



AQUIND Limited

AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR

First Written Question Responses – Appendix 8 Landscape and Visual Correspondance

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

Document Ref: 7.4.1.8

PINS Ref.: EN020022

AQUIND Limited

AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR

First Written Question Responses – Appendix 8 Landscape and Visual Correspondance

PINS REF.: EN020022

DOCUMENT: 7.4.1.8

DATE: 6 OCTOBER 2020

WSP

WSP House

70 Chancery Lane

London

WC2A 1AF

+44 20 7314 5000

www.wsp.com

DOCUMENT

Document	7.4.1.8 First Written Question Responses Appendix 8 Landscape and Visual Correspondance
Revision	001
Document Owner	WSP UK Limited
Prepared By	M. Boden
Date	2 October 2020
Approved By	A. Follis
Date	2 October 2020

[REDACTED]

From: Boden, Maritta
Sent: 24 October 2018 19:00
To: 'Ruth Childs'; [REDACTED]@winchester.gov.uk';
[REDACTED]@havant.gov.uk'; 'Hannah Chapman'
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Aquind - LIVA briefing meeting

Dear Ruth

Thank you very much for your email we have reviewed and taken on board your comments as well as those of Julie and Stuart in our ongoing work to inform the PEIR and converter station design. I have briefly summarised my response taking the headings you have used in your email:

LVIA and cumulative approach

Noted - we now have confirmation from all LPAs and SDNP that they agree with the methodology and extent of the study area in terms of cumulative effects.

Mitigation approach:

Bunding and vegetation:

Your comments on mitigation are very helpful and we entirely agree with the need to retain where possible the existing vegetation. We are therefore in the process of reviewing the cut and fill particularly for Option B to determine whether, whilst maintaining a cut of approximately 5m at the northern end of the converter station, fill can be used to soften the slope to the south rather creating surrounding mounds.

It should be noted that it was always our intention to revise the "bunds" and ensure that if they were used they would be sympathetically integrated into the surrounding topography. As discussed at the meeting the purpose of the indicative mitigation plans for both options was to test the visual extent of the converter stations.

Building:

We have fed back your comments to Norr Architects and they are in the process of reviewing and considering other options. The use of a colour palette stemmed from a request raised by Hambledon Parish Council who referred to other studies that had been undertaken in protected landscapes and that SDNP was considering commissioning a study. We felt that in this instance we should at the very least consider colour in the landscape as part of the "stepping stones" to informing the design.

In terms of whether to hide or "celebrate" the building as mentioned previously we are at a very early stage in developing the concept drawings and the reason for the discussion last week was to test this with you in terms of your views. Your comments, and those from Julie and Stuart were very helpful and we have fed these back to the team, client and architects. The architects are in the process of revising the options, and following a further discussion with the client, we hope to present these to you again.

The architects are exploring different materials, colour, texture and roof form and will provide a clear explanation of alternatives considered as well as the reasons why these have been rejected based on constraints (maintenance, engineering, health and safety, longevity etc). This will form part of a chapter on alternatives and the design approach for the PEIR / ES.

Vegetation:

Again we are at a very early stage in developing the design but we have reviewed the mitigation plans and revised them to improve connectivity with existing features including the ancient woodland. We have also introduced additional features, reinstating historic boundaries and copses where possible, provided further visual screening and replicated the surrounding landscape character. Once approved we hope we can share these revised plans with all of you.

In terms of ancient woodland entirely agree – we are constrained by the overhead lines and associated easements which I suspect has resulted in the loss of some of the ancient woodland in the past (having reviewed the historic maps).

In terms of species and in discussions with our arboriculturalists and ecologists, beech, ash and oak are the most dominant species within the ancient woodland. Both disciplines will be submitting as part of the PEIR their findings including survey information. In terms of elder it is a characteristic species but we are happy to remove it.

The proposed orientation of the buildings and access track as explained at the meeting are based on results of acoustic surveys, the direction of cable routing and relationship with the substation as well as accessibility required for the large articulated lorries to deliver equipment on site. We are reviewing how we can tie the routes into the landscape as well as offering alternative benefits in terms of access if feasible. I have relayed your concerns over three separate entrances off Broadway Lane to the team.

