

## **AQUIND Limited**

---

# **AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR**

## Statement of Common Ground between AQUIND Limited and Portsmouth City Council

The Planning Act (2008)

## **UNAGREED DRAFT FROM PORTSMOUTH CITY COUNCIL FOR DEADLINE 6**

Document Ref: 7.5.3  
PINS Ref.: EN020022

**AQUIND Limited**

---

# **AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR**

Statement of Common Ground Between  
AQUIND Limited and Portsmouth City Council

**PINS REF.: EN020022**

**DOCUMENT: INSERT**

**DATE: DECEMBER 2020**

WSP

WSP House

70 Chancery Lane

London

WC2A 1AF

+44 20 7314 5000

[www.wsp.com](http://www.wsp.com)

## DOCUMENT

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| <b>Document</b>       | <b>Statement of Common Ground with<br/>Portsmouth City Council</b> |
| <b>Revision</b>       | 001  |
| <b>Document Owner</b> | WSP UK Limited   |
| <b>Prepared By</b>    | Alan Hardwick  |
| <b>Date</b>           | October 2020   |
| <b>Approved By</b>    | Marcus Wood / Martyn Jarvis  |
| <b>Date</b>           | <b>INSERT</b>  |

# CONTENTS

|           |  |            |
|-----------|--|------------|
| <b>1.</b> | <b>INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE</b>                                    | <b>1-1</b> |
| <hr/>     |  |            |
| 1.1.      | PURPOSE OF THE STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND                          | 1-1        |
| 1.2.      | DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT                            | 1-1        |
| 1.3.      | THIS STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND AND THE ROLE OF PCC                | 1-2        |
| <b>2.</b> | <b>RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT UNDERTAKEN TO DATE</b>                     | <b>2-3</b> |
| <b>3.</b> | <b>SUMMARY OF TOPICS COVERED BY THE STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND</b> | <b>3-7</b> |
| <hr/>     |  |            |
| 3.1.      | COVERED IN THE STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND                          | 3-7        |
| <b>4.</b> | <b>CURRENT POSITION</b>  | <b>4-9</b> |
| <hr/>     |  |            |
| 4.1.      | PLANNING POLICY  | 4-9        |
| 4.2.      | NEED FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT                                  | 4-10       |
| 4.3.      | LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL AMENITY                                       | 4-10       |
| 4.4.      | ECOLOGY (INCLUDING ARBORICULTURE)                                  | 4-12       |
| 4.5.      | GROUND CONDITIONS  | 4-15       |
| 4.6.      | GROUNDWATER  | 4-18       |
| 4.7.      | SURFACE WATER RESOURCES AND FLOOD RISK                             | 4-20       |
| 4.8.      | HERITAGE AND ARCHAEOLOGY   | 4-22       |
| 4.9.      | TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT  | 4-23       |
| 4.10.     | AIR QUALITY  | 4-25       |
| 4.11.     | NOISE AND VIBRATION  | 4-26       |
| 4.12.     | SOCIO-ECONOMICS  | 4-29       |
| 4.13.     | HUMAN HEALTH   | 4-30       |
| 4.14.     | WASTE AND MATERIAL RESOURCES                                       | 4-31       |
| 4.15.     | CUMULATIVE EFFECTS   | 4-31       |
| 4.16.     | ONSHORE OUTLINE CONSTRUCTION ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN         | 4-33       |

|              |  |             |
|--------------|--|-------------|
| <b>4.17.</b> | <b>DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER (INCLUDING REQUIREMENTS TO THE DRAFT DCO)</b> | <b>4-34</b> |
| <b>4.18.</b> | <b>OPTICAL REGENERATION STATIONS</b>   | <b>4-38</b> |
| <b>4.19.</b> | <b>COMMUNITY FUND</b>  | <b>4-42</b> |
| 4.20         | DEFINITION OF ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT   |             |
| 4.21         | RELEVANCE AND POSITION OF OTHER LICENCES AND CONSENTS (FRANCE                    |             |
| <b>5.</b>    | <b>SIGNATURES</b>  | <b>5-45</b> |

---

## **TABLES**

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| <b>Table 2.1 - Schedule of pre-application meetings and correspondence</b>     | <b>2-4</b>  |
| <b>Table 4.1 - Planning Policy</b>   | <b>4-9</b>  |
| <b>Table 4.2 - Need for the Proposed Development</b>                           | <b>4-10</b> |
| <b>Table 4.3 - Landscape and Visual Amenity</b>                                | <b>4-10</b> |
| <b>Table 4.4 - Ecology (including Arboriculture)</b>                           | <b>4-12</b> |
| <b>Table 4.5 - Ground Conditions</b>   | <b>4-15</b> |
| <b>Table 4.6 - Groundwater</b>   | <b>4-18</b> |
| <b>Table 4.7 - Surface Water Resources and Flood Risk</b>                      | <b>4-20</b> |
| <b>Table 4.8 - Heritage and Archaeology</b>                                    | <b>4-22</b> |
| <b>Table 4.9 - Traffic and Transport</b>                                       | <b>4-23</b> |
| <b>Table 4.10 - Air Quality</b>  | <b>4-25</b> |
| <b>Table 4.11 - Noise and Vibration</b>  | <b>4-26</b> |
| <b>Table 4.12 - Socio-economics</b>  | <b>4-29</b> |
| <b>Table 4.13 - Human Health</b>   | <b>4-30</b> |
| <b>Table 4.14 - Waste and Material Resources</b>                               | <b>4-31</b> |
| <b>Table 4.15 - Cumulative Effects</b>   | <b>4-31</b> |
| <b>Table 4.16 - Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan</b> | <b>4-33</b> |

---

**Table 4.17 - Draft Development Consent Order**

**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

**Table 4.18 - Optical Regeneration Stations**

**4-38**

Table 4.19 Community Fund

Table 4.20 Definition of Associated Development

Table 4.21 Relevance and position of other licences and consents (FRANCE)

# 1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

---

## 1.1. PURPOSE OF THE STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

1.1.1.1. A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is a written statement produced as part of the application process for an application for a Development Consent Order (DCO) and is prepared jointly by the applicant and another party. A SoCG sets out the matters of agreement between both parties, matters where there is not agreement and matters which are under discussion.

1.1.1.2. In this regard paragraph 58 of the Department for Communities and Local Government's guidance entitled "Planning Act 2008: examination of applications for development consent" (26 March 2015) hereafter referred to as DCLG Guidance) describes a SoCG as follows:

*"A statement of common ground is a written statement prepared jointly by the applicant and another party or parties, setting out any matters on which they agree. As well as identifying matters which are not in real dispute, it is also useful if a statement identifies those areas where agreement has not been reached. The statement should include references to show where those matters are dealt with in the written representations or other documentary evidence."*

1.1.1.1. The aim of a SoCG is to assist the Examining Authority to manage the examination of an application for a DCO by providing an understanding of the status of matters at hand and allowing the Examining Authority to focus their questioning. The effective use of SoCG is expected to lead to a more efficient examination process.

1.1.1.2. A SoCG may be submitted prior to the start or during an Examination and updated as necessary or as requested during an Examination.

## 1.2. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

1.2.1.1. AQUIND Limited ("the Applicant") submitted an application for the AQUIND Interconnector Order (the 'Order') pursuant to Section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) (the "PA2008") to the Secretary of State on 14 November 2019 (the 'Application').

1.2.1.2. The Application seeks development consent for those elements of the AQUIND Interconnector (the 'Project') located in the UK and the UK Marine Area (the 'Proposed Development').

The Project is a new 2,000 MW subsea and underground High Voltage Direct Current ('HVDC') bi-directional electric power transmission link between the South Coast of England and Normandy in France. Not considered necessary and not agreed. If Aquind want to keep this PCC request that this is marked not agreed

### **1.3. THIS STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND AND THE ROLE OF PCC**

- 1.3.1.1. This SoCG has been prepared jointly by the Applicant and Portsmouth City Council (“PCC”) in accordance with the DCLG Guidance and precedent examples of SoCG available on the Planning Inspectorate’s website.
- 1.3.1.2. PCC is interested in the Proposed Development as a Local Planning Authority, Highway Authority and Street Authority in respect of the parts of the Proposed Development located within their administrative boundary. In addition, PCC is an owner of land affected by the Proposed Development.
- 1.3.1.3. PCC would be responsible for discharging many of the requirements of the Order associated with development in their administrative area should development consent be granted for the Proposed Development. PCC would also be responsible for monitoring and enforcing many of the DCO provisions and requirements.
- 1.3.1.4. For the purpose of this SoCG the Applicant and PCC will be jointly referred to as the “Parties”.
- 1.3.1.5. This Statement of Common Ground, prepared by AQUIND Limited, has been updated following ongoing discussions with WSP on behalf of AQUIND and is considered to represent an accurate reflection of discussions with PCC to Deadline6 [Updated]. Further discussions will continue to take place throughout the Examination to confirm positions on the outstanding issues indicated in this SoCG.



## 2. RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT UNDERTAKEN TO DATE

---

2.1.1.1. The tables below set out a summary of the key meetings and correspondence between the parties in relation to the Proposed Development.

**Table 2.1 - Schedule of pre-application meetings and correspondence**

| Date     | Form of Contact  | Summary   |
|----------|--|---|
| 10/01/19 | Meeting (Planning and Highways, including WCC, EHC, HBC, HCC, SDNP)            | Preferred Converter Station location;<br>Preliminary Environmental Information Report (“PEIR”) for forthcoming statutory consultation;<br>Update on cable route options;<br>Land referencing (including Land Interest Questionnaires (“LIQ”));<br>Future engagement;<br>Statement of Community Consultation (“SoCC”).   |
| 22/01/19 | Meeting (Planning and Highways, including WCC, EHC, HBC, HCC, SDNP)            | PEIR and forthcoming statutory consultation / process;<br>Cable route options and rationale;<br>Alternatives to limit impact of cable route on highway.   |
| 05/02/19 | Telecon (Planning and Highways, including WCC, EHC, HBC, HCC, SDNP)            | Deposit locations for Consultation Documents;<br>Converter Station design and level of information in PEIR.   |
| 07/02/19 | Meeting (Planning, Estates, Highways)  | Cable route options;<br>Construction methodology for cable installation;<br>Consultation methodology agreed as per SoCC;<br>Awareness to recreational space users who may not live in the area;<br>Proposed Development and forthcoming consultation;<br>Site notices, and appropriate locations along the cable corridor and in car parks of recreational areas. |
| 15/05/19 | Meeting ESCP   | Update on progress and consultation responses;<br>Milton Common proposals and design of sea defences.   |
| 12/06/19 | Meeting (Contaminated Land Officer)  | Review of historical records of contaminated land.  |
| 03/07/19 | Meeting (Planning and Highways)  | Onshore Cable Corridor update on technical work;<br>Transport Assessment scope;<br>Transport SRTM scoping note (methodology and assumptions).   |
| 06/07/19 | Meeting (Landscape)  | Viewpoints, visualisations and mitigation requirements for ORS buildings at landfall.   |
| 15/07/19 | Meeting (Elected Members and senior officers)                                  | February – April 2019 consultation;<br>Onshore underground cable route;<br>Construction impacts.  |
| 23/07/19 | Workshop (LLFA/Drainage, including EA, Portsmouth Water and HCC LLFA/Drainage) | Update on Proposed Development and flood risk profile within the Order Limits;<br>Surface water resources and flood risk assessment;<br>Permitting requirements;<br>Potential constraints at Converter Station;<br>Crossing of the ESCP flood defences.   |
| 06/08/19 | Meeting (Environmental Health, including EHDC and HBC)                         | Construction noise and vibration along Onshore Cable Corridor.  |
| 09/08/19 | Telecon (Planning, Estates, Transport)   | Update on Stakeholder meetings;<br>Timescales and DCO Process;<br>Optioneering Update, specifically, Landfall, Open Space including Bransbury Park and Farlington Playing Fields, and Farlington Avenue;<br>Targeted Consultation;<br>Land Referencing Update.  |

