The Planning Inspectorate
Yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

REPORT on the IMPLICATIONS for EUROPEAN SITES

Proposed AQUIND Interconnector

An Examining Authority report prepared with the support of the Environmental Services Team

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN020022

03 February 2021

[This page is intentionally left blank]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION 1
1.1 BACKGROUND 1
1.2 DOCUMENTS USED TO INFORM THIS RIES 2
1.3 STRUCTURE OF THIS RIES 2

2 OVERVIEW 4
2.1 EUROPEAN SITES CONSIDERED 4
2.2 HRA MATTERS CONSIDERED DURING THE EXAMINATION 5

3 LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS 6
3.1 SUMMARY OF HRA SCREENING OUTCOMES DURING THE EXAMINATION 9

4 ADVERSE EFFECTS ON INTEGRITY 10
4.1 CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES 10
4.2 THE INTEGRITY TEST 10

ANNEX 1: DOCUMENTS USED TO INFORM THE RIES 21

ANNEX 2: EUROPEAN SITES AND FEATURES CONSIDERED IN THE APPLICANT'S SCREENING FOR LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS 27

ANNEX 3: STAGE 2 MATRICES ADVERSE EFFECTS ON INTEGRITY 40

[This page is intentionally left blank]

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1.1.1 AQUIND Limited (the Applicant) has applied to the Secretary of State for a development consent order (DCO) under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008) for the proposed AQUIND Interconnector (the application). The Secretary of State has appointed an Examining Authority (ExA) to conduct an examination of the application, to report its findings and conclusions, and to make a recommendation to the Secretary of State as to the decision to be made on the application.

1.1.2 The relevant Secretary of State is the competent authority for the purposes of the Habitats Regulations[1] and the Offshore Marine Regulations[2] for applications submitted under the PA2008 regime. The findings and conclusions on nature conservation issues reported by the ExA will assist the Secretary of State in performing their duties under the Habitats Regulations and the Offshore Marine Regulations.

1.1.3 This report compiles, documents and signposts information provided within the DCO application, and the information submitted throughout the examination by both the Applicant and interested parties, up to Deadline 7 of the examination (25 January 2021) in relation to potential effects to European Sites[3]. It is not a standalone document and should be read in conjunction with the examination documents referred to. Where document references are presented in square brackets [] in the text of this report, those reference can be found in the Examination library published on the National Infrastructure Planning website at the following link:

https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN020022/EN020022-000996-Exam%20Library%20–%20Published%20Version.pdf

1.1.4 It is issued to ensure that Interested Parties including the statutory nature conservation bodies: Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) and Natural England (NE), are consulted formally on Habitats Regulations matters. This process may be relied on by the Secretary of State for the purposes of Regulation 63(3) of the Habitats Regulations and Regulation 28(4) of the Offshore Marine Regulations. Following consultation, the

[1] The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 as amended by The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 (collectively referred to as the Habitats Regulations). It is noted that the amendment regulations introduce new terminology including reference to the National Site Network rather than the Natura 2000 network, which remains the collective term for sites in the European Union.

[2] The Conservation of Offshore Marine Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 as amended by The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 (collectively referred to as the Offshore Marine Regulations) apply beyond UK territorial waters (12 nautical miles). These regulations are relevant when an application is submitted for an energy project in a renewable energy zone (except any part in relation to which the Scottish Ministers have functions).

[3] The term European Sites in this context includes Sites of Community Importance (SCIs) placed on the list of SCIs before exit day, Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and candidate SACs, Special Protection Areas (SPAs), possible SACs, potential SPAs, Ramsar sites, proposed Ramsar sites, and any sites identified as compensatory measures for adverse effects on any of the above. For a full description of the designations to which the Habitats Regulations apply, and/ or are applied as a matter of Government policy, see PINS Advice Note 10.

responses will be considered by the ExA in making their recommendation to the Secretary of State and made available to the Secretary of State along with this report. The RIES will not be revised following consultation.

1.1.5 The Applicant has identified potential impacts on European sites in EEA States[4] [**APP-491**]. Only UK designated sites are addressed in this report.

1.2 Documents used to inform this RIES

1.2.1 The Applicant's DCO application concluded that there is potential for likely significant effects on 15 European sites and therefore provided a report entitled 'Habitats Regulations Assessment Report Main Text' [**APP-491**] with the DCO application, together with screening and integrity matrices [**APP-501**].

Examination

1.2.2 In response to the ExA's questions and representations made by Interested Parties during the Examination, the Applicant provided updated versions of its HRA report ([**REP1-081**] to [**REP1-086**], [**REP5-016**], [**REP5-017**], [**REP6-034**], [**REP6-035**], [**REP7-029**] and [**REP7-030**]) and updated screening/integrity matrices ([**REP1-128**], [**REP5-018**] and [**REP5-033**]). Unless otherwise specified this report has used the Applicant's most recent revision of the HRA report.

1.2.3 For those European sites and qualifying features where the Applicant's conclusions have been disputed or queried during the Examination, following the submission of the Applicant's updated matrices, the matrices have been updated by the ExA, with the support of the Environmental Services Team of the Planning Inspectorate using the documents listed in Annex 1 of this report. The revised matrices are included as Annex 2 to this report.

1.3 Structure of this RIES

1.3.1 The remainder of this report is as follows:

- **Section 2** identifies the European sites that have been considered within the DCO application and during the Examination period, up to 25 January 2021. It provides an overview of the issues that have emerged during the examination.
- **Section 3** identifies the European sites and qualifying features screened by the Applicant for potential likely significant effects, either alone or in-combination with other projects and plans. The section also identifies where Interested Parties have disputed the Applicant's conclusions, together with any additional European sites and qualifying features screened for potential likely significant effects during the examination.

[4] European Economic Area (EEA) States.

- **Section 4** identifies the European sites and qualifying features which have been considered in terms of adverse effects on site integrity, either alone or in-combination with other projects and plans. The section identifies where Interested Parties have disputed the Applicant's conclusions, together with any additional European sites and qualifying features considered for adverse effects on integrity during the examination.
- **Annex 1** contains a list of the documents used to support the RIES.
- **Annex 2** summarises the outcome of the Applicant's screening exercise for likely significant effects.
- **Annex 3** comprises matrices for those European sites and qualifying feature for which the Applicant's conclusions were disputed in relation to potential likely significant effects and adverse effects on the integrity of European sites. They summarise the evidence submitted by the Applicant and interested parties up to 25 January 2021.

2 OVERVIEW

2.1 European Sites Considered

2.1.1 The project is not connected with or necessary to the management for nature conservation of any of the European sites considered within the Applicant's assessment [**REP7-029**].

2.1.2 The Applicant undertook an initial screening exercise to identify European sites which could be affected by the Proposed Development. This exercise was based on the identification of two study areas. The offshore study area for benthic habitats was defined in para 4.2.1.4 of [**REP7-029**]. For fish, marine mammals and marine birds the offshore study areas are defined in Table 4.1 of [**REP7-029**]. The Applicant applied the criteria listed in Table 6.1 of [**REP7-029**] to identify sites which could be subject to likely significant effects (LSE).

2.1.3 The sites and features identified through this exercise in the offshore environment are listed in [**REP7-029**] in the following locations:

- Sites with Annex I habitat qualifying features – Tables 6.2 and 6.3;
- Sites with Annex II diadromous migratory fish – Table 6.4;
- Sites with marine mammal features – Table 6.5; and
- Sites with marine ornithological features – Table 6.6.