Photomontages:

There have been numerous emails prior to this meeting over the viewpoints and visualisations. In summary what has been agreed to date is that we will prepare:

- 8km ZTV and 3km ZTV
- 17 viewpoints, three of which will cover Old Winchester Hill, Windmill Hill and Fort Widley

We have agreed that we will prepare three wirelines from the following viewpoints:

- Viewpoint 9 Anmore Dell
- Viewpoint 11 From the edge of Denmead and Little Denmead Farm
- Viewpoint 17 Old Winchester Down

We also agreed that we would prepare photomontages from three local viewpoints (viewpoints A, B and C) however since the PEIR is likely to only consider one option we needed to ensure that each Option reflected appropriate viewpoints. Therefore for Option A viewpoints will be:

- Viewpoint A close of Lower Chapters
- Viewpoint 5B from PROW
- Viewpoint C from Old Mill Lane close to two residential receptors

Option B:

- Viewpoint B, C, B3 and D2 along Old Mill Lane. I appreciate these are not from PROW but they are close to residential properties. Option B in terms of viewpoints is difficult since it is already well screened and not immediately adjacent to any PROW.

General Points

In terms of your general points we will try and address these through the PEIR and ES.

A number of alternative options have been considered in terms of access and proximity to the substation, but have been ruled out for various reasons, again the reason behind these will be explained in the PEIR/ ES.

In terms of Option B, and again discussed at the meeting, we are hoping we can move the converter station slightly east, however this is subject to ongoing discussions with National Grid.

Thank you again for your considered response its been very helpful in guiding our next steps and apologies for the delay in responding.

Kind regards

Maritta Boden

Maritta Boden MSc, BA Hons, ARTPI, CMLI
Associate - Landscape Architect



[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Kings Orchard, 1 Queen St, Bristol, BS2 0HQ

wsp.com

Confidential

This message, including any document or file attached, is intended only for the addressee and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any other person is strictly prohibited from reading, using, disclosing or copying this message. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

WSP UK Limited, a limited company registered in England & Wales with registered number 01383511. Registered office: WSP House, 70 Chancery Lane, London, WC2A 1AF.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 October 2018 16:38
To: Ruth Childs <[REDACTED]@southdowns.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]@winchester.gov.uk;
[REDACTED]@havant.gov.uk; Hannah Chapman <[REDACTED]@southdowns.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Aquind - LIVA briefing meeting

Dear Ruth

Many thanks for your reply and I will respond to some of the detail in your note over the next few days.

Just to clarify the mitigation proposed was indicative and the purpose was to only to test as part of the optioneering process the visual extent of the Converter Station based on a combination of cut and fill, bunding and planting for both options. The plans presented also showed a variety of route options relating to the road, DC and AC cables, again these are just options and were tabled as such.

We are more than happy to be guided down the route of removing bunding which I agree without sympathetic ground modelling could be incongruous features and retain existing landscape features but we need to still consider this against achieving a finished platform level for the station and this may result in some fill, subject to the depth of cut required across the site.

In terms of whether to “celebrate” or “hide” the building this again is still a point of discussion between ourselves internally and the client, and what we were looking for from yourselves on Monday was a steer was to whether it should be one or the other – when we met last year there were mixed views around the table. Tree planting still could be beneficial in improving connectivity and strengthening tree belts where trees are either mature or over mature.

What has emerged following our discussions on Monday, and based on discussions today, is that we would like to (subject to agreement with the client) arrange a further meeting with yourselves to discuss these options, with further information on the rationale behind the decisions made considering alternatives (such as timber) and constraints (including durability, cost, maintenance and health and safety risks etc).

I have attached some draft minutes from Monday which should provide some more background.

Kind regards

Maritta

Maritta Boden MSc, BA Hons, ARTPI, CMLI
Associate - Landscape Architect



Kings Orchard, 1 Queen St, Bristol, BS2 0HQ

wsp.com

Confidential

This message, including any document or file attached, is intended only for the addressee and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any other person is strictly prohibited from reading, using, disclosing or copying this message. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

WSP UK Limited, a limited company registered in England & Wales with registered number 01383511. Registered office: WSP House, 70 Chancery Lane, London, WC2A 1AF.