| Date       | Form of Contact                        | Summary  |
|------------|--|--|
| 16/08/19   | Telecon                                | Route Option update;<br>Targeted Consultation;<br>Land Referencing Update.   |
| 22/08/19   | Meeting (Planning, Estates, Transport) | Onshore Cable Corridor – optioneering update;<br>ORS buildings at landfall;<br>DCO process.  |
| 30/08/19   | Meeting (Planning, ESCP)               | Coastal defences at Milton Common;<br>Phase 4 ESCP works.  |
| 04/09/19   | Briefing (Elected Members, Planning)   | Councillor Briefing on Proposed Development, Onshore Cable Corridor and DCO Process.   |
| 10/09/19   | Meeting (Planning, Estates, Transport) | Update on planning and transport;<br>Elected member concerns on air quality;<br>Land interest questionnaire refresh;<br>Update on ESCP meeting (30/08/19);<br>Works at landfall including the ORS;<br>Outputs of traffic (STRM) modelling, focussing on individual junctions;<br>AIL routes;<br>Utilities;<br>Groundwater. |
| 25/09/2019 | Telecon (Planning, Estates, Transport) | Project update;<br>Progress on Order Limits/refinement;<br>ORS at Landfall;<br>DCO process.  |
| 08/10/19   | Meeting (Planning, Estates, Transport) | Order Limits and key changes post consultation, including retained flexibility;<br>Landfall, buildings and construction timescale;<br>HDD/trenchless crossings;<br>Impact on open land;<br>Transport update;<br>DCO process update.  |
| 29/10/2019 | Meeting (Arboriculture, Planning)      | Review of approach and likely impacts of TPO features;<br>Mitigation on worst-case scenario.   |
| 04/11/19   | Telecon (Planning, Transport, Estates) | Submission update;<br>Traffic;<br>Air Quality;<br>Contaminated Land;<br>Arboriculture;<br>ORS;<br>Ecology;<br>Open Space;<br>Post Submission and Comms.  |

| Date              | Form of Contact     | Summary   |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| 18/12/2019        |                     | Updated Order Limits<br>Project Description<br>Landfall, construction and ORS (and permanent land acquisition)<br>Milton Common<br>Baffins Milton Rovers and Langstone Playing Fields<br>Farlington Playing Fields<br>Farlington Avenue<br>Portsdown Hill Road<br>SoCG<br>Section 56 Notices, site notice (additional locations)<br>Communications Strategy |
| 07/01/2020        | Meeting             | Project Update<br>SoCG and Future Meetings<br>Open Space<br>Estates/Property and DCO (PCC Land Ownership)<br>Communications   |
| 12/03/2020        | Telecon             | Project and Examination Update<br>Highways, focus on Relevant Representation<br>SoCG  |
| 04/08/2020        | Telecon             | Examination Update<br>SoCG Draft  |
| 11/08/2020        | Telecon (Transport) | Transport update covering Eastern Road Technical Note, traffic management, modelling, survey data and abnormal loads  |
| 28/09/2020        | Telecon             | Run through of route through Portsmouth City Council's area of jurisdiction (including changes to the Order limits post submission, to be submitted at Deadline 1).   |
| <b>08/10/2020</b> | Teams Meeting       | Meeting to discuss Soio-Economic issues   |
| <b>29/10/2020</b> | Teams Meeting       | Keeping in Touch meeting  |
| <b>12/11/2020</b> | Teams Meetingt      | Keeping in Touch meeting  |
| <b>25/11/2020</b> | Teams Meeting       | Keeping in Touch Meeting  |
| <b>01/12/2020</b> | Teams Meeting       | SoCG meeting - Ecology and Arboriculture  |
| <b>04/12/2020</b> | Teams Meeting       | Keeping in Touch Meeting  |
| <b>08/12/2020</b> | Teams Meeting       | SoCG meeting - Traffic. Transport and Air Quality   |
| <b>16/12/2020</b> | Teams Meeting       | SoCG meeting - Socio Economics  |
|                   |                     |   |

# 3. SUMMARY OF TOPICS COVERED BY THE STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

---

## 3.1. COVERED IN THE STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

3.1.1.1. The following topics discussed between the Applicant and PCC are discussed within this SoCG:

- Planning policy
- Needs for the Proposed Development
- Landscape and visual amenity
- Ecology (including arboriculture)
- Soils and agricultural land use
- Ground conditions
- Groundwater
- Surface water and flood risk
- Heritage and archaeology
- Traffic and transport
- Air quality
- Noise and vibration
- Socio-economics
- Human health
- Waste and material resources
- Cumulative effects
- Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (“Onshore CEMP”)
- Draft DCO (including requirements to the draft DCO)
- Optical Regeneration Stations
- Community Fund

- Definition of Associated Development
- Relevance and position of other licences and consents (FRANCE)
- 

#### 3.1.1.2.

Where helpful to assist with an explanation of the position of the Parties these topics have been split into sections to align with the Onshore Cable Corridor within the administrative boundary of PCC:

- Section 4 (south) – London Road/Portsdown Hill Road to Burnham Road
- Section 5 – Farlington
- Section 6 – Zetland Fields and Sainsbury’s Car Park
- Section 7 – Farlington junction to Airport Service Road
- Section 8 – Great Salterns Golf Course to Velder Avenue/Moorings Way
- Section 9 – Velder Avenue/Moorings Way to Bransbury Road
- Section 10 – Eastney (Landfall)

## 4. CURRENT POSITION

### 4.1. PLANNING POLICY

Table 4.1 - Planning Policy

| Ref.                   | Description of matter | Current Position  | RAG    |
|------------------------|-----------------------|---|--------|
| <b>Planning Policy</b> |                       |   |        |
| <b>PCC 4.1.1</b>       | Role of NPS EN-1      | It is agreed that the relevant National Policy Statement for the Proposed Development is the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) (2011) and represents the primary policy basis for the determination of the application as set out in the Planning Statement (APP-108).  | Agreed |
| <b>PCC 4.1.2</b>       | PCC Development Plan  | Local planning policies from the relevant authorities can be 'important and relevant' considerations for the Secretary of State ('SoS') in determining the Application. The Development Plan for PCC comprises (as set out at Appendix 4 of the Planning Statement (APP-108)): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Portsmouth Plan (2012);</li> <li>• Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013)</li> <li>• Portsmouth City Local Plan saved policies (2006); and the</li> <li>• Seafront Masterplan SPD (2013).</li> <li>• Eastney Beach Habitat Restoration and Management Plan SPD (2014).</li> <li>• Parking Standards and Transport Assessments SPD adopted (2014).</li> <li>• Air Quality and Pollution SPD (2006).</li> <li>• Developing Contaminated Land SPG (2004).</li> <li>• Minerals and Waste Safeguarding SPD (2016)</li> </ul> | Agreed |

## 4.2. NEED FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Table 4.2 - Need for the Proposed Development

| Ref.      | Description of matter    | Current Position  | PCC POSITION   | RAG      |
|-----------|--------------------------|---|--|----------|
| PCC 4.2.1 | Need for the development | The overarching need for the Proposed Development as set out in the Needs and Benefits Report (APP-115) is a matter for consideration by the SoS as decision maker in considering applications for development consent under the Planning Act 2008.   | Not agreed. Unnecessary wording and disagree that 2.2.2 of EN-5 has any relevance.   | On-going |
| PCC 4.2.2 | Wider benefits           | The Needs and Benefits Report (APP-115) also sets out the wider benefits of the Proposed Development in terms of job creation and economic activity. PCC views are sought on these benefits outlined at Section 2.4 of the Needs and Benefits Report where they relate to the local area, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• new employment opportunities (section 2.4.4.); and</li> <li>• wider economic activity (section 2.4.5)</li> </ul> | In order to agree to this, PCC would need an undertaking from AQUIND that direct job opportunities would be made available to Portsmouth residents seeking work, this could include an employment and skills plan delivered under S106. Without that undertaking, whilst PCC recognises the indirect employment benefit that the scheme may bring, the lack of direct job opportunities available to PCC residents would be a detractor.<br><br>The wider economic activity that the scheme could bring are noted. | On-going |

## 4.3. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL AMENITY

Table 4.3 - Landscape and Visual Amenity

| Ref.                                | Description of matter         | Current Position   | PCC Position             | RAG    |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------|
| <b>Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> |                               |  |                          |        |
| PCC 4.3.1                           | Area of study relevant to PCC | It is agreed that the parts of the Landscape and Visual Amenity assessment set out in Chapter 15 of the ES (APP-130) relevant to PCC are Sections 4 (London Road/Portsdown Hill Road to Burnham Road (south)) to Section 10 (Eastney - Landfall) which fall within PCC's administrative boundary.  | 4.3.1to 4.3.4 now AGREED | Agreed |
| PCC 4.3.2                           | ES Methodology - Study Area   | The 120 m study area on either side of the cable route is agreed (as noted at paragraph 15.1.2.6 of Chapter 15 of the ES APP-130) The scoping out of permanent significant operational effects on landscape and visual receptors within and beyond the 120 m buffer on either side of the Onshore Cable Corridor is also agreed (as per paragraph 15.3.5.1). |                          | Agreed |



|                   |   |   |   |          |
|-------------------|---|---|---|----------|
| <b>PCC 4.3.3</b>  | ES Methodology - Study Area   | It is agreed (as noted at paragraph 15.1.2.7 of Chapter 15 of the ES APP-130) that a 300 m study area around the Landfall is appropriate, with no requirement for a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) for the Optical Regeneration Station(s) (ORS).   |   | Agreed   |
| <b>PCC 4.3.4</b>  | ES Methodology - Study Area   | The locations of the verified views and wirelines for the ORS at Landfall have been agreed (as noted at paragraph 15.4.4.24 of Chapter 15 of the ES APP-130).   |   | Agreed   |
| <b>PCC 4.3.5</b>  | ES Baseline   | The landscape and visual baseline environment is set out at section 15.5.3 of Chapter 15 of the ES APP-130). AQUIND welcome PCC's review and agreement of this baseline for the relevant sections.  | Not agreed - ONGOING  | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.3.6</b>  | Predicted impacts   | The impacts considered to have the potential to give rise to temporary significant effects during construction of the Proposed Development in relation to the Onshore Cable Corridor and Landfall are identified at section 15.3.6 of Chapter 15 of the ES (APP-130). AQUIND welcome PCC's review and agreement that these represent an accurate reflection of the predicted impacts.   | Not agreed - ONGOING<br><br>PCC would agree that the temporary significant effects as set out in Section 15.3.6 of the ES represent an accurate account of predicted impacts, save for the potential duration of those impacts  | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.3.7</b>  | Mitigation - Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy  | The Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (APP-506) submitted with the Application and the extent of the mitigation in the Strategy relating to the ORS at the Landfall are matters to be discussed and yet to be agreed.   |   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.3.8</b>  | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – General Environmental Control Measures                        | The measures set out in the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) section 5.2 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) are yet to be agreed.   |   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.3.9</b>  | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – Location Specific Construction Environmental Control Measures | The measures set out in the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• section 6.2.3 (Landscape and Visual Amenity);</li> <li>• section 6.5.1 (Section 4 - Hambledon Road to Farlington Avenue - Arboriculture and Landscape);</li> <li>• section 6.6.1 (Section 5 - Farlington - Arboriculture and Landscape);</li> <li>• section 6.7.1 (Section 6 - Zetland Field and Sainsbury's Car Park - Arboriculture and Landscape);</li> <li>• section 6.8.1 (Section 7 - Farlington Junction to Airport Service Road - Arboriculture and Landscape);</li> <li>• section 6.9.1 (Section 8 - Eastern Road (adjacent to Great Salterns Golf Course) To Moorings Way - Arboriculture and Landscape);</li> <li>• section 6.10.1 (Section 9 - Mooring Way to Bransbury Road - Arboriculture and Landscape); and</li> <li>• section 6.11.1 (Section 10 - Eastney (Landfall) - Arboriculture and Landscape);</li> </ul> are yet to be agreed. | Noting that this is ongoing, PCC would request that rather than stating ' <i>where practicable, design should avoid positioning cables in conflict with RPA's</i> ', this should be ' <i>unless no alternatives exist, cables must not be positioned in conflict with RPA's</i> ' or similar. | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.3.10</b> | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – Onshore Monitoring Plan                                       | The measures set out in the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) section 7.1 (Onshore Monitoring Plan - Landscape and Visual Amenity - Management of Vegetation) are yet to be agreed.  |   | On-going |

|                   |   |  |   |          |
|-------------------|---|--|---|----------|
| <b>PCC 4.3.11</b> | Residual effects                          | Subject to further discussion in relation to predicted impacts and mitigation measures, AQUIND seek PCC's agreement of the assessment of residual effects set out at Tables 15.10 and 15.11 of Chapter 15 of the ES (APP-130).   |   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.3.12</b> | Requirement – detailed landscaping scheme | The draft DCO (APP-019) requirements (7 and 8) relating to the need for a detailed landscaping scheme, comprising hard and soft landscaping, and a scheme of implementation and maintenance (LPA approval) are yet to be agreed. | The draft DCO is being worked on separately. As such it would be inappropriate to agree, or otherwise, at this stage. | On-going |