2.1.4 The onshore study area is defined as the zone within 10km of the onshore and intertidal Order Limits (Section 5.1 [**REP7-029**]). In response to a query from the ExA, the Applicant provided additional justification for the extent of the onshore study area (HAB1.8.2 [**REP1-091**]). The exercise did not identify any further sites with Annex I habitat features (Section 6.3.1 of [**REP7-029**]) or Annex II animal features (Section 6.3.2 of [**REP7-029**]).

2.1.5 In the course of the Examination, the Applicant has made three change requests. The requests involved changes to the Order Limits to include or exclude parcels of land and to the rights being sought within the Limits ([**REP1-002**], [**AS-052**], [**REP3-019**] and [**REP7-078**]). The Applicant has concluded that the proposed changes would not affect the conclusions of the HRA report ([**AS-054**], [**REP1-033**], [**REP3-019**] and [**REP7-078**]). As of Deadline 7, the ExA has accepted two of the changes into the Examination ([**PD-019**] and [**PD-026**]).

2.1.6 No other sites or features were identified by any Interested Party which could be affected by the Proposed Development (but see Section 3 of this report for NE's comments on the effects on Portsmouth Harbour SPA and Ramsar site).

2.1.7 In addition to the change requests, the Applicant's revised HRA Report submitted at Deadline 7 amended the project description to include an additional cable crossing. This would be required to allow the Proposed Development's offshore connection to cross a proposed fibre optic cable running from Brighton to France (para 3.3.3.7 [**REP7-029**]).

2.1.8 The inclusion of an additional cable crossing is stated to affect the worst case scenario by increasing vessel movements by two return trips, increasing the maximum footprint of non-burial protection from 0.7km^2 to 0.74km^2 and an increase in the duration of the offshore construction programme by two weeks (para 3.3.3.8, [**REP7-029**]). The Applicant has not identified any additional sites or features which could be affected by the Proposed Development.

2.2 HRA Matters Considered During the Examination

2.2.1 The key area of debate during the Examination has been the potential effect on the brent goose (*Branta bernicla*) and waterbird features of the Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA and the Portsmouth Harbour SPA. The principal area of concern has been the extent of disturbance likely to be experienced by these species during construction.

2.2.2 The onshore cable runs through functionally linked land used by the species which are qualifying features of both SPAs, notably land identified through the Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy Sites (SWBGS sites). The Applicant has proposed mitigation measures to avoid impacts on the SPA and the SWGBS sites; the adequacy of some of these measures has been disputed by Interested Parties.

3 LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

3.0.1 The Applicant has described how they have determined what would constitute a 'significant effect' within their HRA report [**REP7-029**]. Potential in-combination effects are addressed in Section 8 of the HRA report [**REP7-029**].

3.0.2 The assessment in the version of the HRA report submitted at Deadline 7 reviews the potential effects (including in-combination effects) associated with the additional proposed cable crossing. It concludes that the effects associated with the construction of the additional cable crossing would not affect the conclusions of the HRA report in relation to the effects on European sites [**REP7-029**].

3.0.3 The plans and projects considered in the Applicant's original in-combination assessment are listed in [**APP-503**]:

- Table 1 – marine projects considered for effects on Annex I habitat qualifying features;
- Table 2 – marine projects considered for effects on fish qualifying features;
- Table 3 – marine projects considered for effects on marine mammal qualifying features;
- Table 4 – marine projects considered for effects on marine ornithology qualifying features; and
- Table 5 – projects considered for effects on onshore ecology qualifying features.

3.0.4 The location of the marine projects considered in the in-combination assessments is shown on Figure 8.1 of [**REP7-031**].

3.0.5 No additional sites which could be affected by the Proposed Development were identified by any of the Interested Parties. However, Interested Parties disputed the conclusions of the Applicant's initial assessment of LSE.

3.0.6 In relation to the Portsmouth Harbour SPA, the Applicant's original HRA report [**APP-491**] identified LSE only for the red-breasted merganser (*Mergus serrator*) qualifying feature and not for any of the other species which are also qualifying features. NE advised ([**RR-181**] and [**REP1-216**]) that the onshore cable route runs through sites identified as supporting habitat that form part of a network joining Portsmouth Harbour to Langstone Harbour therefore it would be used by the species that are qualifying features of both the Portsmouth Harbour SPA and the Chichester and Langstone Harbour SPAs [**REP1-216**]. The potential therefore existed for LSE on the other qualifying features of the Portsmouth Harbour SPA. The Applicant provided a revised HRA report ([**REP1-081**] and [**REP1-082**]) which included an updated assessment of LSE that considered the effects on the other qualifying features of the Portsmouth Harbour SPA.

3.0.7 The Applicant's original HRA report [**APP-491**] excluded LSE from visual disturbance during onshore construction works for the bird features of the Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA and Ramsar site. In response to a query from the ExA (ME1.10.33 [**PD-011**]), NE advised that visual disturbance immediately adjacent to the SPA boundary would qualify as a LSE if works were proposed during the over-wintering period [**REP1-216**]. While the Applicant maintains its position that birds would not be affected by visual disturbance in an industrial environment ([**REP2-008**], [**REP4-015**] and [**REP6-045**]) it updated its HRA Report to include visual disturbance on the SPA features ([**REP5-016**] and [**REP5-017**]).

3.0.8 NE [**RR-181**] and Portsmouth City Council (PCC) [**RR-185**] queried the scope of the in-combination assessment for onshore ecology. This was in relation to potential effects on functionally linked land used by the bird species which are qualifying features of the Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA and Portsmouth Harbour SPA/Ramsar site, particularly brent geese. Specific projects identified for inclusion in the in-combination assessment were:

- 19/01368/FUL Flood and Coastal Erosion Management Scheme - North Portsea Island Phase 4B Coastline Between Milton Common and Kendalls Wharf, Eastern Road, Portsmouth; and
- 19/00420/FUL Fraser Range Fort Cumberland, Southsea.

3.0.9 In response to a question from the ExA (HAB1.8.13 [**PD-011**]), the Applicant provided a revised HRA report ([**REP1-081**] and [**REP1-082**]) which included the Flood and Coastal Erosion Management Scheme – North Portsea Island Phase 4B (FCEMS Phase 4B). It advised [**REP1-091**] that the Fraser Range Fort development application was addressed in ES Appendix 16.15 [**APP-423**].

3.0.10 PCC advised that mitigation measures have been proposed as part of the FCEMS Phase 4B on Milton Common to avoid adverse effects on the integrity of the Solent SPAs, particularly the Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA [**REP1-174**]. It was concerned that the effectiveness of these measures would be affected by the construction of the Proposed Development.

3.0.11 The Applicant noted [**REP2-014**] that the FCEMS Phase 4B had revised its proposed mitigation and would no longer be using mitigation areas on Milton Common. PCC remained concerned about the in-combination disturbance effects ([**REP1-175**], [**REP4-009**], [**REP6-043**] and [**REP6-083**]).

3.0.12 Following the updates to the Applicant's HRA, NE agreed ([**REP4-015**] and [**REP6-045**]) that the FCEMS Phase 4B had been treated appropriately in the updated HRA report submitted at Deadline 1. NE also agreed that the Fraser Range application had been treated appropriately in Chapter 29 of the ES ([**REP4-015**] and [**REP6-045**]). However, at Deadline 7, NE stated [**REP7-107**] that it had become aware that a bird refuge for brent geese has been established on Milton Common. It advised that the bird refuge area should be recognised in the HRA report and measures should be taken to avoid impacts. NE recommended that the Applicant should mitigate effects on the bird refuge area on Milton Common in the same

way as it would for known SWBGS sites. NE also advised that a further area may come forward in relation to another planning application and that this second area should also be taken into account to avoid delays in the planning process.