From: Ruth Childs [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@southdowns.gov.uk)]
Sent: 18 October 2018 15:12
To: Boden, Maritta <[\[REDACTED\]@wsp.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@wsp.com)>; [\[REDACTED\]@winchester.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@winchester.gov.uk);
[\[REDACTED\]@havant.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@havant.gov.uk); Hannah Chapman <[\[REDACTED\]@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@southdowns.gov.uk)>
Cc: [\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])
Subject: RE: Aquind - LIVA briefing meeting

Dear Maritta,

Apologies again for not being able to make it on Monday and thank you for allowing Hannah to come along on my behalf.

Hannah has provided me with all the detail so please see comments below, apologies if there's any overlap with discussions you've already had.

Overall, I'm interested in securing the best outcome for the setting of the National Park, which in my view is responded to best by retaining and improving the existing landscape character as much as possible and seeking opportunities within this framework to provide some screening to reduce visual impact.

As usual it is worth noting that my comments below hopefully will be helpful in this regard, but as ever these are my thoughts and others may well take a different view, but I think it is an approach which is based upon the evidence which I'm describing. I'm happy to be challenged as it became a bit of a brain dump after reacquainting myself with the site! I am of course more than happy to chat through if you have any queries, but I'm in and out of meetings a lot so best to email me to agree a time first.

LVIA

- LVIA methodology is fine.

- Cumulative impact approach is also OK.

Mitigation Approach

- The principle of retaining existing vegetation is our preferred option – this vegetation marks key landscape elements which are contributing to the site's character and many are historic, reinforcing time-depth.
- The rationale for the mitigation I'm afraid isn't clear for me, accepting that this is probably because I wasn't at the meeting.
 - For the record, it appears to me the rationale is to hide the development. Main mitigation measures are colour of building, and planting and bunds...

Building

I may be wrong (!) but if we're accepting the building is incongruous in this landscape and we're trying to hide it, why introduce movement to the building? It seems for an urban high street to make a building stand out from the crowd the design intervention is a successful one, but it seems to be eye-catching rather than hidden which I think the rationale appears to be based upon the other mitigation measures shown. Why not a farm typology for the building design? I think if the mitigation rationale is centred on using design as a means to celebrate this addition in to the landscape then let's have a conversation about that. But then if this is the case, what is the point in the bunds and the tree planting? I'm just a bit confused about what it is we're trying to achieve overall. I'm seeking the maximum benefits to be derived through these mitigation measures, hiding the building in my view, is not sufficient.

I think the use of a colour study can be helpful, particularly within big-scale landscapes where vegetation is largely not present and including it would be uncharacteristic. Or where the building is so huge vegetation cannot successfully help to integrate it into the landscape. I'm not certain this site has these issues however. In my view the use of locally characteristic, natural materials is the best way to mitigate/minimise visual harm in buildings. What is typical in farmsteads locally for example. Timber allowed the naturally weather is often a good bet, stone facing etc. but again it comes back to my query about the rationale and ultimately what we're trying to achieve. I feel a little uncomfortable about the use of colour in the way expressed – this is because largely many of these colours are not 'building' colours, therefore they are already more obvious. I would always avoid using 'sky colour' unless a building was *always* seen against the skyline and you could realistically 'lose it'. Otherwise landscapes are dynamic – changeable in colour and elements. If ultimately the building will be surrounded by mature trees, is a detailed colour approach needed?

- It is difficult to say without seeing an example, but the louvres if wooden, sound like an interesting approach.
- As a slight aside from this, does your client own and manage all the land or will it be left for others to manage. Will the existing vegetation you're relying upon for mitigation remain in the control of your client?

Vegetation

- I think the approach of locating vegetation to strategically address impacts from key viewpoints is a positive one. But I would like to see the scheme deliver more benefits and respond better to its local landscape. I've set out a few examples below to illustrate what I mean:
 - The Ancient Woodland is isolated and therefore under threat – yet none of the proposed mitigation measures take the opportunity to address this. The proposed tree clumps are isolated from the existing woodland and each other. As a result the scheme has missed an opportunity to generate a real benefit (this could be considered landscape/ecological mitigation if done well), instead the ancient woodland is left threatened further by this development. This needs urgent consideration in my view.
- Whilst, as stated above, the planting 'blobs' both on and off bunds may protect the views, what is the cost? In my view these bunds and planted areas are both highly incongruous in their own right – there are no other elements like this in this landscape. Instead perhaps consider what the inherited vegetation pattern is. How can this be used to deliver *appropriate* mitigation measures to both prevent significant views of the building and conserve/respond to landscape character, and deliver long-term biodiversity and landscape condition improvements?
- A quick look on aerials and historic maps suggests that thick hedgerows with trees, and blocks of copse woodlands are characteristic, with small circular copses growing around historic extraction pits – of which

there are many. These pits are largely located inside fields and therefore may offer you a smaller scale option for mitigation from specific viewpoints/oblique views.

