

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
1. Miscellaneous and General			
MG1.1.14	The Applicant	<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 Plan respectively) or, as a minimum, a framework to clarify the intended content?</p>	<p>Hampshire County Council (HCC), in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority, seeks an outline management plan to be provided in relation to the Temporary Site Water Management Plan. This should be provided prior to the determination of this application in order to provide the reassurance that the treatment of water associated with the temporary site works can be suitably addressed.</p>
2. Air Quality			
AQ1.2.3	Hampshire County Council	<p>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.)</p>	<p>The Commissioners overseeing the Commission of Inquiry reported their findings to an extraordinary meeting of Hampshire County Council in September 2019: https://www.hants.gov.uk/aboutthecouncil/haveyoursay/visionforhampshire2050. The report sets out a proposed policy of sustaining and enhancing Hampshire's environment to strengthen Hampshire economy and society. This includes a recommendation to tackle the major causes of poor air</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>quality with a specific focus on reducing harmful emissions. In response, the County Council endorsed the Commissioners' Report as a basis for engagement, committing to take a leadership role in ensuring that the report is received and considered by key partners and stakeholders across Hampshire. The County Council also resolved to review its key policies, where appropriate, in the light of the Commissioners' recommendations and establish an evidence base for key policy areas against which progress on the Commissioners' key recommendations can be measured.</p> <p>In relation to setting out an evidence base for air quality, the County Council is preparing a 'State of Hampshire's Natural Environment report' which will include a section on the current issues and trends for air quality across Hampshire. This report is expected to be published shortly and the County Council will ensure that a copy is made available to the Examining Authority.</p>
3. Compulsory Acquisition			
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 contacting landowners whose rights extend to the	Where HCC are the Highway Authority, but not the subsoil owner, the surface of the highway vests in the Highway Authority as a statutory freehold by virtue of s.263 of the Highways Act 1980 (and including any drains beneath the surface s.264). There is no precise definition for the depth of this freehold, the case law provides that it will extend down to the 'top two spits' (or spade depths) or as far down as is necessary for the construction or maintenance of the

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>subsoil beneath the highway? Is there precedent for this?</p>	<p>highway. So if HCC are divested of the sub-soil ownership, this slightly elastic ownership will remain with HCC as the highway authority and statutory freeholder of the surface.</p> <p>HCC's powers of improvement apply over the highway surface, so if it needed to widen carriageways or install new highway infrastructure, it does not need a sub-soil legal interest to undertake this work.</p> <p>Where a highway is stopped up the subsoil, landownership will revive, where the subsoil is owned by HCC. There has been no agreement with respect to the Applicant's proposition to acquire land or rights in the subsoil. Consequently HCC objects to the compulsory acquisition of land in its ownership.</p>
<p>CA1.3.13</p>	<p>The Applicant Statutory Undertakers</p>	<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>HCC has an interest in land within the route parameters.</p> <p>To date, we are not aware of any substantive negotiations initiated with the applicant in this regard.</p> <p>As detailed elsewhere, any proposed compulsory acquisition of land under HCC's control, including sub-soil under the highway, raises significant concerns. This includes concern as to whether other utilities will still be able to install apparatus / plant within the 'highway' given the definition of the sub-soil is '1.0 metre or so' in the Statement of Reasons.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		ii) State whether there are any envisaged impediments to the securing of such agreements. iii) State whether any additional Statutory Undertakers have been identified since the submission of the Book of Reference as an Application document.	
CA1.3.41	The Applicant Statutory Undertakers	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.) 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) ESP Utilities Group Ltd. ii) GTC Infrastructure Ltd (GTC Electricity). iii) GTC Infrastructure Ltd (GTC Gas).	The Applicant contacted the County Council in July 2020 in relation to draft protective provisions as a consequence of the proposed disapplication of the Hampshire Highways Permitting Scheme. The County Council has undertaken an initial review of these proposed provisions, but the County Council remains of the view that the Permit Scheme should be applied and therefore that these matters should be addressed under that scheme rather than through bespoke protective provisions. The County Council provided the Applicant with a draft version of its Local Impact Report which sets out its position in relation to the Permit Scheme. We expect discussions with the applicant to continue on this matter over the coming weeks. The applicant has not discussed any other proposed protective provisions with HCC in its other roles e.g. as Highway Authority on S.278, S.171 and Traffic Regulation Orders.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<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>	
CA1.3.42	The Applicant Environment Agency	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>HCC, in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority, will require an application for Ordinary Watercourse Consent in relation to the proposed works. Further details of this process, including fees, are set out at:</p> <p>https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/environment/flooding/changewatercourse</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	<p>HCC, in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority, has been in dialogue with the applicant on this matter. Based on the information presented to date, the LLFA are satisfied that the general principles of the works are acceptable, with the finer details capable of being resolved through the usual consent process.</p> <p>In relation to other potential environment impacts, including those relating to highway trees, HCC are seeking within the DCO an appropriate mechanism to secure compensation for any loss or damage to such trees.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		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.	
CA1.3.94	The Applicant	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>If the undertaker is granted the benefit of these rights under the DCO, then these would appear sufficient for the installation of their apparatus. These rights would appear sufficient to achieve the undertaker's objective and are less onerous, therefore granting the undertaker compulsory powers of acquisition for subsoil landownership would appear excessive.</p> <p>Where the project travels under the highway it seems most appropriate that the existing legislative framework under NRSWA 1981 is used as the basis for the powers to be granted, since NRSWA is designed specifically for this and is well used and understood by undertakes and street works authorities. This is understood to be the agreed approach where the DCO for the ESSO Southampton to London pipeline crossed the public highway.</p>
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 .	It is not a principle of law, or a matter of fact, that highway subsoil landownership will never have any value to the subsoil landowner. Adjacent landowners owning to the centreline of the highway can (subject to the Highway Authority's permission) build under the highway. Or they