3.1 Summary of HRA Screening outcomes during the Examination

3.1.1 A total of 25 European sites were screened by the Applicant [**REP5-018**]. Of these sites, the Applicant concluded that significant effects were likely for 15 of these sites. The Applicant revised its HRA report during the Examination to take account of concerns raised by Interested Parties. As of Deadline 7, the remaining area of disagreement on LSE was the consideration given to the interaction of the Proposed Development with the FCEMS Phase 4B mitigation measure, notably the bird refuge area on Milton Common.

3.1.2 The outcome of the Applicant's screening is summarised in Annex 2 of this report. The disagreement around the in-combination assessment is covered in the integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report. As no other areas of dispute remain for LSE, no other screening matrices have been produced.

4 ADVERSE EFFECTS ON INTEGRITY

4.1 Conservation Objectives

4.1.1 The ExA requested copies of the conservation objectives and relevant supplementary advice for conservation objectives (SACO) from NE (HAB1.8.18 [**PD-011**]). NE [**REP1-216**] provided a link to their Designated Sites View website as a route to obtain the conservation objectives and SACO. The ExA also asked NE if it was appropriate to rely on the SPA conservation objectives for the purpose of assessing effects on the integrity of the Ramsar sites for which LSE had been identified. NE agreed that use of SPA conservation objectives was appropriate but SAC conservation objectives should also be used where relevant [**REP1-216**].

4.1.2 The ExA noted that it was not appropriate for the Examination to rely on hyperlinks as a source of evidence and requested the Applicant and NE to agree the information and submit it into the Examination ([**EV-012(b)**] and [**EV-044**]). NE advised ([**REP5-097**] and [**REP5-098**]) that the Designated Sites View website format makes it difficult to download information into discreet documents. In their view it is appropriate to rely on the information available through the Designated Sites View system. The Inspectorate Case Team advised that the ExA would seek the information from the Applicant [**REP5-098**].

4.1.3 The Applicant [**EV-044**] undertook to provide the conservation objectives and SACO. At Deadline 6 [**REP6-058**], it provided a generic set of conservation objectives for the SACs and SPAs and reproduced the SACO for attributes for Chichester and Langston Harbours SPA, Solent and Dorset Coast SPA, Portsmouth Harbour SPA, Solent and Southampton Water SPA, Pagham Harbour SPA, South Wight SAC, Solent Maritime SAC, Plymouth Sound and Estuaries SAC, River Itchen SAC, River Avon SAC, and the River Axe SAC.

4.2 The Integrity Test

No Adverse Effects on Site Integrity

4.2.1 The Applicant concluded that the Proposed Development would not adversely affect the integrity of the European sites and features listed in Table 4.1 below.

4.2.2 The Environment Agency (EA) raised concerns [**RR-165**] about potential impacts on the diadromous fish qualifying features of European sites from offshore cable installation. The ExA addressed a question on this point to the EA and NE in their First Written Questions (HAB1.8.17 [**PD-011**]). NE advised [**REP1-216**] that it had reviewed the Applicant's assessment of in-combination effects on migratory fish and agreed with the conclusion that there would be no LSE (sic) on these features. The EA advised [**REP1-203**] that there was potential for the installation of the cables to mobilise sediments within the water creating a barrier for migrating salmon smolts which are a feature of the Solent Maritime SAC*. However, the EA was satisfied that the Applicant had carried out the necessary assessment and

proposed adequate mitigation to avoid significant effects ([**REP1-109**] and [**REP1-203**]).

4.2.3 Table 4.1 identifies where the Applicant's conclusion of no adverse effect on site integrity in relation to the European sites and qualifying features listed is disputed by Interested Parties during the course of the Examination up to Deadline 7. The only sites where the Applicant's conclusion of no adverse effects on integrity are disputed are the Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA/Ramsar site and the Portsmouth Harbour SPA/Ramsar site. Integrity matrices for these sites are provided in Annex 3 of this report.

* Based on the Applicant's matrices [**REP5-018**] and the conservation objective/SACO, Atlantic salmon is not a qualifying feature of the Solent Maritime SAC [**REP6-058**].

Table 4.1: The Applicant's shadow appropriate assessment and degree of agreement with Interested Parties

Features	Potential Adverse Effect on Integrity?	Agreed with SCNB and other relevant parties?	Comments
Solent and Dorset Coast SPA			
Little tern (breeding)	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**]	
Common tern (breeding)	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**]	
Sandwich tern (breeding)	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**]	
Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA			
Dark-bellied brent goose	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Shelduck	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Shoveler	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report

Features	**Potential Adverse Effect on Integrity?**	**Agreed with SCNB and other relevant parties?**	**Comments**
		assessment disputed by Interested Parties	
Wigeon	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Pintail	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Teal	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Red-breasted merganser	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Grey plover	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Ringed plover	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report

Features	**Potential Adverse Effect on Integrity?**	**Agreed with SCNB and other relevant parties?**	**Comments**
Curlew	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Bar-tailed godwit	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Turnstone	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Sanderling	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Dunlin	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Redshank	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Sandwich tern	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report

Features	**Potential Adverse Effect on Integrity?**	**Agreed with SCNB and other relevant parties?**	**Comments**
		assessment disputed by Interested Parties	
Little tern	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Common tern	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Waterbird assemblage	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
<u>Portsmouth Harbour SPA</u>			
Dark-bellied brent goose	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Red-breasted merganser	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Black-tailed godwit	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report

Features	Potential Adverse Effect on Integrity?	Agreed with SCNB and other relevant parties?	Comments
		assessment disputed by Interested Parties	
Dunlin	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Solent and Southampton Water SPA			
Mediterranean gull	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**]	
Sandwich tern	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**]	
Little tern	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**]	
Roseate tern	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**]	
Common tern	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**]	
Pagham Harbour SPA			
Common tern	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**]	
Solent Maritime SAC			
Estuaries	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**]	

Features	**Potential Adverse Effect on Integrity?**	**Agreed with SCNB and other relevant parties?**	**Comments**
Mudflats and sandflats not submerged at low tide	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**]	
Sandbanks slightly covered by seawater all the time	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**]	
Spartina swards	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**]	
Atlantic salt meadows	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**]	
Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**]	
South Wight Maritime SAC			
Reefs	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**]	
Submerged or partially agreed sea caves	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**]	
River Itchen SAC			
Atlantic salmon	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**] and EA response [**REP1-203**]	
River Avon SAC			

Features	**Potential Adverse Effect on Integrity?**	**Agreed with SCNB and other relevant parties?**	**Comments**
Sea lamprey	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**] and EA response [**REP1-203**]	
Atlantic salmon	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**] and EA response [**REP1-203**]	
River Axe SAC			
Sea lamprey	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**] and EA response [**REP1-203**]	
Plymouth Sound and Estuaries SAC			
Allis shad	No [**REP7-029**]	Yes – see NE response [**RR-181**] and EA response [**REP1-203**]	
Portsmouth Harbour Ramsar site			
Dark-bellied brent goose	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Chichester and Langstone Harbours Ramsar site			

Features	**Potential Adverse Effect on Integrity?**	**Agreed with SCNB and other relevant parties?**	**Comments**
Dark-bellied brent goose	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Shelduck	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Ringed plover	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Common redshank	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Grey plover	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Little tern	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Black-tailed godwit	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report

Features	**Potential Adverse Effect on Integrity?**	**Agreed with SCNB and other relevant parties?**	**Comments**
		assessment disputed by Interested Parties	
Dunlin	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report
Waterfowl assemblage	No [**REP7-029**]	No – scope of in-combination assessment disputed by Interested Parties	See integrity matrices in Annex 3 of this report