#### 4.4. ECOLOGY (INCLUDING ARBORICULTURE) MEETING HELD ON 01/12/20

Table 4.4 - Ecology (including Arboriculture)

| Ref.                                     | Description of matter         | Current Position   | PCC Position  | RAG      |
|--|-------------------------------|--|---|----------|
| <b>Ecology (including Arboriculture)</b> |                               |  |   |          |
| <b>PCC 4.4.1</b>                         | Area of study relevant to PCC | It is agreed that the parts of the Onshore Ecology assessment set out in Chapter 16 of the ES (APP-131) relevant to PCC are Sections 4 (London Road/Portsdown Hill Road to Burnham Road (south)) to Section 10 (Eastney - Landfall) which fall within PCC's administrative boundary. |   | Agreed   |
| <b>PCC 4.4.2</b>                         | ES Methodology – Study Area   | It is agreed (as noted in section 16.1.2 of Chapter 16 of the ES APP-131) that the study areas for the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal ("PEA") for ecological features is appropriate.  |   | Agreed   |
| <b>PCC 4.4.3</b>                         | ES Baseline                   | The ecological baseline as set out at section 16.5 of Chapter 16 of the ES APP-131. AQUIND welcome PCC's review and agreement of this baseline for the relevant sections.  | <p><i>PCC is unable to agree the baseline as I have the following areas of concern:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The bat surveys undertaken were restricted to the Converter Station Area. No bat surveys were undertaken within PCC no written justification for this is within the application. PCC therefore request that suitable bat surveys of Milton Common are undertaken to inform the mitigation proposals. Such surveys will help gain an understanding of how effects on this species group can be adequately avoided, mitigated or compensated within PCC. At this stage PCC are of the view that there is insufficient information to assess the project, with respect to bats, in the context of the</i></li> </ul> | On-going |

|                         |                          |   |   |                 |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
|                         |                          |   | <p><i>intrinsic value of Milton Common and the potential impacts.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>PCC disagree with the baseline assessment that the breeding bird community as important at the Local scale. PCC would place it at County importance, at least, given that black redstart is breeding adjacent to the site.</i></li> <li><i>PCC are concerned that the status of reptiles outside the converter station area has not been sufficiently investigated via appropriate survey of suitable habitat. Instead there is an assumption of presence in low numbers. This assumption is not in line with good practice and, particularly given the scale of this scheme, PCC would expect to see a survey of suitable habitat.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Table 16.1 scopes great crested newt out of the assessment, stating that the three lakes on Milton Common and Great Salterns Lake are 'likely' to be saline. PCC are of the view that this should be confirmed before such a conclusion is reached. PCC have also previously requested that detailed HSI results be provided (i.e. results for the 10 HSI factors for each pond assessed) and these do not appear to have been provided to date.</i></p> |                 |
| <p><b>PCC 4.4.4</b></p> | <p>Predicted impacts</p> | <p>The impacts are identified with regards to ecological/environmental designations and species in relation to the Onshore Cable Corridor and Landfall are identified (including mitigation) at sections 16.5.1.47 to 60, 16.6.2 and 16.6.3 of Chapter 16 of the ES (APP-131, and associated Appendix 16.3 (APP-411)). AQUIND welcome PCC's review and agreement that these represent an accurate reflection of the predicted impacts.</p> <p>PCC have raised concerns on the lack of clarity on the final cable route, and a resultant potential for significant effects on bird disturbance to the Solent SPAs (notably Langstone and Chichester Harbour SPA) and the functionally linked land. As such the predicted impacts on Chichester and Langstone Harbour are identified in paragraph 16.6.2.3 to 16.6.2.19 of Chapter 16 of the ES and are yet to be agreed.</p> | <p>PCC may be better placed to agree on the predicted impacts once points above have been addressed.</p>  | <p>On-going</p> |

|                         |  |   |  |                 |
|-------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------|
| <p><b>PCC 4.4.5</b></p> | <p>Mitigation - embedded</p>   | <p>The embedded mitigation measures are set out in paragraphs 16.6.2.1 of Chapter 16 of the ES (APP-131) and are yet to be agreed with PCC.</p>   | <p>PCC have expressed concerns that vegetation clearance works being timed to avoid the breeding bird season and how this will sit alongside completing certain works in the wintering season. If both restrictions were applied to the same element of works, that would only leave September for these elements. PCC would therefore request submission of a programme of ecological works</p>   | <p>On-going</p> |
| <p><b>PCC 4.4.6</b></p> | <p>Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – General Environmental Control Measures</p>                        | <p>The agreement of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• section 5.3 (Onshore Ecology), including precautionary methods of works and arboriculture are yet to be agreed.</li> </ul>   | <p>While section 5.3 of the CEMP is broadly acceptable, PCC hopes to be in a better position to agree with the precautionary measures for reptiles and breeding birds when requested information in 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 above is provided</p>  | <p>On-going</p> |
| <p><b>PCC 4.4.7</b></p> | <p>Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – Location Specific Construction Environmental Control Measures</p> | <p>The agreement of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• section 6.2.1 (Onshore Ecology); <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Winter Restriction of Works Adjacent to Chichester and Langstone Harbour SPA;</li> <li>◦ Bats and Lighting (Farlington Playing Fields);</li> <li>◦ Soil Horizon Preservation (Milton Common SINC, unimproved and semi-improved grassland); and</li> <li>◦ Ground Protection (Milton Common SINC, unimproved and semi-improved grassland);</li> </ul> </li> <li>• section 6.2.2 (Arboriculture)section 6.5.1 (Section 4 Hambledon Road to Farlington Avenue - Arboriculture and Landscape);</li> <li>• section 6.6.1 (Section 5 Farlington - Arboriculture and Landscape);</li> <li>• section 6.7.1 (Section 6 Zetland Field and Sainsbury’s Car Park - Arboriculture and Landscape);</li> <li>• section 6.8.1 (Section 7 Farlington Junction to Airport Service Road - Arboriculture and Landscape);</li> <li>• section 6.9.1 (Section 8 Eastern Road (adjacent to Great Salterns Golf Course) To Moorings Way - Arboriculture and Landscape);</li> <li>• section 6.10.1 (Section 9 Moorings Way to Bransbury Road - Arboriculture and Landscape);</li> <li>• section 6.11.1 (Section 10 Eastney (Landfall) - Arboriculture and Landscape)</li> </ul> <p>are yet to be agreed.</p> | <p><u>Section 6.2.1</u></p> <p>The Applicant has provided further detail in the CEMP relating to the restoration of SWBGS sites, which is welcomed.</p> <p>The requested additional detail on the role of the Ecological Clerk of Works has not been provided.</p> <p>PCC have previously sought further clarification on lighting across the remaining areas of the scheme, if this is indeed required, and how lighting will be minimised where possible in line with the guidance and have yet to see this information.</p> | <p>On-going</p> |
| <p><b>PCC 4.4.8</b></p> | <p>Mitigation - Onshore Monitoring Plan</p>  | <p>The agreement of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• section 7.1 (Onshore Monitoring Plan - Arboriculture - Protection of trees);</li> </ul>  | <p>PCC would consider residual effects unlikely to change following provision of the further information requested as</p>  | <p>On-going</p> |

|                   |   |  |  |          |
|-------------------|---|--|--|----------|
|                   |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>section 7.1 (Onshore Monitoring Plan - Onshore Ecology - Seed harvesting and reseeded at Denmead Meadows, Kings Pond Meadow SINC and Unimproved Neutral Grassland); and</li> <li>section 7.1 (Onshore Monitoring Plan - Onshore Ecology - Construction impacts to the environment)</li> </ul> <p>are yet to be agreed.</p>  | above. On this basis, PCC are broadly in agreement with residual effects. Ecological monitoring requirements for this scheme are limited in the PCC area.  |          |
| <b>PCC 4.4.9</b>  | Residual effects                                    | Subject to further discussion in relation to predicted impacts and mitigation measures, AQUIND seek PCC's agreement of the assessment of residual effects set out in section 16.9 and table 16.9 of Chapter 16 of the ES (APP-131).  | PCC would consider residual effects unlikely to change following provision of the further information requested as above. On this basis, PCC is broadly in agreement with residual effects.  | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.4.10</b> | Requirement - Biodiversity Management Strategy/Plan | Draft DCO (APP-019) Requirement 9 relating to the need for a Biodiversity Management Strategy/Plan with mitigation and enhancement measures (LPA approval) is yet to be agreed.  | PCC have previously commented that while the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy outlines management prescriptions for a 5-year aftercare period the Council would expect the management plan to cover the lifetime of the operational phase of the development. | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.4.11</b> | Arboriculture                                       | <p>The details set out in sections 1.3.1 -1.3.4.1 of the submitted Arboriculture Report (APP-411) are yet to be agreed.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that PCC do not protect trees under its own control (within PCC land). A summary of effects for onshore ecology are included at Table 16.9 of ES Chapter 16 Onshore Ecology (APP-131) and include for the loss of Category A trees. The loss of Category B tree and dense and scattered scrub is scoped out of the assessment as per Table 16.1. These effects are yet to be agreed.</p> |  | Ongoing  |
| <b>PCC 4.4.12</b> | Mitigation  | PCC have advised that the loss of any trees must be avoided and subsequently the details set out in sections 1.7.5 to 1.7.11 identifying the baseline arboricultural conditions, potential impacts and specific mitigation within the submitted Arboriculture Report (APP-411) are yet to be agreed.   |  | Ongoing  |
| <b>PCC 4.4.13</b> |   | PCC are concerned about the potential removal of significant trees within the local authority area as identified in Schedule 11 of the dDCO. The inclusion of the TPO trees within Schedule 11 of the dDCO (APP-019) and other non-protected trees within PCC, and Articles 41 and 42 of Part 7 of the dDCO is yet to be agreed.   |  | Ongoing  |

## 4.5. GROUND CONDITIONS

**Table 4.5 - Ground Conditions**

| Ref.                     | Description of matter | Current Position | PCC Position | RAG |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------|-----|
| <b>Ground Conditions</b> |                       |                  |              |     |

|              |                             |  |   |          |
|--------------|-----------------------------|--|---|----------|
| PCC<br>4.5.1 | ES Methodology – Study Area | It is agreed that the study areas as identified in section 18.1.2 of ES Chapter 18 (APP-133) is appropriate.   |   | Agreed   |
| PCC<br>4.5.2 | ES Methodology – Modelling  | It is agreed that the assessment methodology (as identified in section 18.8 of ES Chapter 18, APP-133) including for the completion of a Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) and preliminary Conceptual Site Model (CSM) to inform further ground investigation work and the Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (GQRA) (APP-429) is appropriate.   | This is ideally a <i>conceptual model</i> in line with BS10175, rather than the simpler geotechnical <i>conceptual site model</i> in line with BS5930. It is understandable that on an engineering project there has been a leaning towards the latter and they overlap considerably and so are accepted. PCC would anticipate that the apposite time for the detailed conceptual model will be created for each section  | Agreed   |
| PCC<br>4.5.3 | ES Methodology – Modelling  | Following the initial ground investigation carried out along the route as part of the ES the CSM was updated accordingly. It is further agreed that where the initial ground investigation and GQRA identified a potentially significant contamination risk to sensitive receptors more detailed ground investigation would be carried out following any grant of the Order. This would be carried out to confirm the required level of remediation and any other mitigation measures. | With regard the land contamination aspects of the work, PCC is of the view that the whole length of the cable run should be risk assessed in tranches, each with its own PRA and GQRA rather than have a screening of the entire length that lacks local detail. The latter seems to be the approach still being adopted and as this scheme is outside of the norm, may be acceptable.<br><br>Some units naturally suggest themselves, such as landfall site, the public open space and allotments at Eastney, Milton Common itself. However, the RA for all areas of the ground will be needed for MS for each tranche. A general MS for restoration may suffice for areas without known contamination issues, but given the soils have been previously worked, their tolerance to being worked and the potential for being mixed with polluted soils nearby or at depth means a Method Statement will be helpful. | Agreed   |
| PCC<br>4.5.4 | ES Baseline                 | The ground conditions baseline environment is set out at section 18.5 of ES Chapter 18 (APP-133) AQUIND welcome PCC's review and agreement of this baseline for the relevant sections.<br><br>PCC consider that a detailed assessment of contaminated land should have been expected as part of the DCO application to build upon the desk study completed with a conceptual model completed for each area. The Conceptual Site Model described in                                     | On-going. For a utilities installation, this seems in-depth, but the conceptual model should be created for each section of the project   | On-going |