- The characteristic copse woodlands have a strong relationship with the contours – perhaps use this to determine planting for *meaningful* new woodland habitat which will a) offer much needed connectivity to ancient woodland species locally, b) provide a characteristic mitigation planting which will have the secondary benefit of screening the scheme into the long term. This will provide for species resilience and keep improving over time. Larger woodland copses will also require less fencing (assuming deer and rabbits are a problem) which will reduce costs.
- The mitigation proposals for Option B also serve to reinforce the building not to hide it. The bund and subsequent planting follows the building line and in my view accentuates it.
- In terms of species – what is found in the Ancient Woodland? Do a survey if one hasn't already been undertaken as part of the Ecological evidence gathering and use these species in the planting scheme...they have been there for 400+ years!
- I support the approach of using some pioneer species to generate a more instant impact, but would also expect a variety of ages of tree to be used too. Elder can be a nightmare in woodlands/hedgerows – is it locally characteristic?? I would like to see the survey/Phase 1 evidence before I make a final decision on the species.
- The current proposed orientation of the buildings, and tracks are totally at odds with the patterns of elements in the landscape – not sure if this is just because details like that haven't been considered yet – but I would suggest a positive mitigation measure would be to sensitively use existing patterns of elements (character) to inform the more detailed orientation of these new elements.

Bunds

- I do not support the use of bunds. They generate an engineered character incongruous in what remains an agricultural landscape.

Photomontage

- I'm happy with the selection – it makes sense to choose some locations within the National Park and some which represent the worst case scenario view. My only comment is none of these are from footpaths – and whether one should be included to represent a more sensitive set of receptors. I don't know the answer but just put it out there for consideration really.

On a more general note, I understand that option B is preferred from a Landscape point of view. I'm tentatively inclined to agree, but with the following comments/caveats:

- B is more in-line with and closer to the existing Sub-station and therefore will be seen in this context. Essentially keeping a tighter footprint.
- A affects the setting of both farmsteads – are these historic? What are their sensitivities?
- B would work well if it was truly dug into the ground – as opposed to a level platform being dug and a bund put around it. The building would require a protective membrane/retaining wall where soil touched it, so the current ground levels remain unchanged.
- B generates the need for a huge track which I do not support. I would be inclined to reconsider my view if this was not resolvable. It is generating additional and in my view unnecessary landscape and visual harm. This impacts the landscape in the following negative ways:
 - Cutting across historic field boundaries
 - Negatively affecting the character of Broadway Lane – becoming more industrial and less rural/agricultural and reducing the GI ability of the hedgerows along it.
 - Preventing the re-connection/improvement of nationally important habitats (Ancient Woodland).
 - Running through the centre of fields, contrary to character and dissecting the inherited field pattern and being more obvious in views compared to following existing hedgelines/field boundaries.
- I'm sure this has been investigated but it would be helpful to understand the reason for not joining B with the substation via a short length of track and using the existing access road. Again this is the sort of mitigation design measures I'd expect to see...designing out harm wherever possible, rather than creating it. All 3 developments are part of the same activity – so it would be helpful to understand why we need 3 separate access tracks and 3 separate entrances onto Broadway Lane.

- A bisects the historic track between the two farmsteads.
- B's location could potentially be adjusted to reduce hedgerow loss, which would improve overall impact.
- I note your intention to investigate a track to the north for B. Please consider historic field boundaries, potential for presence of landscape archaeology e.g. lynchets and the historic parish boundary which will all need to be bisected by the new track. I would urge an approach which attempts to consolidate these routes, rather than increase them.

It might be helpful to drop a CAD file of the scheme into google earth to refine any mitigation regarding planting and also to identify any faces of the building that may require a different treatment/colour. Some sections of trees and the building heights at different future time points e.g. 1 year, 5 years and 15 years would also be useful to help with visualising the desired outcome.

Thank you again for your efforts keeping us all up to date on this project – it really is appreciated.