ANNEX 1: DOCUMENTS USED TO INFORM THIS RIES

Documents reviewed to support the RIES

Application Documents

- Habitats Regulations Assessment Report Volume 1 – Main Text [**APP-491**]
- Habitats Regulations Assessment Report Volume 2 Figures 4.1 – 4.8 [**APP-492**] to [**APP-499**]
- Habitats Regulations Assessment Report Volume 2 Figure 8.1 [**APP-500**]
- Habitats Regulations Assessment Report Volume 3 Appendices [**APP-501**] to [**APP-504**]
- Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development [**APP-118**]
- Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 6 Physical Processes [**APP-121**]
- Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 7 [**APP-122**]
- Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 8 [**APP-123**]
- Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 9 Fish and Shellfish [**APP-124**]
- Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 10 Marine Mammals and Basking Sharks [**APP-125**]
- Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 11 Marine Ornithology [**APP-126**]
- Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 16 Onshore Ecology [**APP-131**]
- Environmental Statement Volume 3 Appendix 8.1 Benthic Ecology Survey Report [**APP-377**]
- Environmental Statement Volume 3 Appendix 16.2 Preliminary Ecological Appraisal/Phase 1 Habitat Survey Report [**APP-377**]
- Environmental Statement Volume 3 Appendix 16.12 Breeding Bird Survey Report [**APP-420**]
- Environmental Statement Volume 3 Appendix 16.13 Wintering Bird Survey Report [**APP-421**]
- Environmental Statement Volume 3 Appendix 16.14 Winter Working Restriction for Features of Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA [**APP-422**]

Representations

- Applicant's Response to Written Questions [**REP1-091**]
- Applicant's revised Habitats Regulations Assessment Report Rev002 [**REP1-081**]
- Applicant's revised Habitats Regulations Assessment Report Rev002 – tracked changes [**REP1-082**]
- Applicant's Habitats Regulations Assessment Report Volume 2 Figure 4.4. Migratory Fish Transboundary Sites Revision 03 [**REP1-083**]
- Applicant's Habitats Regulations Assessment Report Volume 2 Figure 4.7 Marine Ornithology Sites in UK Marine Area Rev002 [**REP1-084**]
- Applicant's Habitats Regulations Assessment Report Volume 3 Appendix 1 European Marine Sites Screening and Integrity Matrices Rev002 [**REP1-085**]
- Applicant's Habitats Regulations Assessment Volume 3 Appendix 3 In Combination Projects Rev002 [**REP1-086**]
- Applicant's Habitats Regulations Assessment Report Volume 3 Appendix 5 Ramsar Screening and Integrity Matrices Rev002 [**REP1-128**]
- Applicant's Comments on Responses to ExA's First Written Questions [**REP2-008**]
- Applicant's Response to Written Representations [**REP2-014**]
- Applicant's Response to Deadline 1 Submission from persons not registered as Interested Parties [**REP3-015**]
- Applicant's Proposed Non-material Changes to the Order Limits and Rights [**REP3-016**]
- Applicant's Response to Request for Further Information - Environmental Statement Addendum [**REP3-018**]
- Applicant's Response to Request for Further Information in Relation to Proposed Changes to the Order Limits and Rights Sought [**REP3-019**]
- Applicant's revised Habitats Regulations Assessment Volume 1 Rev003 [**REP5-016**]
- Applicant's revised Habitats Regulations Assessment Volume 1 Rev003 – Tracked Changes [**REP5-017**]
- Applicant's Habitats Regulations Assessment Volume 3 Appendix 1 Rev003 [**REP5-018**]

- Applicant's Habitats Regulations Assessment Volume 3 Appendix 5 – Ramsar Screening and Integrity Matrices Rev002 [**REP5-033**]
- Applicant's Transcript of Oral Submissions for Issue Specific Hearing 3 on Environmental Matters [**REP5-069**]
- Applicant's revised Habitats Regulations Assessment Volume 1 Rev004 [**REP6-034**]
- Applicant's revised Habitats Regulations Assessment Volume 1 Rev004 – tracked changes [**REP6-035**]
- Applicant's Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan Rev005 [**REP6-036**]
- Applicant's Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan Rev005 – tracked changes [**REP6-037**]
- Applicant's revised Habitats Regulations Assessment Volume 3 Appendix 6 UK Sites Conservation Objectives and Supplementary Advice Attributes [**REP6-058**]
- Applicant's revised Habitats Regulations Assessment Volume 1- Rev005 [**REP7-29**]
- Applicant's revised Habitats Regulations Assessment Volume 1 Rev005 – tracked changes [**REP7-30**]
- Applicant's Request for Changes to the Order Limits [**REP7-078**]
- EA Relevant Representation [**RR-165**]
- EA Response to ExA's First Written Questions [**REP1-203**]
- Marine Management Organisation (MMO) Response to ExA's First Written Questions [**REP1-211**]
- MMO Written Summary of Oral Submission and Comments on Additional Information/Submissions Received Prior to Deadline 6
- NE Relevant Representation [**RR-181**]
- NE Response to ExA's First Written Questions [**REP1-216**]
- NE Response to Request for Further Information [**REP5-097**]
- NE Response to ExA questions set out in the Hearing agenda [**REP5-098**]
- PCC Relevant Representation [**RR-185**]
- PCC Deadline 1 Submission – Appendix C Written Representation [**REP1-174**]
- PCC Deadline 1 Submission – Appendix D Written Representation [**REP1-175**]

- PCC Transcript of Oral Evidence to be presented at Issue Specific Hearing 3 [**REP5-089**]

Statements of Common Ground

- SoCG with NE Agreed Draft [**REP1-105**]
- SoCG with NE Rev 002 [**REP4-015**]
- SoCG with NE Rev 003 [**REP5-027**]
- SoCG with NE Rev 004 [**REP6-045**]
- SoCG with NE and JNCC Rev 001 [**REP1-106**]
- SoCG with NE and JNCC Rev 002 [**REP4-016**]
- SoCG with NE and JNCC Rev 003 [**REP6-046**]
- SoCG with the Environment Agency (EA) [**REP1-109**]
- SoCG with PCC [**REP1-175**]
- SoCG with PCC [**REP4-009**]
- SoCG with PCC Rev 002 [**REP6-043**]
- SoCG with PCC Unagreed Draft [**REP6-083**]

Hearing Documents

- Issue Specific Hearing 3 (15 December 2020) Session 1 – transcript [**EV-044**]
- Issue Specific Hearing 3 (15 December 2020) Session 1 – recording [**EV-040**]

Procedural Decisions

- Request for Further Information from AQUIND Limited– Rule 17 [**PD-008**]
- First Written Questions [**PD-011**]
- Procedural Decision to Accept Change Request [**PD-019**]
- Procedural Decision to Accept Change Request (Interested Parties) [**PD-020**]
- ExA's Further Written Questions [**PD-031**]

Other Documents

- Additional Submission by the Applicant – Letter to the ExA [**AS-052**]
- Additional Submission by the Applicant – Request for Changes to the Order Limits [**AS-054**]

- Outline Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan Rev006 [**REP7-032**]
- Outline Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan Rev006 – tracked changes [**REP7-033**]
- Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy [**REP7-023**]
- Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy – tracked changes [**REP7-024**]