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>uk/projects/south-east/aquind-interconnector/?ipcsection=advice&ipcadvice=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> <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>may wish to lay private services (again with Highway Authority permission) in their subsoil under the highway.</p> <p>In any case since there is no general principle that highway subsoil has no value, the issue of value should be examined in each case, and the DCO should apply the normal compensation provisions. It should not be pre-determined by the order on a generalised basis.</p>
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	It is understood that the preferred option of Winchester City Council is to use the straight crossing for both cable circuits, as an extension of the route through King's Pond Meadow. The Highway Authority would support this in reducing the

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>the Council prefer to see utilised, or have the least objection to, and why?</p>	<p>length of cable route within the highway and to minimise the length of cable within the highway.</p> <p>It is not clear why horizontal drilling is not being utilised to cross Anmore Road given the proposed drilling through King's Pond Meadow. The Highway Authority would prefer methods and routes to be used which reduce the impact of road closures and therefore impact on residents and users of the Highway.</p>
<p>CA1.3.107</p>	<p>Winchester City Council</p>	<p>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</p> <p>https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010084/EN010084-003108-</p>	<p>The Highway Authority refers to its comments on CA1.3.105. Given that the examination has only just commenced, we would expect the Applicant to have further explored these options and identified a preferred route prior to the close of the Examination. In the event that this is shown not to be feasible, the Highway Authority would value the opportunity to offer advice on suitable wording within the DCO.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>TEOW%20%E2%80%93%20Final%20Recommendation%20Report.pdf</p> <p>would provide sufficient clarity at an appropriate time in respect of the chosen cable route, notwithstanding any other concerns that the Council may have?</p>	
5. Draft Development Consent Order			
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>HCC does have some reservations about Hayling Island as an alternative landing point for the AQUIND cable route, particularly if it were to impact on the A3023 rather than a non-highway focussed route. Hayling Island is restricted to one road on and off the island (the A3023) and any disruption or severance along this route would create significant traffic delays for motorists, emergency services and the wider community. Given the extremely sensitive nature of the A3023, all planned highway works on the A3023 is undertaken between October and March, maintaining a single lane of traffic at all times (as a minimum) and must be done at night. Any significant works would cause delays both on the island and the mainland as traffic backs along the Hayling Bridge onto the A27 Langstone Junction, strategic road network and through Havant town centre. Additional assessment would be required to understand the impacts on the A3023, and surrounding road network within Havant, if an alternative route was chosen.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<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>	
DCO1.5.9	The Applicant Local planning	<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</p>	<p>As set out in HCC's Local Impact Report, there is concern about the applicant's approach to addressing the potential impact on highway trees. HCC has declared a 'state of climate emergency' (https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/environment/climatechange). Trees are an important asset of</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
	authorities	<p>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>green infrastructure and mitigating climate change in this regard. Trees within highway land are generally not subject of TPO as they are effectively managed and protected by the County Council itself. As such, the absence of a TPO should not be inferred to reflect a judgement made on the condition, quality or value of tree.</p> <p>The County Council has recently introduced a policy which requires compensation for the loss of highway trees, utilising the Capital Asset Value of Amenity Trees (CAVAT). Such an approach should be secured through this DCO. In addition, the County Council seeks clarification on the compensatory proposals in the draft DCO and wishes to ensure that the applicant will pay compensation for all loss of, or damage to trees.</p>
