16). Consultations are ongoing with the MMO and the Applicant will seek to resolve issues with the MMO through the Examination period.</p>
ME1.10.3	The Applicant	<p>With reference to the WFD sensitive sites listed in Table 8.4 of the ES [APP-123], could the Applicant please supply a figure to show the location of these sites.</p>	<p>WFD sensitive sites and habitat locations are presented on the interactive mapping website Defra Magic Maps which is managed by Natural England (https://magic.defra.gov.uk/About_MAGIC.htm). The Environment Agency (EA) also provides data on WFD habitats and refers assessors to both their tabulated form of the data and Magic Maps. In some cases, these datasets do not appear to be completely aligned with each other and due to copyright terms it is not possible to reproduce the Magic Maps dataset and the datasets are not available for download (https://magic.defra.gov.uk/Dataset_Download_Summary.htm). Therefore, for areas of, and distances to habitats, we have used the areas given in the tables provided by the EA and used Magic Maps to calculate distances to high sensitivity habitats.</p> <p>The Applicant has previously consulted with the EA on this same issue as there was a similar query from them. The EA were content with this approach as identified in Appendix 3 (page 3) of the SoCG (document reference 7.5.15).</p>
ME1.10.4	The Applicant	<p>Could the Applicant confirm whether the omission of biotope A5.24 Infralittoral muddy sand from Table 8.5 is a typographical error and if it is found within the marine cable corridor?</p> <p>If so, where and how has it been accounted for in the assessment of significance as a sensitive receptor?</p>	<p>The habitat A5.24 (infralittoral muddy sand) was not found to be present within the UK Marine Cable Corridor according to the site-specific survey. EModNet broad scale mapping referenced in the baseline environment description (Figure 8.5 (APP-164)) does not differentiate between A5.23 or A5.24 in classification of high energy infralittoral sand hence its mention in Section 8.5.4. The site-specific survey found only A5.23 (infralittoral fine sand) as present and as such, this habitat was taken forward to assessment. Even if A5.24 habitat was present (but just not picked up by the site specific survey), there would be little difference in the assessment as both habitats behave in the same way and</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			are inhabited by communities with similar sensitivities to the Proposed Development.
ME1.10.5	The Applicant	For the information presented in Chapter 8 of the ES [APP-123], please could the Applicant define, justify and present the extent of the total study area based on the likely zone of influence and the relevant receptors identified at the regional level and above. Please refer to the Scoping Opinion [APP-366] in this regard, and provide updated figures, in particular Figure 8.1 [APP-160].	<p>The study area was defined as the area bounded by Figure 8.1 (APP-160) for broadscale habitats (as shown in Figure 8.5; APP-164), as the area bounded by Figures 8.2 and 8.3 (APP-161 and 162) for designated areas, and as the area bounded by Figure 8.4 (APP-163) for intertidal habitats at the UK landfall.</p> <p>These study areas are considerably larger than the Zone(s) of Influence (Zol) as the development of the baseline was undertaken prior to determination of the largest Zol (25 km; as described in Table 8.6; APP-123) which resulted from the sediment plume modelling reported in Chapter 6 Physical Processes (APP-121) and Appendix 6.2 (APP-368) of the ES. As such, it is considered that Figure 8.1 does not require updating as a precautionary approach was taken in determining the study area(s) for the baseline.</p>
ME1.10.6	The Applicant	In relation to section 8.4.4 of Chapter 8 of the ES [APP-123], can the Applicant explain what limitations and assumptions have been made in relation to the definition of the ZOI and sensitive receptors and how data was acquired for the baseline, and how these influence the assessment (for example, the age of the data used to characterise the benthic environment).	<p>The Zol relating to benthic ecology receptors was defined using the outputs of the sediment plume modelling, the assumptions and limitations of which are set out in Chapter 6: Physical Processes (APP-121).</p> <p>Receptor sensitivity was defined for each impact that had connectivity with a given receptor. For many of the impacts this was limited to those receptors within the Marine Cable Corridor (as defined by the site-specific survey; Appendix 8.1 Benthic Ecology Survey Report (APP-377)), however, for some impacts with larger Zol (e.g. increases in suspended sediment concentrations), receptors some distance from the Marine Cable Corridor were identified as having potential to be impacted. Receptors outside the Marine Cable Corridor were identified from a number of sources, primarily the European Marine Observation and Data Network (EMODnet) which maps broad scale habitats (Figure 8.5: APP-164), along with information on WFD high sensitivity habitats and habitats and species present within protected areas as specified by Defra Magic Map (https://magic.defra.gov.uk/).</p> <p>These sources provide the most up to date site-specific and publicly available spatial data on such receptors allowing assessments to be undertaken with as much certainty as possible, especially when combined with the numerical modelling outputs for sediment plume dispersion in Appendix 6.2 Modelling Technical Report (APP-368).</p>
ME1.10.7	The Applicant	In relation to the assessment of significance methodology set out in Chapter 8 of the ES [APP-123], could the Applicant please explain how the sensitivity of receptors has been established? It is unclear what criteria or guidance have been used to determine whether receptors are sensitive or not.	As stated in Section 8.4 of Chapter 8 (APP-123), receptor importance and magnitude of impact have both been considered when determining impact significance. CIEEM (2019) guidance has been employed for the purpose of the assessment, where impact magnitude is considered to incorporate receptor sensitivity such that a given impact will result in a higher magnitude for

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>particularly sensitive receptors and lower magnitude for less sensitive receptors.</p> <p>For example, if two receptors are exposed to the same level of increase in suspended sediment concentrations (SSC), and one receptor is highly sensitive to changes in levels of SSC whereas the other has a very low level of sensitivity, the magnitude of the impact relative to the first receptor will be greater than the magnitude of the impact relative to the second. Where a receptor is not sensitive to the effect at all, then the magnitude of the impact is nil/negligible.</p>
ME1.10.8	The Applicant	Please define 'short-', 'medium-' and 'long-term' in relation to the duration of impacts in Chapter 8 of the ES [APP-123].	<p>The duration of impacts is presented in Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (APP-118) and accompanying appendices where the duration of different activities is described and the worst case scenarios for benthic assessment are presented in Table 8.6 of Chapter 8 (APP-123).</p> <p>Due to the varied nature of the receptors under assessment, the exact definition of short, medium, and long term in relation to duration of effects cannot be defined singularly for all receptors as it is relative to each receptor. However broadly speaking, short term effects see recovery rapidly through active movement of individuals back to the impacted area or through colonisation by fast growing and rapid colonising species (generally within months); medium term effects see recovery through colonisation of the original species, with pre-impacted levels likely returning within 1-2 generations (within 1 year); and long term effects see recovery through re-colonisation over a longer period (multiple years) by longer lived and slower growing species.</p>
ME1.10.9	The Applicant MMO	In relation to paragraph 7.30 of the MMO Relevant Representation [RR-179], is there adequate assessment of additional cable protection during both laying and operation set out in the ES?	<p>Discussions were held during a meeting with the MMO and Cefas on 26 March 2020 on cable protection during both laying and operation. The MMO revised their advice on extended licences for cable protection in 2019 and now, licences would be limited to 10 years with the survey requirement at 5 years. It was agreed that the Applicant would respond more formally in preparing a consultation note (Appendix 9 of SoCG, document reference 7.5.12) to be shared with the MMO (and Natural England) for review.</p> <p>The Cable Protection Technical Note clarifies the cable protection parameters and how they have been assessed within the ES. It also clarifies the proposals for controls for the deployment of cable protection during construction and operations and also seeks feedback from the MMO and Natural England on their revised guidance on cable protection. The document was issued to the MMO (and Natural England) on the 24 June 2020 for review. Feedback from Natural England was received on 17 August 2020 and from the MMO on 27 August 2020 stating that they are content with the approach to assessment of cable protection and, with the addition of conditions for notifications for commencement and completion of works as well as post works survey, they are content with the control mechanisms for laying of cable protection during construction and operation within the dDCO (APP-019). In addition, both the</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>MMO and Natural England are also content to support a longer term licence for this particular cable, 15 years, during operation for laying of additional cable protection. These agreements are reflected within the draft SoCGs with both organisations (document references 7.5.12 and 7.5.16).</p>
<p>ME1.10.10</p>	<p>The Applicant MMO</p>	<p>In relation to paragraph 7.33 of the MMO Relevant Representation [RR-179], and the information in the ES about pre-installation surveys and mitigation through micro-siting (8.8.2.2 [APP-123]), the avoidance of a significant effect on the <i>Ophiothrix fragilis</i> and/ or <i>Ophiocomina nigra</i> brittlestar beds on sublittoral mixed sediment community is dependent on the findings of a pre-construction survey. The ES also recognises a high potential for encountering Annex 1 stony reef habitats and recommends a 500m buffer zone.</p> <p>Has adequate mitigation against finding and avoiding such habitats and communities been included, and can the ExA and Secretary of State be confident that the findings of a pre-construction survey would guarantee that micro-siting within the Order limits that provides an adequate buffer is possible?</p>	<p>The ES does <u>not</u> state that there is ‘high potential’ for encountering Annex 1 stony reef habitats as this is not the case. However, mitigation is secured within the dDCO to avoid any significant effects to these habitats if they are found during the pre-construction surveys. During a meeting held with the MMO and Cefas on 26 March 2020, the Applicant explained that dDCO, Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 3 (1)(a)(ii) covers pre-construction surveys. More specifically, it requires that surveys cannot be carried out until survey details to determine location, extent and composition of any reef identified in the ES have been submitted and approved by the MMO. Condition 4(c)(viii) then requires details of any required micro-siting in relation to biogenic and geogenic reef habitat within the Order limits seaward of MHWS to be included in the pre-construction Cable Burial and Installation Plan which will also be submitted and approved by the MMO prior to the commencement of works.</p> <p>The only reference to a 500 m buffer for reef is made in Appendix 6.2 Modelling Report (APP-368) which includes the proposed constraints for disposal of dredged material within the disposal sites and Appendix 1.3M of the Consultation Report (APP-061) which is a consultation document that the Applicant shared with MMO and NE in agreeing the disposal strategy. These documents state that disposal will avoid sensitive habitats through disposal not occurring within 500 m of this habitat and this proposed buffer is only relevant to disposal activity and not to any other activities. The approach to disposal has since been agreed with the MMO and Natural England and the MMO has issued the Applicant with the reference codes for the disposal sites. The dDCO has been updated to reference these codes.</p> <p>Methods for disposal of dredged material will be included within the Cable Burial and Installation Plan which is secured through the dDCO (Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 4(c)(i)) which will be submitted and approved by the MMO. The MMO has advised (27 August 2020) that they are content with this approach to control disposal activity and this is reflected in the draft SoCG (document reference 7.5.16).</p>
<p>ME1.10.11</p>	<p>The Applicant MMO</p>	<p>Tables 6.13 and 6.14 of the ES [APP-121] refer to ‘embedded mitigation’. Where these measures are qualified by terms such as ‘only where necessary’ or ‘minimised’, it is unclear how they can be regarded as ‘embedded’. Given these unknowns and that the measures are not inherent in the design of the Proposed Development, are they adequately secured through the dDCO?</p>	<p>The terms ‘only where necessary’ and ‘minimising’ are used in relation to dredging operations which are an inherent part of the design although the location and extent of dredging cannot be finalised until pre-construction surveys are employed to inform the final cable route. Similarly, the locations and extent of non-burial measures cannot be finalised until the final cable route is known. Both of these activities are an inherent part of the design of the project and have been assessed as such. They are also listed as licensed marine activities within the dDCO (Schedule 15, Part 1). The qualifications are</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>needed only for example, because bedforms are mobile and therefore the locations of sand waves/large ripples and amounts of dredged material will only be clarified after pre-construction surveys have been undertaken. Again similarly, refined details of non-burial protection will only be clarified once the pre-construction surveys inform and update the Cable Burial Risk Assessment (and potentially until after cable installation itself in case target burial depths are not met). These measures are currently captured within the Marine Outline CEMP (APP-488) in Section 5.7 along with the other measures described in Tables 6.13 and 6.14 of Chapter 6 (APP-121).</p> <p>Further, the commitment to control the location and extent of dredging and non-burial protection activities is secured in the dDCO through the submission of a Design Plan (Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 4(1)(a)) as well as the Cable Burial and Installation Plan (Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 4(1)(c)) which will include methods for disposal of dredged material (Condition 4(1)(c)(i)) and disposal locations will be controlled through the dDCO (Schedule 15, Part 1, Paragraph 4(3)). The approval of cable maintenance and repair activities during operation will be secured through the Cable Burial Management Plan ((Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 11).</p>
ME1.10.12	The Applicant	<p>In the ES [APP-122], the assessment of marine water quality ‘assumes’ mitigation measures are embedded into the design (paragraph 7.8.1.1) - for example, ... ‘<i>use of appropriate construction techniques</i>’ - or measures that constitute industry standard environmental plans would be in place. It is unclear where and how some of these measures (listed in section 7.6.2) are secured in the dDCO. Can the Applicant advise, such that the ExA and Secretary of State can rely on the assessment outcome?</p>	<p>The measures listed in Section 7.6.2 of Chapter 7 (APP-122) are considered as embedded as they are either an inherent part of the design such as, the typical marine HVDC cable design, the target cable burial depth, the Distributed Temperature Sensing (DTS) System which monitors the cables, the disposal site location or are industry standard environmental plans.</p> <p>The HVDC cable design, target cable burial depth, disposal locations and DTS will all be secured through the Design Plan (Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 4(1)(a)), as well as the Cable Burial and Installation Plan (Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 4(1)(c)) which will include methods for disposal of dredged materials (Condition 4(1)(c)(i)). All of these controlling documents will need to be submitted and approved by the MMO prior to the commencement of works.</p> <p>An environmental management plan is secured through the dDCO (Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 4(1)(d)), which is required to accord with the Outline Marine CEMP (APP-488). This documentation will be a necessary part of the pre-construction documents that will be required to be submitted to the MMO for approval prior to the commencement of works.</p> <p>The Outline Marine CEMP (APP-488) and the licence condition identifies that the following standard environmental plans will be further detailed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine Pollution Contingency Plan to address the risks, methods and procedures to deal with any spills and collision incidents of the authorised development in relation to all activities to be carried out; • A biosecurity plan detailing how risk of the introduction and spread of invasive non-native species will be minimised; and

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste and disposal arrangements. <p>Finally, the dDCO also secures measures regarding the appropriate use of coatings and treatments in the marine environment (Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 8(1) and (2)).</p>
ME1.10.13	The Applicant	<p>Paragraphs 8.6.3.1 and 8.8.1.1 of the ES chapter on the mitigation of effects on marine habitats [APP-123] note that, ‘<i>Embedded mitigation measures are considered to be those included as part of the project design or which constitute industry standard plans or best practice</i>’. Just because they are best practice does not mean they would necessarily be followed in practice. How is this secured, so the ExA and Secretary of State can rely on the assessment outcome?</p>	<p>The measures listed in Section 8.6.3 of Chapter 8 (APP-123) are considered as embedded as they are either an inherent part of the design such as, the typical marine HVDC cable design, the target cable burial depth, the Distributed Temperature Sensing (DTS) System which monitors the cables, the disposal site location or are industry standard environmental plans. These measures refer to those plans that are considered as industry standard and are driven by national guidance^{17,18} which is underpinned by legislative requirements such as the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and EU Invasive Species Regulations for example.</p> <p>The HVDC cable design, target cable burial depth, disposal locations and DTS will all be secured through the Design Plan (Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 4(1)(a)) as well as the Cable Burial and Installation Plan (Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 4(1)(c)) which will include methods for disposal of dredged materials (Condition 4(1)(c)(i)) and disposal locations will be controlled through the dDCO (Schedule 15, Part 1, Paragraph 4(3)). Cable maintenance and repair activities during operation will be secured through the Cable Burial Management Plan ((Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 11).</p> <p>An environmental management plan (APP-488) is secured through the dDCO (Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 4(1)(d)), which is required to accord with the Outline Marine CEMP (APP-488). This documentation will be a necessary part of the pre-construction controlling documents that will be required to be submitted to the MMO for approval prior to the commencement of works. The Outline Marine CEMP (APP-488) and the licence condition identifies that the following standard environmental plans will be further detailed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marine Pollution Contingency Plan to address the risks, methods and procedures to deal with any spills and collision incidents of the authorised development in relation to all activities to be carried out; A biosecurity plan detailing how risk of the introduction and spread of invasive non-native species will be minimised; and Waste and disposal arrangements.

¹⁷ Available online from: https://naturalresourceswales.gov.uk/media/681171/marine_biosecurity_planning_guidance_for_wales_and_england_november_2015.pdf?lang=en [last accessed 15/09/2020]

¹⁸ Available online from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-contingency-planncp> [last accessed 15/09/2020]

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
ME1.10.14	The Applicant	Paragraph 9.6.2.1 of the ES chapter on mitigation of effects on fish and shellfish [APP-123] notes that, ' <i>Embedded mitigation measures are considered to be those included as part of the project design or which constitute industry standard plans or best practice</i> '. Just because they are best practice does not mean they would necessarily be followed in practice. How is this secured, so the ExA and Secretary of State can rely on the assessment outcome?	<p>The measures listed in paragraph 9.6.2.1 of Chapter 9 (APP-124) refer to those plans that are considered as industry standard and are driven by national guidance^{19, 20} which is underpinned by legislative requirements such as the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and EU Invasive Species Regulations for example. These Plans (and adherence to them) will be controlled and secured through the environmental management plan which will be submitted and approved by the MMO prior to the commencement of works.</p> <p>The submission of the environmental management plan is secured through the dDCO (Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 4(1)(d)). This documentation will be a necessary part of all of the pre-construction controlling documents that the Undertaker will be required to submit to the MMO for approval prior to the commencement of works. The Outline Marine CEMP (APP-488) and the licence condition identifies that the following standard environmental plans will be further detailed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine Pollution Contingency Plan to address the risks, methods and procedures to deal with any spills and collision incidents of the authorised development in relation to all activities to be carried out; • A biosecurity plan detailing how risk of the introduction and spread of invasive non-native species will be minimised; and • Waste and disposal arrangements.
ME1.10.15	The Applicant MMO Natural England	In the Other Consents Report [APP-106], at 17, marine EPS licensing, should Natural England be the authority rather than MMO? Are Natural England and MMO happy that this licensing is deferred until later, or should it be addressed now on a precautionary basis and to demonstrate that such a licence is achievable?	The MMO will be the authority for the EPS licence. The MMO may seek advice from Natural England about the contents of the EPS risk application and supporting information. The approach taken is itemised within the SoCGs with the MMO and Natural England (document references 7.5.12 and 7.5.16) which demonstrate agreement with consultees that the other consents and licences to be obtained relevant to the marine aspects of the Proposed Development are considered to be appropriate and no likely impediments to the granting of such consents are anticipated.
ME1.10.16	The Applicant	Chapter 3 of the ES [APP-118] notes the maximum footprint of non-burial protection includes a 10% contingency (0.33km ²) for maintenance and repair activities during a 15-year post-construction period. Considering the lifetime of the Proposed Development is anticipated to be 40 years and Table 8.6 of Chapter 3 considers that repairs would be needed every 10 to 12 years, can	This additional 10% contingency covers non-burial protection during maintenance and repair. In September 2018, the MMO and the Applicant discussed the practicalities of repeated marine licence applications for the laying of cable protection in connection with maintenance and repair works. In order to address the challenges of repeated applications, the MMO highlighted an approach whereby, if a reasonable contingency of cable protection was included in the deemed marine licence, and if the use of this contingency during

¹⁹ Available online from: https://naturalresourceswales.gov.uk/media/681171/marine_biosecurity_planning_guidance_for_wales_and_england_november_2015.pdf?lang=en [last accessed 15/09/2020]

²⁰ Available online from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-contingency-planncp> [last accessed 15/09/2020]

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>the Applicant explain how this contingency figure and timeframe have been estimated?</p>	<p>the operational period was adequately assessed within the ES, then it would be possible to incorporate a mechanism within the marine licence to allow cable protection placement during operation. At the time, the discussions involved additional cable protection being able to be laid for a 15-year period during operation, as permission could not be given for the 40 year lifespan of the project as the ES would not remain valid for that period of time. This approach had previously been implemented for the Viking Link Interconnector.</p> <p>Accordingly, a 10% contingency (i.e. 10% of the length of the UK Marine Cable Corridor) was calculated by AQUIND's engineering team to be an appropriate and realistic worst case contingency. The calculations were shared with the MMO in September 2019 and advice received from the MMO in October 2019 stated that the rationale for the 10% contingency was satisfactory. As such, the inclusion of a 10% contingency for maintenance and repair was agreed in principle with the MMO. This information is detailed in Appendix 11 and Appendix 9 of the SoCGs with the MMO and Natural England respectively (document references 7.5.12 and 7.5.16) which presents the Cable Protection Technical Note issued for consultation. Section 3 and Appendices 4 and 5 of the Cable Protection Technical Note provides further detail on how the contingency figures have been calculated.</p> <p>Discussions on the mechanisms for control within the dDCO and the timescales of the extended license have been ongoing as, both the MMO and Natural England advised that in some cases, they may only permit a 10-year period as this was linked to what they considered to be the reasonable validity of the ES baseline. This position was presented in the MMO (paragraph 7.45) and Natural England (Appendix 1) Relevant Representations [RR-179 and 181]. As further queries have also been raised in regard to how cable protection has been assessed in the ES and the controlling mechanisms in the dDCO, the Applicant prepared and shared a Cable Protection Technical Note with the MMO and Natural England in June 2020 to provide further clarity on these matters and to progress discussions. This information is detailed in Appendix 11 and Appendix 9 of the SoCGs with the MMO and Natural England respectively (document references 7.5.12 and 7.5.16) which presents the Cable Protection Technical Note issued for consultation.</p> <p>Feedback on the Technical Note from Natural England was received on 17 August 2020 and from the MMO on 27 August 2020 stating that they are content with the approach to assessment of cable protection and, with the addition of conditions for notifications for commencement and completion as well as post works survey, they are content also with the control mechanisms for laying of cable protection during construction and operation within the dDCO (APP-019). In addition, both the MMO and Natural England are content to support a longer term licence for this particular cable, 15 years, during operation for laying of additional cable protection. These agreements are be</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			reflected within the draft SoCGs with both organisations (document references 7.5.12 and 7.5.16).
ME1.10.17	The Applicant	It is not yet decided whether the landfall HDD at Eastney is on to off or off to on, or both [APP-121]. Would all three options have the same impacts? If not, what was assessed and is it the worst case in respect of all impacts and receptors?	For marine topics, the receptors and impacts to be assessed would be the same for the three options however, the offshore to onshore direction was considered to be the worst-case scenario as works would be more intrusive, larger in scale and for a longer period within the marine environment. The only potential exception to this was for marine mammals (Table 10.3, Chapter 10; APP-125) and marine ornithology (Table 11.10, Chapter 11; APP-126) receptors whereby the offshore to onshore scenario was fully assessed in addition to noise and disturbance effects resulting from the onshore to offshore scenario as sheet piling may need to be installed to accommodate the drilling rig at the onshore compound at Eastney in this latter scenario (if the direction is offshore to onshore, the sheet piling would not be required). The worst case impact has been assessed for all scenarios.
ME1.10.18	MMO	In relation to paragraph 6.6.4.10 of the ES [APP-121], Schedule 15 Part 2 of the dDCO (the DML) [APP-019] and the Atlantic cable crossing protection, are the parameters assessed appropriate and can reliance be placed on the Applicant's assessment of significance?	
ME1.10.19	MMO	In relation to paragraph 6.6.4.42 of the ES [APP-121], Schedule 15 Part 2 of the dDCO (the DML) [APP-019] and the proposals for HDD, are the parameters assessed appropriate and can reliance be placed on the Applicant's assessment of significance?	
ME1.10.20	The Applicant	Over the 15-year period proposed for a 10% contingency for further non-burial protection, there is potential for changes to designations in the marine cable corridor, specifically the Annex 1 reef. Consequently, there may be impacts of greater significance during operation [APP-123]. Since the ES considers the future baseline to be the same as the 'Do Nothing' scenario, can the Applicant explain how this is assessed in the ES?	The were no such proposed designations or changes at the time of the Application, nor is the Applicant aware of any future proposals for commencing any designation process which may be relevant to the Proposed Development. The Applicant has however, undertaken a robust baseline and impact assessment process for benthic habitats present, and as such habitats present and assessed would form the basis of future (Special Area of Conservation; SAC) designations, then the potential effects to habitats which could form the basis of such future designations have already been considered. Furthermore, it would also be necessary for the designation process to consider existing infrastructure and activities when seeking to designate future SACs. Regarding operational and maintenance activities, the Applicant has committed to undertaking appropriate surveys prior to intrusive activities taking place, which would identify the presence of potential Annex 1 habitat so mitigation measures can be agreed and applied. Based upon existing knowledge of the benthic environment in the area, it is not considered likely that Annex 1 habitat will develop over the operational period to