|                   |  |  |   |          |
|-------------------|--|--|---|----------|
|                   |  | section 18.5.3 of ES Chapter 18 Ground Conditions and provided for each section in Appendix 18.1 (APP-429) is yet to be agreed.  |   |          |
| <b>PCC 4.5.5</b>  | ES Baseline – Pollution  | Details for the location of further survey work identified as a post DCO deliverable as identified in section 11.2.1.1 the ES chapter 18 (APP-133) are yet to be agreed. Further discussion regarding agreeing locations/ further surveys is ongoing.  |   | Ongoing  |
| <b>PCC 4.5.6</b>  | ES Baseline – Historic   | PCC have requested a watching brief for the Proposed Development for any unexpected areas of pollution. Details of the proposed mitigation for construction and decommissioning, including a watching brief as set out in section 18.9.2 of ES chapter 18 (APP-133) are yet to be agreed.  | The further survey work should have be undertaken as early in process as possible, ideally when suggested in 2019. There is no reason to delay these works and the knowledge they will bring to the undertaking of the scheme unless the AQUIND project is not going ahead. | Ongoing  |
| <b>PCC 4.5.7</b>  | ES Baseline – Historical Use/Mitigation                                    | The ground conditions baseline environment set out at section 18.9.1.1 – 18.9.3.2 of ES Chapter 18 (APP-133) is yet to be agreed.  |   | Ongoing  |
| <b>PCC 4.5.8</b>  | Predicted Impacts  | The impacts during construction of the Proposed Development in relation to the Onshore Cable Corridor and Landfall are identified at sections 18.7.3 and 18.7.4 (for construction and operation respectively) of Chapter 18 of the ES (APP-133). AQUIND welcome PCC's review and agreement that these represent an accurate reflection of the predicted impacts. |   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.5.9</b>  | Predicted Impacts - CSM Results  | The outcome/results of the Conceptual Site Model (CSM) (section 6 of ES Chapter 18 (APP-133) are yet to be agreed.   |   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.5.10</b> | Mitigation at Milton Common  | The proposed mitigation for Milton Common in ES Chapter 18 (APP-133, section 18.9.2.3) is yet to be agreed.  |   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.5.11</b> | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – General Environmental Control Measures | PCC have identified the need for a Method Statement to include for remediation and waste disposal. The measures set out in section 5.5 (Ground Conditions) of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) specifically section 5.5 and its associated Appendix 4 – Outline Materials Management Plan which includes for a Remediation Strategy are yet to be agreed.      |   | On-going |

|                   |   |  |  |          |
|-------------------|---|--|--|----------|
|                   |   |  |  |          |
| <b>PCC 4.5.12</b> | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – Location Specific Construction Environmental Control Measures | The measures set out in section 6.9.2 (Section 8 - Eastern Road (adjacent to Great Salterns Golf Course) To Moorings Way - Ground Conditions) of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.  |  | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.5.13</b> | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – Onshore Monitoring Plan                                       | The measures set out in section 7.1 – (Onshore Monitoring Plan - Onshore Ecology - Construction impacts to the environment) of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.  |  | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.5.14</b> | Residual effects  | Subject to further discussion in relation to predicted impacts and mitigation measures, AQUIND seek PCC’s agreement of the assessment of residual effects set out in section 18.10 and table 18.8 of Chapter 18 of the ES (APP-133).   |  | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.5.15</b> | Requirement 13 – Contaminated Land and Groundwater  | The draft DCO (APP-019) and its Requirement 13 for a written scheme, per phase, to deal with contaminated land, including groundwater (LPA approval in consultation with the EA (and MMO for intertidal area)) is yet to be agreed.<br><br>Additional provision within Requirement 13 relating to unexpected contamination, and a scheme to deal with such contamination, remediation works, and verification is yet to be agreed. |  | On-going |

## 4.6. GROUNDWATER

Table 4.6 - Groundwater

| Ref.               | Description of matter       | Current Position   |   | RAG    |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|--------|
| <b>Groundwater</b> |                             |  |   |        |
| <b>PCC 4.6.1</b>   | ES Methodology – Study Area | It is agreed that the 0.5 km study areas as identified in section 19.1.2 of ES Chapter 19 (APP-134) is appropriate.  |   | Agreed |
| <b>PCC 4.6.2</b>   | ES Baseline                 | The baseline environment is set out at section 19.5 of ES Chapter 19 (APP-134) AQUIND welcome PCC’s review and agreement of this baseline for the relevant sections. | The Baseline environment for groundwater is agreed as a suitable for sections 4-10 (Portsmouth). The groundwater flows and levels data attained for the project from separate workstream of AQUIND, EA and PCC provide a good baseline of detail, and are also agreed. AQUIND are aware of the future WFD | Agreed |



| Ref.                        | Description of matter    | Current Position   |  | RAG             |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
|                             |                          |  | <p>classifications as a baseline, and further detail on how this will be achieved will be expected in the CEMP at detailed design stage, when dealing with groundwater encountered in trenches etc. PCC LLFA is okay to agree 4.6.2 ref: sections 4-10</p>   |                 |
| <p><b>PCC<br/>4.6.3</b></p> | <p>Predicted Impacts</p> | <p>The predicted impacts (section 19.6.4 to 19.6.9 of ES Chapter 19, APP-134) are considered in light of embedded mitigation identified in section 19.6.1. AQUIND welcome PCC's review and agreement that these represent an accurate reflection of the predicted impacts.</p> | <p>Predicted Impacts - disagree with 19.6.4.31. as PCC consider it medium to high likelihood groundwater will be found at trench depth, especially during / immediately after prolonged or heavy rainfall. 19.6.6.8 - At Detailed Design stage, PCC will ask for clarification of exact location of land drain east of St Johns College playing pitches. Extra care needs to be taken for discharge of groundwaters in this area as EA Main River 'Farlington Marshes Gutter' is home to protected species including water voles. 19.6.6.15 - again extreme care needs to be taken at HDD of Milton Common to not be causing pollution issues. PCC will expect Detailed Design Stage to clarify</p> <p>Also, PCC LLFA believes it will be difficult to design the groundwater mitigation as stated in section 19.6.1.4 as volumes may not be as easy to determine as seems to be expected. Trench work may indeed provide a groundwater flow pathway by penetrating a previously impermeable barrier. As such, PCC LLFA recommends a blanket worse case approach for the worst sections with groundwater found at a level high than bottom of trench level, with a scaled down dewatering approach if groundwater conditions are more favourable than expected. Also, there are other options for groundwater disposal, such as pumping to an infiltration pond that may be feasible. Predicted impacts are as best as can be agreed with the information available.</p> | <p>On-going</p> |

| Ref.         | Description of matter   | Current Position   | RAG  |                |
|--------------|---|--|--|----------------|
| PCC<br>4.6.4 | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – General Environmental Control Measures                        | The measures set out in section 5.6 (Groundwater) of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.  | Mitigation General - Agreed in principle by PCC, but needs also agreement from EA, Highways Authority (for discharge to highway drainage) and Southern Water (if discharge to adopted sewer is proposed). Recognition of good practice guidelines is noted. PCC will expect the full technical detail at Detailed Design Stage, in full CEMP | On-going - see |
| PCC<br>4.6.5 | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – Location Specific Construction Environmental Control Measures | The measures set out in section 6.2.5 (Groundwater) of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.  | Mitigation Location Specific - 6.2.5.1 the sewerage undertaker is Southern Water, NOT Portsmouth Water. As above, agreed in principle by PCC, but needs agreement from the other parties. Good practice guidelines again noted   | On-going       |
| PCC<br>4.6.6 | Residual Effect   | Subject to further discussion in relation to predicted impacts and mitigation measures, AQUIND seek PCC's agreement of the assessment of residual effects set out in section 19.8 and at Table 19.7 of Chapter 19 of the ES (APP-134). | this section is dependent on the above sections 4.6.3-4.6.5 and all comments there apply here also   | On-going       |

#### 4.7. SURFACE WATER RESOURCES AND FLOOD RISK

Table 4.7 - Surface Water Resources and Flood Risk

| Ref.  | Description of matter           | Current Position  | RAG      |
|---|---------------------------------|---|----------|
| <b>Surface Water Resources and Flood Risk</b> |                                 |   |          |
| PCC<br>4.7.1                                  | ES Methodology – Study Area     | It is agreed that the study area as identified in section 20.1.2 of ES Chapter 20 (APP-135) is appropriate.   | Agreed   |
| PCC<br>4.7.2                                  | ES Baseline                     | The baseline environment as per the details set out in section 20.5 of ES Chapter 20 (APP-135) are yet to be agreed. It is noted that PCC disagree with the baseline within Chapter 20. The Applicant can confirm that the EA flood maps have been updated since the publication of the ES and this is being reviewed with regards to the baseline environment. Subsequently, the Applicant agrees that the ORS building is located in Flood Zone 3.<br>The baseline for all other relevant sections of the Order Limits is agreed. | On-going |
| PCC<br>4.7.3                                  | East Solent Coastal Partnership | The East Solent Coastal Partnership are a body formed by PCC and it agreed that PCC will comment on behalf of the East Solent Coastal Partnership in this SoCG in relation to matters relating to the North Portsea Island Coastal Schemes (Milton Common and Great Salterns Quay, and Eastern Road and Kendall's Wharf).   | Agreed   |
| PCC<br>4.7.4                                  | Coastal Flood Defences          | It is agreed in principle that works adjacent to the coastal flood defences can and will be designed to avoid works to existing or proposed coastal flood defence alignments.   | Ongoing  |

|                   |   |  |          |
|-------------------|---|--|----------|
|                   |   | <p>The principle of a short HDD (HDD-6) under the existing coastal flood defence to the north bund, west of Frog Lake is accepted.</p> <p>Furthermore, the principle of the proposed Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD) under Broom Channel (Langstone Harbour HDD-3) to pass below or avoid any sheet piling associated to the coastal flood defence is also agreed.</p> <p>See section 20.7.5.6 and 20.9.2.3 of ES Chapter 20 (APP-135).</p>   |          |
| <b>PCC 4.7.5</b>  | Potential conflict with the proposed construction compound and delivery of NPI Phase 4                | <p>Details as set out in section 20.7.5.6 and 20.9.2.3 covering embedded mitigation associated with the ESCP coastal flood defence works within ES Chapter 20 (APP-135).</p> <p>PCC consider that depending on timing of the construction of the Proposed Development, there is the potential for conflict with delivery of NPI Phase 4 coastal defence works construction compound to the yard to the south-west of Kendall's Wharf. The Applicant is in the process of arranging a meeting with ESCP to discuss the timings of potential works.</p>  | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.7.6</b>  | Cumulative constriction traffic effects/ potential impacts on access to the NPI construction compound | <p>PCC are concerned that the Access and Rights of Way Plans include land to the east of the highway that raises potential concern that:</p> <p>(a) south of the Langstone Harbour Viewing Car Park where land will be realigned in 2022 as part of the NPI Phase 4 coastal defence works and</p> <p>(b) on the northern end of Milton Common, this area will be used as a construction compound during the NPI Phase 4 works and based on the current construction programme will be unavailable from April 2021 until September 2022.</p> <p>Details as set out in section 20.8.1.1 and 20.9.2.10 on cumulative effects within ES Chapter 20 (APP-135) are yet to be agreed. Further detail on Cumulative effects are set out in Chapter 29 of the ES (APP-144).</p> | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.7.7</b>  | Embedded Mitigation   | <p>Details regarding the existing and proposed flood defences and embedded mitigation in paragraph 20.7.5.6 set out in section 20.5.5 the ES Chapter 20 (APP-135) are yet to be agreed.</p>  | Ongoing  |
| <b>PCC 4.7.8</b>  | Predicted Impacts   | <p>The impacts of the Proposed Development in relation to the Onshore Cable Corridor and Landfall are identified at section 20.7 of Chapter 20 of the ES (APP-135). AQUIND welcome PCC's review and agreement that these represent an accurate reflection of the predicted impacts.</p>  | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.7.9</b>  | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – General Environmental Control Measures                            | <p>The measures set out in section 5.7 (Surface Water Resources and Flood Risk) of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.</p>  | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.7.10</b> | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – Location Specific Construction Environmental Control Measures     | <p>The measures set out in sections 6.2.6 (Surface Water Resources and Flood Risk) and section 6.3.5 (Temporary Surface Water Management) of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.</p>  | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.7.11</b> | Residual effects  | <p>Subject to further discussion in relation to predicted impacts and mitigation measures, AQUIND seek PCC's agreement of the assessment of residual effects set out at section 20.10 and table 20.12 of Chapter 20 of the ES (APP-135).</p>   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.7.12</b> | Requirement 12 – Surface and Foul Water Drainage  | <p>Draft DCO (APP-019) Requirement 12 requiring written details, per phase, of surface and foul water drainage systems to accord with FRA (APP-439) (LPA approval in consultation with the sewerage and drainage authority) are yet to be agreed.</p>  | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.7.13</b> | Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)   | <p>The measures set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (APP-439) are yet to be agreed.</p> <p>The Applicant agrees that the FRA (APP-439) requires updating following a change in Flood Zone from 2 to 3 at the ORS location. An updated FRA and sequential test is being produced to address the change in the Environment Agency flood date. PCC will need to review the updated documents and the measures set out within.</p>  | On-going |