DCO1.5.17	The Applicant Local planning authorities	<p>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?</p>	<p>HCC suggest that the Applicant should consider ensuring that the following matters are covered in any such exclusion: <i>remediation works, environmental (including archaeological) surveys and investigation, site or soil survey, erection of fencing to site boundaries or marking out of site boundaries, installation of amphibian and reptile fencing, the diversion or laying of services or environmental mitigation measures.</i> This is without prejudice to any matters that may arise as a consequence of this change of definition in relation to seeking prior approval of further details of the scheme.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
DCO1.5.35	Portsmouth City Council Hampshire County Council	<p>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]?</p> <p>Are these Articles (and the full scope of powers sought within them) necessary for the type of development proposed?</p>	<p>The Highway Authority are not content with the proposed arrangement within the DCO and are yet to see evidence to why alternative approaches are beneficial to the public. In the continued absence of such justification the Applicant is encouraged to sign up to the full S278, S171, TRO and permit scheme processes which are well established and provide the Highway Authority with the appropriate powers to protect the Highway asset and public interest. This preferred approach is set out within HCC's LIR response and comments on the dDCO within Appendix 1.</p> <p>Article 10 gives powers for permanent or temporary amendments to the street whether within the order limits or not. It is considered that changes permitted within the DCO should only apply to the order limits and separate processes would need to be followed to make any further amendments to the street outside of the order limits. The powers for amendments are also not relevant to the type of works being undertaken. The relevance of the powers set out within points A to I require review and only powers relevant to the works required should be included within the DCO. The Article refers to clause 24 relevant to the traffic management strategy and this should be we believe clause 19. Approval for changes to the street must be sought separately and cannot be considered approved through the traffic management strategy. Clause 19 refers to the information required to permit works on the highway under NRSWA requirements and not for assessments of the proposals in engineering terms. As set out in HCC's LIR response, this will require a separate approval process with a requirement for all details for the cable laying works to be submitted to</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			<p>the Highway Authority for appropriate engineering assessment and approval.</p> <p>Article 11 relates to permissions for street works and HCC have no comments on this drafting at this stage however should the permit scheme be adopted appropriate reference will need to be made.</p> <p>Article 13 is regarding the temporary stopping up of the street and public rights of way. It is unclear why temporary stopping up is required and the Highway Authority have requested clarity on this matter. It is considered that all works can be undertaken through temporary closures (either full or part) and therefore there is no benefit to stopping up of the street.</p>
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.	HCC notes that the current draft of the DCO contains no protective provisions relating to the Council's statutory obligations as Highway Authority. Some discussions with the applicant have taken place over the summer regarding potential protective provisions in this regard.
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	Matters relating to the approval timescales have been identified within HCC's dDCO comments in its LIR. The Highway Authority seeks further discussions with the Applicant on the adoption of its Permit scheme, S278, S171 and TRO approval processes. In the absence of these, the timescales would need to be reviewed. A number of the consents allocated to the Planning Authorities are jurisdiction