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			an extent that it would form the basis of a new designation. This is the basis on which the future baseline has been assessed.
ME1.10.21	The Applicant	Chapter 8 of the ES [APP-123] defines the worst-case scenario in terms of activities undertaken within the 'nearshore' and 'offshore' areas, with nearshore being from kilometre point (KP) 1 to 21 and offshore being KP 21 to 109 (the EEZ Boundary). To provide greater clarity could the applicant please update Figures 8.2 [APP-161] and 8.5 [APP-165] to show these KPs in relation to the locations of the habitats and sensitive receptors?	Figures 8.2 (APP-161, Rev 02) and 8.5 (APP-165, Rev 03) have been updated to include the KPs.
ME1.10.22	The Applicant	With reference to the baseline and predicted suspended sediment data and parameters set out in Table 8.6 of the ES [APP-123], which appear to show predicted levels resulting from construction activities well in excess of the baseline, could the Applicant explain and provide evidence in support of the statement that species present within habitats from KP 21 to 109 already experience significant sediment transport? The explanation should address specifically what volume of material constitutes 'significant sediment transport' in this instance.	<p>The wording 'significant sediment transport' is derived from the coastal processes baseline assessment presented in Chapter 6 Physical Processes (APP-121). More specifically, paragraphs 6.5.7.21 – 6.5.7.22 describe that the project-specific analysis of sediment mobilisation undertaken and presented in Appendix 6.2 (APP-368) reflects a highly dynamic transport regime and that sediment mobilisation is greater in regions of higher velocity offshore. Paragraph 6.5.7.21-23 describe <i>'The observations suggest that sediment entrainment/transport due to tides alone is significant...'</i> when examining the mobilisations of different sediment fractions under the tidal flow regime along the coast and offshore. Accordingly, the benthic chapter makes note that the transport regime where these species live is dynamic and highly mobile.</p> <p>For the benthic assessment however, it is the sediment concentrations suspended (mg l^{-1}) within the water column that are most relevant rather than the sediment volumes (m^3) per se, as the assessments determines magnitude of effects on receptors from their sensitivities to increased SSC. And whilst it is acknowledged that increased sediment transport results in increased SSC, the metric for SSC is considered most relevant for assessment purposes rather than volume.</p> <p>Therefore, Section 6.5.7 describes the dominant flood currents transporting sediment eastwards through the Channel resulting in coastal and offshore suspended sediment concentrations ranging between <1 to 75 mg l^{-1} which are within natural variation and storm events. Consideration is given to those increased SSC levels resulting from disposal that are above this for sensitive receptors. Section 8.6.4.31 to 8.6.4.76 presents this assessment and concludes that due to the limited sensitivity of habitats and species to increased SSC and the short duration of impact (hours to days), then effects are deemed as not significant.</p>
ME1.10.23	The Applicant	Table 8.6 of the ES [APP-123] suggests that suspended sediment levels would vary between up to 2km, 5km and 6-10km from the marine cable corridor. To	It is recognised that the Examining Authority is seeking visual representation of which sensitive habitats in the nearshore area are likely to be affected by a given level of suspended sediments. However, the spatial distribution of

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		provide greater clarity please could the Applicant update a figure in the ES to depict the sensitive receptors and habitats within these impact zones.	sensitive habitats in this area (and thus connectivity to the proposed activities) was determined using the Defra Magic Map website (https://magic.defra.gov.uk/About_MAGIC.htm) and due to copyright terms it is not possible to reproduce the Magic Maps dataset in the ES figures as these datasets are unavailable for download (https://magic.defra.gov.uk/Dataset_Download_Summary.htm). Hence, the chapter describes the level of suspended sediments received by each receptor based upon its location as determined using Magic Maps and the distance from specified project activities.
ME1.10.24	The Applicant	<p>Please review information about the proximity of receptors to the Proposed Development set out in ES Tables 8.3 and 8.4, and the assessment of effects in section 8.6.4 of the ES [APP-123]. If there are discrepancies, how has this affected the assessment and conclusions?</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maerl beds within the Bembridge MCZ are said to be located approximately 3.8km from the Proposed Development in Table 8.3 but are assessed as being located 10km from the Proposed Development in Table 8.4 and paragraph 8.6.4.60; • Stalked jellyfish within Bembridge MCZ are said to be located approximately 3.8km from the Proposed Development in Table 8.3 but are assessed as being located more than 5km from the Proposed Development in paragraph 8.6.4.73; • Sheltered muddy gravels within Bembridge MCZ are said to be located approximately 3.8km from the Proposed Development in Table 8.3 but are assessed as being located more than 5km from the Proposed Development in paragraph 8.6.4.68. 	<p>Tables 8.3 and 8.4 in Chapter 8 (APP-123) provide different types of data, hence the difference. Table 8.3 provides the distance between the UK Marine Cable Corridor and the boundary of each protected area. Table 8.4 provides the approximate distance between the Marine Cable Corridor and any high sensitivity habitats presented as being in the vicinity as defined by the WFD/Environment Agency by the Magic Map website (https://magic.defra.gov.uk/About_MAGIC.htm).</p> <p>The assessments of connectivity, and thus exposure to a given level of impact, presented in Section 8.6.4, was determined for each receptor based upon its location (which may have been within a protected area) as presented on Magic Maps, and the distance from the impacting activity. This approach is considered to provide the most realistic (though precautionary) assessment possible, as the shortest distance to a given receptor is used to determine connectivity with the level of impact received.</p>
ME1.10.25	The Applicant	A number of impacts are identified during construction and operation but are not assessed for every receptor identified in Table 8.5 of the ES [APP-123]. Can the Applicant explain the rationale for this selective assessment approach?	Chapter 8 (APP-123) presents an assessment for all receptors that could be affected by a given impact. It is true that for some impacts, the list of receptors is different than for others, however where receptor-impact combinations are not presented this is due to the fact that no interaction occurs. For example, direct impacts can only affect those receptors within the Marine Cable Corridor as identified in Table 8.5 and as such, this list of receptors is more limited compared to receptors affected over the wider area where indirect impacts can extend beyond the Marine Cable Corridor.
ME1.10.26	The Applicant	In relation to paragraphs 8.6.4.98 and 8.6.4.30 of the ES [APP-123], what is the rationale behind the finding of no significant effect on the <i>Ophiothrix fragilis</i> and/ or <i>Ophiocarina nigra</i> brittlestar beds on sublittoral mixed sediment community in relation to habitat loss or disturbance, while finding a significant effect for the same receptor through deposition of sediment disturbed during cable installation?	The disparity arises due to differences in the scale of impact and resulting effect on the receptor. In the case of disturbance (paragraph 8.6.4.30), it is considered that the impact will not lead to the complete loss of the habitat at a local or regional scale and, as such, the function and services of that habitat will continue to be provided. In the assessment of deposition of sediment (smothering) from disposal of dredge material however (paragraph 8.6.4.98), it

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			was determined that loss of the feature in its entirety was possible, with little chance of recovery and as such, a significant effect was determined (prior to mitigation).
ME1.10.27	The Applicant	<p>Should paragraphs 8.6.5.4 to 8.6.5.51 of the ES [APP-123] be part of the construction impact assessment rather than the operational impact assessment?</p> <p>Is the 'Habitat Loss' section relating to operational effects missing from the ES?</p> <p>If so, could a revised version please be produced to avoid any confusion, and does the cumulative assessment need to be revised as a result?</p>	In Chapter 8 (APP-123), temporary loss of habitat resulting from construction activities is assessed in the construction phase impact assessment (paragraphs 8.6.4.2 to 8.6.4.30). Habitat loss (long term resulting from placement of non-burial cable protection) is considered to be an operational impact as the placement of the non-burial protection material is designed to protect an operational cable, and the effect duration is as per the operational life of the cable. The assessment of habitat loss due to operational effects is presented in paragraphs 8.6.5.4 to 8.6.5.21.
ME1.10.28	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 8.6.5.30 of ES Chapter 8 [APP-123], whilst there is reference to previous studies, it is also stated that the results are not directly comparable due to differences in baseline scenarios. No worst-cased scenario is specified in terms of heat emissions and therefore the conclusion is not supported. Can the Applicant provide the worst-case scenario for cable overheating, what temperatures might be reached in the surface sediments and seawater immediately above, and how the surrounding habitats, wildlife and environment would be affected.	Modelled thermal data is now available for the Proposed Development so this assessment (including worst-case scenario) has been updated in ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1).
ME1.10.29	The Applicant	Is there a typographical error in ES paragraph 9.1.1.3 [APP-124]? Should the cumulative assessment for fish and shellfish refer to Section 9.7 rather than 8.7?	Yes, that is correct 8.7 is an error and it should be 9.7. This is itemised within the Errata Sheet in Appendix 1 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1.1).
ME1.10.30	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 10.1.2.2 of the ES [APP-125] in relation to marine mammals, it is unclear what assumptions are made in relation to location of HDD works. The map referred to (ES Figure 3.9) does not appear to show these, as is suggested. Please clarify.	The Examining Authority is correct in identifying that Figure 3.9 does not show the HDD locations. Figure 3.3. of the ES (APP-148) illustrates the location of HDD1 landfall location and the other HDD locations are described in the HDD Position Statement (document reference 7.7.3).
ME1.10.31	The Applicant Natural England	In relation to marine ornithology and protected areas [APP-126], the Minister classified the Solent and Dorset Coast Special Protection Area (SPA) on 16 January 2020, after the submission of the application. The EIA and HRA were undertaken in relation to the Solent and Dorset Coast potential Special Protection Area. Does the classification alter the findings of either assessment?	<p>Assessment for the Solent and Dorset pSPA was undertaken using the conservation objectives listed for Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA. Although both SPAs have differing suites of qualifying features, they have the same conservation objectives. As such, the reclassification of the Solent and Dorset Coast pSPA to SPA does not alter the findings of either assessment.</p> <p>The HRA has been updated to reflect the change from a pSPA to SPA (APP-491 Rev 002).</p>
ME1.10.32	The Applicant	Table 7.9 of the HRA report [APP-491] states that disturbance effects on red-breasted merganser are considered to be negligible due to the rolling safe passage distance of 700m for associated vessel activities. However, Chapter 3 of that document refers to marine cable installation vehicles having a rolling	The information referenced from Table 7.9 of the HRA Report (APP-491) relates specifically to the assessment for Likely Significant Effect to Portsmouth Harbour SPA for disturbance and displacement to red-breasted merganser. The referenced section of Table 7.9 of the HRA report states that there is

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>500m recommended safe passing distance that may increase to 700m where barges are used. Could the Applicant confirm which distance is the correct one?</p> <p>What are the implications for likely significant effects on SPAs where red-breasted merganser is a qualifying feature if the safe passing distance is 500m?</p>	<p>considered to be no significant disturbance or displacement of red-breasted mergansers on the grounds of the distance between favoured foraging and roosting areas in Portsmouth Harbour SPA and the Proposed Development. It is therefore, considered appropriate to conclude no LSE for red-breasted merganser from Portsmouth Harbour SPA in relation to disturbance and displacement effects.</p> <p>The coastal distance between the Portsmouth Harbour SPA and proposed development is greater than 5 km, including a rolling safe passage distance of 700 m for associated vessel activities around the Proposed Development. The rolling passage distance of 700 m which was used in the assessment is correct. It relates to safe passage distances around barges used for inshore cable installation works in shallower coastal areas. As outlined in Section 3.5.7 of Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (APP-118), due to the method of anchorage of these vessels in shallower coastal waters, a 700 m rolling safe passage distance is applied around the works, as opposed to a 500 m equivalent distance for works undertaken by dynamic positioning vessels employed in deeper waters.</p> <p>As the correct safe passage distance has been applied during assessment there are no implications relating to LSEs on Portsmouth Harbour SPA. However, should a 500 m safe passage distance have been used for assessment this would result in effectively greater separation distance between proposed works and the SPA, and as such the assessment outcome of no potential for significant effect to red-breasted merganser would remain valid.</p>
02ji/	Natural England	Does Natural England agree that likely significant effects from visual disturbance (see Table 7.10 of the HRA Report [APP-491]) on the qualifying features of the Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA and Ramsar site can be excluded from the HRA?	
ME1.10.34	The Applicant	In relation to commercial fisheries, there is some confusion in the ES chapter [APP-127] about the definition of the 'landfall' and the consequent findings of the assessment. The impact assessment (including table 12.7) appear to use the HDD exit/ entry area in the subtidal zone as the 'landfall' in common with most other chapters of the ES, while 12.1.2.6 seems to take the intertidal zone as the 'landfall' area and suggests that the assessment is undertaken on this basis. Could the Applicant clarify?	<p>In Chapter 12 Commercial Fisheries (APP-127), the text in paragraph 12.1.2.6 is correct in regard to how the baseline has been gathered and described. In collecting the baseline information, the definition of the landfall includes the intertidal area because it is not possible to separate out fishing between the main construction works occurring in the Marine Cable Corridor (which begins at the HDD entry/exit pits) and the area of sea landward of the HDD entry/exit due to the way that fisheries data is collated (i.e. per ICES rectangle) and occurs in the Solent. That is, there is no way to distinguish between fishing occurring landward and seaward of the HDD entry/exit area within the baseline data.</p> <p>However, the assessment considers the impacts to commercial fishing from the HDD works under the title 'landfall' in line with other chapters. This assessment relied on the baseline for the Marine Cable Corridor as described above.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
ME1.10.35	The Applicant	<p>In ES paragraph 12.6.4.5 [APP-127], the exclusion zones are said to represent ‘a relatively small proportion of the fishing ground available and only for a limited time period.’ While worst case times are set out, it is not clear what is meant by ‘a relatively small proportion’. Similarly, 12.6.4.10, 12.6.4.16, 12.6.4.21, 12.6.4.25, 12.6.4.29, 12.6.4.36, 12.6.4.39 and 12.6.4.46 refer to ‘small’ proportions, and 12.6.4.43 to ‘tiny’. Can the proportions be estimated quantitatively for each of the receptor types?</p>	<p>No, it is not possible to estimate quantitatively the proportions of fishing ground affected by the exclusion zones as reliable spatial data for the entire extent of all the different fisheries is not available. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 15m vessels do not have VMS data so accurate spatial data is not available; • Under 15m vessel spatial data is available in the form of information provided by fishermen, however while this provides a good indication of the extent of the fisheries, it is not reliable enough for quantitative calculations of accurate proportions; and • Data on the spatial distribution of French fishing vessels within UK waters is only available for the UK Marine Area around the Marine Cable Corridor (hence the total spatial extent of these fisheries is not known). <p>As a result of these factors, a qualitative assessment was made using expert judgment, which is consistent with EIA methodology for fisheries assessment and the methodology provided in this chapter. In addition, even when information is available (e.g. MMO landings data), providing quantitative figures for the proportion of ground affected can be misleading as all available ground is not available to all vessels, as some vessels are more limited in their range than others.</p> <p>The use of qualifiers such as ‘relatively small’ are based on an examination of spatial data (using GIS) of the value of the fisheries (classified in fisheries data as high, medium and low) and assessing the proportion of the ground and the value of the each fisheries potentially affected by exclusion zones compared to the wider area where vessels operate for each fishery.</p>
ME1.10.36	The Applicant	<p>In relation to EMF from cables buried in the seabed, the HRA report [APP-491] states that likely significant effects on migratory fish site features from EMF can be excluded because the predicted field strength for EMF around the HVDC interconnector cables would be 42µT at the minimum cable burial depth of 1m. What would the field strength be along the sections of cable where the target burial depth cannot be achieved? Would this change the conclusions of the assessment?</p> <p>What length and period of exposure would be required to cause significant effects?</p> <p>Does the Applicant believe that monitoring of EMF and the behaviour of relevant elasmobranchs and migratory fish during operation is necessary, and, if not, why not?</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.5.9.7 of Chapter 3 - Description of the Proposed Development (APP-118) highlights that the cable ‘will be buried throughout approximately 90% of the Marine Cable Corridor’. The remaining c.10% is expected to require remedial non-burial protection. As such, the whole cable will be either buried or protected and no cable will be exposed (as this would risk the asset). Where the cable is buried, a minimum depth of lowering (depth to top of cable) of 1.0 m is specified. The EMF at this depth (c.1.15 m from the centre of the bundled pair of cables) would therefore be less than 42µT. Protection of the cable will consist of either mattresses or rock placement (Table 3 in Appendix 3.2; APP-356). Similar to burial, employing non-burial cable protection enforces a buffer distance between the cable and fish, although this distance will vary depending on the protection system used, and whether any partial burial (but less than the specified target depth of lowering) has been achieved (e.g. partial burial and cable protection measures may also occur). The non-burial protection system has to provide the cable with equivalent levels of protection as burial would, and must also minimise the risk of snagging of fishing gear. These methods increase the likelihood of a more robust protection system as opposed to simply placing a thin concrete mattress over the cables for example. In this regard, the</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>EMF level decrease quickly with increased distance between source and receptor. For example, a 0.5 m distance from the cable is predicted to have a field strength of 165 μT, whereas at 1 m, it is 42 μT and levels would reduce to background earth levels within a few meters from the cable. Rock protection is more likely to be employed in the main and the use of concrete mattresses is more likely to only be in specific circumstances where rock protection is not considered appropriate or viable (e.g. in very shallow water, where only a very short distance of non-burial protection is required, or where a third-party asset owner specifically excludes the use of rock). In shallow water for example, the permanent cable protection to be used at the HDD exit is anticipated to be rock or rock bags which can be used in this location because, if required, they will be placed into up to 3 m deep pits to prevent the protection from reducing navigable depth.</p> <p>The HRA report (APP-118) provides evidence that salmon are not sensitive to EMF (Armstrong et al., 2015) and lamprey do not respond to magnetic fields (Gill et al.,2010). Migratory fish such as salmon are highly mobile and can transit between 50 to 100 km per day at sea (Solomon et al. (2004). Given this extensive mobility, they are not inclined to stay in one area or be present at the seabed for any length of time and would therefore not even be in a position of EMF exposure. Similarly, allis and twaite shad are pelagic swimmers and do not possess ampullary organs (which allow detection of weak voltages for prey detection) but rely only on sight and sensory detection to find prey. The ES Chapter 9 (APP-124) also provides evidence (MMO, 2014) that EMF does not pose a significant risk to elasmobranchs at a site or population level, and little uncertainty remains. Therefore, in this context, regardless of whether the cables are buried or protected, it is considered that the conclusions of the assessment for likely significant effects of EMF on migratory fish presented and for elasmobranchs in the HRA report (APP-491) and ES chapter (APP-124) remains and monitoring of EMF and fish behaviour during operation is not considered necessary.</p> <p>References:</p> <p>Armstrong, J. D., Hunter, D. C., Fryer, R. J., Rycroft, P., & Orpwood, J. E. (2015). Behavioural Response of Atlantic Salmon to Mains Frequency Magnetic Fields.</p> <p>Gill, A.B. and Bartlett, M. 2010. Literature review on the potential effects of electromagnetic fields and subsea noise from marine renewable energy developments on Atlantic salmon, sea trout and European eel. Scottish Natural Heritage Commissioned Report No.401.</p> <p>Solomon, D.J. & Sambrook, H.T. (2004). Effects of hot dry summers on the loss of Atlantic salmon, <i>Salmo salar</i>, from estuaries in South West England. Fisheries Management and Ecology, 11 (5), 353–363.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			MMO (2014). Review of post-consent offshore wind farm monitoring data associated with licence conditions. A report produced for the Marine Management Organisation, pp 194. MMO Project No: 1031.

