



AQUIND Limited

AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR

**Applicant's Responses to Deadline 6 and 6a
Submissions – Additional Submissions**

The Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 – Rule 8(1)(c)

Document Ref: 7.9.34

PINS Ref.: EN020022

AQUIND Limited

AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR

**Applicant's Responses to Deadline 6
Submissions – Additional Submissions**

PINS REF.: EN020022

DOCUMENT: 7.9.34

DATE: 25 JANUARY 2021

WSP

WSP House

70 Chancery Lane

London

WC2A 1AF

+44 20 7314 5000

www.wsp.com

DOCUMENT

Document	Applicant's Responses to Deadline 6 Submissions – Additional Submissions
Revision	001
Document Owner	WSP
Prepared By	Various
Date	25 January 2021
Approved By	A.Hallam
Date	25 January 2021

CONTENTS

3.	INTRODUCTION	3-1
4.	APPLICANT'S RESPONSES TO DEADLINE 6 SUBMISSIONS – ADDITIONAL SUBMISSIONS	4-2

TABLES

Table 4.1 - [REDACTED]	4-2
Table 4.2 - APLEAL Action Group	4-3
Table 4.3 - East Hampshire District Council – Response to ExQ1 N1.11.5	4-5
Table 4.4 - Highways England	4-5
Table 4.5 - [REDACTED]	4-7
Table 4.6 - [REDACTED]	4-13
Table 4.7 - [REDACTED]	4-13
Table 4.8 - [REDACTED]	4-14
Table 4.9 - [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] (separate submission with the same content)	4-23
Table 4.10 - [REDACTED]	4-24
Table 4.11 - [REDACTED]	4-25
Table 4.12 - National Grid Electricity Transmission	4-27
Table 4.13 - Ian Judd and partners on behalf of [REDACTED]	4-27
Table 4.14 - South Downs National Park Authority	4-31
Table 4.15 - Southern Water	4-38
Table 4.16 - Freeths on behalf of University of Portsmouth	4-39
Table 4.17 - Atkins on behalf of Vodafone	4-40
Table 4.18 - Cllr Judith Clementson on behalf of Ward Member for Winchester City Council	4-41
Table 4.19 - Winchester City Council - Statement on Biodiversity	4-41

Table 4.20 - Winchester City Council Response to Recent Changes to the Order Limits	4-47
Table 4.21 - The Tudor Sailing Club Responses to Recent Changes to the Order Limits (Change Request 1)	4-49
Table 4.22 - Portsmouth City Council Responses to Recent Changes to the Order Limits (Change Request 1)	4-49

3. INTRODUCTION


- 3.6.1.1. The following tables set out the Applicant's responses to other parties' submissions to the Examining Authority (ExA) made at Deadline 6 and 6a that do not relate to the hearings held in December 2020. A separate document provides that Applicant's responses to those documents that relate to the hearings (document reference 7.9.33).
- 3.6.1.2. A response has not been provided for each individual submission or topic raised. The responses have focused on issues thought to be of most assistance to the ExA. Where points have been raised by various parties, the Applicant has responded once, but the responses are applicable to all parties who have made the same point.
- 3.6.1.3. The Applicant also does not seek to respond to all the points made where the Applicant's response is already contained within other submissions made since the Application was accepted, save where it is thought helpful to repeat or cross refer to the information contained in the previous documentation.

4. APPLICANT'S RESPONSES TO DEADLINE 6 SUBMISSIONS – ADDITIONAL SUBMISSIONS

Table 4.1 - [REDACTED]

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>I am writing to object to the Aquind proposal.</p> <p>It is scandalous that you would even think of bringing this through our precious island and disturbing the green space of a heavily densely populated city in Europe! This affects flora, fauna, wildlife & people.</p> <p>I believe it is your duty to take into consideration the public's human rights with regards to the Human Rights Act 1998. As follows:</p> <p>Protocol 1 Article 1; Right to peaceful enjoyment of my property. Article 6 ; Right to a fair trial (or public hearing) Article 8 ; Respect for my private life, home and correspondence. Article 14; Protection from discrimination in respect of those rights and freedoms.</p>	<p>The Applicant has sought to avoid green spaces and has made use of Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) where it can, for example Milton Lock Nature Reserve, Eastney Beach and the Milton Allotments. Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement (ES) (APP-131), and its addendum (REP1-139) have assessed impacts on ecological features (i.e. flora, fauna and wildlife). Its findings are that, with appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures, there will be no residual effects on such features.</p> <p>Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement (APP-131) and the addendum to the ES (REP1-139) have assessed impacts on ecological features (i.e. flora, fauna and wildlife). Its findings are that, with appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures, there will be no significant residual effects on such features.</p> <p>Chapter 25 of the ES (APP-140) assesses impacts on recreation, with appropriate mitigation proposed. This includes the Framework Management Plan for Recreational Impacts (REP4-026).</p> <p>With regard to the Human Rights Act 1998, Section 7.9 of the Applicant's Statement of Reasons (REP5-012) explains how the Applicant has considered any potential infringement of the ECHR in consequence of the inclusion of the compulsory acquisition powers in the Order (Article 1 of the First Protocol, Article 6 and Article 8). As is set out therein, the Applicant considers the Order strikes a fair balance between the public benefit and interest in the Proposed Development being delivered and the interference with the rights that will be affected. Accordingly, the Applicant considers it would be appropriate and proportionate for the SoS to make the Order, including the powers of compulsory acquisition. With regard to Article 14 of the ECHR, the Equality Statement submitted at Deadline 6 (REP6-068) explains how the potential effects on equality have been considered in relation to both the construction of the Proposed Development, its operational phase and the decommissioning phase. The effects upon the relevant protected characteristics are mostly temporary in nature as they relate to the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Mitigation measures have been considered and will be implemented to remove or minimise these effects where possible. The SoS will take into consideration the effects set out when discharging their Public Sector Equality Duty when determining this Application, and the effects should be considered on balance, alongside the benefits arising from the Proposed Development (and more broadly the Project).</p>

Table 4.2 - APLEAL Action Group

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
<p>1</p>	<p>Landscaping</p> <p>A key issue for the APLEAL members is the viability of the Landscaping. The AQUIND proposal is full of intent, but this is not supported by any measurable commitment.</p> <p>For example, the Solar Farm off Day Lane was commissioned in April 2014 this included landscaping. The photo below was taken on 22nd December 2020, that is 6.5 years plus since commissioning. The photo shows scant landscape cover, which is totally ineffective.</p>  <p>The AQUIND proposal does not give any commitment or assurances about the effectiveness and long term viability of the Landscaping Plan.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not unreasonable to demand that a commitment be given that the landscaping will be effective within a specific timescale. This needs to be implemented by a management that can be held to account by local authorities.</p>	<p>The Applicant's Comments on Responses to Examining Authority's First Written Questions MG1.1.22 (REP2-008), the updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (OLBS) (REP6-038) and dDCO (REP6-015) make it clear that the Applicant will be responsible for the ongoing management, maintenance and replacement of planting associated with the Converter Station and ORS during the lifetime of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>As stated in the updated OLBS (REP6-038) paragraph 1.8.2.1 <i>"The management of existing and proposed landscapes / habitats at the Converter Station Area and in connection with the ORS shall be subject to a detailed landscaping scheme. This shall encompass the management, maintenance and monitoring plans to ensure the full and successful establishment and ongoing monitoring of existing, new and replacement planting throughout the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development."</i> Paragraphs 1.1.3.8 and 1.1.3.9 of the updated OLBS also state that management, maintenance and monitoring plans and prescriptions will be prepared alongside the detailed landscaping scheme with periodic reviews for each area of planting/habitat against specific targets /indicators.</p> <p>The Applicant's commitment to long term maintenance, management and replacement is secured through the updated dDCO (REP6-015) Schedule 2 Requirement 8(3) which states that <i>"All landscaping provided in connection with Works No.2 and the optical regeneration stations within Works No. 5 must be retained, managed and maintained during the operational period."</i></p> <p>As this matter is secured by way of a Requirement of the DCO, and the non-compliance with a Requirement would be an offence and enforceable in accordance with Chapter 8 of the Planning Act 2008, appropriate commitments are secured by the DCO in relation to the implementation and management of the landscaping to be provided, and in the event of any breach the relevant local authorities would be able to pursue this to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>Traffic and Transport</p> <p>In our submission at Deadline 1, we made reference to traffic safety issues particular to Day Lane and its junction with Broadway Lane. In the submission, we acknowledged that numbers associated with accidents and traffic volume did not require any remedial work on the roads in questions to meet the existing regulations. The response from the applicant was simply a repeat of what was contained in the AQUIND Proposal – no action required. This response is less than useful, as it does not seek to find a resolution or engage with local residents. In fact it shows a total disregard for the safety of local road users.</p>	<p>The Applicant sets out the proposed approach to be taken to Day Lane within the Day Lane Technical Note submitted at Deadline 6 (REP6-073), with an updated version of this submitted at Deadline 7 (REP6-073, Rev002). The proposed passing bays which are set out on pages 7-11 of the Technical Note address the concerns raised regarding the management of the meeting of HGVs and general traffic on Day Lane, this includes traffic from non-motorised users. The Day Lane Technical Note also contains details of proposed traffic marshal / banksman locations on this road who will be in contact with one another and Converter station staff at all times to coordinate construction traffic movement. These traffic marshals / banksman will be able to make construction vehicle operators aware of any potential hazards on Day Lane, for example non-motorised users.</p>


Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>Our issue here is that because nobody chooses to walk or cycle up or down Day Lane as it is not fit for any non-motorised users. Pedestrians, in particular, have minimal verge to escape oncoming vehicles. The photo below shows the situation at the top of Day Lane.</p>  <p>The fact that minimal pedestrian use is made of Day Lane will distort any statistics and hence the conclusion. The proposed work to include a special slip road for the transformers offers a great opportunity to improve safety for pedestrians and others and be of benefit to the wider community. The cost of this would be minimal, especially compared with the costs that may incurred by the project as the result of an accident.</p> <p>We ask that the applicant reviews the arrangements for all Road Users using Day Lane and the junction with Broadway Lane. Not just site traffic.</p>	<p>In the view of the Applicant and as confirmed by the APLEAL Action Group, there are no specific existing desire lines or origins/destinations along Day Lane that would generate large levels of pedestrian activity. Any footpaths do not lend themselves to circular walks or further long distance activities. As a result, there is unlikely to be a significant level of pedestrian activity in this area.</p> <p>The measures proposed are, in the view of the Applicant, adequate to mitigate the impacts of the construction of the Proposed Development. No further mitigation, or enhancement works are considered to be necessary in connection with the construction and operation of the Proposed Development.</p>
3	Temporary Site Access off Broadway Lane	
	<p>APLEAL has been previously informed that some short-term use will be made of the existing farm track from Broadway Lane, which leads to the Lovedean Converter site. We are now informed that this could extend up to 12 months. This entrance off Broadway Lane is also, the residential access to numbers 1,2 and 3 Broadway Farm Barn, 2, Broadway Farm Cottage and Little Lovedean.</p> <p>Having to share the residential property access with a stream of construction traffic is a considerable incumbrance on all the residents. Our strong recommendation is that this access off Broadway Lane should not be used and alternative access sort.</p>	<p>With regard to the farm track from Broadway Lane, to facilitate access for plant and machinery while the access road is being constructed, temporary use is required over the existing farm track in plot 1-65, plot 1-63, the southern parts of plot 1-60, as well as across the farm track identified as plot 1-71. It is anticipated that the use of the farm track for this purpose will be a period of 3 to 6 months whilst the Converter Station Access junction and the Access Road are constructed. The Applicant can confirm that access to the properties adjacent to Plot 1-65 will be maintained during the period over which the Applicant requires the temporary use of Plot 1-65.</p>

Table 4.3 - East Hampshire District Council – Response to ExQ1 N1.11.5

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p><i>In relation to ExQ1 N1.11.5, the Applicant has provided further explanation at paragraph 17.3.2.3 of the ES addendum [REP1-139] to explain how successive periods of noise have been treated in the noise assessment. Havant Borough Council and East Hampshire District Council have expressed concern about the methodology. Does this update satisfy these concerns and is there now common ground between the parties on this matter?</i></p> <p>I can confirm that the update does satisfy my concerns and this is now a matter of common ground between the parties concerned.</p> <p>To clarify further regarding my attendance, it had already been agreed , following discussions between ourselves, that Winchester's Phil Tidridge would respond to other matters which were relevant for both our Authorities, to avoid us offering duplicate opinions on the same issues .</p>	<p>Resolved</p>

Table 4.4 - Highways England

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
Protective Provisions		
	<p>Dialogue continues with the Applicant to agree the appropriate protective provisions in relation to the Strategic Road Network and protection of its assets (which includes National Roads Telecommunications Services) to be incorporated with the DCO. Highways England have submitted to AQUIND our required protective provisions on 7th December 2020 and we await formal agreement from AQUIND prior to submitting to the ExA.</p>	<p>The Applicant continues to engage with Highways England in respect of these matters. Highways England submitted comments on the protective provisions provided to them by the Applicant on 28 October 2020 on 7 December 2020. The Applicant returned the protective provisions for Highways England's review on 14 January 2020. It is not anticipated there are any points outstanding in relation to the Protective Provisions which will not be capable of being resolved within the time remaining in the Examination.</p>
Traffic and Transport		
	<p><u>An updated, more detailed assessment of the collision data at A3(M) Junctions 2 and 3 and at the A27/ A2030 junction.</u></p> <p>This was discussed at the meeting held on 26th November and WSP stated that this had been done but that they would await agreement on the junction capacity modelling before issuing it to us, as the two were linked (in the sense that the modelling would allow us to understand the risk that collision clusters associated with excessive queueing on the slip roads would be exacerbated by the Scheme);</p>	<p>An updated analysis of collision data at A3(M) Junctions 2 and 3 and at the A27/ A2030 junction is currently being undertaken by the Applicant and has been provided to Highways England ahead of Deadline 7 and submitted to the Examination at Deadline 7 (Applicant's Response to Further Written Questions – Appendix 1 (document reference 7.4.3.1)).</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p><u>A firm commitment that normal sized HGVs (and not just abnormal loads) would access and leave the Farlington Playing Fields work site under traffic management control.</u></p> <p>This was also discussed at the meeting held on 26th November and WSP stated that this would be incorporated in an updated FCTMP, which would be issued once HE, HCC and PCC were all happy with the responses to issues they had each previously raised.</p>	<p>Construction traffic marshalling for this access has been included in Table 6 of the updated Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (REP6-032), which was submitted at Deadline 6. The Applicant considers this matter to be resolved.</p>
	<p><u>A further submission in respect of the junction capacity modelling for A3(M) Junctions 2 and 3.</u></p> <p>This was raised at the meeting held on 18th November, at which we expressed the opinion that the ARCADY and LINSIG models submitted to date required an update. This was to be addressed by WSP by obtaining locally-derived traffic flows for these junctions, rather than those produced by the SRTM, which was regarded as not having sufficiently fine detail in the vicinity of these junctions to produce precise, accurate turning movements. We understand that WSP will incorporate their response to this issue in the updated models referred to above. This will be the subject of a WSP Technical Note, which we will review once we receive it.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the issues identified to date are not showstopper issues and will if necessary be mitigated through commitments to be made either in an updated FCTMP or a supplement to the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>WSP have submitted updated information to Highways England related to the matters above on 17 December 2020, a completion of a review is anticipated ahead of next deadline. Although it is noted that we have yet to receive any updates to the FCTMP.</p> <p>Discussion is ongoing between all parties how statement of common ground between Highways England, Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council and AQUIND can be achieved ahead of next deadline.</p>	<p>The Applicant is aware that Highways England and their Consultants have received all material required concerning this matter and a conducting a review as required. The Applicant continues to discuss this matter with Highways England.</p> <p>As noted above, the Applicant submitted a revised Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (REP6-032) at Deadline 6. This document dealt with comments raised by Highways England Technical Note TN03 as summarised in REP4-042 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to and from Farlington Playing Fields during the construction period will be managed through a combination of temporary junction modification, traffic management and construction traffic marshalling as detailed in Table 6; • Restrictions on peak hour construction traffic movements as included within Section 3.3.2; • Permitted construction traffic routes set in Section 3.4 and 3.5.
<p>Proposed Easement</p>		
	<p>AQUIND have submitted their completed Geotechnical Risk Assessment in accordance with CD622 (Managing Geotechnical Risk) on 3 December 2020 which will inform if Highways England can accept in principle an easement to facilitate a crossing beneath the A27. Highways England have reviewed and</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that Highways England has now accepted the responses provided to them on the clarifications they had requested and formal approval and certification has been issued by Highways England.</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>have requested clarification on some details on 22 December 2020 ahead of a formal approval, we await a response from the applicant.</p> <p>Positive dialogue is ongoing to agree the heads of terms in advance of an agreed geotechnical assessment. Once in principle agreement has been established, formal negotiations for an easement will commence between Highways England and the Applicant.</p>	
Other Matters		
	<p>We have now received the explanation of position from AQUIND on the matters related to Highways England not being included as a 'relevant highway authority'. Highways England are broadly content subject to the agreement of protective provisions to protect the strategic road network and its assets. We remain concerned in relation to how matters in relation to potential mitigation proposals on both Portsmouth City Council's and Hampshire County Council's road networks during the construction period and the important role the strategic road network will play. If Highways England are not formally consulted by AQUIND to determine deliverability of proposals that relate to the strategic road network, this could create unnecessary delay to allow Highways England sufficient time to review and agree. We are meeting with AQUIND early in the new year and will provide an updated position ahead of the next deadline.</p>	<p>The Applicant has confirmed to Highways England that it would be amenable to including Highways England as a consultee in respect of construction traffic management plans to the extent they are relevant to the strategic road network. Updates in this regard are made to Requirement 17 to the dDCO submitted at Deadline 7.</p> <p>The Applicant is however aware that contrary to this statement that consultation on the plan to be approved by the relevant highway authority would be satisfactory, Highways England are seeking the ability to approve the plans alongside and in addition to the relevant highway authority (so a dual approval). As has been confirmed by the Applicant previously, such an approach would be unprecedented, would potentially cause issues with achieving a consistent discharge of requirements (the underlying reason why such an approach is unprecedented), presenting an impediment to timely delivery of the Proposed Development and is not an approach which is acceptable to Applicant.</p>