|                   |                                   |   |          |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---|----------|
| <b>PCC 4.7.14</b> | Design and Access Statement (DAS) | The DAS (APP-114) which incorporates flood risk design measures for the ORS are yet to be agreed. | On-going |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---|----------|

## 4.8. HERITAGE AND ARCHAEOLOGY

**Table 4.8 - Heritage and Archaeology**

| Ref.                            | Description of matter       | Current Position  | PCC Position   | RAG      |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|----------|
| <b>Heritage and Archaeology</b> |                             |   |  |          |
| <b>PCC 4.8.1</b>                | ES Methodology – study area | It is agreed that the study area of 500 m as set out in section 21.1.2 of ES Chapter 21 (APP-136) is appropriate.   |  | Agreed   |
| <b>PCC 4.8.2</b>                | Engagement                  | It is agreed that engagement will be undertaken with the Hampshire County Council (HCC) Archaeologist, as representative for PCC.   |  | Agreed   |
| <b>PCC 4.8.3</b>                | Scope of Geophysical Survey | The scope is agreed with the HCC Archaeologist, and survey subsequently completed.  |  | Agreed   |
| <b>PCC 4.8.4</b>                | ES Baseline                 | The baseline environment is set out at section 21.5 of ES Chapter 21 (APP-136). AQUIND welcome PCC's review and agreement of this baseline for the relevant sections. Further to the identified areas of archaeological interest, Requirement 14 provides for the provision of a written scheme of investigation and is yet to be agreed. | <p>At 21.5.11.2. The applicant states that "this Section does not contain any Designated Heritage Assets but does lie within the vicinity of two Scheduled Monuments". It is noted that a Scheduled Ancient Monument is a Designated Heritage Asset.</p> <p>At 21.5.11.10. PCC also agree with the applicant's assertion that Fort Cumberland is considered to be of Very high significance, and that its setting makes a high contribution to its significance.</p> | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.8.5</b>                | Predicted impacts           | Impacts considered to have the potential to give rise to likely significant effects are set out at section 21.6.2 of ES Chapter 21 (APP-136). AQUIND welcome PCC's review and agreement that these represent an accurate reflection of the predicted impacts.   | At section 21.6.2 the applicant does not identify, acknowledge or address the impact of the proposed ORS on the setting/ open charter of the scheduled Fort Cumberland. PCC consider this to be a significant shortcoming, and do not agree that this represents an accurate reflection of the predicted impacts   | On-going |

|                  |  |   |   |          |
|------------------|--|---|---|----------|
| <b>PCC 4.8.6</b> | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – General Environmental Control Measures | The measures set out in section 5.8 (Heritage and Archaeology) of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.  |   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.8.7</b> | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – Onshore Monitoring Plan                | The measures set out in section 7.1 (Onshore Monitoring Plan - Heritage and Archaeology - Archaeological remains) of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.   |   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.8.8</b> | Residual effects   | Subject to further discussion in relation to predicted impacts and mitigation measures, AQUIND seek PCC's agreement of the assessment of residual effects set out at section 21.9 and table 21.6 of Chapter 21 of the ES (APP-136). | PCC do not agree with the applicant that during the Operational Stage, the only residual effect on Designated Heritage Assets would be in relation to Scotland (Cottage). This fails to acknowledge/ ignores the impact of the proposed ORS on the setting/open character of Fort Cumberland. | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.8.9</b> | Requirement 14 - Archaeology   | Draft DCO (APP-109) Requirement 14 requiring a Written Scheme of Investigation for areas of interest as identified in the ES (LPA approval), with works carried out in accordance with the approved scheme is yet to be agreed.     |   | On-going |
|                  |  | <i>Note that further reference to archaeology is contained within the Hampshire County Council SoCG as the archaeological advisor to PCC.</i>   |   |          |

## 4.9. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT MEETING HELD ON 08/12/20 TO BE UPDATED

Table 4.9 - Traffic and Transport

| Ref.                              | Description of matter               | Current Position  | RAG      |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|----------|
| <b>Traffic/Transport/Highways</b> |                                     |   |          |
| <b>PCC 4.9.1</b>                  | ES Methodology – Study Area & Model | The details within section 22.1.2 of ES Chapter 22 (APP-137)) and the Transport Assessment, incorporating the SRTM Scoping Note (APP-448) are yet to be agreed.   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.9.2</b>                  | ES Methodology - Scenarios          | The assessment methodology as per section 22.4 of ES Chapter 22 (APP-137) and the coding note to be tested within the SRTM is agreed.<br>The Transport Assessment, incorporating the SRTM Scoping Note (APP-448) are yet to be agreed, with PCC concerned that the "worst case" scenario modelling does not cover a possible cable route along the A2030 between Tangier Road and Eastern Avenue, or cumulative residual impacts of traffic merging to pass-by works. The Applicant has provided a Technical Note (ERTN01) which seeks to address the modelling queries raised by PCC. PCC are in the process of reviewing the Note to advise of the modelling is agreed. | On-going |

|                   |   |  |          |
|-------------------|---|--|----------|
| <b>PCC 4.9.3</b>  | Predicted impacts   | The predicted impacts are identified in section 22.6 (specifically sections 22.6.8 to 22.6.14) of ES Chapter 22 (APP-137). AQUIND welcome PCC's review and agreement that these represent an accurate reflection of the predicted impacts.   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.9.4</b>  | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – General Environmental Control Measures                        | The measures set out in the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 5.9 (Traffic and Transport) of the Onshore Outline CEMP, referring to the Framework CTMP and Framework TMS;</li> <li>Section 5.12 (Socio-Economics), of the Onshore Outline CEMP referring to the Framework CTMP, Framework TMS and additional traffic management, are yet to be agreed.</li> </ul> | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.9.5</b>  | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – Location Specific Construction Environmental Control Measures | The measures set out in sections 6.2.7 (Noise and Vibration), referring to out of hours working hours and section 6.2.9 (Human Health), referring to road closures and access, of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.9.6</b>  | Residual effects  | Subject to further discussion in relation to predicted impacts and mitigation measures, AQUIND seek PCC's agreement of the assessment of residual effects set out in section 22.9 and table 22.10 of Chapter 22 of the ES (APP-137).   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.9.7</b>  | Requirement 10 – Details of access to a Highway by Vehicular Traffic                              | Draft DCO (APP-019) Requirement 10 requiring written details of siting, design, layout, visibility splays, access management measures and maintenance programme for permanent or temporary access to a highway to be used by vehicular traffic (LHA approval) is yet to be agreed.   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.9.8</b>  | Requirement 17 – Construction Traffic Management Plan   | Draft DCO (APP-019) Requirement 17 requiring a Construction Traffic Management Plan in accordance with the framework construction traffic management plan, per phase (LHA approval) is yet to be agreed.   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.9.10</b> | Location of Joint Bays  | It is agreed that joint bay locations are to be discussed and agreed subject to DCO approval. The Environmental Statement Volume 2 – Figure 24.2 Illustrative Cable Route (APP-336), HDD sites and Joint Bays for noise and vibration assessment, provides indicative joint bay locations to aid discussions.  |          |
| <b>PCC 4.9.11</b> | Co-ordination of third parties on the public Highway  | PCC have advised that they may be operating a permit scheme by summer 2020, with a lane rental scheme to follow. The Applicant notes this position and welcomes and updates regarding progress of the permit scheme.   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.9.12</b> | Requirement 19 – Traffic Management Strategy  | Draft DCO (APP-019) Requirement 19 requiring a Traffic Management Strategy in accordance with the framework traffic management strategy is yet to be agreed.   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.9.12</b> | Requirement 21 – Travel Plan  | Draft DCO (APP-019) Requirement 21 requiring a Travel Plan for the contractors workforce (LPA/LHA approval) are yet to be agreed.  | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.9.23</b> | Abnormal Loads  | The Applicant agrees with PCC in that the reference to abnormal loads within the Framework Traffic Management Plan incorrectly states that "a vehicle is considered abnormal when... the gross weight is over 80 tonnes". This is to be rectified in an updated version of the FTMP to be submitted to the ExA for consideration to align with the definition (over 44 tonnes) within the Glossary (APP-006).  | On-going |

## 4.10. AIR QUALITY MEETING HELD ON 08/12/20

Table 4.10 - Air Quality

| Ref.               | Description of matter  | Current Position   | PCC Position  | RAG      |
|--------------------|--|--|---|----------|
| <b>Air Quality</b> |  |  |   |          |
| <b>PCC 4.10.1</b>  | ES Methodology – study area  | The area of study is agreed (as noted at section 23.1.2 of ES Chapter 23 (APP-138).  |   | Agreed   |
| <b>PCC 4.10.2</b>  | ES Methodology   | It is agreed that use of the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) Dust Assessment methodology, aligned with the Transport Assessment and modelling referred in 4.1.14 above), and set out in section 23.4.2 of ES Chapter 23 (APP-138) is appropriate. It is also agreed that the assessment should include emissions related to traffic diversions, construction traffic, and the temporary and permanent emissions from backup power generation. |   | Agreed   |
| <b>PCC 4.10.3</b>  | ES Baseline  | The baseline is set out at section 23.5 of ES Chapter 23 (APP-138). AQUIND welcome PCC's review and agreement of this baseline for the relevant sections.  | PCC query why the CAZ scheduled for implementation in November 2021 was not taken account of in the Air Quality modelling | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.10.4</b>  | Predicted impacts  | The potential air quality impacts are identified at section 23.6 of Chapter 23 of the ES (APP-138). AQUIND welcome PCC's review and agreement that these represent an accurate reflection of the predicted impacts.  |   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.10.5</b>  | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – General Environmental Control Measures | The measures set out in section 5.10 (Air Quality) of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.   |   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.10.6</b>  | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – Onshore Monitoring Plan                | The measures set out in section 7.1 (Onshore Monitoring Plan - Air Quality - Human and Ecological receptors) of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.   |   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.10.7</b>  | Residual effects   | Subject to further discussion in relation to predicted impacts and mitigation measures, AQUIND seek PCC's agreement of the assessment of residual effects set out in table 23.79 of Chapter 23 of the ES (APP-138).  | This is now agreed  | Agreed   |