Table 1.11 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Noise

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
N1.11.1	The Applicant	Does the Applicant believe that the implications of the inclusion of Article 9 (defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance) in the dDCO [APP-019] should be explained at ES 24.2.2 [APP-139]?	No, this does not affect the assessment carried out in the ES and is therefore not considered to be a necessary amendment to it. Please see response to MG1.1.9 which provides further information regarding how Article 9 of the dDCO (APP-019) works in conjunction with the Control of Pollution Act 1974.
N1.11.2	Relevant local authorities	Is each affected local authority content with the approach and methodology used for undertaking the construction and operational noise assessments, particularly the location of survey points at the Converter Station and Optical Regeneration Station sites relative to the identified noise-sensitive receptors?	
N1.11.3	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 24.4.2.10 of the ES [APP-139], the construction noise assessment of activities associated with onshore cable installation is based on an illustrative alignment, as shown on Figure 24.2. Could the Applicant explain how this is considered robust when in some stretches (especially in sections 1, 2, 5, 6 and 9) it would be possible for the route to come substantially closer to sensitive noise receptors than the illustrative route.	<p>Within the onshore cable corridor, the relative distance between the illustrative cable route and the noise sensitive receptors influences the magnitude of noise level experienced by any receptor. The magnitude of impact and overall noise effect assigned to this magnitude of level is influenced by the duration, timing and frequency of exposure to that noise level, which is not altered by the alignment of the cable route. The noise assessment has concluded that for trenching and cable duct installation during core working hours, based on the assumed trenching rates in the amended installation rate assumptions ((see Figure 1 (Appendix 2, document reference 7.8.1.2))), any large adverse magnitude of noise level will be of insufficient duration to be deemed a significant adverse effect. Regardless of the alignment of the illustrative route, the overall conclusions with regard to significance of effect for trenching and duct installation during core working hours will not change. Therefore, the assessment approach is considered robust in this respect, and as explained in Paragraph 24.4.2.11 of the ES (APP-139), provides a robust and consistent indication of the impacts whilst remaining proportionate given the linear geographical extent of the Onshore Cable Corridor.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that an alteration to the cable route alignment could influence the number of sensitive receptors affected by each magnitude of noise level. The following information explains, for each section, why the illustrative route is considered robust.</p> <p>The information below also takes into account the amendments to the Order Limits since the submission of the 2019 ES submitted at Deadline 1.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p><u>Section 1</u></p> <p>Adverse noise effects from trenching and duct installation would occur at receptors that are located within 22m of the cable route. Sheet 1 of the Land Plans (APP-008 Rev02) shows that the area where the cable could be laid (the area identified for New Connection Works Rights) is much narrower than the Order Limits in this location, and the sensitive receptors at Little Denmead Farm (the only in the area) are located further than 22m from the land proposed to be used for installation of the onshore cables. Therefore, the cable could be laid anywhere within the land which is identified as to be subject to New Connection Works Rights in section 1 and there will be no adverse noise effects from cable route works. The assessment presented for Section 1 in the ES is therefore considered to be robust.</p> <p><u>Section 2</u></p> <p>Adverse noise effects from trenching and duct installation would occur at receptors that are located within 22m of the cable route. Considering that the cable route will preferentially follow the shortest possible alignment, it is considered unlikely the cable would be installed within 22m of the sensitive receptors located to the east of Edeny's Lane, and therefore no adverse noise effects will occur at these receptors. In the unlikely event that the cables were installed within 22m of these sensitive receptors (i.e. at the boundary of the Order Limits), based on the assumed installation rate of 50m per day and the distance between the receptors and the edge of the Order Limits, the noise impact would be, at most, a minor adverse effect (not significant). Therefore, the assessment presented in the ES is considered robust.</p> <p>In the southern area of section 2 adjacent to the north of Anmore Road, the Order Limits (APP-007 Rev02) have been amended such that the cable will not be laid within the land to east of Hillcrest Children's Services or along Anmore Road (though it will continue to cross Anmore Road). Furthermore, the revision of the Order Limits has reduced the area to the west of Hillcrest Children's Services. These changes will mean the cable route is not laid within 22m of any sensitive receptors other than Hillcrest Children's Services, which is already assessed in Paragraph 24.6.3.2 of the ES (APP-139), and the cable route will not come substantially closer to this receptor than the illustrative cable route used in the noise assessment. Therefore, the assessment for section 2 is considered to be robust.</p> <p><u>Section 3</u></p> <p>Sheet 3 of the Land Plans (APP-008 Rev02) shows that the area south of Clifton Crescent is for temporary use and therefore the cable will not be laid in this area. Sheet 3 of the Land Plans (APP-008 Rev02) also shows that the area to the west of HDD-3 is required for New Access Rights and, therefore, will not be used for the cable route. On this basis, there is not scope for an alternative alignment for the cable route that would change the predicted impacts and</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>therefore the assessment presented in Chapter 24 of the ES (APP-139) is considered robust.</p> <p><u>Section 4</u></p> <p>Throughout much of section 4 there are sensitive receptors located on both sides of the Order Limits (APP-007 Rev02). Consequently, if the illustrative cable route was moved closer to the edge of the Order Limits in either direction, it would not substantially influence the total number of receptors subjected to adverse noise effects. Therefore, the Order Limits in Section 4 are sufficiently narrow that the illustrative cable route alignment used in the noise and vibration assessment is considered to be robust.</p> <p><u>Section 5</u></p> <p>Throughout section 5 the Order Limits (APP-007 Rev02) are sufficiently narrow such that the illustrative cable route used in the noise and vibration assessment is considered robust. With respect to the two cable route options presented around Farlington Avenue, the option assessed in the noise and vibration assessment is considered the worst-case and therefore robust for the following reasons:</p> <p>The magnitude of noise effect for receptors on Eveleigh Road would be comparable with those presented for Farlington Avenue. Effects of no greater magnitude would occur if the cable were laid along Eveleigh Road rather than Farlington Avenue.</p> <p>The works on Eveleigh Road would be undertaken outside of school term time such that Solent Infant School would not be considered a noise sensitive receptor.</p> <p>If the cables were laid within the eastern option, approximately half of the cable length would be installed within open ground between Eveleigh Road and Havant Road. The works here would be quieter due to the absence of road cutting, breaking or resurfacing and would therefore not give rise to effects which are worse than those assessed.</p>

Section 6

In the northern part of section 6, the Order Limits (APP-007 Rev02) have been revised such that the cable route will be laid within Zetland Field rather than along Eastern Road. As this is consistent with the illustrative cable route, the noise and vibration assessment is considered robust. In the southern part of section 6, the Order Limits are sufficiently narrow that alignment within them will not make any material difference to the effects identified and the illustrative cable route is therefore considered to be robust.

Section 7

North of HDD-3, around Farlington Playing Fields, there are no noise sensitive receptors within 22m of the area of the specified for cable installation (New Connection Works Rights on the Land Plans (APP-008 Rev02)). Therefore, regardless of where the cable is laid within Farlington Playing Fields, the adverse noise effects will be no greater than those presented at Paragraph 24.6.8.2 of the ES (APP-139).

South of HDD-3, the Order Limits (APP-007 Rev02) have been revised such that the cable route will follow the option along the western side of Baffins Milton Rovers football ground, as presented in the illustrative route used in the noise and vibration assessment. The revised Order Limits along this section of the cable route are sufficiently narrow such that alignment within them will not make any material difference to the effects identified and the assessment presented at Paragraph 24.6.8.3 of the ES (APP-139).

Section 8

In the northern part of section 8 (north of Milton Common), the Order Limits (APP-007 Rev02) are sufficiently narrow such that alignment within them will not make any material difference to the effects identified and the noise assessment based on the illustrative cable route in Chapter 24 of the ES (APP-139) is considered robust. In the southern part of section 8 (around or through Milton Common), the westernmost alignment assessed in Chapter 24 of the ES (APP-139) is considered to be the worst case of the three possible options for the following reasons:

It is the longest alignment with the slowest estimated installation rate;

It is located closest to the greatest number of sensitive receptors; and

Much of this alignment would be installed within the road rather than over open ground, and therefore, would require noisier road cutting and breaking works.

The ES assessment for section 8 has been supplemented, through Chapter 17 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1), to account for optionality with respect to working hours and whether the cables are laid within roads or open ground (which affects the predicted noise levels). Specifically, this supplementary information accounts for:

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The possibility that that the cable route could be installed closer to the sensitive receptors within the Eastern Road along the north of Milton Common; and • The possibility that the cable route could be installed closer to the sensitive receptors within Moorings Way along the south of Milton Common. <p>This additional work ensures that the worst-case alignment option for section 8 has been assessed, and the assessment is therefore is considered to be robust.</p> <p><u>Section 9</u></p> <p>In section 9, north of HDD-2, the Order Limits (APP-007 Rev02) have been refined such that the cable route will not be installed within Furze Lane, and instead will follow the eastern option through the University of Portsmouth playing fields and alongside or within Longshore Way. The illustrative cable route alignment used in Chapter 24 of the ES assessed the Furze Lane option because this was considered to be the worst case due to the higher number of nearby sensitive receptors. Chapter 17 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) contains amended predicted impacts for Furze Lane and Locksway Road on basis of the revised installation rate assumptions. As the Order Limits are narrow along Furze Lane and Locksway Road, the noise and vibration assessment for this part of Section 9 is considered robust.</p> <p>For completeness following the revision of the Order Limits and the removal of Furze Lane as a cable route option, a supplementary note will be submitted to reflect the revised noise and vibration effects (this is currently being produced and is expected to be submitted at Deadline 2). As the Furze Lane option was considered worst case with respect to noise and vibration, the supplementary note will show a reduction in the total number of sensitive receptors subject to adverse noise and vibration effects in Section 9.</p> <p>In section 9, south of HDD-2, the Order Limits (APP-007 Rev02)) for the Yeo Court option are sufficiently narrow such that the noise and vibration assessment is considered robust. However, it is acknowledged that the option to install the cable along Kingsley Road to the west of Yeo Court was not assessed in Chapter 24 of the ES (APP-139). As this could be considered the worst-case, supplementary information for this option is contained in Chapter 17 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1). This additional assessment, in combination with the information contained in section 24.6.10 of the ES (APP-139), demonstrates that the noise and vibration assessment is robust.</p> <p><u>Section 10</u></p> <p>Throughout the majority of section 10 there are sensitive receptors located on both sides of the Order Limits (APP-007 Rev02)). Consequently, if the illustrative cable route was moved closer to the edge of the Order Limits in either direction, it would not substantially influence the total number of receptors subjected to adverse noise effects. Therefore, the Order Limits in Section 10 are sufficiently</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			narrow such alignment within them will not make any material difference to the effects identified and the illustrative cable route alignment used in the noise and vibration assessment is therefore considered to be robust.
N1.11.4	The Applicant	Which baseline noise monitoring location (or representative location) is used in the assessment of noise effects on the Gypsy and Traveller community identified by the South Downs National Park Authority in its Adequacy of Consultation response [AoC- 010]? Where is this described?	This point has been discussed with SDNPA previously and the Applicant understands this was an error and there is no gypsy and traveller community, but relates to two single storey properties within the same grounds and referred to as the Haven and Old Mill Cottage (receptor group number R1) within section 24.6.2 of ES Chapter 24 (APP-139). The sensitive receptors included in the noise vibration assessment are shown in Figure 24.1 of the ES (APP-335), and the full addresses of the receptors are listed in Table 1 of Appendix 24.3 of the ES (APP-462).
N1.11.5	Relevant local authorities	In ES Tables 24.4 and 24.6 [APP-139], the allocation of a category for the magnitude of impact is wholly dependent on how many 'consecutive' periods would be involved. Do the local authorities believe this is an appropriate approach, or should some account be taken of the overall, total length of time (perhaps with breaks) that the noise or vibration affects a particular receptor?	
N1.11.6	The Applicant	Please could the Applicant confirm if section 24.4.4 of the ES [APP-139] takes account of traffic diverting as a result of road closures and delays as well as traffic directly associated with the construction of the project.	The traffic data supplied for the construction stage road traffic noise assessment takes into account traffic diverting as a result of road closures and delays as well as traffic directly associated with the construction of the project. The traffic data supplied contains average vehicle speed and therefore any changes in speed (including from delays) on noise levels has also been accounted for.
N1.11.7	The Applicant Relevant local authorities	Do you believe that the application of definitions of magnitude of impact to the noise environment as set out in Table 24.13 of the ES [APP-139] is unclear? For example, what would constitute 'a total loss' of key elements or features of the baseline? Would an alternative set of definitions be more appropriate, and if so, would the noise assessment need to be re-run?	<p>The methodology for determining the magnitude of impact from the magnitude of level/change for each element of the noise and vibration assessment is clearly set-out in Tables 24.4, 24.6, 24.8 and 24.12 of the ES (APP-139), and agreed with the relevant Environmental Health Officer at the Local Planning Authorities during consultation meetings, as evidenced in Tables 2 and 4 of Appendix 24.1 of the ES (APP-460).</p> <p>As explained in Paragraph 24.4.7.2 of the ES, the definitions of magnitude of impact set-out in Table 24.13 of the ES are generic because there are various elements to the noise and vibration assessment, including construction noise and vibration, construction road traffic noise and operational noise. It is not possible to produce a set of descriptive definitions that are applicable to all assessment elements because of the wide range of noise and vibration sources in different contexts and geographic locations.</p> <p>However, little reliance has been placed on the generic definitions in Table 24.13 of the ES. Instead, the magnitude categories adopted for each element of the noise and vibration assessment are underpinned by the appropriate British Standard or guidance document, and the methodology for each assessment element has been agreed with the relevant Environmental Health Officer at the Local Planning Authorities during consultation meetings, as evidenced in Tables</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			2 and 4 of Appendix 24.1 of the ES (APP-460). Therefore, it is not considered necessary for revised magnitude of impact definitions to be adopted. However, if a revised set of definitions were adopted, the assessment would not need to be repeated because revised definitions would not change the magnitude of impact adopted for each element of the assessment and, therefore, would not change the assessment outcome.
N1.11.8	Portsmouth City Council	Does Portsmouth City Council consider the limited baseline noise monitoring data set out at ES 24.5.1.25 [APP-139] sufficient to set criteria for the operational noise associated with the Optical Regeneration Station?	
N1.11.9	The Applicant	Could the Applicant confirm if ES paragraph 24.6.1.14 [APP-139] is intended to be the start of section 24.6.2.	No. Paragraph 24.6.1.14 of the ES (APP-139) is intended to be the start of the predicted impacts section, following the embedded mitigation measures detailed in Paragraphs 24.6.1.1 to 24.6.1.13. The predicted impacts for each Section (1 to 10) of the Proposed Development are contained in separate subsections of Section 24.6 (Predicted Impacts). This has been addressed in the Errata Sheet (document reference 7.8.1.1) submitted at Deadline 1.
N1.11.10	The Applicant Relevant local authorities	For all of the impact assessment sections that follow ES paragraph 24.6.1.14 in Chapter 24 [APP-139], in converting the noise level magnitudes to impacts, allowance is made for the temporary nature of the effect, thus ameliorating the severity (from 'medium' to 'low' in 24.6.2.2, for example). However, does not the methodology adopted for the assessment already build duration into the calculation of magnitude (e.g. 24.4.2.36), and thus is there not an element of 'double-counting' of duration in reducing the severity of effects? If so, what are the implications of this for the assessment findings? For example, if trenching impacts for section 4 were recalculated without the 'double-counting', would these become significant (ES 26.4.5.3 ff)?	The duration of construction activities is not 'double-counted' in the noise and vibration assessment. The predicted impacts detailed in section 24.6 set-out, in each instance, the steps that are worked through to reach a given magnitude of effect from a magnitude of noise or vibration level. These steps are explained for each assessment element in Section 24.4 (Assessment Methodology) of Chapter 24 of the ES (APP-139). In the example provided in the question (24.6.2.2 of the ES Chapter 24 (APP-139)), the predicted daytime construction noise level (74dB LAeq,10h at Broadway Farm Cottages) corresponds with a medium adverse magnitude of level, as shown Table 24.3 of ES Chapter 24. As this daytime magnitude of level is expected to last for a period of up to 5 days, this is considered a low magnitude of impact, as shown in Table 24.4 of ES Chapter 24. As shown in Table 24.14 of the ES (APP-139), a low magnitude of impact for a receptor of high sensitivity is considered a minor adverse (not significant) effect. An equivalent process has been followed for all of the predicted construction impacts in Section 24.6 of ES Chapter 24. As there is no 'double counting' of the duration effects, this does not have any implications for the assessment findings.
N1.11.11	The Applicant	What consideration has been given to noise impacts from the HDD construction compounds on wildlife at the Milton Locks Nature Reserve, and any necessary mitigation? Is any information on this required in the ES?	The small Milton Locks SINC lies beside Langstone Harbour and comprises woodland, and an adjacent patch of scrub, separated from one another by the entrance to the Thatched House public house. Horizontal Directional Drilling ('HDD') will be used to avoid this SINC, and therefore despite it being within the Proposed Development's Order Limits, it would not be directly affected. The SINC itself in holding woodland and scrub habitat does not support bird species such as brent geese that are potentially sensitive to noise while noting that the

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			adjacent intertidal habitat forms part of the Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA and subject to the assessment in the HRA Report (APP-491) and the Winter Working Restriction for Features of Chichester & Langstone SPA defined in Appendix 16.14 of the ES (APP-442).
N1.11.12	The Applicant	In relation to section 24.7 of the ES [APP-139], have intra-project cumulative effects in relation to those receptors that would experience noise from more than one construction-related source been considered (such as construction plant noise and changes in traffic noise)? If so, where?	The potential for intra-project cumulative noise effects, specifically in relation to the construction stage, were investigated at the time of the ES assessment. It was concluded that individual receptors are unlikely to experience simultaneous effects from different elements of the construction works for the reasons outlined below. On this basis, intra-project cumulative noise effects would not occur.

			<p><u>Onshore Cable Route construction noise and changes in noise levels from traffic redistribution</u></p> <p>The roads where greater than negligible adverse construction traffic noise effects were identified (see Tables 24.55 and 24.57 of ES Chapter 24 (Noise and Vibration) (APP-139) are located at a sufficient distance from the Order Limits that receptors would not be impacted by noise from both construction of the Onshore Cable Route and changes in road traffic. Intra-project cumulative noise effects are, therefore, not anticipated.</p> <p>The one exception is for the receptors on Eveleigh Road in Farlington which are expected to experience a moderate adverse noise effect from road traffic redistribution (Paragraph 24.6.13.5 of ES Chapter 24), and potentially a moderate adverse effect from construction noise. The western end of Eveleigh Road is located within the Order limits and is a potential route for the cables (Paragraph 3.6.4.23 of the Description of the Proposed Development (APP-118)).</p> <p>The predicted noise effect from road traffic redistribution on Eveleigh Road would only occur when Farlington Avenue (between Eveleigh Road and Havant Road) is closed to facilitate cable installation (i.e. the option presented on Sheet 9 of Figure 24.2 of Illustrative Cable Route, HDD sites and Joint Bays for noise and vibration assessment (APP-336)). The moderate adverse noise effect from traffic redistribution on Eveleigh Road would not occur when cable circuits are being installed along Eveleigh Road because this road would be closed during the works.</p> <p>As such, noise effects from the construction of the Onshore Cable Route along Eveleigh Road and noise effects from road traffic redistribution on Eveleigh Road would not occur simultaneously and, therefore, intra-project cumulative noise effects are not anticipated.</p> <p><u>Trenching/cable duct installation and Joint Bays</u></p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.4.5 of APP-118 explains that the cables are pulled through the ducts 'at a later date after sections of ducts have been installed'. The two sections of cable ducts either side of a joint bay would need to be installed prior to the joint bay works and, therefore, individual receptors would not be subject to cumulative noise from trenching and Joint Bay works. Furthermore, as described in Section 24.6 of ES Chapter 24, all predicted noise effects from joint bays are considered negligible and, consequently are not considered to contribute to any intra-project cumulative effects.</p> <p><u>Trenching/cable duct installation and HDD</u></p> <p>With respect to noise from trenching/cable duct installation works and works at HDD compounds, it is worthwhile considering each HDD site and the adjacent trenching/cable duct installation works in turn.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HDD-1: The receptor considered to be impacted to the greatest extent by noise from trenching/cable duct installation works and HDD-1 is 51 Fort Cumberland Road because it is located closest to the HDD-1 compound
--	--	--	--

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>and trenching works. This receptor is predicted to experience a short-term moderate adverse effect from nearby trenching/cable duct installation works occurring during the weekday daytime (Paragraph 24.6.11.3 of ES Chapter 24). However, the noise effects from weekday daytime works at HDD-1 are predicted to be negligible at all receptors (Table 24.51 of ES Chapter 24) and therefore these simultaneous works would not result in any intra-project cumulative effects. Minor adverse noise effects are predicted during the weekend HDD works (Paragraph 24.6.11.8 of ES Chapter 24) and no trenching/cable duct installation works will occur in this area at the weekend (except Saturday mornings which are considered core working hours) (see Table 3.7 of ES Chapter 3, (APP-118). Therefore, no intra-project cumulative noise effects are expected at 51 Fort Cumberland Road, and the other nearby receptors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HDD-2: The only receptor subject to a greater than negligible noise effect from HDD-2 is the residential flat above the Thatched House public house. This receptor is predicted to experience a short-term moderate adverse effect from nearby trenching/cable duct installation works occurring during the weekday daytime (Paragraph 24.6.10.4 of ES Chapter 24). However, the weekday works at HDD-2 are predicted to be negligible (Paragraph 24.6.10.11 of ES Chapter 24) and, therefore, these simultaneous works would not result in any intra-project cumulative effects. Minor adverse effects are predicted during the weekend HDD works (Paragraph 24.6.10.14 of ES Chapter 24) and no trenching/cable duct installation works will occur in this area at the weekend (except Saturday mornings which are considered core working hours) (see Table 3.7 of ES Chapter 3 (APP-118). Therefore, no intra-project cumulative noise effects are expected at the Thatched House. <li>• HDD-3: Noise effects from weekday daytime works at HDD-3 (Paragraph 24.6.8.11 of ES Chapter 24) and the adjacent trenching works near Kendal's Wharf (Paragraph 24.6.8.3 of ES Chapter 24) are predicted to be negligible. Noise from the weekday evening and weekend works at HDD-3 (Paragraph 24.6.8.12 of ES Chapter 24) will be minor adverse. However, no trenching/cable duct installation works will occur in this area at the weekend (except Saturday mornings which are considered core working hours) (see Table 3.7 of the ES Chapter 3 (APP-118). Therefore, no intra-project cumulative noise effects are expected. <li>• HDD-4: Noise effects from the HDD-4 reception pit works north of the railway line are predicted to be negligible (Paragraph 24.6.7.15 of ES Chapter 24). Therefore, these works will not result in cumulative noise effects at receptors affected by the trenching works in the Sainsbury's car park. Furthermore, the moderate adverse effects from the night-time