ANNEX 2: EUROPEAN SITES AND FEATURES CONSIDERED IN THE APPLICANT'S SCREENING FOR LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Features	Screening result*: LSE alone or in combination?	Assessment of effects on integrity undertaken?	Agreed with SCNB and other relevant parties?
Solent and Dorset Coast SPA			
Sandwich tern (breeding)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Little tern (breeding)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Common tern	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA			
Dark-bellied brent goose (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Concerns raised by IPs in relation to in-combination effects. See Section 3 of this report
Shelduck (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Shoveler (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Wigeon (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Pintail (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Teal (wintering)	Yes [**REP5-018**]	Yes [**REP5-018**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Red-breasted merganser (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Grey plover (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature

Ringed plover (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Curlew (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Bar-tailed godwit (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Turnstone (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Sanderling (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Dunlin (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Redshank (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Sandwich tern (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Little tern	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Common tern	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Waterfowl assemblage	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Portsmouth Harbour SPA			
Dark-bellied brent goose (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Concerns raised by IPs in relation to in-combination effects. See Section 3 of this report

Red-breasted merganser (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Black-tailed godwit (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Dunlin (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Solent and Southampton Water SPA			
Dark-bellied brent goose (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Teal (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Ringed plover (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Mediterranean gull (breeding)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Sandwich tern (breeding)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Black-tailed godwit (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Little tern (breeding)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Roseate tern (breeding)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Common tern (breeding)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Waterbird assemblage	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Pagham Harbour SPA			
Dark-bellied brent goose (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Ruff (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Little tern (breeding)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP

Common tern (breeding)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
River Itchen SAC			
Atlantic salmon	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Southern damselfly	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Bullhead	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
White-clawed crayfish	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Brook lamprey	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Otter	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Watercourses of plain to montane levels with Ranunculion fluitantis and Callitricho-Batrachion vegetation	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
River Avon SAC			
Sea lamprey	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Atlantic salmon	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Desmoulin's whorl snail	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Bullhead	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Watercourses of plain to montane levels with Ranunculion fluitantis and Callitricho-Batrachion vegetation	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
River Axe SAC			
Sea lamprey	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP

Brook lamprey	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Bullhead	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Watercourses of plain to montane levels with *Ranunculion fluitantis* and *Callitricho-Batrachion* vegetation	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	
Plymouth Sound and Estuaries SAC			
Allis shad	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Sandbanks which are slightly covered by sea water all the time	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Estuaries	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Large shallow inlets and bays	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Reefs	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Atlantic salt meadows (*Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae*)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Shore dock	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye Bay SPA			
Bewick's swan (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Shoveler (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP

Bittern (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Marsh harrier (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Hen harrier (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Avocet (breeding)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Golden plover (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Ruff (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Mediterranean gull (breeding)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Sandwich tern (breeding)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Little tern (breeding)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Common tern (breeding)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Aquatic warbler (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Poole Harbour SPA			
Bewick's swan (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Shoveler (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Bittern (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Marsh harrier (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Hen harrier (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Avocet (breeding)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Golden plover (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Ruff (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Mediterranean gull (breeding)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP

Sandwich tern (breeding)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Common tern (breeding)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Aquatic warbler	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Solent Maritime SAC			
Estuaries	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Mudflats and sandflats (not submerged at low tide)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Sandbanks slightly covered by seawater all the time	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Spartina swards	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Shifting dunes alone the shoreline with *Ammophila arenaria*	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Coastal lagoons	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Perennial vegetation of stony banks	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Desmoulin's whorl snail	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Annual vegetation of drift lines	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
South Wight Maritime SAC			
Reefs	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Vegetated sea cliffs of the Atlantic and Baltic Coasts	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP

Submerged or partially sea caves	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Solent and Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC			
Coastal lagoons	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	NE response [RR-181]
Studland to Portland SAC			
Sandbanks slightly covered by seawater all the time	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Southern North Sea SAC			
Harbour porpoise	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC			
Harbour seal	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Otter	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Large shallow inlets and bays	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Reefs	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Atlantic salt meadows	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Mediterranean and thermo-Atlantic halophilous scrubs	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP

Coastal lagoons	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Pembrokeshire Marine SAC			
Grey seal	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Otter	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Sea lamprey	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
River lamprey	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Allis shad	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Shore dock	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Estuaries	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Large shallow inlets and bays	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Reefs	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Coastal lagoons	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Atlantic salt meadows	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Submerged or partially submerged sea caves	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Cardigan Bay SAC			
Bottlenose dolphin	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Grey seal	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP

Sea lamprey	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
River lamprey	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Reefs	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Wight-Barfleur Reef SAC			
Reefs	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Agreed by NE [RR-181]
Portsmouth Harbour Ramsar site			
Dark-bellied goose (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Concerns raised by IPs in relation to in-combination effects. See Section 3 of this report
Intertidal eelgrass beds	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Chichester and Langstone Harbours Ramsar site			
Estuarine basins	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Dark-bellied brent goose (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Concerns raised by IPs in relation to in-combination effects. See Section 3 of this report
Shelduck (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Ringed plover (passage)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Redshank (passage)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature

Grey plover (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Little tern (breeding)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Black-tailed godwit (passage)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Dunlin (wintering)	Yes [**REP7-029**]	Yes [**REP7-029**]	As for dark-bellied brent goose feature
Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar site			
Wetland features	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Assemblage of rare plants & invertebrates	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Dark-bellied brent goose (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Teal (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Ringed plover (passage)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Black-tailed godwit (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Waterfowl assemblage	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Pagham Harbour Ramsar site			
Dark-bellied brent goose (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye Bay Ramsar site			
Wetland features	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP

Internationally important assemblages of vascular plants, bryophytes and invertebrates	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Waterbird assemblage	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Mute swan (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP
Shoveler (wintering)	No [**REP7-029**]	No [**REP7-029**]	Not disputed by any IP

ANNEX 3: STAGE 2 MATRICES ADVERSE EFFECTS ON INTEGRITY

Stage 2 Matrices: Adverse Effects on Integrity

This annex of the RIES identifies the European sites and features for which the Applicant's conclusions with regards to adverse effects on integrity were disputed by Interested Parties. Revised integrity matrices have been produced by the Planning Inspectorate.

Key to Matrices:

✓	Adverse effect on integrity (AEoI) cannot be excluded
×	No AEoI
?	Applicant and Interested Parties do not agree that an AEOI can be excluded
C	construction
O	operation
D	decommissioning

Information supporting the conclusions is detailed in footnotes for each table with reference to relevant supporting documentation.

Where an impact is not considered relevant for a feature of a European Site the cell in the matrix is formatted as follows:]

n/a

Stage 2 Matrix 1a: Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA – marine ornithology features

Distance to project: 0.1 km

European site features	Likely effects of NSIP														
	Disturbance and displacement			Indirect effects			Accidental spills			Litter			In-combination effects		
	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Red-breasted merganser (wintering)	× a	× a	× a	× b	× b	× b	× d	× d	× d	× d	× d	× d	× a × d × e	× a × d × e	× a × d × e
Sandwich tern (breeding)	n/a	n/a	n/a	× b	× b	× b	× d × g	× d × g	× d	× d	× d × h	× d	× d	× d	× d
Little tern (breeding)	× c	× c	× c	× b	× b	× b	× d × g	× d × g	× d × g	× d × h	× d × h	× d × h	× d × e × f	× d × e × f	× d × e × f
Common tern (breeding)	n/a	n/a	n/a	× b	× b	× b	× d × g	× d × g	× d × g	× d × h	× d × h	× d × h	× d × g × h	× d × g × h	× d × g × h

Supporting habitat	n/a	n/a	n/a	× b	× b	× b	× d	× d	× d	× d	× d	× d	× d × e	× d × e	× d × e