Table 4.5 - [REDACTED]

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
Book of Reference		
	<p>It is clear that the Book of Reference (BOR) is an important and integral document within the dDCO and needs to be accurate and definitive if it is asking the relevant Secretary of State to override the Human Rights of the Public and in particular with regards to Protocol 1 Article 1 of the HRA 1998.</p> <p>On the current version of the BOR tables throughout the entire route with regards to privately owned dwellings only details of 'Owners or Reputed Owners' are listed in the BOR tables.</p>	<p>The Book of Reference (REP6-022) contains all identified owners, lessees, tenants, occupiers and other interests in land identified along the route of the Proposed Development. Column 3 lists the description of the land over which acquisition or use listed in column 2 is sought. In instances of private ownership, lessees, tenants and occupiers are also listed as well as owners.</p> <p>The Applicant has completed a full diligent inquiry process as set out in paragraphs 11.2.1.20 and 11.2.1.21 of the Consultation Report (APP-025) to identify all owners, lessees, tenants, occupiers and other interests in land and set out in the Book of Reference. Every plot always has an owner and an occupier, and lessees and tenants are listed if they exist. Where the results of this diligent inquiry process have not concluded the named owner or where the name of the owners cannot be confirmed, an additional interest has been included as 'The Owner' to ensure that correspondence is sent to those</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>What enquiries have been made by the applicant with the private Owners to ascertain who the actual owners are?</p> <p>Why are these tables empty with regards to details of Occupants, Tenants and Lessees of these private dwelling houses?</p> <p>What diligent enquiries have been made by the applicant to engage with all these groups of people?</p> <p>On some occasions within the BOR tables it simply has written 'The owner of' and does not name them. Does the Examining Authority find this as an acceptable level of diligent enquiries in order that the owner / occupiers have their interests protected? Or is this a straight copy and paste from various Land Registry records?</p> <p>The applicant has had a significant amount of time since the project commenced to engage with and obtain details of all affected people with an interest in the land. This can be equated to the decision by the Examining Authority with regards to the Milton allotment scenario where the tenants were given affected person status.</p> <p>I am aware this would be a large task for the Applicant but they, the Applicant are seeking massive disruption for house owners / occupiers and road users over the entire route. It is therefore surely only proportionate and justifiably required.</p> <p>I also note that the Owners or Reputed Owners of Dunlin Close in Milton are still contained within the BOR tables. If it is the case that the Applicant has removed the Furze lane option from their proposal why are they seeking rights to this land.</p> <p>I also note that the owners or reputed owners of the private dwelling houses in Locksway Rd (in between the service road to the Milton and Eastney Allotments and the shops) are also included in the BOR tables. If the intended cable route is by HDD from Kingsley Rd Green to the Thatched House car park, why does this still remain the case? Again where the Furze lane option has been removed from the proposal?</p> <p>As there are currently 3 options of the cable route over or around Milton Common (a matter I will also refer to again later). Why is it that the owners of Eastern Avenue, which is one of the proposed cable route options, are not included in the BOR tables whereas the Owners of Moorings Way dwellings are currently are included.</p>	<p>addresses. All of these identified groups of people have been consulted in accordance with the legal requirements applicable in this regard, as is explained in the Consultation Report (APP-025).</p> <p>As set out in the Highway Subsoil Acquisition Position Statement (REP1-131), a large proportion of the Proposed Development is contained within the boundary of the highway and the legal interests in this land include the relevant highway authority and adjacent freeholders of land in instances where the highway is unregistered. The occupiers of adjacent land do not hold a legal interest in this land and as such are not included in the Book of Reference.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are secured in connection with the Proposed Development to manage the impacts on residents and the access to properties during the period when works will affect them. These are secured through Requirement 25 of the dDCO (REP6-015), which requires traffic management strategies to be approved before the relevant works to which they relate commence and for these to detail the the measures to be taken in relation to access to residences, businesses and community facilities. All traffic management strategies must be in accordance with the Framework Traffic Management Strategy (REP6-030), with that document, and in particular Appendix 1 to that document - Onshore Cable Route Construction Impacts on Access to Properties and Car Parking and Communication Strategy, setting out the approach that is to be taken to maintaining access during the period when the works are undertaken.</p> <p>The Furze Lane option was removed from the Order limits, however a section of highway was retained adjacent to the properties at Dunlin Close. As such, the freeholders of these properties were retained within the Book of Reference (REP6-022).</p> <p>In respect of the inclusion of the dwelling houses at Locksway Road between the service road between the Eastney and Milton Allotments and the shops, the removal of the Furze Lane option means that these properties should no longer be included within the Book of Reference. These interests will be removed in the next iteration of the Book of Reference.</p> <p>In respect of the options at Milton Common, the owners of Eastern Avenue which is registered to Portsmouth City Council is included within the Book of Reference. As the land is registered, the adjacent landowners do not have a legal interest in the land and are therefore not included.</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
Milton Allotments		
	<p>I understand that the proposal is that the cable route is to be completed by HDD. What Health and Safety risk assessments have been carried out by the Applicant for people working on these allotments whilst this drilling operation is carried out?</p>	<p>The HDD is to be undertaken within a competent geological layer, which reduces the risk of break out of drilling fluid to surface. Additionally, there will be visual monitoring and real time annular pressure readings, in the event of a breakout these controls would immediately notify the driller who would cease drilling, reducing the risk of material reaching surface. In the unlikely event of drilling fluid breakout, the material quantities to reach surface would be minimal and manageable. A risk assessment and method statement will be undertaken at detailed design, this will include management and mitigation measures to provide safety to allotment users. The risk of bentonite break out at the allotments is small to negligible / minor when determined in accordance with a high-level risk register for the directional drills, as required in the CDM 2015 Regulations (Construction Design & Management).</p>
	<p>I am not an allotment holder, but I have noticed and common sense suggests, that several tenants use their private vehicles to enter these allotments and drive to the proximity of their plots. I have also seen larger transit van type enter the allotments and use the internal pathways. What Risk Assessments have been carried out for vehicular access over the drilling route? Will there be any restriction on vehicles entering and driving through the allotments during this whole drilling process? I understand from the hearings that the drilling process is to take 3 months to complete. I also understand that no Contractor has yet been appointed to give an accurate estimate as to what is technically and operationally feasible at this stage. What is Plan B in this proposal if the drilling operation under the allotments and Milton Nature reserve fails for whatever reason? Can restrictions be placed into the dDCO regarding no open trenching?</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that there will be no restrictions on vehicles entering and driving through the allotments during the drilling process.</p> <p>The HDD in this location is technically and operationally feasible and this has been assessed by Stockton Drilling, who are the technical experts, appointed by the Applicant.</p> <p>There will be no open trenching within the allotments. Requirement 6(10) at Schedule 2 to the dDCO (REP6-015) confirms that HDD must be used for the purpose of passing under Eastney and Milton Allotments (in the area identified as a trenchless crossing zone on Sheet 10 of the works plans), with the Work Plans (REP6-008) identifying the areas where HDD must be used and the compound areas in relation to those trenchless crossing zones.</p>
Milton Nature Reserve		
	<p>I also understand that the HDD drilling proposal will be brought out into the car park of the Thatched House Public house. There are in effect 3 separate car parks contained within this area. One is an initial car park with access from Locksway Rd, the actual car park to the public house which is closest to the Nature Reserve and the other an extended public car park situated in between and following the coastal path and Milton Locks.</p> <p>The initial car park from Locksway Road gives access to their compound for vehicles and boat transport where there are double gates to the Langstone Harbour Fisherman's Association clubhouse, dry boat compound and the wet locks moorings. It also gives access to a pedestrian footpath to the coastal path and a public slipway to Langstone Harbour and the Locks Sailing club.</p>	<p>Access to Langstone Harbour Fisherman's Association will be approached as per the principles set out in both the Framework Traffic Management Strategy (REP6-030) and the Onshore Cable Route Construction Impacts on Access to Properties and Car Parking and Communication Strategy which is included in Appendix 1 of the Framework Traffic Management Strategy (REP6-030).</p> <p>In particular this means that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contractors will be required to provide access to the site through best endeavours where reasonable notice of such requirements is given, noting that this may not always be possible and is dependent upon the stage of construction at any one time; The Contactor will be required to communicated planned works to the Langstone Harbour Fisherman's Association and Locks Sailing Club at least 10 days in advance of works commencing. In addition, the Contractors will be required to notify the Fisherman's Association prior to the start of construction that would impact their access.