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>trenching works, if required (Paragraph 24.6.7.12 of ES Chapter 24), are as a result of the works in the northern part of the car park and Fitzherbert Road, i.e. not adjacent to the HDD-4 works. Therefore, no intra-project cumulative noise effects are expected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HDD-5: Noise effects from the HDD and adjacent trenching works are both predicted to be negligible (Paragraphs 24.6.4.3 and 24.6.4.5 of ES Chapter 24 (APP-139) and, therefore, no intra-project cumulative noise effects are expected. HDD-6: Noise effects from the HDD works (Paragraph 24.6.9.27 of ES Chapter 24) and the trenching works either side of the HDD compound (Paragraph 24.6.9.2 of ES Chapter 24) are predicted to be negligible at all residential receptors and, therefore, no intra-project cumulative noise effects are expected. <p><u>Joint Bays and HDD</u></p> <p>The indicative joint bays where the predicted magnitude of noise level is greater than negligible are JB6/7, JB8/9 and JB10/11 (and even so the overall noise effect is considered negligible at these Joint Bays (due to a negligible magnitude of impact)). These joint bays are located a substantial distance from any HDD compounds and, therefore, no intra-project noise effects are expected.</p> <p><u>Trenching/cable duct installation and Converter Station construction</u></p> <p>Noise effects associated with trenching of the HVDC and HVAC cables are predicted to be negligible (Paragraphs 24.6.2.10 and 24.6.2.11 of ES Chapter 24) and, therefore, will not contribute to the overall construction noise effect experienced at receptors in Section 1. Therefore, no intra-project cumulative noise effects are expected.</p>

Table 1.12 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Onshore Water Environment

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
OW1.12.1	The Applicant	Denmead Parish Council [RR-052] has raised a concern that the heat generating qualities of the cable once operating could cause ‘clay shrinkage’ and affect the drainage of the surrounding soil. Please comment on the likelihood of effects and whether there is potential for highways to be damaged in the long term due to changed soil conditions.	HVDC cables generate heat during operation and it is caused by energy losses in the underground cables because they are typically not 100% efficient (as identified in ES Chapter 3 (Description of the Proposed Development) (APP-118), the Additional Supporting Information for Onshore Works (APP-359), and Onshore Electric and Magnetic Field Report (APP-361)). All electrical cables generate heat; however, the Proposed Development has HVDC cables, which

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>generate less losses than traditional HVAC cables – some of which are already installed in the vicinity of the proposed Order limits.</p> <p>Whilst not included in the submission, the Applicant's technical advisors note that traditional AC cables have two types of losses that generate heat: Dielectric losses and sheath losses. The dielectric losses are naturally created by the insulating material and the sheath losses are created by induced voltage and currents in the cable's metallic screen. HVDC cables do not have either of these losses and therefore generate significantly less heat than traditional AC cables of a smaller size, making them ideal for underground cables for interconnector projects as described in paragraph 2.4.5.2 of the ES (APP-117).</p> <p>In addition, the HVDC cables have been extensively modelled for different seasonal and environmental conditions, and a typical calculated increase in temperature at ground level is in the order of 2-3°C therefore having negligible effect on the environment. As for clay or other ground drying out, the installation is designed specifically to prevent this from occurring as dried-out ground presents a significantly greater thermal resistance which makes the system less efficient and increases losses. Accordingly, cables are installed in ducts (plastic pipes) that offer good thermal properties at higher temperatures. The cross-section of the ducts is designed such that the temperature outside of the surrounding material does not dry out the surrounding clay or other ground.</p>
OW1.12.2	The Applicant	<p>Would the Proposed Development result in the disruption of any private water supplies used for agricultural purposes (including irrigation and water for animals) or to private residential properties ([RR-027] as an example)?</p> <p>If so, what alternative arrangements (e.g. tankering) are proposed to ensure water supplies would be maintained for the duration of any disruption and how are these secured in the dDCO?</p>	<p>There are no areas of agricultural land within or adjacent to the Order Limits that rely on irrigation. There are a number of land holdings that are used for grazing horses and that rely on adequate water supplies, but the information collected by the Applicant's agricultural consultants during farm visits did not establish whether these holdings rely on private or public water supplies.</p> <p>The Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan as updated (APP-505 Rev002) and secured by requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019), includes at section 5.4.1.2 for the replacement of any temporarily severed water supplies as may occur.</p>
OW1.12.3	The Applicant	<p>There are a number of terms used in ES Chapter 19 [APP-134] that may be considered technical and require explanation to a lay reader. Several are not included in the glossary that was submitted with the application (e.g. karst, clearwater flooding, dolines). Please could a suitable chapter glossary be provided, or the relevant terms added to an updated version of the submitted glossary.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 19 (APP-134) has been reviewed to identify any additional terms which may require explanation to a lay reader. The Glossary has been updated and the updated version is submitted with this document. (APP-006 Rev002)</p>
OW1.12.4	The Applicant	<p>Table 19.1 in ES Chapter 19 [APP-134] notes that the HDD works would introduce 4 x 36-inch diameter tubes that would act as small hydraulic barriers in the aquifers. Please justify the basis for scoping this out of the assessment.</p>	<p>The 4 x 36-inch tubes which act as hydraulic barriers have been scoped out of the assessment because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are made of an inert (non-polluting) material which is bentonite. Bentonite is a type of fine clay which is absorbent, consisting mostly of montmorillonite. It is widely used as a sealing barrier in boreholes and is

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>not considered a pollutant, therefore eliminating any possible water quality impact from the material itself.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They act as impermeable barriers preventing any inflows or outflows into or out of the tubes carrying the electric cables (therefore will prevent any transportation of contaminants). All introduced ground materials will be inert in any case. • They are (relative to the aquifer) very small and water can flow around them, therefore there is no anticipated impact on groundwater flow and quantity. <p>For the above reasons there are no impacts anticipated on water quality or quantity.</p>
OW1.12.5	The Applicant	Paragraph 19.4.3.5 of the ES [APP-134] notes that the groundwater assessment is based on an assumption that the trenchless technique used for HDD-4 (Farlington railway crossing) would be designed in such a way that groundwater does not seep into, or drilling fluids seep out of, the micro tunnel annulus. How and where is this secured in the dDCO [APP-019]?	The design of the trenchless technique used for HDD-4 is set out in Section 6.2.5.5 of the updated Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (APP-505 Rev002), compliance with which is secured by Requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019).
OW1.12.6	The Applicant	Paragraph 19.6.1.2 of the ES [APP-134] confirms that the assessment includes important 'embedded' mitigation to grout the surface karst at the Converter Station site prior to any earthwork movements, to interrupt any pathway to the underlying Chalk aquifer. It refers to Appendix 3.6 [APP-360] for the details. However, this Appendix notes that these are strategic proposals by the Applicant's consultants, and that the information is for information purposes only, it being ultimately the responsibility of the appointed contractor to develop the mitigation proposal. This mitigation is relied on in the assessment. Please could the Applicant explain how this mitigation is 'embedded' in the design of the proposals, and detail how and where it is secured in the dDCO [APP-019]. It is noted that there is no definition of an 'Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy' in the dDCO [APP-019].	<p>The Applicant has updated Appendix 3.6 (APP-360 Rev002) to include additional certainty on the mitigation proposed. The Applicant has included the updated document as Appendix 7 to the Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (APP-505 Rev002), compliance with which is secured by Requirement 15 of dDCO (APP-019).</p> <p>A definition of surface water drainage and aquifer contamination mitigation strategy is contained at paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 to the dDCO (APP-019), which is the appropriate location as the term is used in this Schedule and not in the Articles to the Order. This document is also listed as a certified document at Schedule 14 to the dDCO.</p>
OW1.12.7	The Applicant	Karst grouting is mentioned in paragraph 19.6.3 of the ES [APP-134], but general effects associated with the infiltration of any spilled contaminant through the soils and permeable geology does not seem to be addressed. Please clarify.	<p>The vulnerability of the Principal Aquifer (Chalk) to surface pollution sources is discussed in Section 19.5.5.17 (Groundwater Vulnerability) of Chapter 19 of the ES (APP-134). Additionally, the mitigation of the effects of spilled contaminants is discussed in detail in Section 19.7 (Proposed Mitigation and Enhancement). These are secured in the revised Onshore Outline CEMP, Section 5.6 (Groundwater) and requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p> <p>This assessment is also included in Section 10.3 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1).</p>
OW1.12.8	The Applicant	Paragraph 19.6.3.4 of the ES [APP-134] states that the groundwater assessment is dependent on construction vehicles and plant tracking along	Section 3.4 of the updated Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (FCTMP) (APP-450 Rev002) (document reference 6.3.22.2) includes designated construction routes for the Converter Station and all sections of the

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		designated routes only. Please could the Applicant explain where and how this measure is secured through the dDCO [APP-019].	Onshore Cable Corridor. Compliance with the FCTMP is secured by Requirement 17 of the dDCO (APP-019).
OW1.12.9	Portsmouth Water Environment Agency	Given the importance of groundwater in the vicinity of the Proposed Development, and especially the Converter Station site, are Portsmouth Water and the Environment Agency content with the conclusion reached in paragraph 18.5.4.4 of the ES [APP-133] that there is no real risk to public water supply in Source Protection Zone 1 as a result of these proposals?	
OW1.12.10	The Applicant	In ES Table 19.7 [APP-134], there are several references to ‘mitigation measures outlined in... 19.8’. Could the Applicant please explain what these are?	The reference to Section 19.8 in ES Table 19.7 is a typo and should instead be referencing Section 19.7 (Proposed Mitigation and Enhancement). This is addressed in the Errata Sheet (document reference 7.8.1.1) submitted alongside this response.
OW1.12.11	The Applicant	ES Appendix 19.3 [APP-434], The Hydrogeology of Kings Pond and Denmead Meadows, appears to suggest that, despite the title, little is known about the hydrogeology of King’s Pond. Could the Applicant please clarify which observations are referred to in 1.3.1.5 (<i>‘Observations conflict slightly with the observations...’</i>) and explain the implications of any uncertainties for the impact assessment, taking account of the cable installation methodologies proposed in this area.	<p>At the Applicant’s site walkover, it was observed that there was approximately the same volume of water flowing in to Kings Pond as was flowing out, the implication being that the water level in the pond is supported principally by this surface flow contribution rather than groundwater (in the form of a spring in the base of the pond).</p> <p>The historic data indicated that the water table was approximately 5 m below the ground level at Kings Pond, indicating that when those historic measurements were taken there was no groundwater baseflow contribution to Kings Pond. However, it cannot be excluded that there may be times when the groundwater is temporarily above the pond base elevation providing occasional groundwater contribution, hence Appendix 19.3 (Section 1.3.1.4) (APP-434) states that the historic data were likely to represent minimum groundwater levels and that groundwater could theoretically rise above the levels in the historic data (235 m AOD) and provide a baseflow contribution for at least some of the time (while groundwater levels are above the base of Kings Pond). Notwithstanding this, there is no data to indicate that is the case (Appendix 19.3 states groundwater levels are “to be confirmed”) and therefore the Applicant does not consider there to be any conflict between the historic data and our observations on site.</p> <p>The slight conflict is that if there is a clay-rich layer, then this would then be considered to act as a hydraulic barrier which in theory would prevent the pond from receiving a groundwater contribution and acting as a spring discharge. The Applicant’s observations on the site walkover, along with the information from the Ground Investigations (indicating that there may be a presence of Tertiary deposits providing a clay-rich barrier) indicate that there may not be direct hydraulic connection with the Chalk aquifer at Kings Pond, which is what is concluded in Appendix 19.3 (Section 1.4.1.1). This conclusion is considered to be robust, given it considered all available data and information.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there is uncertainty in relation to the potential seasonal fluctuation in groundwater levels at Kings Pond (as highlighted in Appendix</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>19.3), which cannot be confirmed without long term groundwater monitoring. However, Chapter 19 (Section 19.6.1.7) identifies that the cable trench excavation works is to be undertaken in summer when groundwater is expected to be low (and therefore not providing baseflow to Kings Pond), which would mitigate this uncertainty with respect to Kings Pond and any possible interference with groundwater baseflow contributions to it from the works. This is secured in the revised Onshore Outline CEMP, paragraph 6.2.1.11.</p>
<p>OW1.12.12</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>How would the HDD work and other elements of the Proposed Development affect the drainage of the Farlington Playing Fields?</p> <p>Could existing drainage problems be exacerbated?</p> <p>Could measures be adopted during cable installation or restoration of the land to assist or improve the current drainage problems there? (Refer to [APP-306], document 20.1 sheet 4 of 7, and [APP-312], document 20.7 sheet 2 of 3.)</p>	<p>The Onshore Cable is designed to pass under the Farlington Marshes Gutter and Broom Channel watercourses to ensure it does not impact on flow or conveyance. Temporary construction works associated with the Proposed Development, including those within Farlington Playing Fields (e.g. trenchless solution and HDD compound set up) has the potential to affect overland flow routes and/ or requiring dewatering. The works will require appropriate approval or exemption of environmental permits and will require temporary measures/mitigations to be adopted to ensure flood risk is not increased. This is secured within the updated Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (APP-505 Rev-002), and Requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019). Based on the proposed mitigation, current drainage problems are not expected to be exacerbated. During operation, ground levels will be reinstated to existing, having a negligible impact on overland drainage.</p> <p>Dewatering is considered very unlikely. Some over-pumping of the launch and reception pits at HDD-4 may be required, but elsewhere dewatering is considered unlikely. Discharge techniques for the over-pumping at HDD4 would need to be considered further as part of Construction Stage Documentation, typically a Surface Water Management Plan or Pollution Prevention Plan forming part of CEMP documentation, but would likely comprise sediment control by formation of settlement lagoons with silt traps (aided by hay bale filtration if required). Any contaminated water would require containment and off-site disposal.</p> <p>If pumping operations required must comply with the overall project CEMP and the Permit to Pump system.</p> <p>All pumping operations should be monitored and maintained. No direct pumping into watercourses allowed.</p> <p>All existing drainage systems should be identified and plotted, incorporate into new drainage designs - if new drainage required.</p>
<p>OW1.12.13</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>ES Appendix 3.5 [APP-359] at 1.1.3.6 states that the transformers and diesel generators would be banded to ensure any oil leakage is safely contained. Could the Applicant advise where and how this mitigation is secured?</p>	<p>The bunding of transformers and diesel generators is captured and secured through the Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy (APP-360, rev 002), paragraphs 4.2.1.1 and also in Section 2.9 Fuel Tank and Diesel Generator. The updated version of the Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy (APP-360, Rev 002) is submitted</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			as Appendix 7 to the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505, Rev 002) and secured under requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019)”
OW1.12.14	The Applicant	Section 1.2.3 of ES Appendix 3.5 [APP-359] notes that the design of the Converter Station includes provision for the installation of a deluge system to deal with fires. Could the Applicant provide more detail on how the drainage design for the site would deal with the operation of this system and indicate how and where this has been accounted for in the ES and surface water drainage and contamination strategy in terms of water quality.	<p>The operation of the fire deluge system will have no impact on the quality of the surface water that will be discharged from the site because the discharge from deluge system will be contained in an underground containment.</p> <p>Subject to the outcome of the detailed fire risk assessment, a fire active suppression/deluge system may be designed and installed on site and, the size of the transformer bund will be determined based on the volume of the oil in transformer and the water from active fire suppression system as well as an appropriate factor of safety and a suitable freeboard. In the event of a catastrophic failure/fire, the fire deluge system will be activated and the transformer oil and water from the active fire suppression system will permeate through a flame trap into the oil drainage system through a cast in ductile iron (or an appropriate alternative material) U-bend syphon flame trap to the oil drainage system and into underground oil containment where, the oil and water will be stored and will be emptied manually and will be transferred off-site to a designated waste facility when it is safe to do so.</p> <p>For further information refer to sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 of the updated Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy (APP-360, Rev 002) is submitted as Appendix 7 to the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505, Rev 002) and secured under requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019)</p>
OW1.12.15	The Applicant	<p>ES Appendix 3.6 [APP-360] explains that the surface water drainage and contamination strategy is simply the Applicant’s consultant’s proposal and provided to the Examination for information only, with the Applicant’s chosen contractor said to be being ultimately responsible for developing any detailed design. Given that the EIA relies on the strategy, could the Applicant please demonstrate how the assumptions and mitigation measures contained in the strategy could be incorporated into the final design, such that the ExA and Secretary of State can be assured that the built scheme provides at least the same protection for surface water drainage and the aquifer as the assessed scheme.</p> <p>Please also provide similar information in relation to the proposed SuDS maintenance plan that is assumed in 5.16.1.2 and the draft Code of Construction Practice mentioned in 8.1.1.7.</p>	<p>The Applicant has updated Appendix 3.6 (APP-360 Rev002) to include additional certainty on the mitigation proposed. The Applicant has included the updated document as Appendix 7 to the updated Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (APP-505 Rev002), compliance with which is secured by Requirement 15 of dDCO (APP-019))</p> <p>The updated Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy (APP-360 Rev002) is submitted as Appendix 7 to the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev 002), compliance with and secured under requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019)</p> <p>The requirement for the SuDS maintenance plan is included at Section 5.16 of the updated Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy (APP-360 Rev002).</p>
OW1.12.16	The Applicant	How and where has the temporary car park for workers’ cars (said to be for 150 vehicles in Work No.3 in Schedule 1 to the dDCO [APP-019]) been taken into account in the surface water drainage and contamination strategy?	The Applicant has identified indicatively a suitable space for up to 227 vehicles with suitable access and egress. The area will receive an impermeable finish with raised kerbs and appropriate surface water drainage to divert run-off to the attenuation pond through an interceptor.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		How would appropriate measures to control drainage from the car park be secured in any DCO?	The appropriate measures to control drainage from the car park are captured and secured through the updated Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy (APP-360 Rev002), paragraph 9.1.1.1, bullet point 8, included as Appendix 7 to the updated Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (APP-505 Rev002) which compliance with is secured Requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019). Appendix 6 of the updated Onshore Outline CEMP includes drawing AQ-ITT-LAY-101 which indicatively details the proposed construction worker parking and surface water drainage strategy.
OW1.12.17	The Applicant Environment Agency	The surface water assessment in ES Chapter 20 [APP-135] assumes that the measures detailed in the Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy are supported by the regulators and that these measures <i>'will be further developed during detailed design by the Appointed Contractor'</i> (construction and operation). To what extent can the ExA and Secretary of State rely on this assumption? Also, in the absence of a definition for this Strategy in the dDCO [APP-019], could the Applicant advise how and where can it be secured?	Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 8 and 9 of the updated Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy (APP-360 Rev002) now provides a clear set of mitigation measures which are required to be complied with through Requirements 6 and 15 of the dDCO (APP-019 Rev 002). As per the response to WQ OW1.12.6, a definition for strategy was included in the dDCO (APP-019).
OW1.12.18	The Applicant	Please could the Applicant explain the repetition of entries in ES Table 19.6 [APP-134].	These 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 License 11/42/33.1/1, the original license ran from 23rd December 1965, until 11th June 2009 when the license was renewed following company name change. However, there is an error in that all are listed as "Portsmouth Water Ltd" in Table 19.6 (APP-134) but some should have been "Portsmouth Water Co." The errors have been corrected in the Errata Sheet (document reference 7.8.1.1) submitted as Appendix 1 of the ES Addendum at Deadline 1.
OW1.12.19	The Applicant	Please could the Applicant clarify if the reference to Section 3 in ES paragraph 19.5.2.22 [APP-134] is a typographical error or if incorrect information is presented. If the latter, please provide the correct information.	The information presented is correct, however the paragraph (as it relates to Section 3) has been placed under the wrong subheading. It should appear under subheading "Section 3" and not "Section 4" and this is reflected in the Errata Sheet (document reference 7.8.1.1) submitted as Appendix 1 of the ES Addendum at Deadline 1.
OW1.12.20	The Applicant	Please clarify and rectify an apparent 'cut-and-paste' error in paragraph 20.8.1.13 of the ES [APP-135].	Paragraph 20.8.1.13. of the ES (APP-135) should state: <i>"It is not currently considered that there are any significant intra-project effects as a result of the Proposed Development."</i> The text has been corrected in the Errata Sheet (document reference 7.8.1.1) submitted as Appendix 1 of the ES Addendum at Deadline 1.