Notes

a. Applicant's conclusion (Section 10.3, Tables 10.1 and 10.3 [**REP7-029**]): Horizontal Direct Drilling (HDD) works in Langstone Harbour would take place over 4 km from the closest wintering site at Farlington Marshes. Noise and visual disturbance associated with construction and maintenance/repair works would not be noticeable above baseline levels of disturbance within Langstone Harbour. Whilst considered unlikely, should red-breasted merganser be temporarily disturbed from their wintering sites within Langstone Harbour, other equivalent foraging and roosting sites are present in Chichester Harbour. As there is no potential for adverse effects on integrity from the Proposed Development alone, there is no potential for in-combination effects.

b. Applicant's conclusion (Section 10.3, Tables 10.1 and 10.3 [**REP7-029**]): Where the cable corridor crosses Langstone Harbour, HDD would be used. The exit point is expected to be onshore, thus an increase in suspended sediment concentration (SSC) and any resultant smothering and/or reduced dissolved oxygen (DO) is not predicted to affect key prey species present in the water column at Langstone Harbour. Outside of Langstone Harbour, the permanent loss of fish, shellfish and benthic habitat as a result of non-burial cable protection is not predicted to affect key prey species since these measures will be limited in spatial extent.

c. Applicant's conclusion (Section 10.3, Tables 10.1 and 10.3 [**REP7-029**]): HDD works in Langstone Harbour would take place approximately 4 km from the closest breeding colony on Baker's Island, with little terns often foraging within 1 km of their nest site. Noise and visual disturbance associated with construction and repair/maintenance works will not be noticeable above baseline levels of disturbance within Langstone Harbour. Whilst considered unlikely, should little terns be temporarily disturbed from foraging habitat in the vicinity of the landfall within Langstone Harbour, other equivalent shallow water foraging sites are present within their maximum foraging range. There would be no adverse effect on site integrity from the Proposed Development alone.

d. Applicant's conclusion: Routine standard best practice waste management and pollution prevention measures and strict navigational protocols would prevent accidental releases of chemicals or litter during all phases of the Proposed

Development. There would be no adverse effects on site integrity from the Proposed Development alone. When these effects are considered in combination with other relevant plans or projects (Table 4 of [**APP-503**]) there is no potential for adverse effects on site integrity (Section 10.3, Tables 10.1 and 10.3 [**REP7-029**]).

e. Applicant's conclusion: Where the cable corridor crosses Langstone Harbour, HDD will be used. The exit point is expected to be onshore, thus an increase in SSC and any resultant smothering and/or reduced DO is not predicted to affect key prey species present in the water column at Langstone Harbour. Outside of Langstone Harbour, the permanent loss of fish, shellfish and benthic habitat as a result of non-burial cable protection is not predicted to affect key prey species since these measures will be limited in spatial extent (0.7 km^2 in total). When this effect is considered in combination with potential effects resulting from other relevant plans or projects (Table 4 of [**APP-503**]) it is concluded that there is no potential for adverse effects on site integrity in combination with other projects and plans (Section 10.3, Tables 10.1 and 10.3 [**REP7-029**]).

f. Applicant's conclusion: HDD works in Langstone Harbour would take approximately 4 km from the closest breeding colony on Baker's Island, with little terns often foraging within 1 km of their nest site. Little terns are known to breed and forage within Chichester and Langstone Harbours despite baseline levels of anthropogenic noise and visual disturbance. Disturbance associated with construction and repair/maintenance works will not be noticeable above baseline levels of disturbance within Langstone Harbour. Whilst considered unlikely, should little terns be temporarily disturbed from foraging habitat in the vicinity of the landfall within Langstone Harbour, other equivalent shallow water foraging sites are present within their maximum foraging range. Therefore, there is no adverse effect from disturbance and displacement. When this effect is considered in combination with potential effects resulting from other relevant plans or projects (Table 4 of [APP-503]) it is considered that there is no potential for adverse effects on site integrity in combination with other projects and plans (Section 10.3, Tables 10.1 and 10.3 [**REP7-029**]).

g. Applicant's conclusion (onshore effects): Unplanned or chemical spillages may occur during construction and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. Standard best practice in terms of pollution prevention measures as secured in the OCEMP [**REP7-032**] would make the likelihood of these events occurring highly unlikely and therefore not resulting in an adverse effect on site integrity. Potential effects from plans or projects would overlap spatially or temporally with the Proposed Development are considered to be localised and temporary. They would also be required

to adhere to similar best practice measures so there is no potential for in-combination adverse effects on integrity (Section 10.3, Tables 10.2 and 10.4 [**REP7-029**]).

Matrix 1a follows HRA Integrity Matrix 2D [REP5-018]. Matrix 2D does not appear to be consistent with the assessment in Table 10.4 of [REP7-029] which only predicts effects from onshore accidental spillages during construction and decommissioning. The Applicant is invited to clarify this point.

h. Applicant's conclusion (onshore effects): Unplanned disposal of plastic during construction and decommissioning has the potential to affect bird mortality through ingestion or entanglement. Routine mitigation measures of standard best practice in terms of waste management (see OCEMP [**REP7-032**]) would make the likelihood of these events occurring highly unlikely. There would be no adverse effects on site integrity. Potential effects from plans or projects would overlap spatially or temporally with the Proposed Development are considered to be localised and temporary. They would also be required to adhere to similar best practice measures so there is no potential for in-combination adverse effects on integrity (Section 10.3, Tables 10.2 and 10.4 [**REP7-029**]). (Section 10.3, Tables 10.2 and 10.4 [**REP7-029**]).

Matrix 1a follows HRA Integrity Matrix 2D [REP5-018]. Matrix 2D does not appear to be consistent with the assessment in Table 10.4 of [REP7-029] which only predicts onshore effects from plastic waste during construction and decommissioning. The Applicant is invited to clarify this point.

Supporting habitat is not a designated feature of the SPA/Ramsar site. The Applicant is requested to explain which of the designated features would be affected by effects on the supporting habitat.

Stage 2 Matrix 1b: Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA/Ramsar site (Onshore Ecology)

Distance to project: 0.1 km

European site feature(s)	**Likely Effects of NSIP**																	
	Disturbance and displacement			**Indirect Effects**			**Invasive non-native species (INIS)**			**Accidental Spills**			**Litter**			**In combination effects**		
	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Dark-Bellied brent goose (wintering)*	× ?a	n/a	× a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	× d	× d	× d	× e	× e	× e	× d × e × ?f	× d × e	× d × e × ?f
Shelduck (wintering)*	× b	n/a	× b	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	× d	× d	× d	× e	× e	× e	× d × e × g	× d × e	× d × e × g
Shoveler (wintering)†	× b	n/a	× b	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	× d	× d	× d	× e	× e	× e	× d × e × g	× d × e	× d × e × g
Wigeon (wintering) †	× b	n/a	× b	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	× d	× d	× d	× e	× e	× e	× d × e × g	× d × e	× d × e × g
Pintail (wintering)†	× b	n/a	× b	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	× d	× d	× d	× e	× e	× e	× d	× d × e	× d

																× e × g		× e × g
Teal (wintering) †	× b	n/a	× b	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	× d	× d	× d	× e	× e	× e	× d × e × g	× d × e	× d × e × g
Grey Plover (wintering)*	× b	n/a	× b	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	× d	× d	× d	× e	× e	× e	× d × e × g	× d × e	× d × e × g
Ringed plover (wintering)*		n/a		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	× d	× d	× d	× e	× e	× e	× d × e	× d × e	× d × e
Curlew (wintering) †	× b	n/a	× b	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	× d	× d	× d	× e	× e	× e	× d × e × g	× d × e	× d × e × g
Bar-tailed godwit (wintering) †	× b	n/a	× b	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	× d	× d	× d	× e	× e	× e	× d × e × g	× d × e	× d × e × g
Turnstone (wintering) †		n/a		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	× d	× d	× d	× e	× e	× e	× d × e × f	× d × e	× d × e × f