With best wishes

Ruth

From: Boden, Maritta [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@wsp.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@wsp.com)]
Sent: 17 October 2018 11:22
To: [REDACTED]@winchester.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@havant.gov.uk; Hannah Chapman
<[REDACTED]@southdowns.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Aquind - LIVA briefing meeting

Dear Stuart and Julie

Many thanks for your comments that's very helpful and entirely agree about protecting the existing landscape features. It is likely that we will have to "loose the fill" somewhere on site, however we will continue our discussions with our engineers and if we have to create bunds we are very keen that these are done sympathetically and tie into the surrounding landscape.

In terms of releasing the concept plans, I have spoken to our internal planning team and they are in the process of checking whether we can release some or all of the concept images which were presented on Monday.

Rachel very sorry to chase but we have a photographer out on site next week, could you confirm by tomorrow whether you are happy with the local viewpoints and ideally get back to us on other points of clarification early next week?

Kind regards

Maritta

Maritta Boden MSc, BA Hons, ARTPI, CMLI
Associate - Landscape Architect



Kings Orchard, 1 Queen St, Bristol, BS2 0HQ

Confidential

This message, including any document or file attached, is intended only for the addressee and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any other person is strictly prohibited from reading, using, disclosing or copying this message. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

WSP UK Limited, a limited company registered in England & Wales with registered number 01383511. Registered office: WSP House, 70 Chancery Lane, London, WC2A 1AF.

From: [REDACTED]@winchester.gov.uk [mailto:[REDACTED]@winchester.gov.uk]
Sent: 16 October 2018 15:01
To: Boden, Maritta <[REDACTED]@wsp.com>; [REDACTED]@havant.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@southdowns.gov.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Aquind - LIVA briefing meeting

Maritta

Further to yesterday's meeting, my comments are:

- I am comfortable with the LVIA methodology being proposed which appears to me to be fairly standard;
- I also agree with the proposed approach to cumulative effects;
- Viewpoints: for Option A: – A, C and 5B. For Option B: B3, D2 and C are all agreed, with the addition of view B as we discussed yesterday which displays the significance of the existing tree screening;
- The indicative planting palette is agreed, although I would question Beech, which I haven't seen in this area and is far more common further north on the chalk;
- I happy with the idea of pioneer species, providing a scheme of management over say 15 years could be agreed;
- Mitigation methods: I agree with Julie that the removal of existing mature hedgerows and mature hedgerow trees at Option B should be avoided as their loss would run counter to the advice in the WCC LCA in that these are characteristic features of this landscape which should be preserved, quite apart from the fact that these features would probably form a more appropriate visual screen (locally) than planting on mounds;
- I am not comfortable with mounding in this landscape unless it can be demonstrated that it could be designed sensitively;
- The concept designs for approaching colour are interesting and I too welcome art in the landscape but I am not convinced that (and I am simplifying it here) selecting blue to match the sky, green to match the grass and brown to match the soil is going to be successful. Due to changes in light conditions and seasons there are going to be periods of time when the indicative colour palette does not mimic the colours in the landscape/skyscape and will look contrived. It is acknowledged that these are very large structures but I believe a simpler approach to colour will be more successful.

Kind regards,

Stuart Dunbar-Dempsey CMLI
Landscape Team
Winchester City Council
[REDACTED]

This email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the addressed individual. The information in this email may be confidential; if you have received it in error, please accept our apologies and notify the sender as soon as possible, and delete it from your system without distributing or copying any information contained within it. Under UK Data Protection and Freedom of Information legislation, the contents of this email might have to be disclosed in response to a request. We check emails and attachments for viruses before they are sent, but you are advised to carry out your own virus checks. Winchester City Council cannot accept any responsibility for loss or damage caused by viruses.

Do you love the South Downs Way? Please help us to mend it.
Mend our Way is a new campaign to raise £120,000 to help us fix four damaged sections of the trail.
Find out more and donate www.southdowns.gov.uk/mendourway

This email is confidential, may be legally privileged and/or contain personal views that are not the Authority's. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us and delete the message from your system immediately. Under Data Protection and Freedom of Information legislation contents may be disclosed and the Authority reserves the right to monitor sent and received emails.

[REDACTED]

From: Boden, Maritta
Sent: 31 May 2018 12:51
To: [REDACTED]@winchester.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@southdowns.gov.uk;
[REDACTED]@havant.gov.uk
Subject: RE: Aquind LVIA - scoping responses

Hi Stuart

Thank you that's very helpful.