Table 1.13 - Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions – Planning Policy

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
PP1.13.1	Local Planning Authorities	Could each of the local planning authorities please provide comments and any updates in relation to the Applicant's summary of the Development Plan position, including any emerging plans and plan documents. (The Planning Statement Appendix 4 [APP-112] refers.)	
PP1.13.2	The Applicant	The Dorset Council and Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council adopted a Waste Plan on 31 December 2019, after the submission of the Application for the proposed Development. Does this have any relevant policies or implications affecting the waste strategy for the Proposed Development?	No, the Proposed Development is located over 45 km from the local planning authorities covered by the Waste Plan. The relevant Waste Plan for the Proposed Development is the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) and this is summarised and considered at paragraph 27.2.3.14, Chapter 27 of the ES (APP-142).
PP1.13.3	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 3.9.1.3 of the Planning Statement [APP-108], could the Applicant please explain the applicability of National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-5 to the Proposed Development, given that the proposal is for an underground cable. How does the Applicant believe that the Proposed Development performs when tested against NPS EN-5?	The Applicant has produced a position statement (document reference 7.7.12) to explain the applicability of NPS EN-5.
PP1.13.4	The Applicant	Could the Applicant please review ES Chapter 24 [APP-139] and provide any updates that may be necessary in relation to the topics that NPS EN-5 specifies as being necessary for inclusion in a noise assessment.	The Applicant has produced a position statement (document reference 7.7.12) to explain the applicability of NPS EN-5. With respect to noise, NPS EN-5 is applicable to the assessment of noise from overhead high voltage transmission lines and therefore is not relevant to the Proposed Development which comprises underground high voltage direct current cables.
PP1.13.5	The Applicant	The Planning Statement [APP-108] emphasises benefits in relation to the policy shift to renewable, low carbon energy. Please explain how the Proposed Development delivers benefits in relation to this, the Government's pledge to achieve Net Zero by 2050 and the goals of the Paris Agreement. How is the CO ₂ emission reduction of 1,452,000 tCO ₂ derived?	The Needs and Benefits Report (APP-115) sets out the benefits that the Project would deliver in terms of flexibility of supply and therefore supporting the integration of renewable generation (section 2.3.4). By facilitating better integration of renewable generation, the Project will help to achieve national decarbonisation targets in both countries by contributing to CO ₂ emissions reductions. The Needs and Benefits Report Addendum (document reference 7.7.7) provides a further update with reference to recent reports (including National Grid ESO's 2020 Network Options Assessment) which further highlight the benefit of increasing interconnection in achieving decarbonisation goals. The benefits of integrating renewables are summarised at paragraph 3.1.1.3 of the Needs and Benefits Report Addendum. This refers to studies which specifically recognise the contribution that interconnectors can make to the decarbonisation of electricity supply through supporting more renewable generation (by facilitation of integration between markets) but also importing electricity from countries like

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>France which are currently less carbon intensive than the UK. This is supported by the findings of the independent report on the role of AQUIND Interconnector in achieving Net Zero, which also showed that AQUIND Interconnector will help reduce the costs of achieving Net Zero targets to British consumers by over £2.3bn (see Needs and Benefits Report Addendum, document reference 7.7.7).</p> <p>The estimated CO2 emission reductions of the Proposed Development are explained at section 28.6.2 of Chapter 28 (Carbon and Climate Change) of the ES (APP-143). This identifies that the net emissions (emissions increases minus emissions reductions), due to the operation of the scheme over the lifespan of the Proposed Development, are a reduction in emissions of approximately -1,529,000 tCO2e (net operational emissions). Table 28.4 of the ES separately identifies the increase in emissions during the construction of the project (as 256,563 tCO2e).</p> <p>The Applicant can advise that the figure at Paragraph 8.1.1.4 in the Planning Statement (APP-108) is incorrect and should be -1,529,000 tCO2e and clarify that this relates to the reduction in net emissions over the operational lifespan of the project. The Applicant also confirms, therefore, that the figure at Paragraph 4.2.1.4 of the Planning Statement relates to the operational lifespan of the project</p>
PP1.13.6	The Applicant	<p>The report '<i>The Ofgem Decarbonisation Programme Action Plan</i>' was published in February 2020 after the submission of the application for the Proposed Development. Does the Applicant believe the report is relevant? Please explain the response.</p> <p>If so, please provide information on how the Proposed Development would meet the aims of decarbonisation as set out in the document. Does Chapter 3 of the ES need to be updated to reflect this, and how the proposal accords with the decarbonisation agenda?</p>	<p>The Needs and Benefits Report Addendum (document reference 7.7.7) includes a review of the Ofgem 'Decarbonisation Programme Action Plan' at Section 2.5. The report emphasises the need to increase the amount of renewable energy in the system and the challenges that brings to balancing (i.e. the need for greater flexibility) enabling more low carbon power and ensuring that consumers are protected in meeting decarbonisation goals.</p> <p>As per the Applicant's response to PP1.13.5, the AQUIND Interconnector will contribute to decarbonisation goals by reducing emissions, supporting renewables generation and the import of electricity from less carbon intensive sources.</p>
PP1.13.7	The Applicant	<p>The ES [APP-132] suggests at 17.6.2.7 and 17.2.3 that the loss of 5ha of best and most versatile land is not significant. Could the Applicant please reconcile this with the relevant policy in NPS EN-1.</p>	<p>The degree of significance of effect is based on the magnitude of impact and the sensitivity of the receptor as set out in section 17.4.4 of ES Chapter 17 (APP-132). The assessment has concluded that the effect on BMV land is not significant in EIA terms. In addition, Table 17.1 identifies the magnitude of impact on soil resources and agricultural land, between 5 ha and 20 ha as a low magnitude, and less than 5 ha as negligible, with further criteria in Table 17.2 on impact on individual farm holding. Subsequently using these criteria, the loss of 5 ha of BMV is found to be of minor to moderate significance.</p> <p>The relevant policy in NPS EN-1 is contained in paragraph 5.10.8 which indicates that applicants should seek to minimise impacts on BMV agricultural land, and use poorer quality land in preference, except where this is inconsistent with other sustainability considerations. In this case, approximately 80% of the</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>permanent land required is lower quality, and the need to use a limited amount (5 ha) of BMV land in an area to the south and south-west of the converter station is justified in terms of gaining access to the Converter Station and landscaping, with no options to locate these on poorer quality land and maintain functionality. It should also be noted that the siting of the Converter Station was required to be proximate to the grid connection point for the reasons set out at the response to WQ MG1.1.1.</p> <p>Similarly, paragraph 5.10.15 of EN-1 indicates that schemes should not be sited on BMV land without justification - this scheme predominantly uses poorer quality land, which 5.10.15 indicates should be given little weight, and has justified the need to use an area of BMV land as above.</p>
<p>PP1.13.8</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>With reference to paragraph 5.3.4 of NPS EN-1, could the Applicant explain how opportunities to enhance and conserve biodiversity and geological conservation interests have been addressed in the design and objectives for the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.3.4 of NPS EN-1 states ‘The applicant should show how the project has taken advantage of opportunities to conserve and enhance biodiversity and geological conservation interests.’</p> <p>Measures have been included within the design of the Proposed Development to mitigate impacts associated with the construction stage and their effects on ecological features (see APP-131).</p> <p>The design parameters and principles of the Converter Station (see Chapter 3 (Description of the Proposed Development) of the ES (APP-118) for further information) and the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (APP-506) has been informed by ecological baseline data to minimise effects of impacts. Embedded mitigation, which is inherent within the design of the Proposed Development, includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applied buffer of 15m to the areas of ancient woodland near to the Converter Station Area; • Landscape planting at the Converter Station Area to incorporate ecologically important habitats to offset those lost due to construction works; • Planting will include mixed woodland, scrub, hedgerow, scattered trees and marshy grassland associated with flood attenuation features; and • Sections of hedgerows removed to accommodate the installation of the Onshore Cable Route will be replanted. These planting measures are designed to enhance biodiversity within the Converter Station Area and will replace grassland which has developed on arable land that is no longer farmed. <p>It is noted that Section 1 is located within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (‘SPZ’) 1. SPZ’s are assigned by the EA to protect public groundwater abstractions. SPZ 1’s is defined as having a 50 day or less travel time to the abstraction source, SPZ 2’s having a 400 day or less travel time and SPZ 3’s are defined as the abstraction’s entire recharge catchment. Section 1 is also located</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>in a Karst Zone 2 – an intermediate area where the Clay with Flints superficial deposits are present.</p> <p>The construction design includes grouting of the surface karst at the Converter Station site prior to any earthwork movements, removing the primary pathway to underlying Chalk aquifer. The mitigation measures to complete this are outlined in Appendix 3.6 Surface Water Drainage and Aquifer Contamination Mitigation Strategy (APP-360) and secured as part of the updated Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (APP-505) within Requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p> <p>Where necessary, construction methodology has been carefully considered in sensitive locations. For example, HDD-5 (near Kings Pond) will be installed within the Lambeth Group geology to avoid the Chalk. This will therefore ensure the HDD alignment avoids the Chalk karst features. Karst features can be present in ground materials overlying the Chalk and if any voided overburden is encountered, drilling fluid control measures will be implemented to prevent drilling fluid losses. Further detail is contained in ES Chapter 19 (Groundwater) (APP-134).</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted a Biodiversity Position Paper (document ref. 7.7.9), the purpose of which is principally to show how the Proposed Development has taken opportunities to conserve and enhance biodiversity in line with National Planning Policy. The Paper has been informed by baseline and post-development calculations of biodiversity units using Biodiversity Metric 2.0 (Natural England 2019). Sensitive habitats of particular biodiversity interest are subject to specific mitigation strategies developed in consultation with NE. These include restoration of hedgerows, restoration of lowland meadow habitat within Denmead Meadows and enhancement of grassland with green hay post-development at the Converter Station Area.</p>

Table 1.14 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Shipping and Navigation

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
SN1.14.1	The Applicant MoD	With reference to paragraph 13.6.2.44 of ES Chapter 13 [APP-128], in the event of an urgent military need (rather than just exercise), can the path be cleared for naval forces to deploy and would sufficient notice be available to allow cable installation works to cease to enable this to occur?	<p>The Applicant has been engaging with the Ministry of Defence (‘MoD’) and the Queen’s Harbour Master (‘QHM’) at Portsmouth since 2018 [Consultation Report: APP-025, Section 9.3] directly and through the NAB VTS User Group meetings as evidenced in the Navigation Risk Assessment (document reference 6.3.13.1, Section 6.2.1) which are attended by MoD//QHM representatives.</p> <p>Further consideration of military vessel movements from Portsmouth and Southampton has been undertaken using analysis of AIS data for two 3-month periods (between December 2017 – February 2018) and (May – July 2018).</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>Military vessels tend to follow the same channels through the Solent, with larger vessels transiting close to the Nab Channel which is approximately 2 km west of the Marine Cable Corridor. This additional information is presented in Section 8 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) and concludes that there is reasonable separation and distance between the Proposed Development and any military vessel transits, therefore there is no potential for the Proposed Development to interfere with normal military operations or what might be considered an urgent military need.</p> <p>During construction of the Proposed Development there will be regular and ongoing communication with key stakeholders such as local ports including the MoD/QHM Portsmouth (see Section 5.6.3 of the Outline Marine CEMP (APP-488)) as well as the relevant notifications that are a requirement of the dDCO (APP-019),] Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 2]. In the unlikely event it is necessary to do so, Proposed Development activities would be able to temporarily cease, or other arrangements be made so that there will not be a significant impact to military operations.</p>
SN1.14.2	The Applicant	At paragraphs 13.6.1.5 and 13.6.2.2, the ES [APP-128] lists ‘embedded’ mitigation measures that are ‘ <i>assumed to be in place</i> ’ prior to the construction and decommissioning stages and the operational stage respectively. The assessment is reliant on these. Could the Applicant please clarify how and where these are secured in the dDCO [APP-019].	The mitigation measures identified in paragraphs 13.6.1.5 and 13.6.2.2 are either secured through deemed marine licence conditions within Part 2 of Schedule 15 of the dDCO and/or Section 5.6 of the Marine Outline CEMP. Specific cross references to where individual measures have been secured will be provided in the updated Mitigation Schedule to be submitted at Deadline 2.
SN1.14.3	The Applicant	There is a suggestion in paragraph 13.6.2.55 of the ES [APP-128] that post-installation monitoring of compass deviation effects is required, followed by consultation if the change exceeds agreed parameters. Could the Applicant please provide details of this and indicate how and where this is secured in the dDCO [APP-019].	The Applicant can confirm that this mitigation is secured and included in dDCO (APP-019) in Schedule 15, Part 2 Condition 10 (2).
SN1.14.4	The Applicant	<p>In its Relevant Representation [RR-021], the National Federation of Fishermen recommends the implementation of a Fisheries Liaison and Co-Existence Plan. What benefits does the Applicant believe this would have, over and above the measures secured through Part 2, Section 4(d) of the Deemed Marine Licence?</p> <p>How could the dDCO and Deemed Marine Licence [APP-019] be amended to secure this?</p>	<p>The Applicant has engaged with the National Federation of Fishermen’s Organisations (NFFO) and it is proposed that a Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan will be produced under the umbrella of the Outline Marine CEMP. As such, the dDCO has been updated with a new condition such that Schedule 15, Condition 4 (d)(v) will now read as follows:</p> <p><i>(v) a fisheries liaison and coexistence plan to ensure relevant fishing fleets are notified of commencement of the licensed activities and to address the interaction of the licensed activities with fishing activities.</i></p>
SN1.14.5	The Applicant Trinity House	With reference to paragraph 12.6.2.1 of ES Chapter 12 [APP-127], is there an exclusion margin to the east of the Isle of Wight and would this, in combination with the proposed exclusion zone around the marine cable corridor, lead to navigational concerns or conflict with ships entering or leaving the Solent?	Neither Chapter 12 (Commercial Fisheries) (APP-127) or Chapter 13 (Shipping, Navigation and Other Marine Users) (APP-128) identify the presence of an exclusion margin to the east of the Isle of Wight. However, it is recognised that a number of anchorages exist in this area and the Nab Channel shipping lane. It is acknowledged that the area to the east of the Isle of Wight is a busy shipping area which does lend to exclusion of activities; however the Marine

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>Cable Corridor is located over 1 km from the Nab Channel, anchorage areas and deeper waters. Whilst there may be some disruption to smaller vessels that are not required to use the channel, there will be sufficient space for such vessels to navigate around construction vessels.</p> <p>This question specifically references the Chapter 12 Commercial Fisheries (APP-127) which states for example, that there will be a “500 m recommended exclusion zone around Dynamic Positioning vessels”. For the purposes of assessment however, the worst case scenario assumes that proposed pre-installation and installation exclusion zones include the Marine Cable Corridor and are areas where fishing activity only is excluded (see Table 12.7 of Chapter 12), i.e. areas where static gear fishermen will be requested not to set fishing gear, or where mobile gear fishermen will be requested not to trawl or dredge. Fishing exclusion zones however, will not prevent transit of fishing vessels or any other vessels across the Marine Cable Corridor and therefore will not contribute navigational concerns or conflict with ships entering or leaving the Solent.</p> <p>Fishing vessels displaced by the pre-installation and installation exclusion zones are unlikely to actively fish in a busy shipping channel so navigational concerns or conflict with fishing vessels from ships entering or leaving the Solent is also unlikely to occur. In addition, the Chapter 13 (APP-128) uses the wording “Rolling 500 m recommended safe passing distance around DP vessels” as this 500 m zone is an advisory zone around the main construction cable lay vessel. This means that passing vessels will be requested to maintain a safe distance around the construction vessels employing Dynamic Positioning systems as these DP vessels are restricted in manoeuvrability. The safe passing distance is not around the Marine Cable Corridor as implied by the question but around the vessel undertaking the works.</p>
SN1.14.6	The Applicant	The ES does not appear to address the possibility of ‘stray’ or ‘lost’ craft inadvertently entering the area of subsea cable laying works and associated activities (for example, a vessel with a disabled crew, or a small craft carrying illegal migrants). Has this been considered, and what measures would be put in place to deal with the possibility?	As discussed in paragraph 13.6.1.5 of the ES (APP-128), guard vessels will be employed where appropriate to work alongside the installation vessels during any work carried out. These vessels would alert any errant vessels to the installation works and provide assistance in an emergency. The use of guard vessels is secured in the Outline Marine CEMP in paragraph 5.6.3.9.
SN1.14.7	The Applicant	<p>In ES Chapter 13 [APP-128], the emphasis is on the potential risk of vessels snagging on the cable. In areas where non-burial protection is used, creating shallower water, is there a risk to vessels associated with snagging on the protection methods (e.g. on the edges of a concrete mattress)?</p> <p>If so, where is this addressed in the ES?</p>	<p>The consideration of creating shallower ground and risk of vessel grounding due to reduction in water depths as a result of the Proposed Development (including cable protection and cable crossing points) has been considered within Chapter 13 (APP-128) in paragraphs 13.6.2.20-23. It is concluded that this impact is extremely unlikely and that the overall risk ranking is tolerable.</p> <p>Mitigation to avoid reduction in navigable water depths will be secured through the Cable Burial and Installation Plan in Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 4(c)(iii) in the first instance to ensure existing and future safe navigation is not compromised and subsequently through post-construction survey in Schedule</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>15, Part 2, Condition 10(3) to confirm final clearance depths over the cable or cable protection and any Aids to Navigation as deemed required by the MCA, Trinity House and the MMO.</p> <p>Chapter 13 (APP-128) paragraph 13.4.3.2 assumes that vessels will not anchor directly over the cable once installed as the cable will be clearly marked on nautical charts in line with UKHO requirements with any associated notes and warnings. Details of the Marine Cables and associated cable protection will also be included in fishermen's awareness charts issued by Kingfisher. Any non-burial protection employed would be designed to be over-trawlable by fishing vessels and post-construction surveys (Schedule 15, Part 2, Condition 10(1)(a) and (3)) will be conducted to inform of any obstacles on the seabed and areas of non-burial protection that may cause navigation risk to any vessels. Further engagement with the fishing industry will also be undertaken to understand any concerns with non-burial protection and matters such as this will be covered within the Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan which will be included within the revised dDCO under Schedule 15, Condition 4 (d)(v) – see SN1.14.4.</p>
SN1.14.8	The Applicant	Chapter 13 of the ES [APP-128] notes that military vessels, fishing vessels less than 15m in length and recreational vessels are not required to carry automatic identification systems and are therefore under-represented in the data. Can the Applicant explain how the assessment has accounted for the potential under-representation of marine vessels and whether this may affect the outcome of the EIA in terms of significant effects?	The impact assessment presented in Chapter 13 (APP-128) has taken into consideration that certain vessels including small craft and military vessels may be under-represented in AIS data. This has been addressed through review of additional data sources such as the RYA Coastal Atlas and through consultation with fisheries representatives, recreational groups and the Ministry of Defence. This has therefore been considered when undertaking both EIA and Navigational Risk Assessment when defining the potential effects and associated risk.

Table 1.15 – Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions – Socio-Economic Effects

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
SE1.15.1	The Applicant	Please provide a detailed response to Sport England's Relevant Representation [RR-009] to explain and justify the extent, nature and permanence of effects on sports field provision in Portsmouth.	<p>A detailed response to Sport England's Relevant Representation (RR-009) is provided in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representation (document reference 7.8.2) submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>The Applicant welcomes the comments in Sport England's Relevant Representation (RR-009) and will continue to work Sports England to further assess the impacts on playing fields and discuss the proposed mitigation. The Applicant has subsequently met and developed the Framework Management Plan for Recreational Impacts (document reference 7.8.13) in consultation with Sport England and provided the draft document for further comment on 08 July 2020. Sport England has subsequently raised a number of questions and</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>comments regarding impacts on playing fields and the Framework Management Plan for Recreational Impacts (document reference 7.8.13) has been updated and reissued to Sport England on 25 September 2020 for further discussion.</p> <p>Chapter 25 (Socio-economics) of the ES (APP-140), Table 25.15 summarises the anticipated effects on open spaces including playing fields. Mitigation measures identified which are also included in the Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (APP-505) include consultation with affected groups, use of alternative spaces, and contractor review of programme and construction area requirements to reduce effects on open space (Section 25.9.5 of Chapter 25).</p>
SE1.15.2	The Applicant	<p>With reference to Paragraph 7.1.2.2 of ES Chapter 7 [APP-122], could the Applicant confirm if any part of the beach or any access to the beach at Eastney would need to be closed off during the construction works, and if so for how long?</p> <p>Have any such effects been considered in the socio-economic assessment in the ES [APP-140]?</p>	<p>As stated at paragraph 25.7.2.1 of ES Chapter 7 (APP-122) horizontal directional drilling (HDD) will be used at Eastney Beach, thereby avoiding direct impacts as the beach would not need to be closed off during construction. Effects on Eastney beach therefore have not been assessed.</p> <p>There will however be a partial loss of Fort Cumberland Road Car Park which can be used to access the beach. This is assessed in Table 25.14 of the ES as being not significant. Indicative phasing plans have been prepared for Fort Cumberland Road car park which describe the duration of given stages of the work and their approximate footprint (see Appendix B of the Framework Management Plan for Recreational Impacts (document reference 7.8.13).</p>
SE1.15.3	The Applicant	<p>Two agricultural units mentioned at paragraph 17.5.1.8 of the ES [APP-132] would appear to be owner-occupied, but the allocated sensitivity of 'low' suggests (following ES Table 17.4) that the land in question comprises '<i>off-lying areas that are not contiguous with main farm holdings</i>'. Other sections that follow seem to make similar assessments. Please clarify, explaining how this influences the assessment of effect on the affected receptors.</p>	<p>Table 17.4 of Chapter 17 of the ES differentiates between farms and areas of land, with farms defined as either high or medium sensitivity depending on the type of enterprise undertaken, and areas of land as low or negligible, depending on their commercial use or otherwise. The holdings that are used for grazing horses are all assessed as being of low sensitivity whether they are occupied by their owners or rented out. Where there is no commercial equestrian activity, for example at Mill Farm in paragraph 17.5.1.9, the sensitivity of the holding is assessed as negligible.</p>
SE1.15.4	The Applicant	<p>Please provide a reference for the '<i>existing statutory consultation procedures with Natural England for the development involving the loss of agricultural land</i>' (ES paragraph 17.4.4.2 [APP-132] refers). In doing so, please provide a rationale for the values quoted in ES Table 17.1 for the magnitude of impact on agricultural land.</p>	<p>The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, SI 2015/595, Schedule 4 requires consultation with Natural England for development that is not in accordance with the development plan and which involves the loss of 20ha or more of best and most versatile agricultural land. The involvement of Natural England in individual consultations in this way introduces the national interest to local decisions and carries weight. A threshold of 20ha has therefore been adopted in ES Table 17.1 for impacts of medium magnitude and above, which result in potentially significant effects for all receptors other than those of a negligible sensitivity.</p> <p>Natural England have confirmed that the assessment of agricultural land in ES Chapter 17 (APP-132) is agreed, and this is confirmed within the Statement of</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			Common Ground with Natural England submitted alongside these responses (document reference 7.5.11).
SE1.15.5	The Applicant	<p>For clarity, please could the Applicant provide annotated maps at an appropriate scale to show the locations of each of the businesses and other enterprises within 500m of the Order limits, as listed in ES Appendix 25.2 [APP-341]?</p> <p>Please provide a reasoned summary of the Proposed Development's likely effect on each business.</p>	<p>Figure 25.1 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) provides a basemap, at a scale of 1:3,500, identifying all businesses and enterprises within 500m of the Order Limits. It also shows other community receptors such as schools, leisure centres, churches etc. Figure 25.1 clearly sets out the businesses likely to be impacted by the footprint of Proposed Development and has been used to inform the assessment of the potential impacts and proposed mitigation on each business in Table 25.14 of the ES Addendum.</p>
SE1.15.6	The Applicant	<p>Please clarify the scope of the socio-economic assessment set out in Chapter 25 of the ES [APP-140]. Paragraph 25.1.1.6 states that the '<i>chapter assesses the impacts arising from the Proposed Development within the Onshore Components of the Order Limits and the Site only (above Mean Low Water Springs ('MLWS'))</i>.' However, later sections such as 25.7.2.6 and table 25.11 seem to include employment generated by the marine works.</p> <p>Could the Applicant please provide a comprehensive analysis of the coverage of the offshore socio-economic assessments in the ES, explaining which issues are covered where, confirm there is no double-counting, and indicate which, if any, socio-economic issues associated with the marine works were scoped out of the assessment.</p>	<p>Chapter 25 of the ES (Socio-economics) (APP-140) has assessed the potential employment generation resulting from the marine construction works in connection with the Proposed Development. In addition, Appendix 25.2 identifies community facilities, businesses and tourism receptors that are related to marine activities such as watersports and sailing clubs, Southsea Marina and Portsmouth Port and Harbour. These receptors are assessed from an onshore perspective in Chapter 25 in terms of impacts on access and disruption to their onshore activities whereas disruption to these receptors in terms of their ability to operate at sea is assessed within the marine chapters as set out below. Chapter 12 of the ES (Commercial Fisheries) (APP-127) is referenced in paragraph 25.1.1.4 of the Socio-Economic Chapter. Chapter 12 evaluates the potential offshore impacts on relevant local, regional and international commercial fishing industries in terms of their economic importance and value of fish landings, and disruption of access to fishing grounds. Therefore, there is no double counting.</p> <p>In addition, Chapter 13 of the ES (Shipping, Navigation and Other Marine Users) (APP-128) assesses the potential impacts and navigation risks resulting from the Proposed Development that could disrupt operations of local maritime receptors such as shipping routes, port and harbour activities, ferries, fishing and aggregate dredging activities. Chapter 13 also assessed the potential impacts in terms of disruption to recreational maritime activities such as recreational angling, and recreational sailing and other tourism activities such as sailing clubs, personal watercraft (e.g. jet skis), and events such as Cowes Week.</p> <p>These cross references are now provided in the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) for clarity. No marine impacts related to socio-economic aspects have been scoped out of these chapters.</p>
SE1.15.7	The Applicant	<p>With reference to paragraph 25.7.2.1 of the ES [APP-140], could the Applicant please provide details of where and how the 'embedded' mitigation measures set out and relied upon in the assessment are secured in the dDCO [APP-019], especially where they are said to be 'where practicable'.</p>	<p>The use of HDD at specific locations is secured by the HDD Method Statement forming an appendix of the updated Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (APP-505 Rev002) and secured by requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>In terms of avoiding key recreational facilities, the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002) has been updated at paragraph 6.2.8.2 to remove 'where practicable' and clarify that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baffins Milton Rovers football pitch has been removed from the list as it is now the preferred route, where the cable would be installed to the west of Baffins Milton Rovers stadium, through the pitch, which is stripped for re-grassing every off-season. Discussions are ongoing with the Chairman of the football club, who has agreed in principle subject to timing and reinstatement commitments. • The footway in Bransbury Park is now affected at the northern and southernmost extents as set out in the Public Rights of Way Note (document reference 7.8.1.14), with minor temporary diversions in place. <p>In addition, a Framework Management Plan for Recreational Impacts (document reference 7.8.1.13) has been developed to demonstrate ways in which the general mitigation principles described in paragraph 5.12.3- above can be applied to construction to minimise effects with a particular focus on carefully timing the works and minimising the working areas in the open spaces affected. Specific mitigation (for example relocation of pitches) has been explored within the Plan, which is referenced at paragraph 6.2.8.9 of the Onshore Outline CEMP and would be adopted where necessary and practicable.</p>
SE1.15.8	The Applicant	The Mitigation Schedule [APP-489] suggests that the proposed beneficial reinstatement of the Fort Cumberland car park set out at 25.9.5.5 (repeated at 25.9.7.1) is subject to the agreement of a s106 agreement with Portsmouth City Council. When will the Heads of Terms be available for the Examination?	The Applicant has been unable to meaningfully discuss the reinstatement of the car park with PCC to date, who have been focused on producing their Local Impact Report (LIR) during the recent period. The Applicant looks forward to discussing this with PCC in due course.
SE1.15.9	The Applicant	Could the Applicant please provide details about where and how the 'embedded' mitigation set out and relied upon in the assessment to commit to equivalent reinstatement of open spaces at ES paragraph 25.9.5.6 [APP-140] is secured. It is noted that the Mitigation Schedule [APP-489] suggests this is done through the Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy [APP-506], but the mitigation route mapping is not clear.	<p>Paragraph 1.4.2.7 of the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (OLBS) (APP-506) states: <i>Prompt reinstatement of temporary construction areas (including trenches, Laydown Area, Works Compound and construction (including haul road) corridor on completion of the Onshore Cable installation as soon as practicable after sections of work are complete. Reinstatement would involve the careful handling of soils and a return to the existing habitat type.</i> This commitment is also set out in 6.2.3.1 of the updated Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (APP-505 Rev002).</p> <p>Further details on reinstatement methods are set out at Section 4.1.2 of the Framework Management Plan for Recreational Impacts (document reference 7.8.13) submitted with the updated Onshore Outline CEMP.</p>
SE1.15.10	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 25.7.2.5 of the ES [APP-140], the headings and previous sections imply that the data set out here in relation to the assessment of effects on employment generation apply to decommissioning	The Applicant can confirm that the minor positive effects reported in relation to employment would only apply to the Construction Stage and not to the Decommissioning Stage if the cables were left <i>in situ</i> .