Sanderling (wintering) †	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	× d	× d	× d	× e	× e	× e	× d × e	× d × e	× d × e
Dunlin (wintering)*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	× d	× d	× d	× e	× e	× e	× d × e	× d × e	× d × e
Redshank (wintering)*	× b	n/a	× b	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	× d	× d	× d	× e	× e	× e	× d × e × g	× d × e	× d × e × g
Waterfowl Assemblage (wintering)*	× a	n/a	× a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	× d	× d	× d	× e	× e	× e	× d × e	× d × e	× d × e
Black-tailed godwit (passage)**	× b		× b							× d	× d	× d	× e	× e	× e	× d × e	× d × e	× d × e
Supporting Habitat Freshwater and coastal grazing marsh	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	× c	n/a	× c	× d	× d	× d	× e	× e	× e	× d × e	× d × e	× d × e

† SPA qualifying feature only

* SPA and Ramsar qualifying feature

** Ramsar feature only

Notes

a. Applicant's conclusions: (Section 10.3, Tables 10.2 and 10.4 [**REP7-029**]) Effects of the construction stage on Chichester and Langstone Harbour SPA and the dark-bellied brent goose and the waterfowl assemblage features would

be avoided by restricting works on sites identified within the SWBGS sites as land used by the brent geese. The restrictions would apply within the winter season (defined as October to March) when the birds are present. The restrictions would be based on the six winter working principles initially described in ES Chapter 16 [**APP-131**] and ES Appendix 16.14 [**APP-422**].

NE raised concerns about the adequacy of several principles, the potential for visual disturbance to overwintering birds and whether it would be possible to fully restore affected SWBGS sites before the next winter as required by the principles ([**RR-181**] and [**REP1-216**]. The Applicant provided additional information on noise modelling and a revised version of the principles ([**REP1-139**], [**REP1-081**] and [**REP1-082**]). It advised that while it did not agree that visual disturbance would not give rise to LSE, where the onshore cable route is adjacent to the SPA or to SWBGS sites, the winter working principles preclude construction work in the overwintering period because of potential noise impacts [**REP2-008**]. However, it undertook to provide an updated HRA [**REP5-069**] which included an assessment of visual disturbance. The version of the HRA submitted at Deadline 7 concluded that adverse effects on integrity from disturbance and displacement during construction would be avoided for the following reasons (Table 10.4 [**REP7-029**]):

- Principle 1 states that no construction works would take place between October and March (when the birds are present) in SWBGS sites classed as core, primary support, secondary support low use or candidate, apart from SWBGS site P11 which is a car park already disturbed by vehicle movements.
- Principle 6 states that percussive piling or works with heavy machinery (defined as plant resulting in a noise level in excess of 69dB LAmax measured at the sensitive receptor) should be avoided between October and March. Trenching/road saw noise at 69dB LAmax would overlap with 14 SWBGS sites to varying extents. For 12 of these sites, construction work would be restricted between October and March. For the remaining two SWBGS sites, buildings between the construction works and the sites are expected to buffer the noise so that the sites (P54 and P29) are excluded from the restriction.
- HDD works are expected to require the insertion of sheet piles, generating percussive noise at the locations shown on Plate 6.1 of the OCEMP [**REP7-032**]. The OCEMP [**REP7-032**] requires the use of screening at least 2m high around the HDD compounds for the purposes of noise mitigation (example screening solutions are shown in Plate 6.1 of the OCEMP [**REP7-032**]). When the effects of the screening are taken into account, only

two HDD locations (HDD-3 and HDD-6 as shown on Plate 6.1 of the OCEMP [**REP7-032**]) are identified which could lead to noise levels of 69dB LAmax affecting SWGBS sites. For HDD-3, noise levels are not expected to extend beyond the site compound so would only affect areas of hardstanding. Noise levels from HDD-6 would marginally overlap with SWBGS site P23A but as the HDD compound lies within the SWGBS site, work between October and March is restricted by Principle 1.

- The SPA is in an urban setting; recent research has established that visual disturbance does not have a significant impact on waterbirds in an estuary. In addition, screening at the perimeter of the HDD compounds would reduce the visual disturbance to indistinguishable levels regardless of the baseline environment.
- Restoration measures and aftercare for SWBGS sites where works have been carried out are outlined in the OCEMP [**REP7-032**]. SWBGS sites P11, P23A, P23B and P23R would be restored before October. For SWBGS site P08A it is considered unlikely that restoration would not be possible until the start of October and a minimum of 2 – 3 weeks would be required for the re-establishment of the grass sward required for geese grazing.

The winter working principles are listed in the OCEMP [**REP7-032**] and the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (OLBS) [**REP7-023**].

Following the revisions to the HRA report, NE agreed that adverse effects on integrity could be excluded for the Proposed Development alone ([**REP5-097**] and [**REP6-045**]).

PCC remained concerned about the potential effects on brent geese ([**REP1-174**], [**REP1-175**], [**REP4-009**], [**REP6-043**] and [**REP6-083**]). It agreed with the proposed measures in principle but did not agree that sufficient information had been provided on the details of the mitigation measures, particularly in relation to the restoration of SWBGS sites [**REP1-174**].

b. Applicant's conclusions (Section 10.3, Tables 10.2 and 10.4 [**REP7-029**]): The winter working principles described in footnote b would also avoid effects on the waterbird features of the SPA. All species were found to be restricted to intertidal habitat during baseline surveys of the Proposed Development. Noise effects from both trenching /road saw and HDD works overlaps at 69db LAmax would be extremely limited with regards to intertidal habitat of the SPA. Trenching/road saw construction would be restricted along Eastern Road because of overlap with SWBGS sites so this

section would not lead to any disturbance to adjacent intertidal habitat. The only other section of the route that is restricted by Principle 6 is the section of the Onshore Cable Route from Milton Locks north to the P23B SWBGS site. Visual disturbance would be reduced to indistinguishable levels regardless of the baseline environment for the reasons described under footnote a.

Following the revisions to the HRA report, NE agreed that adverse effects on integrity could be excluded for the Proposed Development alone ([**REP5-097**] and [**REP6-045**]).

PCC remained concerned about the potential effects on the qualifying features of the SPA ([**REP1-174**], [**REP1-175**], [**REP4-009**], [**REP6-043**] and [**REP6-083**]). It agreed with the proposed measures in principle but did not agree that sufficient information had been provided on the details of the mitigation measures, particularly in relation to the restoration of SWBGS sites [**REP1-174**].

c. Applicant's conclusions (Section 10.3, Tables 10.2 and 10.4 [**REP7-029**]): No habitat within the SPA site would be lost on either a permanent or temporary basis as a result of onshore construction/decommissioning activities. SWBGS sites within the Order Limits would be restored as described in the OCEMP [**REP7-032**], either through re-seeding or re-turfing. Components of P08A would not be restored until the month of October. No data has been located which shows arrival dates at this SWBGS site or the wider SPA but it can be expected that smaller numbers will be present in October. National census data gathered by the British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) through their Wetland Bird Survey (WeBS) shows that the number presents in England during October are approximately 30% of those during the peak month of January. The October restoration area of 1.7ha accounts for 12% of the P08A SWBGS site, 1.2% of SWGBS core sites and 0.2% of the entire SWBGS site network. The habitat loss would be temporary, covering at most 17% of a single non-breeding season and during a period when the majority of the brent goose population would not be present. The P08A site would be restored in advance for period when peak numbers of geese are present in the region. The effect would be de minimis so there would be no adverse effect on site integrity.