## ONGOING: MEETING TO BE ARRANGED IN JANUARY

### 4.11. NOISE AND VIBRATION

Table 4.11 - Noise and Vibration



| Ref.                        | Description of matter   | Current Position   | PCC Position | RAG      |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--------------|----------|
| Noise and Vibration         |   |  |              |          |
| <b>PCC</b><br><b>4.11.1</b> | ES Methodology – study area   | The study area as set out in paragraphs 24.1.2.5 to 24.1.2.11 of ES Chapter 24 (APP-139) is agreed.  |              | Agreed   |
| <b>PCC</b><br><b>4.11.2</b> | ES Methodology  | The detailed methodology for construction noise and vibration assessment and baseline information set out in section 24.4 of ES Chapter 24 (APP-139) is agreed.  |              | Agreed   |
| <b>PCC</b><br><b>4.11.3</b> | ES Baseline   | The baseline environment is set out at section 24.5 of ES Chapter 24 (APP-139). AQUIND welcome PCC’s review and agreement of this baseline for the relevant sections.  |              | On-going |
| <b>PCC</b><br><b>4.11.4</b> | Predicted impacts   | The impacts of Noise and Vibration for the Proposed Development are set out in section 24.6 of Chapter 24 of the ES (APP-139). AQUIND welcome PCC’s review and agreement that these represent an accurate reflection of the predicted impacts. |              | On-going |
| <b>PCC</b><br><b>4.11.5</b> | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – General Environmental Control Measures                        | The measures set out in section 5.11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.   |              | On-going |
| <b>PCC</b><br><b>4.11.6</b> | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – Location Specific Construction Environmental Control Measures | The measures set out in section 6.2.1 (Onshore Ecology), referring to construction noise effects on Wintering Birds and section 6.2.7 (Noise and Vibration) of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.                        |              | On-going |

| Ref.                                | Description of matter                                     | Current Position  | PCC Position  | RAG             |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|
| <p><b>PCC</b><br/><b>4.11.7</b></p> | <p>Requirement 20 – Control of noise during operation</p> | <p>Draft DCO (APP-019) Requirement 20 with regards to the ORS, a noise management plan setting out particulars of noise attenuation and mitigations to minimise noise, and a scheme for monitoring and attenuation and mitigation measures, and a complaints procedure (LPA approval), in accordance with BS4142:2014 (<i>See below for ORS</i>) is yet to be agreed.</p> | <p>Requirement 20 refers to the operation of the ORS and there is no mention of the Converter Station. Whilst PCC agree that any plant could technically operate at back ground level with mitigation, these measures have yet to be agreed as the type of plant to be installed is not yet known.</p> <p>Noise levels for Requirement 20 2 (a) have been agreed (noise levels from plant/equipment at the ORS are to operate equal to background 43dB(A) daytime and 35dB(A) night time (ES Chapter 24 Table 24.53) and also in octave bands (ES Chapter 24 24.6.11.27 - 24.6.11.29) but no information has been submitted for Requirement 20 2(b) - mitigation or 20 2 (c) - noise monitoring for testing attenuation and mitigation measures. It is unlikely that these can be agreed until the plant/equipment and the design construction of the building is known.</p> <p>If the plant/equipment was to be operated at the agreed levels then it would not give rise to statutory nuisance or cause a loss of amenity unless there is equipment or plant failure giving rise to an increase in noise levels. Under S80 (7) of the Environmental Protection Act the company would have a defence to prove best practicable means were being used. PCC therefore are of the view that it is not necessary to have this Article.</p> | <p>On-going</p> |

4.12.

**SOCIO-ECONOMICS**

**MEETING HELD ON 16/12/20 AWAITING UPDATE**

**Table 4.12 - Socio-economics**

| Ref.                   | Description of matter                              | Current Position  | RAG      |
|------------------------|--|---|----------|
| <b>Socio-economics</b> |  |   |          |
| PCC 4.12.1             | ES Methodology – Study Area                        | The study area is set out in section 25.1.2 of ES Chapter 25 (APP-140). AQUIND welcome PCC’s review and agreement of the study area.  | On-going |
| PCC 4.12.2             | ES Baseline  | The baseline environment is set out at section 25.5 of ES Chapter 25 (APP-140). AQUIND welcome PCC’s review and agreement of this baseline for the relevant sections.   | On-going |
| PCC 4.12.3             | Predicted impacts                                  | The predicted impacts set out at section 25.7 of ES Chapter 25 (APP-140) are yet to be agreed.  | On-going |
| PCC 4.12.4             | Parking  | The details for parking set out in section 25.7 of ES Chapter 25 (APP-140) are yet to be agreed, with PCC concerned about the temporary loss of provision to Farlington Playing Fields.   | Ongoing  |
| PCC 4.12.5             | Access to Farlington Playing Fields/Bransbury Park | The details for access to Farlington Playing Fields and Bransbury Park set out in Table 25.14 of ES Chapter 25 (APP-140) are yet to be agreed.  | Ongoing  |
| PCC 4.12.6             | Time required for reinstatement of playing fields  | The details for reinstatement of open space set out in ES Chapter 25 (APP-140) are yet to be agreed, with PCC raising concerns about the time taken for reinstatement of pitches for re-use. Further detail on reinstatement options is provided in the Framework Management Plan for Recreational Impacts submitted to PCC for comment in advance of finalisation and submission to the ExA.   | Ongoing  |
| PCC 4.12.7             | Timing/ Temporary loss of open space               | The details of the timing and temporary loss of open space set out in section 25.10 of ES Chapter 25 (APP-140) and illustrative phasing included in Appendix 25.5 (APP-473) are yet to be agreed.<br><br>Further detail on how the impacts on recreational assets can be mitigated is provided in the Framework Management Plan for Recreational Impacts submitted to PCC for comment in advance of finalisation and submission to the ExA.   | Ongoing  |
| PCC 4.12.8             | Accessibility of allotments                        | The details as set out in 3.6.4.45 – 3.6.4.46 ES Chapter 3 (APP-118) confirming the cable installation via HDD under Milton Allotments, and confirming access over the paths during installation for monitoring works is yet to be agreed.  | Ongoing  |
| PCC 4.12.9             | Loss of Open Space regarding events / festivals    | The details of the residual effects on tourism (including the loss of open space set out in section 25.9.6 of ES Chapter 25 (APP-140) are yet to be agreed.<br><br>Further details on the illustrative phasing for retaining access to Farlington Playing Fields as shown in Appendix 25.5 (APP-473) is yet to be agreed. Additional detail on how the works at Farlington Playing Fields could be phased to allow use for the festivals is provided in the Framework Management Plan for Recreational Impacts submitted to PCC for comment in advance of finalisation and submission to the ExA. | Ongoing  |
| PCC 4.12.10            |  | The details included within Work Nos 1 to 5, with regards to the impacts on open space contained within Schedule 1 (2) of the dDCO (APP-019) are yet to be agreed.  | Ongoing  |
| PCC 4.12.11            | Maintenance rights                                 | The details for maintenance rights set out in 3.6.4.45 – 3.6.4.46 ES Chapter 3 (APP-118) are yet to be agreed, with PCC considering the rights to be too onerous.   | Ongoing  |
| PCC 4.12.12            | Temporary Diversions PRow                          | The details for temporary diversions set out in ES Chapter 25 section 25.7.2.34 - 25.7.2.38 (APP-140) are yet to be agreed.   | Ongoing  |
| PCC 4.12.13            | Cable works- Loss of business activity             | The potential impacts of the Proposed Development on business activity within the City of Portsmouth is not yet agreed.   | Ongoing  |

|                    |   |  |          |
|--------------------|---|--|----------|
| <b>PCC 4.12.14</b> | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – General Environmental Control Measures                        | The measures set out in section 5.12 (Socio-economics) of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.12.15</b> | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – Location Specific Construction Environmental Control Measures | The measures set out in section 6.2.8 (Socio-economics) of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.  | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.12.16</b> | Residual effects  | Subject to further discussion in relation to predicted impacts and mitigation measures, AQUIND seek PCC's agreement of the assessment of residual effects set out at section 25.10 and tables 25.15 of Chapter 25 of the ES (APP-505). | On-going |

## 4.13. HUMAN HEALTH ONGOING

**Table 4.13 - Human Health**

| Ref.                | Description of matter   | Current Position   | RAG      |
|---------------------|---|--|----------|
| <b>Human Health</b> |   |  |          |
| <b>PCC 4.13.1</b>   | ES Methodology – Study Area   | The study area is set out in section 26.1.2 of ES Chapter 26 (APP-141). AQUIND welcome PCC's review and agreement of the study area.   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.13.2</b>   | ES Baseline   | The baseline environment is set out at section 26.5 of ES Chapter 26 (APP-141). AQUIND welcome PCC's review and agreement of this baseline for the relevant sections.  | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.13.3</b>   | Predicted Impacts   | The predicted impacts are set out at section 26.6 of ES Chapter 26 (APP-141). AQUIND welcome PCC's review and agreement that these represent an accurate reflection of the predicted impacts.                      | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.13.4</b>   | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – Location Specific Construction Environmental Control Measures | The measures set out in section 6.2.9 (Human Health) of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.13.5</b>   | Residual effects  | Subject to further discussion in relation to predicted impacts and mitigation measures, AQUIND seek PCC's position on the assessment of residual effects set out at table 26.19 of Chapter 26 of the ES (APP-141). | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.12.8</b>   | Health- Access to Leisure Facilities and Open Space   | The details set out in paragraphs 26.6.3.17 to 41 of ES Chapter 26 (APP-141) are yet to be agreed.   | Ongoing  |

#### 4.14. WASTE AND MATERIAL RESOURCES

**Table 4.14 - Waste and Material Resources**

| Ref.                                | Description of matter  | Current Position   | RAG      |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|----------|
| <b>Waste and Material Resources</b> |  |  |          |
| <b>PCC 4.14.1</b>                   | ES Methodology – Study Area  | The primary and secondary study areas are set out in section 27.1.2 of ES Chapter 27 (APP-142). AQUIND welcome PCC’s review and agreement of the study area.   | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.14.2</b>                   | ES Baseline  | The baseline environment is set out at section 27.5 of ES Chapter 27 (APP-142). AQUIND welcome PCC’s review and agreement of this baseline for the relevant sections.  | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.14.3</b>                   | Predicted Impacts  | The predicted impacts are set out at section 27.6 of ES Chapter 27 (APP-142). AQUIND welcome PCC’s review and agreement that these represent an accurate reflection of the predicted impacts.  | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.14.4</b>                   | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP – General Environmental Control Measures | The measures set out in section 5.13 (Waste and Material Resources) of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.  | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.14.5</b>                   | Mitigation - Onshore Outline CEMP - Onshore Monitoring Plan                | The measures set out in section 7.1 (Onshore Monitoring Plan -Soils and Agricultural Land Use and Waste and Material Resources - Construction impacts to soil, waste and material resources) of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed. | On-going |
| <b>PCC 4.14.6</b>                   | Residual effects   | Subject to further discussion in relation to predicted impacts and mitigation measures, AQUIND seek PCC’s agreement of the assessment of residual effects set out in section 27.9 and table 27.22 of Chapter 27 of the ES (APP-142).                     | On-going |

#### 4.15. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

**Table 4.15 - Cumulative Effects**

| Ref.                      | Description of matter | Current Position  | PCC Position  | RAG     |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---------|
| <b>Cumulative Effects</b> |                       |   |   |         |
| <b>PCC 4.15.1</b>         | Methodology           | It is agreed that the approach taken to the assessment of cumulative effects, including the zone of influence is set out in section 29.4 of ES Chapter 29 of the ES (APP-144) is appropriate and proportionate, in accordance with PINS Advice Note 17 (Cumulative Effects Assessment). |   | Agreed  |
| <b>PCC 4.15.2</b>         | Costal Defence Scheme | Details of the cumulative effects associated with the coastal defence schemes set out within section 29.5 of ES Chapter 29 (APP-144) are yet to be agreed.  | Several meetings have taken place with our project team for our North Portsea Island schemes (which are potentially affected by the alignment of the Aquind scheme). These meetings have discussed programme/timings and how the projects can work together to minimise disturbance, maintain landscaping etc. We have also | Ongoing |

|                   |   |  |  |          |
|-------------------|---|--|--|----------|
|                   |   |  | discussed the requirement to ensure the flood protection is not affected |          |
| <b>PCC 4.15.3</b> | HRA – cumulative effects  | <p>Details of the cumulative effects associated with the HRA (APP-491) are set out within section 16.7 of Chapter 16 (APP-131) are yet to be agreed.</p> <p>PCC raise concern on the disturbance to SWBGS sites, specifically that the HRA in-combination assessment for onshore defers to the onshore ecology cumulative effects assessment. The Applicant is in the process of updating the HRA as it considers appropriate and will provide PCC and the ExA with the updated document for consideration once updated.</p> |  | Ongoing  |
| <b>PCC 4.15.4</b> | Cumulative effects and co-ordination of project and other planned works | <p>Details of the cumulative effects of other developments set out within Table 29.14 of ES Chapter 29 (APP-144) are yet to be agreed.</p> <p>The Applicant is in the process of arranging a meeting with ESCP to discuss the timings of potential works.</p>  |  | Ongoing  |
| <b>PCC 4.15.5</b> | Programme of works  | Details of the cumulative considerations regarding temporal scope set out within paragraph 29.4.5.9 to 11 of Chapter 29 (APP-144) are yet to be agreed.  |  | Ongoing  |
| <b>PCC 4.15.6</b> | ES Chapter  | The assessment of Cumulative Effects for the Proposed Development as set out in table 29.14 of Chapter 29 of the ES (APP-144) are yet to be agreed.  |  | On-going |

