

From: [Holmes, Jon](#)
To: [Aquind Interconnector](#)
Subject: EHDC Deadline 3 comments
Date: 03 November 2020 16:48:32
Attachments: [EHDC Deadline 3.docx](#)

Dear sirs,

Please find attached East Hampshire District Council's comments for Deadline 3.

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 Three

3 November 2020

East Hampshire District Council : Response for Deadline Three

Comments in response to the Applicants' comments on EHDC LIR

The Applicant's Response to Local Impact Report Document Ref: 7.70.13 responds to EHDC's LIR from 11-174. The comments below follow the numbering system as per that document.

2.2 EHDC accepts that the existing pylons are an influencing factor in the local landscape and does not dispute the site description as set out in ES Chapter 15 (APP-130)

2.4 It is noted that the pylons extend into the surrounding landscape, but these are not considered to provide a meaningful visual connection to Horndean or Denmead or alter the isolated nature of the substation insofar as it is set in its rural position.

4.8 EHDC welcomes discussions on the proposed entranceway at Broadway Lane / Day Lane.

4.9 The engineering requirements for the access in the location proposed for construction purposes are noted eg to accommodate abnormal loads and the needs to avoid impacting on the belt of trees to the north. However, it is the permanent retention of the track in this location that is a concern and it considers that a route that better relates to existing landscape features and which avoids the protected trees could be used given the low level of operational traffic once operational.

4.11 Noted.

4.13-19 All noted.

4.20 It is acknowledged that large proportions of the Converter Station development necessitates specialist work from outside the region but welcomes the Applicant's willingness to discuss local employment potential and any assurances in this regard.

All other matters responded to by the Applicant are noted.

Comments in respect of the dDCO

Section 9 of Part 2 Principal Powers of the DCO (Defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance) is not necessary and should be removed. If noise levels are such that there is a need to serve a Statutory Nuisance it is reasonable to take such action, bearing in mind that the assessment which has been prepared demonstrates that impacts have been mitigated to such a level

that nuisance should not exist. Either the assessed noise levels are wrong or the activities and operations taking place are not those that were assessed and should not be allowed to continue unchallenged. There is no exemption for NSIPS within the Statutory Nuisance EPA 1990 legislation and such an exemption as sought by Section 9 could leave local residents unacceptably exposed to noise impacts. A Statutory Nuisance is not considered to be an 'unreasonable impediment' to the delivery of the project as noted in The Applicant's response to ExA