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>them as the relevant consenting authority?</p>	<p>of the Highway Authority and this should be reviewed within further drafts of the DCO. HCC does not support a position where the absence of a response is taken to be deemed consent. A process requiring agreement to all works to be approved must be achieved before any works are undertaken.</p>
<p>DCO1.5.44</p>	<p>The Applicant Relevant local planning authorities</p>	<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</p>	<p>Please see HCC's response to 5.1.17</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>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 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</p>	

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>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>	
DCO1.5.45	Hampshire County Council	<p>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?</p>	<p>HCC, as Highway Authority, does not consider it acceptable to disapply the permit scheme. The Hampshire County Permit Scheme ('permit scheme') replaced the existing noticing regime as specified in the New Roads and Street Works act 1991. Powers to replace noticing with regimes with permit schemes is provided in the Traffic Management Act 2004. The permit scheme is a nationally prescribed system for coordinating all works on the public highway. The permit scheme forms a critical part of enabling a local authority to execute its legal duties to coordinate all works and maximise traffic flow. All works promoters (utility companies and County Council works) need to apply for a permit to undertake works. Prior to granting a permit, the County Council will review the proposals and check for clashes with other works or activities. Permits may be granted subject to conditions which are aimed at minimising disruption to traffic flow (eg, working outside of peak times). Permits are never withheld unreasonably, and conditions are always relevant to the impact on the network. Standard response times and conditions are set out in legislation and the permit scheme itself.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
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].)	<p>Generally HCC is content with this broad approach, albeit it wishes to highlight the potential need and desirability of providing sufficient time to consult with local planning authorities where appropriate to do so e.g. in considering impacts on residential amenity, landscape mitigation etc HCC in its role as Highway Authority will need to review these requirements in more detail as matters progress and delivery mechanisms for works are agreed. Specifically at this stage the Highway Authority have the following comments:</p> <p>Requirement 18 construction hours relates to areas which are covered under the NRSWA requirements for approval of street works. The provisions set out within the clause to restrict working hours, as per construction sites generally, are not applicable here. Where appropriate, the Highway Authority need to be free to amend the working hours (for example permit night works or restrict works to shorted day time working to avoid peak traffic periods) where traditional daytime working would cause greater disruption to the road users and residents. Requirement 18 should therefore have additional wording applied to allow the Highway Authority directly to permit working hours outside those set, when considered necessary by the Highway Authority and are set out within the traffic management plan for each works area. It is suggested that wording from the Esso Pipeline DCO is incorporated as an appropriate starting point.</p> <p>Requirement 21 relates to securing the travel plan requirements, <u>yet it makes no reference to be in accordance with the Framework Travel Plan.</u> Presently there is no</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
			mechanism in place to secure any fees to cover costs of this work. In the absence of such provision through suitable alternative mechanisms, HCC requests that this is secured under a s106 obligation to enable it to secure the necessary approval fees for the full travel plan and the associated monitoring fees, as well as a bond/cash deposit to cover and default on the proposals by the Applicant.
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 matter has been identified within HCC's LIR response, Appendix 1. The Highway Authority is seeking clarity on the definition of 'reasonable time'.
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	As detailed in its LIR, HCC seeks clarity over the use of the term 'stopping up' and whether this refers to single lane or road closures rather than the formal process of stopping up under the Highways Act 1980 Section 247 and the County Planning Act 1990 Section 116.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		carriageway would remain open for the duration of the works?	
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 adequate notice and consultation with the relevant street authority takes place?	HCC considers that Article 13 is unclear on the approval process for any temporary closures and what consultation with the relevant street authority includes. An appropriate approval process should be secured within the DCO.
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.	HCC shares the ExA view that further plans showing the details of the proposed access points, and associated works, are required to inform a view on the acceptability of these arrangements.
DCO1.5.72	The Applicant	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	HCC has an approval and monitoring process as set out within its adopted workplace travel plans document. Further details of its requirements and processes can be found on its website. https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/travelplans/assessment