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		as well as construction. Could the applicant comment on the accuracy of this in relation to decommissioning if the cable is left <i>in situ</i> .	
SE1.15.11	The Applicant	Please could the Applicant confirm if the cross-reference in paragraph 25.7.2.20 of the ES [APP-140] is a typographical error and, if so, provide the correct reference.	The cross-reference in paragraph 25.7.2.20 of the ES (APP-140) is a typographical error. The cross-reference should be to updated ES Chapter 23 Air Quality (APP-138 Rev002). This correction has been included within the Errata Sheet (document reference 7.8.1.1) forming part of the ES Addendum submitted alongside these responses.
SE1.15.12	The Applicant	<p>What consideration has the Applicant given to using planning obligations or contributions as part of the Proposed Development to secure benefits to the local communities? (For example, for education, open space, local sourced workforce, apprenticeships, highways, healthcare.)</p> <p>Please explain your intentions in this regard and, if none are proposed or intended, provide justification for the approach and position.</p>	<p>As discussed at Preliminary Meeting 1 (18 August 2020), the Applicant is amenable to entering into planning obligations where necessary to mitigate the impacts of the Proposed Development and such obligations satisfy the legal tests provided for by Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), however to date none of the LPA's have provided any clear indication of the planning obligations they would be seeking and the justification for these, and as such no heads of terms have been put forward at this time.</p> <p>A Position Statement on Planning Obligations in connection with the Proposed Development (document reference 7.7.6) is submitted alongside these responses, with provides further information regarding the Applicant's considerations in this regard. Ultimately, at this time it has not been identified that any planning obligations are necessary to provide necessary mitigations in relation to the Proposed Development.</p>
SE1.15.13	The Applicant	<p>In the human health assessment methodology set out at ES paragraph 26.4.2.4 [APP-141], variation in sensitivity of receptors is acknowledged and the assessment methodology is said to take sensitivity into account as well as magnitude of change in determining significance (ES Table 26.3). Where is this done?</p> <p>Please clarify section 26.6, Predicted Impacts, to explain how and where sensitivity ratings have been used to conclude a measure of significance of effect.</p>	<p>As set out in ES Chapter 26 paragraph 26.4.2.2 (APP-141) professional judgement was used to determine that all human health receptors are sensitive, with particular groups within the population being more vulnerable to certain effects than others. Particular vulnerable groups within the population were not given specific sensitivity ratings but were assumed to be distributed throughout the general population.</p> <p>Where a group within the population was deemed to be particularly vulnerable to an effect, a note was made within the assessment. Not all effects identified will be disproportionately felt by groups within the population. Below are examples of where specific groups have been identified as being particularly vulnerable to an effect;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 26.6.2.19: Unemployed and low-income groups are identified as gaining particular benefit from increased employment opportunities. • Paragraph 26.6.3.6: Members of the population with pre-existing health conditions are identified due to being more vulnerable to dust and poor air quality. • Paragraph 26.6.3.16: Older people, people with existing health conditions, and unemployed or low-income groups are identified due to their

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>likelihood to spend more time at home and be more exposed to noise impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 26.6.3.31: Those with existing health conditions, older people, those with mobility impairment and socially isolated groups are all identified due to their reliance on facilities to which access could be disrupted. Paragraph 26.6.3.41: Older people, children and young people, low-income groups and people with existing health conditions have been identified as vulnerable to the effects of reduce physical activity or who may depend more on free of charge recreational activities. Paragraph 26.6.3.48: Unemployed and low-income groups are identified as likely to benefit the most from increased employment opportunities and income levels. <p>The magnitude of impacts was determined by identifying the “intensity” and “duration” of an impact, as set out in paragraph 26.4.2.1 and illustrated in Table 26.3. Intensity is based on the size of the sensitive population affected by an impact and therefore sensitivity is implicit in determining the intensity of an effect.</p> <p>The wording in Table 26.3 in the column for “intensity” is clarified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major effect: “The exposures tend to be of high intensity, over a large geographical area, or affect a large number of sensitive people” Moderate effect: “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.” Minor effect: “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.” <p>The assigning of sensitivity, magnitude (intensity and duration of impact) and resultant identification of significance for each effect relied on professional judgement, using the evidence base provided in ES Chapter 26 Section 26.5 and the assessment scale in Table 26.3 (APP-141). Professional judgement was also informed by a desk-based analysis of the public health baseline of the study area, and scientific literatures on health effects.</p>
SE1.15.14	The Applicant	With reference to ES paragraph 18.5.4.11 [APP-133], in Sections 1 and 2, the presence adjacent to the Order limits of disused chalk pits that are potentially filled with unknown materials is noted. Similarly, the baselines for most of the other Sections include former contaminative land uses and hazardous materials in samples. In each case, a sensitivity of ‘low’ is concluded for human health. What was the rationale for allocating this ‘low’ sensitivity to the human health in relation to construction workers and adjacent land users?	The sensitivity for construction and maintenance workers for all sections of the route is high due to the potential for them to come into contact with contaminated ground / water. Table 18.2 of ES Chapter 18 (Ground Conditions) (APP-133) details the sensitivity of receptors categories. It is acknowledged that there are errors in Section 18.7 of Chapter 18 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. The assessment has been reviewed and results in a Moderate Adverse Significant effect without mitigation apart from Section 8 and 9 which will result in a Major to Moderate Adverse Significant Effect without mitigation (as the

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>magnitude of change is medium in these sections due to contamination identified in previous ground investigations in 2018) The Paragraphs affected are 18.7.3.3, 18.7.3.13, 18.7.3.26, 18.7.4.2 and 18.7.4.10 of ES Chapter 18 (APP-133). These corrections have been included within the Errata Sheet (document reference 7.8.1.1) submitted alongside this response.</p> <p>In regard to adjacent land users, the sensitivity is low for the majority of the sections as the land use is commercial / industrial and public open space and predominately in highway land. However, the sensitivity for Section 8 and Section 9 is medium due to allotment land and landfill. This conclusion has been reached based on professional judgment and guidance within Roads and Bridges (DRMB) LA 109, Geology and Soils (2019). It should be noted that the DMRB guidance includes a 'very high' classification for the sensitivity of receptors. For the purpose of this assessment receptors assessed with 'very high' sensitivity in accordance with DRMB have been assessed as having a 'high' sensitivity.</p> <p>With corrections to the sensitivity from low to high for construction and maintenance workers, there will be no change to the residual effects as these remain negligible with the application of the mitigation measures, as set out in Section 25.9 of APP-140.</p>
SE1.15.15	The Applicant	In relation to the health and safety of workers, the local community and the natural environment, could the Applicant explain the hazardous materials that would be used and stored at the Converter Station, what they are used for, how they are managed, and what the impacts would be in the event of an accidental release to the environment.	<p>The Hazardous materials which are subject to the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health ('CoSHH') regulations and their uses are detailed in Table 2 of ES Appendix 3.5 (Additional Supporting Information for Onshore Works) (APP-359).</p> <p>Table 18.8 of Chapter 18 of the ES (APP-133) states that prior to mitigation the potential impact arising from accidental spillages is considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate (Significant) for Section 1 at Principal Aquifers; • Minor (Not Significant) for Section 1 and 1 at Secondary Undifferentiated Aquifers; • Major to Moderate (Significant) for Section 2 to 7 at Principal and Secondary (A) Aquifers over Principal • Moderate (Significant) for Section 8 to 10 at Secondary (A) Aquifers. <p>However, with the outlined mitigation measures the residual impact is Negligible (Not Significant) as confirmed in Section 18.10 of ES Chapter 18 (Ground Conditions) (APP-133).</p>
SE1.15.16	The Applicant Environment Agency	Given the actual and perceived human health concerns around the potential disturbance of the former landfill at Milton Common, including ground instability, the mobilisation of contaminants and the release of landfill gas, is it possible in principle to design and engineer a 'safe' (acceptable level of risk) cable installation solution through the area?	<p>Yes, it is considered to be possible to design and engineer a 'safe' (acceptable level of risk) cable installation solution through this area, with the mitigation measures listed in section 6.9.2 of the Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (APP-505), secured by Requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>Brownfield construction procedures are common practice in the UK. The Proposed Development will use approved methodologies for contamination control using industry standard guidance. The Applicant recognises the complexity of the site, which is why options remain to utilise Eastern Road in this area but is confident that the cable installation through Milton Common will be capable of being carried out in a 'safe' (acceptable level of risk) manner.</p> <p>It is also noted that construction at Milton Common has occurred previously with the sea flood defence embankment and the ground gas ventilation system. The Order limits across Milton Common follow the construction zone for the sea defences constructed by the East Solent Coastal Partnership. As a result, the proposed route would use as much of the imported and made-up ground arising from those works as is practicable, especially in the construction road between the two bunds to the north and south of Milton Common.</p> <p>The Applicant has consulted with a local cable installation contractor, to establish that the removal and safe disposal of this quantity of contaminated material is practicable.</p> <p>Installation contractors have established practices for safe working, excavation and removal of contaminated material, and have done so at sites such as disused power stations and industrial sites.</p> <p>Should the Applicant, following the appointment of a Contractor and following the making of the DCO, determine the use of the more direct route across Milton Common to be appropriate (taking into account technical complexities and comparative cost), it is anticipated that they would divert around the areas of the worst contamination.</p> <p>Crossing the Common via HDD was considered, but the ground investigation works established that the ground conditions were not suitable for drilling.</p>
SE1.15.17	The Applicant	<p>Given local health and safety concerns, were any alternatives to cable installation by trenching considered for the Milton Common stretch of the route, including HDD or overhead lines?</p> <p>If so, what were the conclusions of the optioneering?</p> <p>If not, why not?</p>	<p>The depth of the Made Ground is variable across Milton Common and this variation can be a challenge for the HDD. The HDD would likely cross the landfill Made Ground-natural geology boundary at both ends of the drill and this has the potential to create pathways which would be difficult to manage (as they could be created at multiple points along the drill length). Excavating the pits below the landfill Made Ground (i.e. to avoid drills breaching the boundary with the natural geology) would require exceptionally deep excavations. This would pose greater risks than trenching, unless the pits were outside the area of landfill Made Ground which is not feasible in light of the surrounding land use. If the drilling was to occur within the landfill Made Ground it could expose ground gas pockets, which would be a constructability issue as well as a contamination risk.</p> <p>An alternative is overhead lines, but these would require large swathes of land which is unrealistic for the construction along the proposed cable route and the project feasibility. The cables within the Proposed Development are 320Kv and therefore the supporting structures and insulators associated with an overhead</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			line would be considerable, akin to a standard transmission tower or pylon. The visual impact of overhead lines across the recreational land of Milton Common was also considered to be of greater negative long-term impact to the site than the proposed underground solution.
SE1.15.18	The Applicant	<p>Could the Applicant please summarise how and where the assumptions and mitigation in relation to EMF set out in paragraph 26.5.8 of the ES [APP-141] and repeated in paragraph 26.6.1.9 are secured through the dDCO [APP-019].</p> <p>Similarly, how and where would the mitigation measures set out in paragraph 26.6.1.4 of the ES be secured?</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that the assumptions and mitigation in relation to EMF are contained within sections 4.1.3.8 to 4.1.3.12 of the updated Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (APP-505 Rev002), compliance with which is secured as part of Requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p> <p>The mitigation measures set out in paragraph 26.6.1.4 of ES Chapter 26 (APP-141) are similarly secured by section 6.2.9.1 of the Onshore Outline CEMP.</p>
SE1.15.19	The Applicant	Appendix 3.7 of the ES [APP-361] states that, in the absence of a detailed design for the Converter Station infrastructure, the impact from AC magnetic fields is unknown and that <i>'the Converter Station reactors must be designed and positioned to limit AC magnetic fields at the compound perimeter to levels below the guideline levels'</i> . Where is the information provided to demonstrate that this would be the case, and that there would be no resultant impact on human health?	The Applicant can confirm that the Proposed Development must be designed to accord with the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) public exposure guidelines to ensure there is no impact on human health. This requirement, and the mitigation in relation to EMF is contained within sections 4.1.3.8 to 4.1.3.12 of the updated Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (APP-505 Rev002), and subsequently secured as part of requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019).
SE1.15.20	The Applicant	Can the Applicant demonstrate or provide reassurance that there would not be any residual harmful effects on the health of those individuals living close to the proposed cable route that may be considered especially vulnerable to EMF, including those with a perception that they would be vulnerable to EMF?	<p>Appendix 3.7 (Onshore Electric and Magnetic Field Report) of the ES (APP-361) provides an assessment of the Electromagnetic Fields (EMF) due to the Proposed Development. For the HVAC Cables and HVDC Cables, this report concludes that, due to the earthed shielding of the HVAC Cables and HVDC Cables there will be no electric field present along the Onshore Cable Route. The HVAC and HVDC Onshore Cables are laid in open land and along public highways, and the magnetic field strength is well below the guidelines and reduces rapidly with distance from the Onshore Cables. There will be no AC electric field outside of the Converter Station due to the earthed perimeter fence (APP-361).</p> <p>Public Health England ('PHE') have responded to the application through a Relevant Representation confirming that they are satisfied with the methodology used to undertake the environmental assessment. PHE agreed that the potential impacts of the static and alternating electric and magnetic fields associated with the onshore electricity infrastructure have been considered and satisfactorily addressed; and that they are satisfied that, based on the submitted documentation and suggested control/mitigation measures, the development is unlikely to present a significant risk to public health (see Section 4.17 Public Health England (RR-065)).</p> <p>Health evidence on EMF used in the Human Health assessment (including consideration of health evidence on EMF and children) is summarised within ES Chapter 26 (Human Health), Section 26.5.8.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
SE1.15.21	The Applicant	<p>Amongst the assumptions explicitly included in the LVIA set out in the ES [APP-130] is that all public rights of way affected by the Proposed Development would be reinstated to the same condition and quality as previously. Can the Applicant explain how effective reinstatement of affected public rights of way has been secured in the dDCO?</p> <p>What would be the timescale for reinstatement?</p> <p>How would it be determined that the affected public rights of way had been reinstated to the same condition and quality for users as was present prior to construction?</p> <p>Has the Applicant given any consideration to enhancement?</p>	<p>Reinstatement of affected public rights of way is secured by Requirement 22 of the dDCO (APP-019)</p> <p>The timescale for the physical reinstatement or an affected Public Right of Way is typically one working day.</p> <p>As part of any diversion the Applicant will be required to first consult with the relevant street authority, who may attach reasonable conditions to any consent, including in relation to reinstatement. This is secured by Article 13 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider enhancement to be necessary/justified given the limited nature of impacts, resulting from crossing public rights of way.</p>

Table 1.16 – Applicant’s Responses to First Written Questions – Traffic and Transport

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
TT1.16.1	The Applicant	Could the Applicant please provide an update on progress towards Statements of Common Ground and any other agreements on highways matters with Highways England, Hampshire County Council and Portsmouth City Council.	Discussions are ongoing with all parties, and details of the meetings held are included within the respective Statements of Common Ground with Highways England, Hampshire County Council and Portsmouth City Council (document reference 7.5.10, 7.5.5 and 7.5.3 respectively) submitted at Deadline 1 for the relevant highway authorities.
TT1.16.2	The Applicant	Has Hampshire Police been consulted over the likely effects of the Proposed Development on traffic and the proposed mitigation measures? If so, please provide direction to any responses received.	The Applicant met with Hampshire Police alongside the Fire Service and NHS on 9 June 2020. The notes of the meeting are included in Appendix 9 of this document (document reference 7.4.1.9); these provide confirmation that each of the emergency services has been satisfied with the consultation to date and the mitigation proposed in respect of traffic impacts.
TT1.16.3	The Applicant Local planning authorities	With reference to paragraphs 22.2.3.10 to 22.2.3.39 of Chapter 22 of the ES [APP-137], are there any pertinent updates in respect of the local planning policy framework?	The Applicant can confirm that there are no pertinent updates in respect of the local planning policy framework.
TT1.16.4	The Applicant	Could the Applicant please describe and explain the sources used in the desk study of the highway system and how these influenced decisions in relation to setting the baseline for the wider study area. The answer should address the approach to determining highway capacity and the sensitivity of the receiving environment.	The desktop study of the highway system sought to create a quantitative evidence base in order to set the baseline for the wider study area. This was undertaken using a two-stage approach. The approach first used professional knowledge of the Applicant’s transportation consultants, who have completed several projects in the Portsmouth / South Hampshire region. This professional local knowledge was used to gain an initial understanding of key junctions, links, corridors and receptors which were likely to be impacted by the proposals. This was subsequently expanded upon through analysis of data sources which we subsequently included in the desktop