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>It is proposed that the cable route will be brought out of the car parks and onto Longshore Way and onwards onto the University of Portsmouth playing fields. In Longshore Way there is an entrance for vehicles to the Locks Sailing Club compound which contains a large amount of small sailing boats etc. This is the only entrance that gives vehicular access to the compound for the removal and placing of the boats.</p> <p>During this proposed process what will be the effects of people wanting to gain access to use, work on, stow or remove their boats from the compounds contained within the Locks Sailing club and LHFA. Is this Protocol 1 Article 1 compliant?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside of construction working hours, access will be maintained though the use of road plates to bridge over the trench. Road plates will be secured to prevent slippage and site security fencing will be re-arranged to allow the trench to be crossed. • During construction works hours, urgent access will also be provided for vulnerable people, those with mobility impairments and emergency services by stopping the works, re-arranging the fences and bridging the trench using steel plates or similar. <p>With regard to Article 1 of the First Protocol, Section 7.9 of the Applicant's Statement of Reasons (REP5-012) explains how the Applicant has considered the potential infringement of the ECHR in consequence of the inclusion of the compulsory acquisition powers in the Order (Article 1 of the First Protocol, Article 6 and Article 8). As is set out therein, the Applicant considers the Order strikes a fair balance between the public benefit and interest in the Proposed Development being delivered and the interference with the rights that will be affected. Accordingly, the Applicant considers it would be appropriate and proportionate for the SoS to make the Order.</p>
Milton Common		
	<p>To the north of the University playing fields the proposed cable route leaves those grounds and enters a large copse containing several trees.</p> <p>How many of the trees and natural habitat does the Applicant assess would need to be destroyed to accommodate the open trenching? I have not seen that mentioned in the reports to date.</p>	<p>Any loss of trees in this location will be confirmed at detailed design stage within the Arboriculture Method Statement as secured by requirement 15 of the dDCO (APP-019). It is the applicant's intent to utilise existing gaps in vegetation such as that at Grid Ref: SU 67718 00325 preferentially in order to minimise any losses.</p>
	<p>Is the applicant also aware that if it is proposed to bring the cables out from this copse it has to cross a pathway? This pathway was installed a few years ago during the coastal defence upgrade. The pathway is in fact a bund created to form part of the secondary sea defence. Where it is proposed to cross the bund sea defence at the northern end of Milton Common the Applicant intends to use a short length of HDD to overcome the problem. Is this then proposed to be the case at the southern end of the bund sea defence as I have described or to open trench the bund?</p>	<p>The cable array will be placed on the required side of the bund before reaching the bund southern end, and therefore, will not require a crossing at the southern end and it is therefore not necessary to include for an additional HDD in this location.</p>
	<p>There are currently 3 options remaining in place in order for the cable route to cross Milton Common. I heard during the hearing that they would prefer the north to south option adjacent to the Sea Defence bund.</p> <p>I was bewildered during the hearings to hear that the reason why there are 3 different options still proposed. I understand that they haven't ruled out using 2 of the 3 options ie splitting the cable route into paired circuits.</p> <p>The reason given was that the Applicant to date has not yet appointed an actual Contractor to establish what is technically or operationally feasible and</p>	<p>The technical reasoning for retaining three potential routes is summarised in Applicant's Transcript of Oral Submissions for Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (REP5-034) in response to questions 9.4 and 9.5 on the agenda for that hearing.</p> <p>To summarise, the Made Ground at Milton Common requires engineering remedial solutions which may require greater land requirements than conventional methods. Therefore, it is necessary to have alternate routes in the locality of Milton Common to ensure the cable array can be split if the preferred engineering solution for a single trench requires the full extent of a single Order limit corridor. In addition, the principal contractor will require flexibility within this area due to the spatial requirement of any potential ground remediation. The south and west perimeter of Milton Common encounters relatively shallower Made Ground which reduces the risk of contamination, obstructions, or adverse settlement.</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>is unlikely to do so prior to any recommendations by the Examining authority or decision by the Secretary of State.</p> <p>During the Hearings the same rationale was given with regards to the 2 options at Farlington Ave / Everleigh Rd proposed route options and in relation to the cable joint bays along the entire cable route to Lovedean.</p> <p>I find that incredible for a company's project that requires the disruption of so many lives in order to complete a private project.</p> <p>An earlier decision by the Applicant as to the 3 options across the Common would have at least alleviated some owner's fears. I believe that is an extraordinary attitude towards someone's rights and wellbeing!</p> <p>Whilst these 3 options remain some of the owners / occupiers on Moorings Way and Eastern Avenue have been left in a state of worry and distress as to their future are and in the case of Moorings way worried by letters talking of Compulsory acquisitions. Has this been fair? Has this been in compliance with Protocol 1 Article 1? I believe not, either currently or in the future if this scheme is approved.</p>	<p>There is an existing gas ventilation system along the south and west perimeter potentially reducing the available space for trenching, therefore, there is the requirement for alternative corridors in the vicinity of Milton Common. Retaining the option of Eastern Road is important as the use of the deeper Made Ground along the eastern side of Milton Common or even the south and west perimeter may not be able to satisfy settlement or contamination constraints in which case the ability to run the cable array along Eastern Road would be required.</p> <p>The potential for spatial restriction caused by existing infrastructure and the required remedial solution footprint, combined with the potential for one of the routes not being feasible at detailed design means the following three corridors need to be retained within the Order limits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southern and western perimeter of Milton Common • East of Milton Common running parallel and west to the sea defence embankment • Eastern Road <p>At no point was the reason given by the Applicant for retaining the options because the Applicant has not yet appointed the contractor who will construct the Proposed Development. The Applicant has, as is clearly explained in the Applicant's Transcript of Oral Submissions for Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (REP5-034), carried out an appropriate level of ground investigations to inform its understanding of the ground conditions at Milton Common to evidence the feasibility of the laying of the cables within Milton Common. The level of investigations carried out is entirely appropriate for the purposes of obtaining consent. The appointment of a contractor would not in any way have altered the extent of the investigations carried out for the purposes of informing the Application for the Proposed Development.</p> <p>As is explained at paragraph 9.32 of the Applicant's Transcript of Oral Submissions for Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (REP5-034), detailed design will inform the required remedial solutions and evaluate the practicality of these accommodating the entire cable array, informing the preferred route and the potential of splitting the cable array. This will confirm the preferred cable routing with the practical design to produce the most beneficial solution for the environmental impact and social use of Milton Common and Eastern Road.</p> <p>The optionality at Farlington Avenue and Eveleigh Road is provided in the event of detailed route investigation showing that there is not enough space at the lower end of Farlington Avenue at the junction with Havant Road to install both cable circuits. In this circumstance, one circuit could be routed along Farlington Avenue and the second circuit along Eveleigh Road and through the green area adjacent to Scoutlands.</p> <p>The Applicant would highlight that at no point has it proposed the acquisition of any homes or gardens and it has sought to send all communications required for the purpose of undertaking its diligent enquiries and to satisfy the legal consultation requirements in a responsible manner. Where issues have been raised with the Applicant in respect of communications, the Applicant has proactively taken steps to provide further communications to allay any concerns regarding the acquisition of any homes or gardens.</p>
<p>Langstone Harbour</p>		