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>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 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>It is understood that an overarching travel plan will be produced for the whole development and secured at present under Clause 21 with separate Construction Traffic Management Plans being produced for each phase of the works as secured in Clause 17. It is unclear if the phases are yet defined and the clauses within the DCO should refer to an agreed phasing plan.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		Does the Applicant believe that the wording of draft Requirement 17 is adequate in this respect?	
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?	The Highway Authority would also like the Applicant to consider additional wording for this requirement to ensure appropriate reinstatement approval powers are provided for the Highway Authority. The level of required reinstatement should be agreed for each phase within the Construction Traffic Management Plans. As set out within the LIR the Highway Authority wish to secure additional reinstatement requirements above the standard requirements due to the extent of the proposed works. This is to ensure that the highway network is not subject to extensive trenching as a result of the cable laying which would reduce the resilience of its asset, creates ongoing maintenance issues and in some instances concerns with regards highway safety.
13. Planning Policy			
PP1.1 3.1	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.)	As set out in its Local Impact Report, HCC is content with the Applicant's summary of the policy position in relation to its Minerals and Waste Planning function.
16. Traffic and Transport			

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
TT1.1 6.3	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?	As set out in its Local Impact Report, HCC is content with the Applicant's summary of the policy position in relation to its Minerals and Waste Planning function.
TT1.1 6.9	Local planning authorities Highway authorities	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?	The baseline traffic flows are taken from HCC's Sub Regional Transport Model (SRTM). Additional baseline surveys were undertaken to support and validate the SRTM baseline flows and were considered acceptable. The Highway Authority consider the baseline flows a sufficient representation of usual traffic conditions and therefore adequate to assess the impact of the proposals.
TT1.1 6.16	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	HCC also have restrictions which apply to the cable laying corridor which restrict work timings and traffic management types. This primarily includes seasonal restrictions during the Christmas period from the 1 st December to 5 th January. These types of working restrictions do not appear to have been accounted for within the proposed build programme as detailed conversations regarding the construction method and traffic management requirements are yet to be held with the Highway Authority.

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		reflected in the ES ([APP-137] and [APP-449])?	
TT1.1 6.31	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>The Highway Authority agree that this has not been thoroughly assessed and have made recommendations within the LIR response for this to be considered further. This includes recommending engagement with the bus operators and HCC's Passenger Transport Team, along with securing of appropriate mitigation measures to protect the delivery of public transport services and pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure.</p>
TT1.1 6.32	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>	<p>The City region's TCF bid (comprising Portsmouth City Council, HCC and the Isle of Wight Council) submitted to the DfT on the 28th November 2019 was initially unsuccessful in receiving funding in the March 2020 TCF bid announcement. On the invitation from the DfT, a revised TCF bid was submitted by the City region on the 3rd July 2020, with confirmation recently received that funding has been awarded to deliver a number of junction improvement schemes.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		<p>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?</p>	<p>The AQUIND interconnector route alignment coincides with the location of one of the City region's TCF rebid schemes located along the A3 London Road in the vicinity of Ladybridge Roundabout. In addition, there are important cumulative impacts of the diverted traffic associated with the development's construction activities on diversionary routes located within both Hampshire and Portsmouth. The TCF rebid scheme delivery period remains the same, concluding in March 2023. This means that all site works related to the bid must be completed by this date, otherwise HCC and its partners risk losing any unspent TCF funding. Following confirmation of the successful TCF rebid, HCC and its partners wish to share details of TCF scheme designs and associated construction programmes at an early stage with a view to coordinating TCF site works with AQUIND and other street works to enable all schemes to be delivered within agreed funding windows.</p>
17. Trees			
TR1.1 7.3	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>Please see HCC's response to DCO1.5.9 and its Local Impact Report.</p>

Reference	Respondent(s)	Question	Response
		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.	