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>study and used to inform the baseline for both the Onshore Cable Corridor and the wider study area.</p> <p>The data sources consulted in the desktop study are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive reviews of existing conditions, through the use of site inspections, web-sources such as Google maps and Google Earth to determine the nature of the receiving environment and determine sensitivity, including factors such as proximity of residential properties to the carriageway, locations of schools, care homes, bus stops, pedestrian crossings; • Ordnance Survey data was reviewed and used for the measurements of carriageway, footway, island widths; • Local public transport schedules and route maps were reviewed and consultation with public transport operators undertaken; • Local walking and cycling and Public Rights of Way plans; • Highways England data diversion routing plans; • Assessment of Personal Injury Accident data obtained from local police; • Highway boundary information from Local Authorities; and • Tree surveys which were used to inform any proposals made. <p>The desktop study was also supplemented by several site visits to both the Onshore Cable Corridor and the wider study area undertaken through the course of 2018 and 2019, together with an extensive suite of traffic count surveys outputs. Traffic surveys completed included over 30 Automated Traffic Counts, 10 Manual Classified Turning Counts, as well as various Parking Surveys. The locations of the completed surveys can be seen in ES Chapter 22, Figure 22.2, Traffic Survey Locations (APP-317).</p> <p>Further information regarding how the collated data was used to determine the baseline sensitivity of highway links is set out in Section 22.4.9. of Chapter 22.</p> <p>The second element of the desktop study was based upon a review of the of the outputs of the Solent Sub Regional Transport Model (SRTM) modelling which was undertaken to inform this work which is included within the Transport Assessment (APP-448) and the Supplementary Transport Assessment (document reference 7.8.1.11). The results of the SRTM were reviewed to assess the extent of worst-case of traffic redistribution that could take place as a result of the proposed development, and thus inform the extent of the study area required. In line with the guidance set out in the Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic, links were included in the study area is they incurred a change in traffic flow (or HGV flow) of over 30%, or 10% in the case of links which contain sensitive receptors. Further information regarding the selection criteria can be found in Section 22.4.4 of Chapter 22.</p> <p>Throughout all stages of the preparation of the Application, the Applicant held discussions with the Local Highway Authorities to further inform the results of the desktop study.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
TT1.16.5	The Applicant	The 'Study Area' section of ES chapter 22 (22.1.2) [APP-137] refers to many street and place names that cannot be identified on the plates (22.1 to 22.15) provided in that chapter. The chapter also refers to the access into the Converter Station site, suggesting this can be seen on plate 22.1, but again this is not obvious. Could the Applicant please update Figure 22.7 [APP-322] and apply link names to the road network to aid understanding of the location of the affected links mentioned in the text, and clearly label the access into the Converter Station site.	Figure 22.7 (APP-322) has been updated (APP-322 Rev002), and link names have been applied to the road network. The updated Figure 22.7 should be taken to supersede that included within Chapter 22 of the ES (APP-137).
TT1.16.6	The Applicant	When discussing the magnitude of effects (section 22.6 of ES Chapter 22 [APP-137] and ES Appendix 22.4 [APP-452]), references are made to 'local factors' that have also been considered. Please describe these local factors and explain how they have influenced the determination of the magnitude of effects in relation to each link assessed.	<p>Paragraph 22.4.5.7 of Chapter 22 of the ES (APP-137) states that "relevant local factors are considered when assessing severance. For example, the presence of crossing facilities, type of road and volume / speed of traffic."</p> <p>Paragraph 22.4.5.25 of Chapter 22 states that for fear and intimidation "where appropriate relevant local factors have been considered in the assessment of the magnitude of change resulting from the proposed development."</p> <p>In responding to this question, it should be noted that Appendix 22.4 (APP-452) was superseded by Appendix 22.5 (AS-018) due to an error made in numbering of the Appendices as part of the original submission. Appendix 22.5 has been updated to provide details of all local factors which have been taken into account in the assessment of Severance and Fear and Intimidation. These updates have also been included in the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) as a replacement to Appendix 22.5 (AS-018 Rev002).</p>
TT1.16.7	The Applicant	Could the Applicant please explain and justify why different methods have been used to assess effects on accidents and safety in the Onshore Cable Corridor and the Wider Study Area in Chapter 22 of the ES [APP-137].	<p>Personal Injury Collision data was only available at submission for the Onshore Cable Corridor, which is assessed within Section 1.7 of the Transport Assessment (APP-448). For the wider study area assessment completed within ES Chapter 22 (APP-137) the Department for Transport's 'Cost and Benefits to Accidents – Light Touch' (COBALT) methodology has been used, which estimates the typical number of accidents on a link based upon the type of road, traffic speed and volume and predicted accident rate.</p> <p>All assessments of accidents and safety contained within Chapter 22 have now been superseded by analysis contained within Section 3 of the Supplementary Transport Assessment and Section 15 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1). This analysis uses Personal Injury Collision data collected for the whole study area, which has been used to identify clusters of accidents across the study area which may be vulnerable to changes in traffic flow, composition or implementation of traffic management.</p> <p>This further assessment will be the subject of further discussion with the relevant highway authorities during the course of the Examination.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response																																
TT1.16.8	The Applicant	<p>Please explain how the duration of impact (short-, medium- and long-term) has been determined with reference to the project schedule and relevant guidance.</p> <p>What assumptions have been applied in relation to sites where construction activities would extend over longer periods of time, for example HDD sites with up to 44 weeks of activity?</p>	<p>The duration of impact has been determined as defined in Paragraph 4.2.4.1 of Chapter 4 of the ES (APP-119) as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • short-term: less than one year; • medium-term: one to five years; and • long-term: greater than five years. <p>A review of ES Chapter 22 (APP-137) has found some discrepancies in stated durations that require updating to align with the definition of duration of impacts. All identified discrepancies are in relation to Section 1 of the Onshore Cable Corridor and / or Wider Study Area, with updates included within the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) at Table 15.3.</p> <p>A complete list of the required updates can be seen below:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Paragraph Number</th> <th>Submission Duration</th> <th>Updated Duration</th> <th>Impact on Level of Significance</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>22.6.5.8</td> <td>Short term</td> <td>Medium Term</td> <td>No Change</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22.6.5.10</td> <td>Short term</td> <td>Medium Term</td> <td>No Change</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22.6.5.11</td> <td>Short term</td> <td>Medium Term</td> <td>No Change</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22.6.5.13</td> <td>Short term</td> <td>Medium Term</td> <td>No Change</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22.6.5.14</td> <td>Short term</td> <td>Medium Term</td> <td>No Change</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22.6.5.16</td> <td>Short term</td> <td>Medium Term</td> <td>No Change</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22.6.5.22 (all links listed)</td> <td>Short term</td> <td>Medium Term</td> <td>No Change</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The updated durations do not impact upon the level of significance reported in Chapter 22. All of the durations of impacts included in Chapter 22 which are not included in the above table remain unchanged.</p> <p>HDD sites with up to 44 weeks of activity are classified as having short-term duration of impacts as works will be undertaken for less than one year.</p>	Paragraph Number	Submission Duration	Updated Duration	Impact on Level of Significance	22.6.5.8	Short term	Medium Term	No Change	22.6.5.10	Short term	Medium Term	No Change	22.6.5.11	Short term	Medium Term	No Change	22.6.5.13	Short term	Medium Term	No Change	22.6.5.14	Short term	Medium Term	No Change	22.6.5.16	Short term	Medium Term	No Change	22.6.5.22 (all links listed)	Short term	Medium Term	No Change
Paragraph Number	Submission Duration	Updated Duration	Impact on Level of Significance																																
22.6.5.8	Short term	Medium Term	No Change																																
22.6.5.10	Short term	Medium Term	No Change																																
22.6.5.11	Short term	Medium Term	No Change																																
22.6.5.13	Short term	Medium Term	No Change																																
22.6.5.14	Short term	Medium Term	No Change																																
22.6.5.16	Short term	Medium Term	No Change																																
22.6.5.22 (all links listed)	Short term	Medium Term	No Change																																
TT1.16.9	Local planning authorities Highway authorities	<p>Are the baseline traffic surveys set out in the Transport Assessment sufficient (Appendix 22.1: sections 1.5.3 for the Converter Station; 1.5.4 for the onshore cable corridor; and 1.5.5 for the routes that may be affected by traffic redistribution in the wider transport network) [APP-448], or is there a need for data from a wider spread of months to present a more representative view and to take account of festivals and events?</p>																																	
TT1.16.10	The Applicant	<p>The Western Link converter station has been used as a basis for the assessment of traffic that is likely to be generated by the construction of the Converter Station. (Paragraph 22.4.6.4 of Chapter 22 of the ES [APP-137] refers.) Explain the extent to which the assumed comparison is appropriate, having regard to the works required to prepare the Lovedean</p>	<p>Following review paragraph 22.4.6.4 of ES Chapter 22 (APP-137) has been corrected in Section 15 of the ES Addendum to (document reference 7.8.1) read:</p> <p><i>“As details of the Converter Station are still to be confirmed, principal quantities of materials have been used from other Converter Station / Sub-Station projects and then adjusted pro-rata to reflect the Proposed Development. This methodology has been used to calculate quantities of materials related to:</i></p>																																

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>site, in particular the 'cut-and-fill' works and the scale and extent of the Proposed Development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>steel tonnage/building</i> • <i>cut-and-fill</i> • <i>Foundations and ground floor slab construction</i> • <i>Road construction within converter station</i> • <i>Converter station finishes</i> • <i>Transformer technical specification and associated transformer bund."</i> <p>As stated in the revision of paragraph 22.4.6.4, of Chapter 22 of the ES (APP-137) all estimates are based upon pro-rata adjustments of materials to reflect the Proposed Development and are therefore considered to be appropriate and do not require any additional assessment.</p> <p>All other assumptions included in Paragraph 22.4.6.4 and 22.4.6.5 of Chapter 22 are correct and alterations are not required to the estimated number of HGVs generated by the Proposed Development.</p>
<p>TT1.16.11</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Paragraph 22.4.7.15 of Chapter 22 of the ES [APP-137] states that a number of potential joint bay locations have been included within the Order limits, but the final number would be determined by the contractor. Please could you explain the assumptions that have been applied in relation to the joint bay locations and the consequential impacts.</p> <p>Please clarify the meaning in this paragraph of the phrase <i>'these are considered to result in the same predicted impact and significance of effect as the proposed traffic management requirements.'</i></p>	<p>The assumptions that have been made in relation to the location of Joint Bays are as follows, and as are included in the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typical cable lengths of 1000 m – 1200 m, limited by the size of the drums, not the production process. A length of 1500m will be required for the HDD crossing of Langstone Harbour. • The amount of material excavated from a Joint Bay is approximately (15m x 3m x 1.7m =) 76.5m³. This can be managed within the corridor in the space allocated for cable drums and stands or cable winches • Joint Bays are to be located off carriageway, where practicable, to mitigate disruption to traffic. An exception is likely to be in the A3/London Road, where joint bays will be in the bus lane. • There must be space for a joining compound, typically 20 m x 6 m, for workshops, welfare, storage, security and parking. • There should be good access to the Joint Bays for cable drum deliveries, and space at the ends of the Joint Bays for cable drums and delivery vehicles or drum stands and for cable winches and anchors. • Cable section lengths may also be dictated by the cable route. Where practicable any significant bends should be at the start of the pull, to mitigate pulling tension and side loadings on the cables during installation. Where there are a number of significant bends then shorter cable sections are appropriate. <p>Paragraph 22.4.7.15 of ES Chapter 22 (APP-137) states that <i>"within the Order Limits a number of potential Joint Bay locations have been included, all of which provide adequate space for construction works to take place without blocking the carriageway (including vehicle delivery / parking). The exact number and location of the Joint Bays however will be determined by the contractor, and for this assessment, with this Chapter, these are considered to result in the same predicted impact and significance of effect as the proposed traffic management requirements."</i></p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>In answer to the second part of the question, all of the potential Joint Bay locations have been selected on the basis that construction could be facilitated by similar or less disruptive traffic management when compared to installation of the ducting for the Onshore Cable Route. For example, where Joint Bays are constructed on A3 London Road, this could be facilitated through a single lane closure rather than requiring shuttle working traffic signals or a full road closure. Construction of Joint Bays will also be completed using the same construction working hours and will generate a similar number of construction traffic movements as installation of the cable ducts for the Onshore Cable Route. Therefore, construction of Joint Bays results in predicted impacts no worse than those assessed within ES Chapter 22, and therefore is considered to be comparable with the traffic management required to facilitate the construction of the Onshore Cable Route.</p> <p>Further to this, Section 3 of the Supplementary Transport Assessment (document reference 7.8.1.11) and Section 15 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) include an assessment of abnormal load HGV movements associated with delivery of cable drums to required Joint Bay locations. This assessment has concluded that these HGV movements do not result in any significant effects in relation to construction of the Joint Bays.</p>
TT1.16.12	The Applicant	The definition of abnormal indivisible loads given in section 2.7.7 of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-450] does not appear to match the definition used in paragraph 22.4.5.37 of ES Chapter 22 [APP-137]. Can the Applicant explain this discrepancy and if this alters the assessment of significant effects?	<p>The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (FCTMP) (APP-450 Rev 002) has been updated to remove the incorrect definition of an Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) contained within Section 2.7.7.</p> <p>As defined by The Road Vehicles (Authorisation of Special Types) (General) Order 2003 an AIL is an abnormal “load that cannot without undue expense or risk of damage be divided into two or more loads for the purpose of being carried on a road.”</p> <p>The FCTMP has also been updated to reflect the difference between an Abnormal Load and an Abnormal Indivisible Load. The UK Government definition of an Abnormal Load is as follows:</p> <p>“An ‘abnormal load’ is a vehicle that has any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A weight of more than 44,000kg • An axle load of more than 10,000kg for a single non-driving axle • A width of more than 2.9 metres • A rigid length of more than 18.65 metres” <p>(https://www.gov.uk/esdal-and-abnormal-loads)</p> <p>The Supplementary Transport Assessment (Section 3.8) and ES Addendum (Section 12) include further assessment of Abnormal Loads associated with Proposed Development and have confirmed that no new significant effects have been identified.</p> <p>The updated FCTMP at Sections 2.7.7 and 2.7.8 also provides additional information in relation to the management of abnormal and AIL vehicle movements associated with the Proposed Development.</p>
TT1.16.13	The Applicant	Paragraph 22.6.5.19 of Chapter 22 of the ES [APP-137] and the CTMP [APP-450] detail that pruning and tree works would need to take place	Pruning outside of the Order Limits to allow abnormal loads shall be designed to comply with the Highways Act 1980 section 154 requirements. This is a statutory

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response																																			
		along the routes of access for abnormal loads. What process would be used in relation to the necessary consents and any compensation, given that the powers under the Order would be limited to the Order limits?	obligation for the person who owns / is responsible for the trees to prune tree to remove an obstruction to the safe use of the highway. Should the abnormal loads require additional clearance, this shall be targeted pruning at specific points to be agreed with the haulier, landowner, project team and where appropriate, the local planning authority prior to the works being carried out. All tree works are to be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998:2010 "Tree Work - Recommendations", as is confirmed at paragraph 5.1.5 to the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (document reference 6.10).																																			
TT1.16.14	The Applicant	<p>The Framework Transport Management Strategy [APP-449] contains several instances where works are for '<i>between x and x weeks</i>' depending on the chosen construction options. Some of these range from 1 day to 9 weeks. Can the Applicant explain the approach that the chosen contractor would be expected to take in formulating an approach, and if the works with the shortest duration and most limited environmental effects would be selected?</p> <p>In the event that multiple contractors were to be used in the construction of the Proposed Development, what measures would be put in place to ensure that their work is co-ordinated in line with the Framework Traffic Management Strategy [APP-449] and the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-450]?</p> <p>How would this be secured in the dDCO?</p>	<p>Following further discussions with the local highway authorities, the Framework Traffic Management Strategy (FTMS) (APP-449 Rev002) has been amended to include the following instances where a range of construction periods is provided.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Section</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Proposed TM</th> <th>Duration Per Circuit</th> <th>Reason for Range in Duration</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3.1</td> <td>Anmore Road</td> <td>Road Closure</td> <td>1 Day to 2 Weeks</td> <td>Different cable route options available</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.1</td> <td>B2150 Hambledon Road between Soake Road and Milton Road</td> <td>Shuttle working TS</td> <td>11 - 22 weeks</td> <td>Different cable route options available</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.34</td> <td>A3 London Road between Post Office Road and Rocking Horse Nursery</td> <td>Road Closure</td> <td>2-4 weekends</td> <td>Option available for day-time only construction working or 24hr construction working</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.4</td> <td>A2030 Havant Road</td> <td>Road Closure</td> <td>1-2 weekends</td> <td>Option available for day-time only construction working or 24hr construction working</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8.1</td> <td>A2030 Eastern Road between Airport Service Road and Tangier Road</td> <td>Lane Closures</td> <td>5-8 weeks</td> <td>Option available for day-time only construction working or 24hr construction working</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8.2 Option</td> <td>Both Circuits within Milton Common</td> <td></td> <td>1-2 weeks</td> <td>Different cable route options available</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Section	Description	Proposed TM	Duration Per Circuit	Reason for Range in Duration	3.1	Anmore Road	Road Closure	1 Day to 2 Weeks	Different cable route options available	4.1	B2150 Hambledon Road between Soake Road and Milton Road	Shuttle working TS	11 - 22 weeks	Different cable route options available	4.34	A3 London Road between Post Office Road and Rocking Horse Nursery	Road Closure	2-4 weekends	Option available for day-time only construction working or 24hr construction working	5.4	A2030 Havant Road	Road Closure	1-2 weekends	Option available for day-time only construction working or 24hr construction working	8.1	A2030 Eastern Road between Airport Service Road and Tangier Road	Lane Closures	5-8 weeks	Option available for day-time only construction working or 24hr construction working	8.2 Option	Both Circuits within Milton Common		1-2 weeks	Different cable route options available
Section	Description	Proposed TM	Duration Per Circuit	Reason for Range in Duration																																		
3.1	Anmore Road	Road Closure	1 Day to 2 Weeks	Different cable route options available																																		
4.1	B2150 Hambledon Road between Soake Road and Milton Road	Shuttle working TS	11 - 22 weeks	Different cable route options available																																		
4.34	A3 London Road between Post Office Road and Rocking Horse Nursery	Road Closure	2-4 weekends	Option available for day-time only construction working or 24hr construction working																																		
5.4	A2030 Havant Road	Road Closure	1-2 weekends	Option available for day-time only construction working or 24hr construction working																																		
8.1	A2030 Eastern Road between Airport Service Road and Tangier Road	Lane Closures	5-8 weeks	Option available for day-time only construction working or 24hr construction working																																		
8.2 Option	Both Circuits within Milton Common		1-2 weeks	Different cable route options available																																		

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response				
			1		Lane Closure		
			8.2 Option 2	One Circuit within Milton Common		1-8 weeks	Different cable route options available
			<p>In all cases it will be for the Contractor to determine the approach for construction of the Onshore Cable Route.</p> <p>At some locations the Applicant has identified preferred routes or working hours that minimise traffic disruption, however, each of these locations present engineering challenges, and it is recognised that the contractor, having performed additional surveys and searches, may not choose these routes due to unforeseen constraints and use those with the worst-case assessed environmental effects. These worst-case environmental effects have been fully assessed within the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>In the event of multiple contractors being employed, all will be required to work within the programme and calendar restrictions identified within the updated FTMS, which will be secured by a specific requirement of the dDCO (APP-019 Rev 002). These restrictions have been formulated to mitigate the cumulative impacts of multiple construction works in similar locations or at sensitive times. This will also ensure that delays to construction in one location will not result in a cumulative traffic impact beyond that already assessed within the Environmental Statement. The submission of information to confirm compliance with the requirements of the FTMS and to inform when the works in the highway will be carried out, in addition to securing compliance with those submitted and approved details, is proposed to be secured via the protective provisions for the protection of highways and traffic located at Part 5 of Schedule 13 to the dDCO (APP-019 Rev 002).</p>				
TT1.16.15	The Applicant	<p>There are numerous mentions of ‘weeks per circuit’ (<i>inter alia</i> paragraphs 6.2.2.6, 6.13.2.1 and 7.8.2.2 of the Framework Transport Management Strategy [APP449]). Was the option of undertaking all circuit works concurrently explored, and would such an approach limit the duration of works in a stretch of the route to 3 weeks in total rather than 3 weeks per circuit?</p> <p>If not, why not?</p> <p>If so, why has it not been adopted as the default approach?</p>	<p>The completion of works concurrently would limit the duration on works on a stretch of road to 3 weeks in total rather 3 weeks per circuit. The strategy for construction of the Onshore Cable Route did consider the potential for all circuit works being undertaken simultaneously but this was discounted due to the predicted impacts associated with such an approach. In some instances, it also would not be possible to work concurrently due to the available highway width and space required for construction to take place safely.</p> <p>Taking account of the construction methodology and associated traffic management requirements, such an approach would have required the implementation of full road closures on all single-carriageway parts of the Onshore Cable Corridor, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B2155 Hambledon Road; • A3 London Road where bus lanes are not present; • Portsdown Hill Road; 				

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farlington Avenue; • Moorings Way; • Longshore Way; • Locksway Road; • Kingsley Road; • Henderson Road; and • Fort Cumberland Road. <p>Also, where single lane closures are required on dual-carriageway sections of the Onshore Cable Corridor (e.g. A2030 Eastern Road), the simultaneous closure of a lane in each direction would result in a greater level of traffic reassignment onto the wider highway network, placing a greater strain on individual junctions and links. In each case, this approach was considered to lead to an unacceptable impact on traffic and transport users and in the judgement of the Applicant would not be acceptable to the Local Highway Authorities.</p> <p>Consequently, the construction methodology discounted the option of undertaking all circuit works concurrently.</p>
TT1.16.16	Portsmouth City Council	In your Relevant Representation [RR-185], you state planned works on traffic-sensitive routes are only allowed during off-peak hours and the City also operates works embargoes. Could you set out how the route and timing of the Proposed Development would be affected by these embargoes, and whether any such restrictions are reflected in the ES ([APP-137] and [APP-449])?	
TT1.16.17	The Applicant	<p>There may be discrepancies in assigning magnitude and sensitivity between ES Volume 3, Appendices 22 (22.4 in particular) [APP-448] to [APP-453] and the assessment in ES Chapter 22, section 22.6.5 [APP-137]. Please check for any discrepancies across the whole of these documents and provide clarifying information if necessary, including any necessary updates to the findings of the assessment.</p> <p>Some examples, <i>inter alia</i>, are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Appendix 22.4, traffic delay assessment, section 8, A2030 Eastern Road/ Burfields Road, the magnitude is determined to be low. In ES Chapter 22, paragraph 20.6.12.4 it is determined to be medium; and • In Appendix 22.4, traffic delay assessment section 4, B2150 Hambledon Road/ Ashton Road the sensitivity is determined to be medium. In ES Chapter 22, paragraph 22.6.8.19 it is determined to be low. 	<p>Updated versions of Appendix 22.4 – Baseline and Methodology Tables (AS-017) and Appendix 22.5 – Impact Tables (AS-018) have also been submitted. These updated appendices account for all changes to sensitivity of receptors, resultant magnitude of impact and significance of effect. All updates to these appendices are reflected within Section 15 of the ES Addendum</p> <p>Furthermore, included in Table 15.4 of the ES Addendum is the revised summary of residual effects for traffic and transport. Table 15.4 clearly summarises all changes made within the ES Addendum in respect to significance and nature of effects prior to mitigation, summary of mitigation / enhancement and the significance of any residual effects following mitigation / enhancement.</p>
TT1.16.18	The Applicant	No specific account appears to have been given to home football matches played by Portsmouth FC. Please describe the typical transport conditions associated with the football club's home games and where and how traffic moves through the City as a result.	Discussions have been held with Portsmouth FC in respect of the Proposed Development and it is recognised that football traffic has an effect on traffic flows on Portsea Island before and after a football match, with the A2030 Eastern Road providing the main access route to Fratton Park from the A27. In addition to traffic