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>The applicant it appears had decided at an earlier stage in this project to discount the option to use the eastern side of the Harbour due to the protected status of it and the problems of HDD platform areas to the south and north of Hayling Island Bridge. Yet the current proposal is to HDD the cable route from north of Kendall's Wharf to Farlington playing fields.</p> <p>Not that I would wish this project on any other area or people, can the applicant explain what the difference is between the Eastern side and the Western side of that same protected harbour is?</p>	<p>Langstone Harbour is an inlet of the English Channel, sandwiched between Portsea Island to the south and west, Hayling Island to the south and east and Langstone to the north. It is subject to various environmental designations as summarised in section 6.2 of the Supplementary Alternatives Chapter (REP1-152). The eastern side of the Chichester and Langstone Harbour Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site also crosses over with the Hayling Billy and West Hayling Island Local Nature Reserves and Chichester Harbour Site of Special Scientific Interest.</p> <p>Potential options for crossing Hayling Island to the mainland were considered, with aspects such as potential environmental impacts, working area requirements and technical feasibility outlined for each option. These options included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option A2 – fixing cables to an existing bridge from Hayling Island (sections 6.3.2.7 to 6.3.2.10 of the Supplementary Alternatives Chapter (REP1-152)) • Option B – fixing cables to the former Hayling Billy Line (a former railway bridge structure) (section 6.3.3 of the Supplementary Alternatives Chapter) • Option C – the use of an HDD adjacent to the existing Hayling Island Bridge (section 6.3.4 of the Supplementary Alternatives Chapter). <p>With regard to HDD platform areas to the south and north of Hayling Island Bridge, the Applicant has explained the site-specific constraints present in section 6.3.4.2 of the Supplementary Alternatives chapter (REP1-152). It was discounted due to presence of environmentally designated areas, laydown area requirements and technical risk associated with the length of the HDD works. It was therefore considered by the Applicant that the limitations on the available land for this option posed too high a level of environmental and technical risk to be considered as a reasonable alternative.</p> <p>By using HDD to cross beneath the harbour from Kendall's Wharf to Farlington Playing Fields, any effects on the environmentally designated harbour have been avoided, as further explained below.</p>
	<p>Is there any evidence to show that HDD is a less environmentally impactful method on the Western side of the harbour?</p>	<p>The proposed method of HDD beneath Langstone Harbour has been selected in order to avoid the harbour itself which is designated as a Special Protection Area (SPA), Ramsar Site, Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Local Nature Reserve (LNR). There are no impacts on this protected environment as a consequence of the use of HDD.</p>
	<p>Having listened to the Traffic (and by definition Air Quality) debate during the Hearings, I must add that I thought it was unrealistic and minimalized. Anyone who lives, works or travels through the general Portsmouth area knows from experience that any disruption and / or major incident to any of the 3 arterial routes into and out of Portsea Island causes major delays and even gridlock.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment (Appendix 22.1 of the ES) (APP-448) and Supplementary Transport Assessment (REP1-142) have assessed the impacts of the Proposed Development on the transport network. The effects of the Onshore Cable Corridor temporary works have been carefully considered and the changes to the operation of the highway network are temporary with the highway network returning to normal levels of operation following the completion of the works.</p> <p>The Applicant concludes in both assessments that there will be localised areas on the highway network that experience an increase in traffic levels and associated congestion as a result of the construction of the Proposed Development. However, any impacts are temporary in nature and will be mitigated through measures set out within the Framework Traffic Management Strategy (FTMS) (REP6-030) and Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (FCTMP) (REP6-032) (which are secured by Requirements 17 and 25 respectively of the dDCO (REP6-015)).</p>

Table 4.6 - [REDACTED]

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>Please accept my objection to this proposed development. I am astonished this application is still being considered when it is being overwhelmingly opposed by the people of the City of Portsmouth, more or less all of the local councillors and [REDACTED].</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The Application is currently going through the Examination Stage which will end on 8 March 2021. The Examining Authority will make a recommendation to the Secretary of Stage 3 months after the Examination has closed (June 2021). The Secretary of Stage then has 3 months to make a final decision of the DCO application (September 2021).</p>

Table 4.7 - [REDACTED]