#### 4.16. ONSHORE OUTLINE CONSTRUCTION ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN ONGOING

**Table 4.16 - Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan**

| Ref.  | Description of matter   | Current Position  | PCC Position   | RAG      |
|---|---|---|--|----------|
| <b>Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (document reference 6.9)</b> |   |   |  |          |
| <b>PCC</b><br><b>4.16.1</b>   | Roles and Responsibilities                                    | The Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) and the personnel with defined environmental responsibilities as set out in Section 3 of the Onshore Outline CEMP are yet to be agreed.  |  | On-going |
| <b>PCC</b><br><b>4.16.2</b>   | General Environmental Requirements                            | The General Environmental Requirements set out in Section 4 of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirements and Consents;</li> <li>• Competence, Training and Awareness;</li> <li>• Internal Communication;</li> <li>• External Communication;</li> <li>• Method Statements; and</li> <li>• Environmental Incidents;</li> </ul> are yet to be agreed |  | On-going |
| <b>PCC</b><br><b>4.16.3</b>   | Monitoring and Review   | The CEMP and the proposal for an Environmental Manger to be responsible for maintaining the register of all environmental monitoring, to be made available for auditing and inspection as set out in Section 7 of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.  |  | On-going |
| <b>PCC</b><br><b>4.16.4</b>   | General Environmental Control Measures                        | The proposed general environmental control measures contained in Section 5 of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505), where relevant to the Onshore Cable Corridor are yet to be agreed.  |  | On-going |
| <b>PCC</b><br><b>4.16.5</b>   | Location Specific Construction Environmental Control Measures | The proposals for site specific management measures for Sections 4 to 10 as set out in Section 6 of the Onshore Outline CEMP (APP-505) are yet to be agreed.  |  | On-going |
| -   | -   | <i>For topic specific outline CEMP environmental control measures see the relevant specialist/topic areas.</i>  | It is difficult to see how this can be agreed within the SoCG when much of its content relies on the drafting of the DCO and requirement 15: |          |

## 4.17. DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER (INCLUDING REQUIREMENTS TO THE DRAFT DCO) **MEETING HELD ON 18/12/20**

**Table 4.17 - Draft Development Consent Order**

| Ref.       | Description of matter  | Current Position   | PCC Position   | RAG      |
|------------|--|--|--|----------|
|            | Scope of the Draft DCO and Draft Requirements  |  |  |          |
|            | PCC considers the dDCO to be continuing to develop iteratively and will want to review the dDCO as amended at following ISH1. This work is therefore ongoing. PCC would welcome the applicant convening a roundtable meeting with all local authorities present to review the dDCO in detail following the Deadline 6 update. PCC acknowledges that the wording of the dDCO is likely to continue to change until shortly before the close of the examination so common ground on the dDCO will broadly remain ongoing until then. |  |  |          |
| PCC 4.17.1 | Scope of Powers  | PCC consider the scope of the powers being sought through the dDCO (APP-019) are appropriate. PCC raises concerns on the securing of powers regarding trees, amendment of existing legislative frameworks, and departure from the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. | PCC consider the scope of the powers being sought through the dDCO (APP-019) are appropriate. PCC is pleased to note certain concessions but remains fundamentally opposed to the nature and breadth of the powers sought. In particular, PCC raises concerns on the securing of powers regarding trees, amendment of existing legislative frameworks, and departure from the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. | Disagree |
| PCC 4.17.2 | Operative Provisions   | The dDCO (APP-019) is being reviewed by PCC, and consequently the wording of the operative provisions are yet to be agreed.  | The dDCO (APP-019) is being reviewed by PCC, and consequently the wording of the operative provisions are yet to be agreed. PCC acknowledges that the wording of the dDCO is likely to continue to change until shortly before the close of the examination so this point will remain ongoing until then.  | On-going |
| PCC 4.17.3 | Discharge of Requirements (procedure and timescales)   | The dDCO (APP-019) is being reviewed by PCC, and consequently the procedure and timescales provided for the discharge of requirements are yet to be agreed. PCC consider the procedure and timescales provided for the discharge of requirements to be too short.      | The dDCO (APP-019) is being reviewed by PCC, and consequently the procedure and timescales provided for the discharge of requirements are yet to be agreed.  | On-going |



| Ref.       | Description of matter   | Current Position  | PCC Position  | RAG      |
|------------|---|---|---|----------|
|            |   |   | <p>PCC consider the <del>procedure and</del> 40 working day timescales provided for the discharge of requirements <del>to be too short</del> are adequate.</p> <p>PCC is concerned that the procedure for discharging requirements is unduly restrictive in relation to the request of further information.</p> <p>PCC fundamentally disagrees with any provision for deemed approval in the event that PCC does not respond in a specified time period; deemed refusal is the appropriate outcome.</p> |          |
| PCC 4.17.4 | Interpretation  | The dDCO (APP-019) and its explanation of meaning are yet to be agreed.   | The dDCO (APP-019) and its explanation of meaning are yet to be agreed.   | On-going |
| PCC 4.17.5 | Phases of authorised development onshore                          | The dDCO (APP-019) requirement for a written scheme setting out phases of the authorised development to be submitted and approved (LPA approval) are yet to be agreed.  | The dDCO (APP-019) requirement for a written scheme setting out phases of the authorised development to be submitted and approved (LPA approval) are yet to be agreed.  | On-going |
| PCC 4.17.6 | Works No. 4 – Detailed design approval (onshore HVDC Cables)      | The requirement of Works No. 4, details of the (a) proposed layout; (b) proposed cable burial depths; and (c) indicative location of the joint bays, link boxes and link pillars within the dDCO (APP-019) are yet to be agreed.                                    | The requirement of Works No. 4, details of the (a) proposed layout; (b) proposed cable burial depths; and (c) indicative location of the joint bays, link boxes and link pillars within the dDCO (APP-019) are yet to be agreed.  | On-going |
| PCC 4.17.7 | Works No. 5 – Detailed design approval (onshore connection works) | The requirement of Works No. 5, details of the (a) proposed layout; (b) proposed cable burial depths; (c) indicative location of the joint bays, link boxes and link pillars; and (d) optical regeneration stations within the dDCO (APP-019) are yet to be agreed. | The requirement of Works No. 5, details of the (a) proposed layout; (b) proposed cable burial depths; (c) indicative location of the joint bays, link boxes and link pillars; and (d) optical regeneration stations within the dDCO (APP-019) are yet to be agreed.   | On-going |

| Ref.        | Description of matter  | Current Position  | PCC Position   | RAG      |
|-------------|--|---|--|----------|
| PCC 4.17.8  | Requirement 11 – Fencing and other means of enclosure                  | The dDCO (APP-019) requirement that construction sites are to remain securely fenced at all times during construction and removed on completion of phase is yet to be agreed.   | The dDCO (APP-019) requirement that construction sites are to remain securely fenced at all times during construction and removed on completion of phase is yet to be agreed.  | On-going |
| PCC 4.17.9  | Requirement 15 - CEMP  | The dDCO (APP-019) requirement for a CEMP according with the outline CEMP, per phase (LPA approval). <i>See reference to Onshore Outline CEMP within tables below for specific topic/theme considerations</i> is yet to be agreed.                            | The dDCO (APP-019) requirement for a CEMP according with the outline CEMP, per phase (LPA approval). <i>See reference to Onshore Outline CEMP within tables below for specific topic/theme considerations</i> is yet to be agreed.                           | On-going |
| PCC 4.17.10 | Requirement 18 – Construction Hours                                    | The proposed standard working hours between 0700 and 1700 hours on weekdays and 0800 and 1300 hours on Saturdays, excluding public holidays, except in the event of emergency unless otherwise agreed (LPA approval) are yet to be agreed.                    | The proposed standard working hours between 0700 and 1700 hours on weekdays and 0800 and 1300 hours on Saturdays, excluding public holidays, except in the event of emergency unless otherwise agreed (LPA approval) are yet to be agreed.                   | On-going |
| PCC 4.17.11 | Requirement 22 – Restoration of land used temporarily for construction | The dDCO (APP-019) requirement for reinstatement of land to its former condition (LPA approval) within 12 months of completion is yet to be agreed.<br><i>Note open space reinstatement also covered in the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy.</i>  | The dDCO (APP-019) requirement for reinstatement of land to its former condition (LPA approval) within 12 months of completion is yet to be agreed.<br><i>Note open space reinstatement also covered in the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy.</i> | On-going |
| PCC 4.17.12 | Requirement 25 – Amendment to approved details                         | The dDCO (APP-019) requirement for development to be carried out with approved details unless any amendment or variation is previously agreed in writing with the relevant LPA or HA, being in accordance with the principles of the ES, is yet to be agreed. | The dDCO (APP-019) requirement for development to be carried out with approved details unless any amendment or variation is previously agreed in writing with the relevant LPA or HA, being in   | On-going |

| Ref.                       | Description of matter    | Current Position  | PCC Position  | RAG      |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|----------|
|                            |                          |   | accordance with the principles of the ES, is yet to be agreed.  |          |
| PCC 4.17.13                | Order Limits             | Details as set out in Environmental Statement - Volume 2 - Figure 3.2 Order Limits (Onshore) (APP-147) and Environmental Statement - Volume 2 - Figure 3.9 Order Limits Sections (Onshore) (APP-154) are yet to be agreed, with PCC considering that the Order Limits contain an unjustified amount of land which results in uncertainty for the Council. | Details as set out in Environmental Statement - Volume 2 - Figure 3.2 Order Limits (Onshore) (APP-147) and Environmental Statement - Volume 2 - Figure 3.9 Order Limits Sections (Onshore) (APP-154) are yet to be agreed, with PCC considering that the Order Limits contain an unjustified amount of land which results in uncertainty for the Council. | Ongoing  |
| PCC 4.17.14                | Part 3 – Streets         | Discussions are ongoing with PCC with regard to the rights to carry out works in the highway and the ability for the undertaker to utilise statutory highway powers to facilitate the carrying out of such works in an expeditious manner. The Applicant has confirmed that the dDCO will be updated to remove the ability to make permanent TTROs.       | Discussions are ongoing with PCC with regard to the rights to carry out works in the highway and the ability for the undertaker to utilise statutory highway powers to facilitate the carrying out of such works in an expeditious manner. The Applicant has confirmed that the dDCO will be updated to remove the ability to make permanent TTROs.       | Ongoing  |
| Working Hours (Exceptions) |                          |   |   |          |
| PCC 4.17.WH1               | Works No. 4, exception 1 | The proposed working hours exception for Section 5 Havant Road near Drayton between Farlington Avenue and Eastern Road – up to 24 hour working for one weekend (noisy activities avoided during darkness) or 0700 to 2200 hours for up to four weekends are yet to be agreed.   |   | On-going |
| PCC 4.17.WH2               | Works No. 4, exception 2 | The proposed working hours exception for Section 6 Fitzherbert Road and Sainsbury's car park – night works (noisy activities avoided during darkness) are yet to be agreed.   |   | On-going |
| PCC 4.17.WH3               | Works No. 4, exception 3 | The proposed working hours exception for Section 6/7 Farlington Railway Crossing (trenchless) – 24 hour working are yet to be agreed.   |   | On-going |
| PCC 4.17.WH4               | Works No. 4, exception 4 | The proposed working hours exception for Section 7 Langstone Harbour (Kendall's Wharf to Farlington Playing Fields HDD) – 24 hour working are yet to be agreed.   |   | On-going |
| PCC 4.17.WH5               | Works No. 4, exception 5 | The proposed working hours exception for Section 8 Eastern Road between Airport Service Road and north of Milton Common – up to 24 hour working, seven days a week for approximately 33 days (noisy activities avoided outside Harbourside Caravan Park during darkness) are yet to be agreed.  |   | On-going |
| PCC 4.17.WH6               | Works No. 5 (Onshore)    | Proposed Requirement 18, setting working hours between 0800 and 1800 hours on weekdays and 0800 and 1300 hours on Saturdays, excluding public holidays, except in the event of emergency unless otherwise agreed (LPA approval) are yet to be agreed.   |   | On-going |

| Ref. | Description of matter | Current Position | PCC Position | RAG |
|------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------|-----|
|      | Connection Works)     |                  |              |     |

