

From: [Holmes, Jon](#)
To: [Aquind Interconnector](#)
Subject: EHDC Response to Deadline 2
Date: 20 October 2020 19:55:04
Attachments: [EHDC Deadline 2.docx](#)

Dear Sirs,

Please find attached East Hampshire District Council's response for Deadline 2.

Yours faithfully

Jon Holmes
Principal Planning Officer
East Hampshire District Council
Penns Place
Petersfield GU31 4EX
T. 01730 234243
W. www.easthants.gov.uk

East Hampshire District Council



Aquind Ltd

Aquind Interconnector Project
Application for a Development Consent Order

Ref: EN020022

Response to Deadline Two

20 October 2020

East Hampshire District Council : Response for Deadline Two

East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) is currently engaged with the applicant in a range of discussions on some of the core issues relating to the proposal.

A not inconsiderable amount of information has been submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 1 and EHDC may continue to review these with a view to further comments being made at Deadline 3.

The following submitted documents are key to EHDC's interests:

- Design and Access Statement Revision 002;
- Applicants' response to the Examining Authority's first set of questions;
- Position Statement on Planning Obligations in connection with the Proposed Development;
- Updated CEMP (6 October 2020)
- Draft Development Consent Order (6 October 2020)

Design and Access Statement Revision 002

Section 5.2.3 provides more information on the AC switchyard. It is considered this will not greatly affect the landscape in view from the EHDC area other than the lightning masts, stated as being up to 30m in height. Reference is also made to the possibility of steel cables being strung between the masts, which would add to the appearance of visual clutter between the masts on the buildings and ground mounted masts.

Section 5.2.3.27 details Auxiliary Transformers. These would be oil filled and it will be critical that appropriate bunding is provided in the event of a leak. The same is applicable to the diesel generator (Plate 5.13). It is stated these would be sound-proof units, but assurance / evidence of sound-proofing should be provided, albeit these would only be used in emergency situations.

Section 5.2.4.3 states the standard roof design would result in a building height of 22m which has been the understanding throughout preliminary discussions. It is stated a more complex architectural solution may result in a building height of 26m which is a discernible difference and EHDC would like a landscape led approach to the scale of the building and a commitment to 22m rather than this being led by engineering / contractor preferences.

Comments on Applicants response to the ExA first set of Questions

MG1.1.2 EHDC note the ongoing discussions with landowners and also between the Applicant and National Grid other siting options but these must be resolved before the end of the Examination.

MG1.1.3 EHDC note the Position Statement (Doc Ref 7.4.1.1) regarding the approach to design. The design approach leans on the acknowledgement in section 4.5 of NPS-EN-1 (and the National Design Guide (NDG)) that such infrastructure development limits

the extent to which it can contribute to the quality of the area. In early design discussions with the applicant, EHDC had sought a design approach that represented innovation / high standards of external appearance to respond to the location/landform rather than limiting the design of the Converter Station Buildings to primarily functional requirements. Design discussions with the Applicant are ongoing.

- MG1.1.21 EHDC note and welcome the intention to manage and retain the landscaping for the operational life of the Development and this is confirmed in the revised dDCO.
- MG1.1.32 EHDC note the response from the Applicant, but it evades the question regarding the question regarding an update on whether an agreement is in place from the French authorities, which is considered critical.
- LV1.9.25 The Council notes the reference to cranes of 84m in height during construction. The Applicant states the significance of the construction stage effects would not change as a consequence of this information, however, this is considered to make light of the significance of the visual effects of cranes of such scale in this location. Clarification over the likely duration of presence of such cranes is requested to assess the impact further given a three year construction period is planned.
- LV2.9.37 The Applicant's comments in relation to Monitoring and Management of mitigation planting is noted and welcomed (as MG1.1.21 above).
- SE1.15.12 EHDC note the Position Statement on Planning Obligations (Doc Ref 7.7.6). Notwithstanding EHDC policies and thresholds contained in its CIL SPD, it is considered that the District will be significantly impacted by the development during the construction phase but that the project provides no mitigation or benefits in socio-economic terms to the District. EHDC welcomes the acknowledgement that discussions will continue in this regard.

Further comments as necessary will follow for Deadline 3.