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed Aquind interconnector project. Myself and my husband have just moved to Milton, and after reading information that this work and this line is not only not necessary but could even be placed somewhere less detrimental to residents, wildlife and the environment, I am wondering why this is happening.</p> <p>I am also wondering how it came to be that this project has been granted the national status it has to supercede local government?</p>	<p>A detailed explanation of the assessments undertaken in relation to alternative routes and the rationale for the route selected is provided within Chapter 2 (Consideration of Alternatives) (APP-117) and the Supplementary Alternatives Chapter (REP1-152), with further information provided in the Applicant's Transcript of Oral Submissions for CAH1 (REP5-034).</p> <p>It is demonstrated in these documents that after an extensive review of the available options for the Proposed Development, the Applicant has thoroughly considered and balanced the relevant considerations in relation to the alternatives studied, guided by the relevant policy requirements provided for by National policy and guidance in relation to the compulsory acquisition of land, and has reached reasonable and logical conclusions. Whilst there is no requirement for an applicant to demonstrate that a proposed project represents the best option from the alternatives which were studied, it is the view of the Applicant that when balancing all relevant considerations in relation to the reasonable alternatives, it has selected an optimal final option for the Proposed Development.</p> <p>An application under Section 35(1) of the PA 2008 was made to the SoS of BEIS for the application to be considered under PA 2008. In July 2018, the SoS directed that "the proposed Development, together with any development associated with it, is to be treated as development for which development consent is required", being of the view that the proposed Development by itself is nationally significant and satisfied that the relevant legal tests for a direction to be issued were met. The Section 35 Direction is document reference AS-039.</p> <p>An application submitted to PINS in November 2019, and on 12 December 2019 PINS having considered the application documents accepted the application for Examination in accordance with s55 of the PA 2008.</p>
	<p>I am appalled to learn the work planned includes digging up areas vital to maintaining minimal traffic congestion, important areas for wildlife and some of the few areas of green space this side of the city has.</p>	<p>Measures to address traffic disruption are set out in the Framework Traffic Management Strategy (FTMS) (REP6-030) and Onshore Cable Route Construction Impacts on Access to Properties and Car Parking and Communication Strategy included as Appendix 1 of the Framework Traffic Management Strategy. The FTMS and its associated documents are secured via Requirement 25 at Schedule 2 to the DCO (REP6-015)</p> <p>Although the Proposed Scheme passes through areas that support ecological features (i.e. wildlife), the Applicant has placed a high level of importance on such features. The Applicant's design team has</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
		worked closely with ecologists to deliver proposals that are sensitive to ecological features, and measures put in place to offset potential effects on them. These have been assessed within Chapter 16 of the ES (APP-131), the ES Addendum (REP1-139) and the Habitats Regulations Assessment (REP5-016). With avoidance and mitigation measures as put forward in these documents, informed by supporting surveys and plans forming appendices to them, there will be no residual significant effects on ecological features.
	This plan is for an unsustainable energy source when the government recently pledged to be more green and this plan is not something the local councils have any say in which is not remotely democratic and doesn't seem transparent enough to the public.	<p>Linking the British and French electric power grids will make energy markets more efficient, improve security of supply and enable greater flexibility as power grids evolve to adapt to different sources of renewable energy and changes in demand trends. The Proposed Development will be contribute to the UK meeting 2050 Net Zero targets along with providing numerous other benefits, with need for and benefits of the Proposed Development set out in the Needs and Benefits Report (APP-115), the Needs and Benefits Addendum (REP1-136) and the Second Addendum submitted at Deadline 7 (document reference 7.7.19).</p> <p>The Application is being examined in accordance with the Planning Act 2008 and the legal requirements that apply to it by virtue of that. The Application process, including a six month public examination, is fully transparent.</p>

Table 4.8 - [REDACTED]

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
3.	<p>Got an allotment plot in July 2020, unaware of the AQUIND project until sight of a public post on the allotment gates on October 3rd 2020 from the Lets Stop Aquind Facebook Group.</p> <p>Concerns over changes to plans, issues have not been addressed to combat.</p> <p>Long standing communication issue between AQUIND and the public, council and MPs.</p>	<p>The position in respect of the Eastney and Milton Allotments and the required rights over land are set out in 4.55.6 of the Applicant's Transcript of Oral Submissions for CAH1 (REP5-034). For ease of reference, this states <i>"No works will take place on the Allotments. However, it is necessary for access on foot to be available over the existing internal network of paths within the Allotments to allow for the inspection of the area whilst the HDD works are ongoing. Furthermore, in the event of any breakout of Bentonite drilling fluid (which is a non-toxic Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (CEFAS) approved clay-based lubricant), rights of temporary use of the land is sought to allow for any required clean up to be undertaken whilst minimising any potential for damage as a result."</i></p> <p>The Applicant's response to request for further information in relation to Eastney and Milton Allotments (REP3-020) confirms that communication has been ongoing between the Applicant and Portsmouth City Council and outlines the diligent inquiry process to identify interests in land at Eastney and Milton Allotments. The Applicant sent a letter to the Chairman of the Eastney and Milton Allotment Holders Association Committee dated 20th October 2020, to provide clarity in response to concerns when raised regarding the potential impact of the Proposed Development on the Eastney and Milton Allotments and the adjacent Milton Locks Nature Reserve (AS-047).</p> <p>The Applicant has worked with PCC to issue Land Interest Questionnaires to all allotment holders on 27th November 2020 and have included all interests in relation to which information has been received into the Book of Reference (REP6-022).</p>
4.	<u>'No Impact'</u>	The Applicant has fully taken into account the legal rights of those persons affected by the Proposed Development. Section 7.9 of the Applicant's Statement of Reasons (REP5-012) explains how the