We are still waiting on outcome of the Ground Investigations. I understand that they have been to site in the last few weeks and I have not heard what the outcome is yet. But yes you are correct there are potential issues in terms of how much cut can be achieved without affecting the underlying hydrology. Both option 1 and 3 are still being considered at this stage.

Kind regards

Maritta

Maritta Boden MSc, BA Hons, ARTPI, CMLI
Associate - Landscape Architect



[REDACTED]
Kings Orchard, 1 Queen St, Bristol, BS2 0HQ

wsp.com

Confidential

This message, including any document or file attached, is intended only for the addressee and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any other person is strictly prohibited from reading, using, disclosing or copying this message. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

WSP UK Limited, a limited company registered in England & Wales with registered number 01383511. Registered office: WSP House, 70 Chancery Lane, London, WC2A 1AF.

From: [REDACTED]@winchester.gov.uk [mailto:[REDACTED]@winchester.gov.uk]
Sent: 31 May 2018 12:46
To: Boden, Maritta <[REDACTED]@wsp.com>; [REDACTED]@southdowns.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@havant.gov.uk
Subject: RE: Aquind LVIA - scoping responses

Hi

Thanks Maritta.

No, I am happy with the additional viewpoints, but don't think there is anything to be gained by providing *further* viewpoints on top of the ones provided on the plans.

While we are mailing, was there any update on whether the proposed converter station can be *set into the slope*? Given that the construction platform will need to be level, there was some discussion earlier about the degree to which it could or could not be excavated in to the topography.

The last I heard was that due to sensitive hydrology (?) the construction platform could not be 'cut into the slope'.

Are you able to comment on this, please?

Stuart

Stuart Dunbar-Dempsey CMLI

Landscape Team

Winchester City Council

From: Boden, Maritta [mailto:[REDACTED]@wsp.com]

Sent: 31 May 2018 11:33

To: Ruth Childs; Stuart Dunbar-Dempsey; Julie Boschi

Subject: RE: Aquind LVIA - scoping responses

Hi Julie, Stuart and Ruth

Thanks all for getting back so promptly, and Ruth tomorrow morning is fine.

Stuart just to clarify are you happy with the additional viewpoints (the revised viewpoints list covering viewpoints 3, 8 and 17 and additional local viewpoints) or do you consider that there should be further viewpoints on top of the ones provided on the two plans? Sorry we may be getting muddled in terms of terminology!

Further to this email it is likely that the LVIA will now form part of a DCO application. We had suggested wirelines from three viewpoints 9, 11 and 17 are you still happy with this proposal and do you all have any specific comments on lighting?

Kind regards

Maritta

Maritta Boden MSc, BA Hons, ARTPI, CMLI
Associate - Landscape Architect



[REDACTED]
Kings Orchard, 1 Queen St, Bristol, BS2 0HQ

wsp.com

Confidential

This message, including any document or file attached, is intended only for the addressee and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any other person is strictly prohibited from reading, using, disclosing or copying this message. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

WSP UK Limited, a limited company registered in England & Wales with registered number 01383511. Registered office: WSP House, 70 Chancery Lane, London, WC2A 1AF.

From: Ruth Childs [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@southdowns.gov.uk)]

Sent: 31 May 2018 11:04

To: '[REDACTED]@winchester.gov.uk' <[REDACTED]@winchester.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]@havant.gov.uk;

Boden, Maritta <[REDACTED]@wsp.com>

Subject: RE: Aquind LVIA - scoping responses

Hi Maritta,

I'm afraid I'm unable to look at this until tomorrow – I'll endeavour to get back to you then.

With best wishes

Ruth

From: [REDACTED]@winchester.gov.uk [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@winchester.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@winchester.gov.uk)]

Sent: 31 May 2018 10:57

To: [REDACTED]@havant.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@wsp.com; Ruth Childs <[REDACTED]@southdowns.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Aquind LVIA - scoping responses

Hi Maritta

I am happy with the revised viewpoint locations and agree that there should be additional viewpoints incorporated into the LVIA. I also agree that a second study area would be useful and that a ZTV for the wider area is unnecessary.

Thanks,

Stuart.