#### 4.18. OPTICAL REGENERATION STATIONS

Table 4.18 - Optical Regeneration Stations

| Ref.                                      | Description of matter    | Current Position   | PCC Position  | RAG      |
|---|--------------------------|--|---|----------|
| <b>Optical Regeneration Station (ORS)</b> |                          |  |   |          |
| <b>PCC 4.18.1</b>                         | Location                 | <p>AQUIND wish to seek PCC's in principle agreement that the ORS should be sited at Fort Cumberland Car Park, being considered by the applicant to be the most appropriate location within 1 km search radius of landfall.</p> <p>Details considered in Chapter 2 of the ES (APP-117) from paragraph 2.6.6.22 is to be agreed.</p> <p>The site at Eastney is in use as a public car park, which is finished in rolled scalplings. The parking facility nestles inconspicuously into the scrubland character of the adjacent open space to the north-east, which forms part of a Local Wildlife Site encircling Fort Cumberland."</p> | PCC do not agree that the ORS should be sited at Fort Cumberland car park. However if the SoS agrees that an ORS is a legitimate part of this development, there is still insufficient evidence regarding its size and scale  | On-going |
| <b>4.18.2</b>                             | Parameters               | <p>PCC does not wish to comment on the appropriateness of the Proposed Development's design from an engineering point of view, though it is acknowledged and agreed that the Applicant has sought to incorporate a degree of flexibility within the layout and design.</p> <p>The flexible approach and maximum design parameters which are set out and secured in Table WN6 of Requirement 5 (Schedule 2) of the draft DCO are matters for further discussion. AQUIND would welcome PCC's review of these design principles and agreement that they provide appropriate guidelines for future detailed design. .</p>                | PCC notes that the applicant is seeking wide parameters, PCC considers this to be unnecessary and unjustified   | On-going |
| <b>4.18.3</b>                             | Detailed design approval | <p>The design principles for Works No. 5, optical regeneration stations, contained in the Design and Access Statement (APP-114) are yet to be agreed. AQUIND welcome PCC's review of these design principles and agreement that they provide appropriate guidelines for future detailed design.</p> <p>Proposed Requirement 5 of the dDCO (APP-019) is also yet to be agreed.</p>  | <p>PCC do not agree that the very limited design principles articulated in the D&amp;A (for the ORS) provide appropriate guidelines for future detailed design.</p> <p>The site justifies and requires more than simply 'adequate' mitigation of the scheme's impact. The scale etc of the compound is such that the LPA does not consider mitigation measures alone (which could themselves further erode open setting and context) as sufficient to make the scheme acceptable.</p> | On-going |

| Ref. | Description of matter | Current Position | PCC Position  | RAG |
|------|-----------------------|------------------|---|-----|
|      |                       |                  | <p>Significance of Assets – ‘flawed’ and downplayed</p> <p>PCC agree with the applicant’s assessment (as set out at 21.5.11.10. of the ES), that “The group of assets which make up Fort Cumberland is considered to be of Very high significance. Their setting makes a high contribution to their significance, derived from their value as a group and the preserved surrounding landscape which contributes to their context and understanding as heritage assets. Although the presence of modern residential developments has impacted on the asset’s historic setting”.</p> <p>The ES goes on to suggest that the car park (where the proposed structure would be located) does not currently contribute to the setting of the fort, “but as it is still flat does allow continuation of the historic ‘fields of fire’ from the ravelin towards Fort Cumberland Road”. PCC do not agree with this statement, and consider its reasoning to be flawed. Whilst the surface treatment of the carpark contrasts with its surroundings it is at present ‘open’ (free of buildings), and for this reason contributes to the significance of the fort by sustaining uninterrupted views within the asset’s historic field of fire (both from, and towards the asset). The introduction of a new structure (particularly of the footprint, scale, and height of the proposal) in this location cannot but erode and diminish the existing ‘openness’ which the car park and its environs provide and sustain.</p> <p>Assessment of Impact is considered to be downplayed</p> |     |

| Ref. | Description of matter | Current Position | PCC Position   | RAG |
|------|-----------------------|------------------|--|-----|
|      |                       |                  | <p>The ES analysis of the fort concludes with the assertion that the likely direct, permanent, long-term effect of the proposal on Fort Cumberland would be of negligible significance (prior to the implementation of mitigation measures).</p> <p>PCC are of the view that this assertion significantly downplays the impact of the proposal. It suggests that the applicant has brought insufficient consideration of the scheme's heritage impacts to bear in their justifications for its acceptability. This 'setting aside' of impact (implicit in the line taken by the applicant), lacks credibility and is in my opinion unconvincing.</p> <p>Impact 'less than substantial'</p> <p>Notwithstanding these observations, it is not asserted here that the impact of the structure, as it stands, would be 'substantially harmful' to the setting of the asset.</p> <p>It is also acknowledged that the proposal would inevitably require above ground physical infrastructure at landfall. In light of this the point of contention is the, scale, height, finish and overall physical 'presence' of the structure within its setting.</p> <p>Minimisation of Impact – unconvincing</p> <p>At p.43 (Para 7.5) - The Design and Access Statement which accompanies the submission suggests that the "The design and land take for the ORS and the Telecommunications Buildings will be minimised as much as possible".</p> <p>It is unclear why the site should accommodate telecommunications equipment (in addition to any machinery/ infrastructure required for the ongoing monitoring /maintenance of the interconnector). If the purpose</p> |     |

| Ref. | Description of matter | Current Position | PCC Position  | RAG |
|------|-----------------------|------------------|---|-----|
|      |                       |                  | <p>of this equipment is for example a revenue raising measure unrelated to the functioning of the interconnector, it is reasonable to suggest that its inclusion within the scheme (and therefore any increase in scale/impact which it necessitates), are unnecessary.</p> <p>It is also unclear why the proposed boundary/ means of enclosure around the site has the footprint it does. The 8m offset for example between the proposed boundary enclosure, and the buildings on the site is notable.</p> <p>These factors suggest that the statement made in the D&amp;S is also unconvincing. The approach taken is inconsistent with the 'very high' significance of the asset, and the value of its preserved surrounding landscape. Insufficient effort has been made to genuinely minimise the land take and other related design parameters for this structure.</p> <p>Proposal not capable of conservation support</p> <p>In light of this the proposal as it currently stands is not considered capable of conservation support. The proposal's impacts call for measures which go beyond the planting of soft landscaping around the structure to help 'screen' its presence.</p> <p>Reduction in scale/footprint required</p> <p>Insufficient effort has been made to ensure that the proposed compound is genuinely as compact/ small as it should/could be. The footprint/scale of the structure are considered excessive within their sensitive context, and in need of significant</p> |     |

| Ref.   | Description of matter                | Current Position   | PCC Position   | RAG      |
|--------|--------------------------------------|--|--|----------|
|        |                                      |  | revision (downsizing), it is suggested, by a minimum of at least 50%, The proposed height of the structure (4m) may also benefit from a reduction. |          |
| 4.18.4 | Fencing and other means of enclosure | Proposed Requirement 11 of the dDCO (APP-019) requiring permanent fencing to be completed before ORS is brought into use and maintained for the operation lifetime are yet to be agreed. |  | On-going |
| -      | -                                    | <i>For landscape associated with the ORS, see reference 5.9.3 within Table 5.9.</i>  |  |          |
| -      | -                                    | <i>For noise associated with the ORS, see reference 5.18.2 within Table 5.18.</i>  |  |          |

## 4.19. COMMUNITY FUND ONGOING

Table 4.19 – Community Fund

|                 |                |  |         |
|-----------------|----------------|--|---------|
| <b>PCC 4.19</b> | Community Fund | From PCC’s RR “PCC consider that a fund for community benefits to secure localised improvements for road users should be at least be required from Aquind to assist project mitigation. Biodiversity enhancement measures and a delivery programme for such improvements at Eastney after completion of works for the landfall underground connection bay should also form part of essential mitigation works.”<br><br>PCCs position is noted with regard to funding for the community and will be considered. | Ongoing |
|-----------------|----------------|--|---------|

## 4.20. TABLE 4.20 DEFINITION OF ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT

|                 |                                      |  |            |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|--|------------|
| <b>PCC 4.20</b> | DEFINITION OF ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT | The Examining Authority is directed towards following documents which clearly set out Portsmouth City Council's stance regarding the Fibre Optic Cable:<br><br>RR-185 Portsmouth City Council<br>PDA-003 Portsmouth City Council - Submission for procedural Deadline A<br>REP1-172 Portsmouth City Council - Deadline 1 Submission - APPENDIX A - Task A - Response to Examining Authority's first written questions<br>REP1-173 Portsmouth City Council - Deadline 1 Submission - APPENDIX B - Task B - Local Impact Report<br>REP1-174 Portsmouth City Council - Deadline 1 Submission - APPENDIX C - Task C - Written Representation<br>REP2-018 Portsmouth City Council - Deadline 2 Submission - Comments on responses to Deadline 1<br>REP3-025 Portsmouth City Council - Deadline 3 Submission - Comments on responses to Deadline 2 and draft Development Consent Order<br>REP4-034 Portsmouth City Council - Deadline 4 Submission<br>REP4-036 Portsmouth City Council - Deadline 4 Submission - Comments on responses to deadline 3 | NOT AGREED |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|--|------------|



|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>REP5-084 Portsmouth City Council Deadline 5 Submission - Letter regarding Fibre Optic Cable Development and Project of Common Interest</p> <p>REP5-086 Portsmouth City Council - Deadline 5 Submission - Transcript of Oral Evidence to be presented at Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1</p> <p>REP5-087 Portsmouth City Council - Deadline 5 Submission - Transcript of Oral Evidence to be presented at Issue Specific Hearing 1</p> <p>REP5-090 Portsmouth City Council - Deadline 5 Submission - Transcript of Oral Evidence to be presented at Open Floor Hearing 1</p> <p>PCC fundamentally disagrees that it would be lawful to include fibre optic cables and equipment as associated development for the purposes Aquind are seeking. The practical implications that this line of reasoning has had for the compulsory acquisition of land make this point especially stark: the addition of fibre optic cables to this electricity interconnector is directly responsible for the optical regeneration stations near Fort Cumberland and the Telecommunications Buildings at Lovedean and their excessive size. The ORS are designed solely to serve commercial data purposes totally distinct from the transmission of electricity. The dominance of the fibre optic elements of what is proposed as the actual Interconnector Scheme and which are wholly for commercial gain (in what is supposed to be solely electrical infrastructure) has become 'the tail that wags the dog' in this application.</p> |  |
|--|--|---|--|

**4.21. TABLE 4.21 RELEVANCE AND POSITION OF OTHER LICENCES AND CONSENTS (FRANCE)**

|                                   |   |  |                       |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------|
| <p><b>PCC</b><br/><b>4.20</b></p> | <p>RELEVANCE AND POSITION OF OTHER LICENCES AND CONSENTS (FRANCE)</p> | <p>The Examining Authority is directed towards the following documents which clearly set out Portsmouth City Council's stance regarding the uncertainties concerning the development proposed in France:</p> <p>REP5-084 Portsmouth City Council - Deadline 5 Submission - Letter regarding Fibre Optic Cable - Development and Project of Common Interest</p> <p>REP5-090 Portsmouth City Council - Deadline 5 Submission - Transcript of Oral Evidence to be presented at Open Floor Hearing 1</p> | <p>NOT<br/>AGREED</p> |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------|



## 5. SIGNATURES

---

| Ref.         | Portsmouth City Council | AQUIND (the Applicant) |
|--------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Signature    |                         |                        |
| Printed Name |                         |                        |
| Title        |                         |                        |
| On behalf of | Portsmouth City Council | AQUIND Limited         |
| Date         |                         |                        |