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>AQUIND are ignoring the issue of people's existence and legal rights.</p> <p>For example, within the letters to the allotment holders, AQUIND state they only want rights to access underground, and have removed the 'surface' from their application because there is 'no impact on the surface'.</p> <p>AQUIND has therefore attempted to remove ownership, right to reject and are refusing to accept the thousands of rejections for all homes, land owners and land for which people are concerned about losing or being irrevocably damaged by AQUIND.</p> <p>Also concerns over property values, right to a peaceful life, right to easy travel, right to live within pollution limitations.</p>	<p>Applicant has considered the potential infringement of the ECHR in consequence of the inclusion of the compulsory acquisition powers in the Order (Article 1 of the First Protocol, Article 6 and Article 8). As is set out therein, the Applicant considers the Order strikes a fair balance between the public benefit and interest in the Proposed Development being delivered and the interference with the rights that will be affected. Accordingly, the Applicant considers it would be appropriate and proportionate for the SoS to make the Order, including the powers of compulsory acquisition.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant has undertaken a thorough Environmental Impact Assessment of the proposals, which includes the identification of impacts on human receptors. Mitigation measures as appropriate are to be secured to minimise impacts during the period of construction, including on human receptors.</p> <p>The position with regard to the works in the proximity of and the rights required over the allotments has been refined in response to further information and feedback received to ensure that the Applicant is seeking only those rights which are necessary in connection with the Proposed Development. The Applicant has, in selecting a route beneath the allotments, taken into account the reasonable alternatives, and in fact has included this route so as to avoid other impacts on the highway network had a highway route been followed instead.</p> <p>The Applicant has had regard to all communications received in relation to the Proposed Development, with a summary of the pre-application consultation being provided within the Consultation Report (APP-025).</p> <p>The Applicant would highlight that at no point has it proposed the acquisition of any homes or gardens and that there will therefore be no acquisition of or damage to homes or gardens as a consequence of or in connection with the Proposed Development.</p>
	<p>Concerns over clay pumped from HDD ruining the allotment plots, and impacts to surface level.</p>	<p>The likelihood of a breakout of drilling fluid (bentonite and additives) to surface is minimised by the drill being within a competent geological layer determined by the ground investigation finding. In addition, calculation to determine the appropriate viscosity of the drilling fluid and the maximum drilling fluid pressure will be completed prior to drilling. In the unlikely event of drilling material breakout the control mechanisms of drilling material returns and real time annular pressure monitoring will indicate any loss of materials from the bore (See Section 4 of Appendix 4 - Bentonite Breakout Note (document reference 7.4.3.4)). At the time of detection of drilling material breakout, which is often immediate, drilling can be stopped thus reducing the pressure and minimising movement of drilling fluid to surface. In the unlikely event of drilling fluid breakout the material quantities to reach surface would be minimal and manageable (see Section 6 of Appendix 4 - Bentonite Breakout Note (document reference 7.4.3.4)). Any settlement at ground surface associated with the HDD construction is predicted to be minimal; settlement calculations will be completed at detailed design to estimate the settlement at ground surface.</p>
	<p>No benefits to Portsmouth, only destruction: physical, financial, mental, environmental, sociological devastation.</p>	<p>The Applicant disagrees with this statement and directs the reader to the Needs and Benefits Report (APP-115), Addendum (REP1-136) and the Second Addendum submitted at Deadline 7 (document reference 7.7.19), which provides a robust explanation of the need for and benefits of the proposal. Chapter 4 of the addendum (REP1-136) serves to provide an update on available data, analysis and publications since the original report was prepared and demonstrates a wide range of benefits the scheme would bring on a local level as well as nationally.</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
		<p>In addition, the Applicant has carried out a robust assessment of the likely significant environmental effects of the project and mitigation is provided were required as outlined in the Socio-Economic Chapter to the ES (ES) (APP-116). The assessment described in this report confirms that there will be no sociological devastation or destruction to the physical, environmental, mental or financial operation of the City.</p>
	<p>Must find an alternative route that doesn't destroy lives, environment, nature and land.</p> <p>None of the current mitigation will be sufficient.</p>	<p>A detailed explanation of the assessments undertaken in relation to alternative routes and the rationale for the route selected is provided within Chapter 2 (Consideration of Alternatives) (APP-117) and the Supplementary Alternatives Chapter (REP1-152), with further information provided in the Applicant's Transcript of Oral Submissions for CAH1 (REP5-034).</p> <p>It is demonstrated in these documents that after an extensive review of the available options for the Proposed Development, the Applicant has thoroughly considered and balanced the relevant considerations in relation to the alternatives studied, guided by the relevant policy requirements provided for by National policy and guidance in relation to the compulsory acquisition of land, and has reached reasonable and logical conclusions. Whilst there is no requirement for an applicant to demonstrate that a proposed project represents the best option from the alternatives which were studied, it is the view of the Applicant that when balancing all relevant considerations in relation to the reasonable alternatives, it has selected an optimal final option for the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Mitigation which is deemed to be sufficient and proportionate and in line with IEMA guidance note 'Delivering Quality Development' (IEMA, 2016) is set out within each of the technical ES Chapters 6-28 (APP-121 – APP-143 and REP1-033), the ES Addendum (REP1-139) the ES Addendum 2 (document reference 7.8.2) and the Mitigation Schedule (REP2-005).</p>
	<p><u>Covid -19</u></p> <p>Police were more recently stopping people leaving the island on the roads.</p> <p>How can it be justifiable for AQUIND to cause city wide road grid locks for years for construction.</p> <p>The staged development construction mitigation cannot work.</p> <p>The Council and professionals have told AQUIND and PINS this already.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment (Appendix 22.1 of the ES) (APP-448) and Supplementary Transport Assessment (REP1-142) have assessed the impacts of the Proposed Development on the transport network. The effects of the Onshore Cable Corridor temporary works have been carefully considered and the changes to the operation of the highway network are temporary with the highway network returning to normal levels of operation following the completion of the works.</p> <p>The Applicant concludes in both assessments that there will be localised areas on the highway network that experience an increase in traffic levels and associated congestion as a result of the construction of the Proposed Development. However, any impacts are temporary in nature and will be mitigated through measures set out within the Framework Traffic Management Strategy (FTMS) (REP6-030) and Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (FCTMP) (REP6-032) (which were both updated and submitted at Deadline 1 and are secured by Requirements 17 and 25 respectively of the dDCO (REP6-015)).</p>
	<p>Agrees with the PCC briefing report of 25th November 2020 from page 21.</p> <p>The briefing report states that AQUIND will require permanent rights of access to the allotments, that AQUIND are requesting the rights to potentially open dig through the allotments and that there is the clear potential for AQUIND to disrupt the allotments and allotment holders.</p>	<p>The position in respect of the Eastney and Milton Allotments and the required rights over land is set out in 4.55.6 of the Applicant's Transcript of Oral Submissions for CAH1 (REP5-034). For ease of reference, this states "No works will take place on the Allotments. However, it is necessary for access on foot to be available over the existing internal network of paths within the Allotments to allow for the inspection of the area whilst the HDD works are ongoing. Furthermore, in the event of any breakout of Bentonite drilling fluid (which is a non-toxic Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>The note also states the lack of communication with the Council and the Applicant in this regard, and lack of addition into the Book of Reference.</p> <p>Concerns over the Order Limits shown within the Land Plans which will affect 52 allotments, plus 2 car parks, access roads and paths.</p>	<p><i>(CEFAS) approved clay-based lubricant), rights of temporary use of the land is sought to allow for any required clean up to be undertaken whilst minimising any potential for damage as a result."</i></p> <p>The Applicant's response to request for further information in relation to Eastney and Milton Allotments (REP3-020) confirms that communication has been ongoing between the Applicant and Portsmouth City Council and outlines the diligent inquiry process undertaken by the Applicant to identify interests in land at Eastney and Milton Allotments. The Applicant has worked with PCC to issue Land Interest Questionnaires to all allotment holders on 27th November 2020 and have included all interests as received into the Book of Reference (REP6-022).</p>
	<p>Portsmouth will have 1/3 less emergency escape routes during construction.</p> <p>Portsmouth is overcrowded, highly polluted, high mental health issues. There is no mitigation that will work.</p>	<p>Psychological and mental health effects resulting from the proposed scheme have been assessed in Chapter 26 (Human health) of the 2019 ES (APP-141). No adverse impacts have been found to be significant and therefore no mitigation measures relating to mental health have been suggested.</p> <p>With regard to pollution, the results of the Air Quality assessment undertaken indicate some slight beneficial and adverse significant effects on local air quality as a result of the construction related traffic emissions. However, no new exceedances of Air Quality objectives are predicted as a result of the project that do not already exist. The impacts associated with diversions, road closures and construction traffic impacts are transitory and temporary in nature and are not predicted to impact on the ability of PCC to meet its obligations under the EU Ambient Air Quality Directive 2008/50/EC. No significant effects are predicted for non-construction traffic related emissions. Air emissions will be minimised on Eastern Road through the scheduling of diversions and closures for summer holidays outside the football season when traffic flows are at their lowest. The execution of a communications strategy is also built into the traffic model predictions which will serve to raise public awareness of disruption and reduce the likelihood of unexpected congestion peaks where air emissions can be elevated. Furthermore, the OOCEMP (REP6-036) provides for local air quality and dust mitigation measures to be implemented in accordance with IAQM best practice guidelines and each phase of onshore development will have to comply with a CEMP in relation to that phase.</p> <p>As is set out in Section 10 of the Framework Traffic Management Strategy (REP6-030), single lane closures only are proposed for the section of the A2030 Eastern Road included in the Onshore Cable Corridor on Portsea Island for the limited durations during which works are undertaken in this location. Bi-directional traffic will be retained on this link at all times throughout construction.</p>