Stuart Dunbar-Dempsey CMLI

Landscape Team

Winchester City Council

From: Boschi, Julie [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@havant.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@havant.gov.uk)]

Sent: 31 May 2018 08:25

To: Boden, Maritta; [REDACTED]@southdowns.gov.uk; Stuart Dunbar-Dempsey

Subject: RE: Aquind LVIA - scoping responses

Dear [REDACTED]

I confirm that

- a. I am happy with the revised viewpoint locations
- b. I am happy for you to create a second study area
- c. I do not think that this requires a ZTV

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

Julie Boschi

Landscape Team Leader

From: Boden, Maritta [mailto: [REDACTED]@wsp.com]

Sent: 30 May 2018 16:28

To: [REDACTED]@southdowns.gov.uk; Boschi, Julie < [REDACTED]@havant.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]@winchester.gov.uk

Subject: FW: Aquind LVIA - scoping responses

Dear Julie, Stuart and Ruth

Please could you let me know when you are available to go through the email below?

Kind regards

Maritta Boden

Maritta Boden MSc, BA Hons, ARTPI, CMLI
Associate - Landscape Architect



[REDACTED]
Kings Orchard, 1 Queen St, Bristol, BS2 0HQ

wsp.com

Confidential

This message, including any document or file attached, is intended only for the addressee and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any other person is strictly prohibited from reading, using, disclosing or copying this message. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

WSP UK Limited, a limited company registered in England & Wales with registered number 01383511. Registered office: WSP House, 70 Chancery Lane, London, WC2A 1AF.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 24 May 2018 14:25

To: [REDACTED]@havant.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@southdowns.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@winchester.gov.uk < [REDACTED]@winchester.gov.uk >

Subject: Aquind LVIA - scoping responses

Dear Julie, Stuart and Ruth

Thank you for contributing to the scoping responses which we have received.

Please could I clarify comments received in relation to the extent of the study area and associated viewpoints which are outlined in East Hampshire District Council's scoping opinion below, dated 29 March 2018 and Havant Borough Council's scoping opinion dated 25 April 2018:

"It proposes to scope out visual receptors beyond 3 km of the site boundary, and this should be scoped in. It is noted work is still ongoing to determine the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and this should be used to inform receptor points that are beyond 3 km but which may be sensitive to change. It is noted (8.3.5) that it is intended to include three sites beyond the 3 km zone (Old Winchester Hill Downs, Windmill Hill and Ports Down Hill), however, there may be other locations that should be incorporated in the LVIA rather than being scoped out by a more arbitrary 3 km zone. Winchester Hill is a Scheduled Ancient Monument with the South Downs Way National Trail crossing it, so should be assessed in that context."

In discussions with yourselves we prepared a ZTVs showing a study area of 3 km within which are a number of viewpoints. We have also proposed that we will consider the impact on views outside of this area and agreed viewpoints include:

- Viewpoint 3 (approximately 4.7 km)
- Viewpoint 8 (approximately 6.8 km)
- Viewpoint 17 (approximately 7.2 km)

Can you advise on the following:

- a. Do you consider that there should be now be additional viewpoints other than the ones agreed which should be incorporated into the LVIA? Please note that we have taken winter views for all the viewpoints discussed including local viewpoints in advance of preparing wirelines. I have attached a copy of the revised viewpoint locations plus additional local viewpoints discussed previously for background. Viewpoint 18 was omitted following field verification.
- b. The study area was defined as 3 km with additional views outside. Would you be happy if we create two study areas. Firstly a 3 km study area considering local viewpoints and landscape character, and secondly a 8 km study area to cover the above viewpoints and associated visual receptors?

c. Based on the above can you advise as to whether you consider that a ZTV should be prepared which encompasses the wider study area. From recollection we had agreed previously that this was unnecessary, but I would be grateful for your advice.

In terms of lighting, comments have been received from SDNP recommending a lighting assessment *"to consider potential environmental pollution impacts. Lighting impacts should be assessed in accordance with best practice guidelines from the Institute of Lighting Professionals and should consider the operational phase of development. Consideration should also be given to temporary effects during construction for example, light pollution from floodlighting of construction site. The lighting assessment should detail the baseline conditions, and consider the cumulative impact from any existing/approved developments as identified above."*

We are in internal discussions as to how we undertake this work however in the meantime do you have any further comments based on the above?