Supporting habitat is not a designated feature of the SPA/Ramsar site. The Applicant is requested to explain which of the designated features would be affected by effects on the supporting habitat.

d. Applicant's conclusion (Section 10.3, Tables 10.2 and 10.4 [**REP7-029**]): Unplanned or chemical spillages may occur during construction and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. Standard best practice in terms of pollution

prevention measures as secured through the OCEMP [**REP7-032**] would make the likelihood of these events occurring highly unlikely and therefore would not result in an adverse effect on site integrity. Potential effects from plans or projects would overlap spatially or temporally with the Proposed Development are considered to be localised and temporary. They would also be required to adhere to similar best practice measures so there is no potential for in-combination adverse effects on integrity.

Matrix 1b follows HRA Integrity Matrix 2C [REP5-018]. Matrix 2D does not appear to be consistent with the assessment in Table 10.4 of [REP7-029] which only predicts effects from accidental spillages during construction and decommissioning. The Applicant is invited to clarify this point.

e. Applicant's conclusion (Section 10.3, Tables 10.2 and 10.4 [**REP7-029**]): Unplanned disposal of plastic during construction and decommissioning has the potential to affect bird mortality through ingestion or entanglement. Routine mitigation measures of standard best practice in terms of waste management (see OCEMP [**REP7-032**]) would make the likelihood of these events occurring highly unlikely. There would be no adverse effects on site integrity. Potential effects from plans or projects would overlap spatially or temporally with the Proposed Development are considered to be localised and temporary. They would also be required to adhere to similar best practice measures so there is no potential for in-combination adverse effects on integrity (Section 10.3, Tables 10.2 and 10.4 [**REP7-029**]).

Matrix 1b follows HRA Integrity Matrix 2C [REP5-018]. Matrix 2D does not appear to be consistent with the assessment in Table 10.4 of [REP7-029] which only predicts effects from plastic waste during construction and decommissioning. The Applicant is invited to clarify this point.

f. Applicant's conclusions (Section 10.3 Tables 10.2 and 10.4 [**REP7-029**]): Potential effects from the plans and projects which would overlap temporally or spatially with the Proposed Development are considered to be localised and temporary. The mitigation measures described under footnote a minimise the contribution of the Proposed Development to in-combination effects. The FCEMS Phase 4B includes a full winter working restriction so would not disturb the brent geese. Potential overlap between the Proposed Development Order Limits and mitigation areas of the FCEMS Phase 4B would occur if the Proposed Development takes the southern route option round Milton Common. However, the measures on Milton Common are not part of the proposed mitigation/compensation measures for the

FCEMS Phase 4B as shown on the most recent documents submitted to discharge the relevant planning conditions for this project (see also [**REP2-014**]). There would be no in-combination effects on site integrity.

PCC [**RR-185**] queried the scope of the Applicant's in-combination assessment of disturbance and displacement effects. PCC advised that mitigation measures have been proposed as part of the FCEMS Phase 4B on Milton Common to avoid adverse effects on the integrity of the Solent SPAs, particularly the Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA [**REP1-174**]. It was concerned that the effectiveness of these measures would be affected by the construction of the Proposed Development. As of Deadline 7 these concerns remained ([**REP1-175**], [**REP4-009**], [**REP6-043**] and [**REP6-083**]).

NE [**RR-181**] initially raised similar concerns in relation to the in-combination assessment. Following the Applicant's revisions to their HRA report, NE agreed with the Applicant's conclusion that there would be no in-combination effects on the integrity of the SPA [**REP6-045**]. However, at Deadline 7 it advised that a bird refuge had been established on Milton Common and that an additional area may also come forward in relation to another planning application. It advised that these areas should be included in the Applicant's HRA [**REP7-107**].

g. Applicant's conclusions (Section 10.3, Tables 10.2 and 10.4 [**REP7-029**]): The contribution of the Proposed Development to in-combination effects would be minimal for the reasons described under footnote b. The FCEMS Phase 4B includes a full winter working restriction (October – March) so would not disturb features of the SPA. There would be no in-combination effects on site integrity.

Stage 2 Matrix 2: Portsmouth Harbour SPA/Ramsar site

Distance to project: 4.9km

European site feature(s)	**Likely Effects of NSIP**																	
	Disturbance and displacement			**Indirect Effects**			**Invasive non-native species (INIS)**			**Accidental Spills**			**Litter**			**In combination effects**		
	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Dark-bellied brent goose (wintering)*	×?a	n/a	×a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	×c	×c	×c	×d	×d	×d	×c ×d ×?f	×c ×d	×c ×d ×?f
Red-breasted merganser (wintering)†	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	×b	×b	×b	×b	×b	×b	×b	×b	×b
Black-tailed godwit (wintering)†	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	×c	×c	×c	×d	×d	×d	×c ×d	×c ×d	×c ×d
Dunlin (wintering)†	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	×c	×c	×c	×d	×d	×d	×c ×d	×c ×d	×c ×d
Supporting habitat (water column)	n/a	n/a	n/a							×b	×b	×b	×b	×b	×b	×b	×b	×b
Supporting habitat	n/a	n/a	n/a	×e		×e				×c	×c	×c	×d	×d	×d	×c	×c	×c

(freshwater and grazing marsh)																×d	×d	×d

* SPA/Ramsar feature

† SPA feature only

Notes

a. Applicant's conclusions: (Section 10.5, Tables 10.8 and 10.10 [**REP7-029**]): See footnote a to Matrix 1b above.

b. Applicant's conclusions (Section 10.5, Tables 10.7 and 10.9): Routine mitigation measures of standard best practice in terms of waste management, pollution prevention measures and strict navigational protocols would prevent accidental releases of chemicals or litter in the marine environment during all phases of the Proposed Development. There would be no adverse effect on site integrity from the Proposed Development alone. Given the scale and nature of other proposed plans and projects, combined with the requirement for those projects to also employ best practice measures means that in-combination effects on integrity would not arise.

c. Applicant's conclusion (Section 10.5, Tables 10.8 and 10.10 [**REP7-029**]): See footnote d to Matrix 1b above.

Matrix 2 follows HRA Integrity Matrices 3C and 3D[REP5-018]. Matrices 3C and 3D do not appear to be consistent with the assessment in Table 10.10 of [REP7-029] which only predicts effects from accidental spillages during construction and decommissioning. The Applicant is invited to clarify this point.

d. Applicant's conclusion (Section 10.5, Tables 10.8 and 10.10 [**REP7-029**]): See footnote e to Matrix 1b above.

Matrix 2 follows HRA Integrity Matrices 3C and 3D[REP5-018]. Matrices 3C and 3D do not appear to be consistent with the assessment in Table 10.10 of [REP7-029] which only predicts effects from litter during construction and decommissioning. The Applicant is invited to clarify this point.

e. Applicant's conclusion (Section 10.5, Tables 10.8 and 10.10 [**REP7-029**]): See footnote c to Matrix 1b above.

f. Applicant's conclusion (Section 10.5, Tables 10.8 and 10.10 [**REP7-029**]) See footnote f to Matrix 1b above.

Supporting habitat is not a designated feature of the SPA/Ramsar site. The Applicant is requested to explain which of the designated features would be affected by effects on the supporting habitat.