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>How would the Proposed Development affect or be affected by such traffic given there are limited routes onto Portsea Island and into Portsmouth?</p>	<p>flow increases on the A2030 Eastern Road, the M275 also experiences an increase in traffic on football match days as result of supporters accessing Fratton Park but also general traffic diverting away from the A2030 Eastern Road.</p> <p>It was the intention of the Applicant to complete traffic surveys of the A2030 Eastern Road to correspond to Portsmouth FC home matches however the ability to carry out this exercise has been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, which has clearly reduced traffic movements and attendance at football matches.</p> <p>It is the view of the Applicant that traffic conditions associated with football matches would be similar to weekday peak traffic conditions which are accounted for and fully assessed in the Transport Assessment (TA) (APP-448). Section 1.12 of the TA included detailed peak-period local modelling of the highway network along the route of the Onshore Cable Corridor, along with areas of the network likely to be affected by diverted traffic based upon professional judgement and local knowledge of the study area.</p> <p>The updated Framework Traffic Management Strategy (FTMS) (APP-449 Rev002) considers Portsmouth FC home matches through the use of programme constraints that limit construction as far as practically possible to periods outside of the football season. As shown in Section 10 of the updated FTMS construction along the A2030 Eastern Road is permitted only during the following periods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easter school holidays; • May half-term; • June; • July; and • August <p>With these restrictions, construction will take place during the football season only during the Easter school holidays and in August, which may correspond with 2-3 Portsmouth FC home matches during construction of each circuit. Where such games are played on weekday evenings however, there will be lower traffic flows than term-time weekday home games.</p> <p>On the basis that traffic conditions are similar during Portsmouth FC home games and weekday peak periods; at time when works are being undertaken along the A2030 Eastern Road the impacts are anticipated to be the same as those assessed for the weekday peak periods.</p>
<p>TT1.16.19</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>It is not clear from [AS-016] what consultation has taken place with the relevant bus operators in coming to conclusions on providing temporary bus stops and diverted services. Explain what consultation has taken place and what the outcomes of this consultation were.</p>	<p>A meeting was held with First Group (First Hampshire & Dorset) on the 22nd August 2019 to discuss the Proposed Development and the potential impact to local bus services in the Portsmouth and South Hampshire area. At this meeting, discussions were held regarding the potential for First Group to provide a shuttle bus service along Moorings Way / Locksway Road and Milton Road should the closure of Furze Lane be required to facilitate construction of the Onshore Cable Route. Since this meeting was held, the Order Limits have been further refined, with the entirety of Furze Lane and the associated Bus Link being removed. Following this Order Limit</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>update, the need to provide a shuttle bus service has also been removed, as bus movements along Furze Lane will no longer be impacted by the proposed construction works.</p> <p>At pre-submission an attempt was also made to consult with Stagecoach on the Proposed Development, but no response was received. Since submission, contact has also been made on the 25th August and 3rd September 2020, but no response has been received.</p> <p>The Applicant is keen to continue engagement with First Group, and a further meeting has been scheduled on 8th October 2020. The Applicant is also keen to engage Stagecoach and has been actively requesting meetings on this basis.</p>
TT1.16.20	The Applicant	<p>150 construction worker cars are assumed during the peak of construction [APP-137]. The dDCO [APP-019] allows for parking facilities for up to 150 vehicles in Work No 3. Please provide details (in written and diagram form) of the location, design parameters and scheduling of the parking provision for these vehicles and demonstrate that the car park would include capacity sufficient for the vehicles of the cable gangs, transfer vehicles and general visitors to the site.</p> <p>How would fly parking on and adjacent to the local highway network be prevented?</p>	<p>In response to question OW1.12.16 a Technical Note and Drawing 'AQ-ITT-LAY-101', which details the proposed construction worker parking and surface water drainage strategy, has been produced (Appendix 6 of the updated Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (APP-505 Rev002)). This has capacity for 227 construction vehicles. This accounts for all construction works associated with the Converter Station and Cable route, plus LGVs and HGVs associated with construction of the cable route.</p> <p>Fly parking by construction workers will be prevented by all construction workers needing to sign-in at the start of the working day and sign-out at the end of the working day at the Converter Station Area compound, while the staff communication strategy will also provide details of permitted driver behaviours, HGV routing and parking. This is detailed within Section 4.4 of the updated Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (APP-450 Rev002).</p>
TT1.16.21	The Applicant Highways England	<p>With reference to ES 22.4.6.10 [APP-137], the worst-case scenario for the A3 and the A27 might be considered to be all of the construction traffic using each road individually. Can the Applicant explain how a worst-case scenario has been assessed when it is assumed there is an equal split of movements between the two roads?</p>	<p>With reference to paragraph 22.4.6.10 of Chapter 22 of the ES (APP-137), the assumption of an even split of traffic between the A3 (M) north of Junction 2 and the A3 (M) south of Junction 2 is regarded as a worst-case assessment due to the relatively small number of construction vehicles that are proposed to route on these roads comparative to the overall flow. The relatively low level of traffic in comparison to the overall flow means that the impact of routing of all construction traffic onto one of these routes is negligible regardless of the directional split on construction traffic. Due to this relatively low number of construction vehicles in relation to the overall flow, the impact would still remain negligible should all construction vehicles entering this junction travel in the same direction. For context, if all construction traffic used either the A3(M) north or south of junction 2 the percentage increase in 18-hour traffic flow would be 0.6-0.7%. This traffic increase is not considered material and would not be permanent.</p>
TT1.16.22	The Applicant	<p>The traffic assessment relies on a worst-case maximum of six, simultaneous, 100m sections of cable installation (ES 22.4.7.3 [APP-137]).</p>	<p>The worst-case maximum of six, simultaneous, 100 m sections of cable installation is controlled via paragraph 2.3.1.7 of the updated Framework Traffic Management Strategy (FTMS) (APP-449 Rev002).</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		What is the basis for this assumption, and how and where is this controlled in the dDCO [APP-019]?	A maximum of six working gangs are permitted to be constructing the Onshore Cable Route on the highway at any one time. This number was chosen in order to facilitate timely construction of the Onshore Cable Route whilst limiting the cumulative impacts of works on the operation of the highway network to an acceptable level by limiting the instances of traffic management locations being required.
TT1.16.23	The Applicant	With reference to the Relevant Representation of N Craze [RR-036], can you please provide details of any proposed mitigation measures relating to the works in the vicinity of Bransbury Park, Yeo Court and Godiva Lawn to allow for local traffic circumstances and access for service vehicles.	Where the final cable route uses Yeo Court, a full road closure will be required for approximately one week per circuit (two weeks in total) to facilitate construction works as defined in section 11.9 of the updated Framework Traffic Management Strategy (FTMS) (APP-449 Rev002). However, during this period, pedestrian and emergency access will be retained at all times to the rear of the Godiva Lawn even-numbered properties, these being those on the north western side of this route. This retained pedestrian access will also allow refuse collectors to collect wheelie bins by hand from Godiva Lawn and Yeo Court when required with the refuse vehicle waiting on Kingsley Road. The strategy for maintaining access to properties during the construction period is provided within Section 4 of the "Onshore Cable Route Construction Impacts on Access to Properties and Car Parking and Communication Strategy" included at Appendix 1 of the FTMS.
TT1.16.24	The Applicant	In relation to the trenchless solution under the South Coast Railway, the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-450] states that HGV movements would avoid peak traffic hours Monday to Friday but then states that there may be a requirement for some HGV movements to support 24-hour working. Given this caveat, what confidence can the Examining Authority have that the assumptions about onshore cable construction traffic movements in paragraph 22.4.7.8 of the ES [APP-137] are correct?	<p>All construction vehicle movements will be enforced as per the restrictions detailed within the updated Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (FCTMP) (APP-450 Rev002) and where 24-hour construction working is required, vehicles will not be permitted to travel within the AM and PM peak periods. Section 3.3.6 of the updated FCTMP (APP-450) contains the following text in relation to control of HGV movements:</p> <p><i>"The majority of HGV movements will occur Monday to Friday 09:00 to 17:00, avoiding the peak traffic hours of 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00. There may be a requirement for some HGV movements outside of the time periods presented above to support 24 hour working (though not during the peak traffic hours of 08:00 to 09:00 and 17:00 to 18:00). However, endeavours will be made to avoid HGV movements between the hours of 19:00 to 07:00 to avoid disturbance to nearby residential properties."</i> For other HDD locations where 24-hour working may be required Paragraph 3.3.4.1 of the FCTMP notes the following:</p> <p><i>"These movements however will be restricted to outside of the 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00 peak traffic hours and 19:00-07:00 to avoid disturbance to nearby residential properties. However, in areas that are not in close proximity to residential properties may require working between 19:00 and 07:00."</i></p> <p><i>"Whilst 24 hour working is sought to be permitted by way of the DCO, the FCTMP will prevent movement of HGV movements during weekday peak traffic hours. This is the situation that has been modelled within the ES and therefore confirms that an assessment that reflects the conditions of construction activity has been undertaken."</i></p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			Adherence to controls contained within the updated FCTMP is secured by Requirement 17 of the dDCO (APP-018).
TT1.16.25	The Applicant	<p>Section 7 of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-449] states that SMART targets would be set, and monitoring surveys would be undertaken by the Travel Plan Coordinator at 6 months, 1 year and 2 years into the construction stage.</p> <p>Please clarify how many monitoring surveys would be undertaken and at what locations, how monitoring would trigger remedial action, and what form such action might take.</p>	<p>It is correct that Travel Plan monitoring would be completed at 6 months, 1 year and 2 years into the construction phase as detailed within Paragraph 7.2.1.1 of the updated Construction Worker Travel Plan (Appendix 6 of the updated Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan) (FCTMP) (APP-450). This monitoring would be completed by the Travel Plan Coordinator who would record as part of a Travel Survey the mode of transport used by all construction workers accessing the construction compound, which together with data held on origin of trips can be used to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote car sharing with other construction workers; • Provide information on available public transport options; • Determine if the proposed shuttle-bus service routing could be altered to include additional nearby railway stations / bus stations or hotels. <p>The Travel Plan will set modal share targets for construction workers, which are to be agreed with Hampshire County Council as the relevant Highway Authority. These targets will need to be agreed between The Applicant and the Highway Authority and will be used as the basis to measure the performance of the Travel Plan against the baseline.</p> <p>Through the monitoring surveys, in the event that the SMART targets are not achieved, these will trigger the need to introduce remedial action. The proposed forms of this remedial action are set out in the Construction Worker Travel Plan at Appendix 7 of the updated FCTMP (APP-450 Rev002).</p>
TT1.16.26	Portsmouth City Council	Your Relevant Representation [RR-185] suggests that reliance on the agreement of tailored Construction Traffic Management Plans post-consent is unacceptable as the impacts of the Proposed Development should be understood in advance of consent. Please explain the approach that would normally be expected for projects such as this and detail any additional information you would like to see included in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan.	
TT1.16.27	The Applicant	<p>Can the Applicant explain what measures the chosen contractor would be expected to put in place to ensure road access for residents, businesses and emergency services is maintained during the construction of the Proposed Development?</p> <p>How are these expectations secured through the dDCO [APP-019]?</p>	<p>Full details of the strategy to maintain access to properties is included within the Onshore Cable Route Construction Impacts on Access to Properties and Car Parking and Communication Strategy included within Appendix 1 of the updated Framework Traffic Management Strategy (APP-449 Rev002), compliance with which is secured by Requirement 17 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
TT1.16.28	The Applicant	Given the possibility of traffic build-ups and delays due to lane closures, can the Applicant explain why no monitoring is proposed for situations where there would be lane closures without shuttle working traffic signals?	Where the Applicant seeks to use shuttle working traffic signals, the Traffic Management Contractor will be able to monitor traffic conditions and adjust the operation of signals to allow queue dispersion, if necessary. This effectively allows for the sharing of capacity among the two directions of traffic by allocating green time as appropriate, depending upon the level of demand. However, at lane closures without shuttle working signals, only one lane would be closed and at least one lane per direction would remain open to traffic. In these situations, all traffic would be moving in the same direction and the Traffic Management Contractor would not be able to respond to improve the traffic flow. Therefore, real-time monitoring would have no benefit in these situations.
TT1.16.29	The Applicant	In ES 22.4.3.4 [APP-137], please clarify what 'IEMA topics' are, provide a reference and explain their relevance here.	<p>The reference "IEMA topics" at paragraph 22.4.3.4 is incorrect and instead should reference "EIA topics". These relate to Chapter 22 of the ES where assumptions included within Chapter 22 have been used in other assessments or where information contained within the Transport Assessment, Framework Traffic Management Strategy or Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan is relevant to these assessments.</p> <p>Examination Library references of the listed documents are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual impacts: Chapter 15 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) of the ES (APP-130); • Ecological impacts: Chapter 16 (Onshore Ecology) of the ES (APP-131); • Dust and dirt and air pollution: Chapter 23 (Air Quality) of the ES (APP-138); • Noise and vibration: Chapter 24 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (APP-139); and <p>The reference to Heritage and conversation areas: Chapter 21 (Heritage and Archaeology) of the ES (APP-136) is incorrect and should be removed.</p> <p>This text has been clarified as part of Section 15 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) and Table 1 of the Errata Sheet (document reference 7.8.1.1) submitted at Deadline.</p>
TT1.16.30	The Applicant	With reference to ES 22.6.5.13 [APP-137], please could the Applicant clarify which highway is referred to here (<i>'However, given the potential for a temporary stopping up of the highway...'</i>)	That sentence is referring to Broadway Lane and Day Lane. This has been clarified in Section 15 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) and Table 1 of the Errata Sheet (document reference 7.8.1.1) submitted at Deadline 1.
TT1.16.31	The Applicant	<p>Could the Applicant please identify where the assessment of intra-project cumulative effects of construction works at (up to) six simultaneous sites is addressed (in terms of matters such as driver delay, public transport disruption, pedestrian and cyclist amenity, etc on a longer journey that would encounter multiple construction sites).</p> <p>What additional mitigation has been considered, discounted or employed to deal with any cumulative effects such as these?</p>	<p>An assessment of the cumulative effects of construction works at six simultaneous sites is provided in the following documents and informed by use of the Sub-Regional Transport Model, which takes account of traffic re-assigning onto alternative routes as a result of the construction works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An assessment journey time increases on 8 corridors in the study area is provided in Section 1.11.7 of the Transport Assessment (TA) (APP-448);

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An assessment of junction operation and delay at 31 key junctions is provided in Section 1.12 of the TA; and • An assessment of walking and cycling for each section of the Onshore Cable Corridor is included in Section 1.13 of the TA noting that in the vast majority of cases, pedestrian and cycle routes will be maintained in some form during construction works. • An assessment impacts to bus journey times across the study area is provided in Section 5 of the Supplementary Transport Assessment (document reference 7.8.1.11) and within Section 15 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1). <p>Due to the length of the Onshore Cable Corridor and programme restrictions set-out in the Updated Framework Traffic Management Strategy (FTMS) (APP-449 Rev002) general traffic routes not being fixed within the study area , it is considered very unlikely that traffic would be subject to the cumulative delays associated with passing through the six construction sites and therefore this has not been assessed. For example, traffic traveling between Denmead and Eastney would most likely use the B2150 Hambledon Road, Hulbert Road, A3(M), A27, A2030 Eastern Road, A288 Milton Road, Bransbury Road, Henderson Road and Fort Cumberland Road during which they would only travel through a maximum of three traffic management locations. In reality additional, vehicles would re-route away to avoid the construction works if faced with multiple locations as part of one trip, as has been fully assessed within the TA and Chapter 22 of the ES (APP-138).</p> <p>It is also considered very unlikely that pedestrians or cyclists would be subject to the cumulative effects of routing through each of the six construction sites, due to the way in which the programme constraints prohibit multiple work locations in the same area. In all cases, as set out in Section 2.9 of the updated Framework Traffic Management Strategy (FTMS) (APP-449 Rev002)), pedestrian and cycle routes will also be maintained wherever possible with full closure of routes considered as a last resort. Therefore, it would be unlikely that construction works would lead to a cumulative effect beyond that already assessed within the Chapter 22 of the ES for individual links.</p> <p>As the cumulative effects of the work have been fully considered no further mitigation is proposed beyond that already set-out in the updated FTMS (APP-449 Rev002), updated Construction Traffic Management Plan (APP-450 Rev002) and Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (APP-505 Rev002)</p>
TT1.16.32	Portsmouth City Council	<p>Please give further details of the bid to the 'Transforming Cities Fund' and the programme of works anticipated to take place up until 2023, including any decision made in March 2020 (as alluded to in [RR-185]).</p> <p>Is the Council able to submit into the Examination any maps or diagrams to show which parts of the City could be affected by the South East Hampshire Rapid Transit system?</p>	

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		How would the Proposed Development impact on the proposed programme of works associated with the bid to the 'Transforming Cities Fund', if it was successful?	
TT1.16.33	The Applicant	Could the Applicant please review paragraph 22.4.9.6 of the ES [APP-137] and clarify.	Paragraph 22.4.9.6 of Chapter 22 of the ES (APP-137) has been updated within Section 15 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) and Table 1 of the Errata Sheet (document reference 7.8.1.1) submitted at Deadline 1.
TT1.16.34	The Applicant	Please could the Applicant review paragraph 22.6.5.16 of the ES [APP-137] and revise as necessary.	Paragraph 22.6.5.16 of Chapter 22 of the ES (APP-137) has been superseded by an updated analysis of accidents and safety included within Section 15 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1).
TT1.16.35	The Applicant	ES 22.7.1.4 [APP-137]: This paragraph may be missing a 'not'? Please could this be clarified.	Agreed. This has been clarified within Section 15 of the ES Addendum (document reference 7.8.1) and Table 1 of the Errata Sheet (document reference 7.8.1.1) submitted at Deadline 1.

Table 1.17 - Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions – Trees

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
TR1.17.1	The Applicant	<p>What is the effect of Portsmouth City Council's stated policy not to apply TPOs to qualifying trees in its guardianship, as set out in the Council's Relevant Representation [RR-185]? (See Schedule 11 of the dDCO [APP-019].)</p> <p>Has any progress been made towards an agreement with Portsmouth City Council over how this matter can be accommodated in the assessment and the dDCO?</p>	<p>The decision by Portsmouth City Council (PCC) or any other LPA not to apply a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) their own trees does not affect the assessment of their retention category. The aim of the Proposed Development is to remove as few trees as possible.</p> <p>The Tree Survey is compliant with British Standard 5837:2012, taking account of the trees physiological and structural condition at the time of inspection. This in turn informs the retention category which does not take into account trees designated by TPOs. It should be noted that a TPO does not, by virtue of designation, warrant a high retention category. It is not uncommon for trees that are subject to TPOs to be awarded lower retention categories due to declined physiological or structural condition as a result of pest disease or other factors beyond the tree owners' control. With this in mind, the decision by Portsmouth City Council not to TPO their trees has no impact on the retention category awarded to trees within the survey. The Applicant would seek to replace lost TPO trees as outlined in the OLBS where the loss is as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing with PCC and progress will be included within the Statement of Common Ground (document reference 7.5.3) to be submitted at Deadline 1.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
TR1.17.2	The Applicant	<p>ES Chapter 15 [APP-130] explains that the onshore cable corridor would result in the loss or partial loss of trees in Section 6 and Section 9. What are the Applicant's intentions for the replacement of these?</p> <p>Could the Applicant please confirm whether the LVIA set out in the ES [APP-130] relies on the replacement of trees and shrubs that are lost to the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Paragraph 15.8.11.2 states in relation to the trees in Section 6, '<i>The Onshore Cable Corridor would result in the loss or partial loss of Category B tree groups or trees (G660, G910 and T73) and a Category C tree T74 within Zetland Field. Where practicable trees and shrubs would be replaced with like for like species, trees repositioned at least 5 m away from the Onshore Cable Route</i>'. How is this secured through the dDCO [APP-019]?</p> <p>Paragraph 15.8.14.2 explains that there would be a loss of some Category B trees and shrubs within and edging Milton Lock Nature Reserve, but there is no explanation as to whether these trees and shrubs would be replaced. Could the Applicant explain if and how these losses would be mitigated and how this would be secured through the dDCO [APP-019]?</p>	<p>In terms of Section 6 and 9 where there is the loss or partial loss of trees it is the Applicant's intention to replace these where trees can be sited at least 5 m away from the Onshore Cable Route and more specifically the edge of the cable trench as set out in the updated OLBS (APP-506 Rev002) and secured by Requirement 9 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p> <p>The LVIA does rely on replacement planting lost to the Proposed Development as stated in "Assumptions and limitations" paragraph 15.4.7.2 bullet point 6 which states "[A]ll planting lost will be replaced with like for like species where practicable and in agreement with the relevant discharging authority."</p> <p>Draft DCO Requirement 7 has been revised to include reference to Work no.4 so as to secure the measures relating to this Work No. in the updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (APP-506 Rev002) and the detailed landscaping scheme. Notwithstanding the update to the Order Limits, impacts on groups or trees (G660, G910 and T73) and a Category C tree T74 within Zetland Field will be mitigated as set out in the OBLS and secured by Requirement 9 of the dDCO as set out above. The updated tree survey schedule and constraints plans can be found at Appendix 10 to this document (document reference 7.4.1.10).</p> <p>In terms of paragraph 15.8.14.2 of ES Chapter 15, replacement planting will take place where these can be sited at least 5 m away from the Onshore Cable Route and more specifically the edge of the cable trench as stated in the OLBS (APP-506) Paragraph 1.4.2.12. This is secured through dDCO Requirement 8 which requires all landscaping to be carried out in accordance with the landscaping scheme approved under Requirement 7, with the requirement for the replacement planting included at para 1.1.3.7 of the updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (APP-506 Rev002) and the detailed landscaping scheme.</p>
TR1.17.3	The Applicant Relevant local authorities	<p>The Government places importance on 'street trees' in the National Design Guide for the benefit of placemaking. Is the Applicant's approach to the identification, retention, protection, mitigation of impacts and compensation for any losses of such trees sufficiently unambiguous and is it appropriate?</p> <p>Could the Applicant please comment in detail on how the 'potential removal' of the TPO trees listed in dDCO [APP-019] Schedule 11 would be avoided.</p>	<p>The Applicant will seek to avoid all impacts on trees where possible as identified within paragraph 6.3.2.1 of the updated Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505 Rev002). Where this is not possible, all pruning and felling works will be specified by a suitably trained and experienced Arboriculture consult and will be carried out by a suitably trained and experienced arboriculture contractor, in accordance with the updated OLBS (APP-506 Rev002) at Section 1.3.4, secured by requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019).</p> <p>British Standard 5837: 2012 "Trees in relation to Demolition Design and Construction – recommendations" and British Standard 3998:2010 "Tree Work - Recommendations" as set out in the OLBS. These British Standards set out the principles of identification, retention, protection and mitigation of impacts which align with the National Design Guide. Regarding compensation, the Applicant proposes replacement trees as set out in the OLBS (APP-506).</p>