Apologies for the long email, I have tried to call and left messages and I will follow up this email with a further call tomorrow / Tuesday

Kind regards

Maritta

Maritta Boden MSc, BA Hons, ARTPI, CMLI
Associate - Landscape Architect



Kings Orchard, 1 Queen St, Bristol, BS2 0HQ

wsp.com

Confidential

This message, including any document or file attached, is intended only for the addressee and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any other person is strictly prohibited from reading, using, disclosing or copying this message. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

WSP UK Limited, a limited company registered in England & Wales with registered number 01383511. Registered office: WSP House, 70 Chancery Lane, London, WC2A 1AF.

This email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the addressed individual. The information in this email may be confidential; if you have received it in error, please accept our apologies and notify the sender as soon as possible, and delete it from your system without distributing or copying any information contained within it. Under UK Data Protection and Freedom of Information legislation, the contents of this email might have to be disclosed in response to a request. We check emails and attachments for viruses before they are sent, but you are advised to carry out your own virus checks. Winchester City Council cannot accept any responsibility for loss or damage caused by viruses.

Do you love the South Downs Way? Please help us to mend it.

Mend our Way is a new campaign to raise £120,000 to help us fix four damaged sections of the trail.

Find out more and donate www.southdowns.gov.uk/mendourway

This email is confidential, may be legally privileged and/or contain personal views that are not the Authority's. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us and delete the message from your system immediately. Under Data Protection and Freedom of Information legislation contents may be disclosed and the Authority reserves the right to monitor sent and received emails.

This email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the addressed individual. The information in this email may be confidential; if you have received it in error, please accept our apologies and notify the sender as soon as possible, and delete it from your system without distributing or copying any information contained within it. Under UK Data Protection and Freedom of Information legislation, the contents of this email might have to be disclosed in response to a request. We check emails and attachments for viruses before they are sent, but you are advised to carry out your own virus checks. Winchester City Council cannot accept any responsibility for loss or damage caused by viruses.

[REDACTED]

From: Ruth Childs <[REDACTED]@southdowns.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 July 2018 13:32
To: Boden, Maritta
Cc: [REDACTED]@havant.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@winchester.gov.uk
Subject: RE: Aquind Lovedean - extent of study area and lighting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Maritta,

Yes this is fine by me.

Best wishes

Ruth

From: Boden, Maritta [mailto:[REDACTED]@wsp.com]
Sent: 04 July 2018 08:58
To: Ruth Childs <[REDACTED]@southdowns.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]@havant.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@winchester.gov.uk
Subject: Aquind Lovedean - extent of study area and lighting

Dear Ruth

Please find below a brief summary our discussion on Monday morning:

- 1) Lighting: The proposed converter station will be a dark site, with emergency lighting which would only be used in case of an emergency. The LVIA would consider the visual impact of the Proposed Converter Station on the DNS reserve and visual perceptions whilst ecological harm would be covered by our ecologists. RC (SDNP) confirmed that she was happy with this approach as long lighting was covered and explained in the ES and relevant chapters including project description. Consideration will also be given to alternative lighting options.
- 2) Study Area: RC agreed that it would be beneficial to have as background a 8 km ZTV to cover the additional viewpoints already agreed through consultation exercise. The ZTV would form part of the initial baseline and informed through this, the study area would be refined down to 3 km. The 3 km study area would therefore focus on the detail picking up on local landscape character and views, whilst a 8km study area would refer to district / county level assessments and the more long distance views agreed.

Please let me know if you disagree with any of the comments drafted.

Kind regards

Maritta

Maritta Boden MSc, BA Hons, ARTPI, CMLI
Associate - Landscape Architect



[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Kings Orchard, 1 Queen St, Bristol, BS2 0HQ

wsp.com

Confidential

This message, including any document or file attached, is intended only for the addressee and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any other person is strictly prohibited from reading, using, disclosing or copying this message. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

WSP UK Limited, a limited company registered in England & Wales with registered number 01383511. Registered office: WSP House, 70 Chancery Lane, London, WC2A 1AF.

Do you love the South Downs Way? Please help us to mend it.
Mend our Way is a new campaign to raise £120,000 to help us fix four damaged sections of the trail.
Find out more and donate www.southdowns.gov.uk/mendourway

This email is confidential, may be legally privileged and/or contain personal views that are not the Authority's. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us and delete the message from your system immediately. Under Data Protection and Freedom of Information legislation contents may be disclosed and the Authority reserves the right to monitor sent and received emails.