	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>The Applicant disagrees with this statement. The letter responded to the comments made by Stephen Morgan and merely provided further clarification on the DCO process.</p> <p>With regard to additional submissions or representations following a deadline, it is for the ExA to determine whether or not to accept any additional representations, the Applicant has no influence over the decision of the ExA.</p>
	<p>Do not agree that AQUIND did all they could to update new or pre-existing interested parties.</p> <p>AQUIND did not find and communicate with new interested parties every time they changed a plan that would impact more people.</p>	<p>The Applicant's response to request for further information in relation to Eastney and Milton Allotments (REP3-020) outlines the diligent inquiry process to followed by the Applicant to seek to identify interests in land at Eastney and Milton Allotments.</p> <p>In any instances where proposals have changed to include more land, the relevant owners and occupiers of that land have been consulted.</p> <p>The Applicant is content that the Application and the Examination of it has complied with all relevant legal consultation requirements, be those provided by statute or common law.</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>Alarmed AQUIND could conclude the Application contains a thorough assessment of the environmental issues.</p>	<p>The Applicant has undertaken an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the Proposed Development to consider and assess the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development. The ES and ES Addendum (REP1-139) report the findings of the EIA.</p> <p>The ES and ES Addendum also provide information about the Proposed Development including its context, a full description of the Proposed Development and its construction, the main alternatives considered, the consultation process that was part of the EIA, and any relevant technical information that has been used to assess the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development. The ES and ES Addendum include a series of chapters that consider and assess the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development in relation to each relevant environmental topic.</p>
	<p>At the start of October I looked at some of the 501 Environmental documents (to date) focussing on newts as my example.</p> <p>Newts are well observed across the allotments.</p> <p>I have also seen bioluminescent centipedes on my allotment plot, which are exceptionally rare.</p> <p>There is an abundance of life above and below the surface of the allotment area where AQUIND wish to lay their cables, including slow worms, adders, reptiles, lizards, frogs, toads, bats etc.</p>	<p>The Applicant has placed a high level of importance on ecological features including protected sites, protected and notable plant and animal species and the habitats that support them. This includes Milton Piece allotments, as identified in the Proposed Development's Phase 1 Habitat survey (APP-410); the allotments comprise a mosaic of cultivated plots, buildings and access tracks dominated by non-native species which are grown as crops or as ornamental plants and thus have only limited ecological importance due to the disturbance from allotment owners working their plots. The non-native invasive species Japanese knotweed was identified on the allotments boundary (APP-410).</p> <p>The Applicant's design team has worked closely with ecologists to deliver proposals that are sensitive to ecological features, and measures put in place to offset potential effects on them. These have been assessed within Chapter 16 of the ES (APP-131), the ES Addendum (REP1-139) and the Habitats Regulations Assessment (REP6-034). The avoidance and mitigation measures put forward in these documents, as informed by supporting survey and desk study data from Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre cover all areas of the Order Limits where suitable habitat for ecological features is found, including the Milton Piece allotments. It should be noted that the allotment plots themselves will be avoided by Horizontal Directional Drilling and will not be directly affected, with use of allotment land within the Order Limits confined to existing access tracks for use by vehicles. Thus, the assessment is robust in its conclusion that there will be no residual effects on ecological features.</p>
	<p><u>My research on AQUIND's environmental reporting</u></p> <p><u>EIA Scoping Report</u></p> <p>b) The Scoping Report is 604 pages long.</p> <p>c) Searching 'newt' only comes up 12 times</p> <p>Aquinds Reference to Newts:</p> <p>ii. <i>'A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) has been undertaken to inform this Report. A detailed habitat survey was undertaken for areas within the indicative site boundary and broad habitat mapping and identification of water bodies (for great crested newts) was undertaken for areas up to 250m from the Proposed Development. The updated RLB will be assessed to identify any further water bodies within 250m. Impacts on other protected species will also be considered, with the revised red line.'</i></p>	<p>The Applicant undertook surveys for great crested newt to support the assessment within Chapter 16 of the ES (Onshore Ecology; APP-131). Surveys identified waterbodies providing potentially suitable great crested newt breeding habitat. Surveys were supported by data obtained from Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre (HBIC) which collects and aggregates ecological records collected by conservation groups and includes records for amphibians and reptiles. Thus, assessments have been supported by up-to-date and robust desk study information as well as field survey data. It is important to note that the great crested newt presence/absence surveys did not identify evidence of great crested newts using ponds. While great crested newts may be present within the wider local area, they are not likely to occur within habitats that may be impacted by the Proposed Development.</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>d) Despite saying the surveys would be carried out thoroughly over the entire area being worked on, it seems that only the 'station' areas have been assessed for Newts, and not the areas along the route planned for digging etc.</p> <p>i. <i>There are no ponds or area surveys for newts within the Milton Piece allotment planned or completed.</i></p> <p>ii. <i>ii. The identified possible areas in the Milton Locks Nature Reserve next to the allotments were systematically 'scoped out' of the assessment.</i></p> <p>e) No surveys have been carried out at Milton Piece Allotments for any wildlife or fauna; as far as I can comprehend.</p> <p>f) AQUIND have not included standard reports in their investigations. E.g referencing Record Pool: https://www.recordpool.org.uk/ : The Record Pool collects data on herpetofauna (reptiles and amphibians) in the UK and to makes it available, locally and nationally, for conservation purposes.</p> <p>g) Almost half of the ponds visited were scoped out of the survey leaving only 33 study ponds. further scoping out reduced this number to 24.</p>	
	<p><u>Environmental Statement – Volume 3 – Appendix 16.9 – Great Crested Newt Survey</u></p> <p>Statements such as "all accessible ponds in april , may and june 2019' scream inaccuracy: The ones that were not 'accessible' were just 'scoped out of the project survey'. Additionally only doing the survey over a hot dry period is not conducive to accuracy in findings.</p> <p>I also note that although the "additional submission" document was submitted on 21/09/20, it seems to be a rewrite/edited version of last year's document, rather than an update for the changes that have been made this year</p> <p>It therefore looks like AQUIND have changed their plans over the past year and have not reported or submitted new data for those changes; and is still trying to sell the vague but exhaustively confusing documentation - 1003 documents. There is still no reference to Milton Piece allotment surveys for example and yet AQUIND has thrown the entire city into panic and distress, including all the allotment holders. This is unforgivable intimidation.</p>	<p>The Applicant has discussed limitations of the surveys undertaken openly within the reports submitted to support ES Chapter 16 (Onshore Ecology; APP-131), including Appendix 16.9 – Great Crested Newt Survey Report (APP-417). The Applicant maintains that the reasoning of the limitations, as repeated by the respondent, is robust along with its conclusion that great crested newts are absent from the Study Area, and the decision to scope them out of the assessment in ES Chapter 16.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Additional Submission documents submitted on the 21/09/20 were low resolution versions (and thus smaller file sizes) of existing reports to aid accessibility, making it easier for a wider range of users to download and open them. They do not contain rewritten or edited material from that provided at submission. These documents were submitted in this form at the request of the Examiners.</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>On one hand it concluded that they were not able to survey properly, because of the weather, for some planned pond sites. But then state they did find newts. Then state that 'newts are absent':</p> <p><i>'As previously discussed, the spring of 2019 was particularly dry and as a result some ponds were dry before surveys commenced or dried up during the presence/absence surveys. This resulted in three ponds not being surveyed, and a further four not having all survey visits completed or all preferable survey methods (use of bottle trapping) used. This has meant that, when considered individually, these ponds could not be fully assessed for great crested newts. The remaining ponds were successfully surveyed, 12 of which were found to support other species of newt. It is considered that the conclusions of this study are reliable and that great crested newts are absent from the Survey Area.'</i></p> <p>Stating that great crested newts are absent from the survey area'. This is not accurate, or, a distortion of the facts, boldly defined by creative 'survey area' definition.</p>	
3. Conclusion		
	<p>Recorded sightings and the area of milton piece allotment and milton lake nature reserve:</p> <p>Recorded sightings and the area of milton piece allotment and milton lake nature reserve are within the 1km grid square Records for NGR square SZ6799:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common frog • Slow-worm • Common lizard • (12 x Records) 	<p>Ecological records from Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre were included within the baseline data supporting ES Chapter 16 Onshore Ecology (APP-131). This comprised records of three reptile species (slow worm, common lizard and adder) and two amphibian species (great crested newt and common toad) (APP-410); records covered British Grid square SZ6799.</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p><u>Work in Progress:</u></p> <p>Milton allotments and the Milton Lake Nature Reserve fall into the same grid square which had no studies by Aquind done/ grid square su60 and south sz69</p> <p>Additionally, I have looked up the grid references and can see that the ponds studied conveniently seem to be unlikely newt habitats. I would be interested to know from locals at each of the survey points listed in the environmental report, what sightings of newts they have had? It would be nice to at least question if they deliberately choose unviable sites to survey, and omitted sites that should have been included?</p> <p>I also want to encourage everyone to formally record their sightings of newts and all other wildlife to respective official records. I also want to check how to get this year's recent sightings confirmed and published as 'official', so if anyone can help work out that, or know, it would really help to know!</p> <p>We need to actually have a 'robust' amount of 'official' sightings recorded, with photographs, time date, notes preferably recorded to present for our objection against Aquind's plans for Portsmouth, Lovedean and the surrounding area.</p>	<p>Ecological surveys, including those for great crested newts, covered study areas established at Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) stage and attempted to cover all suitable habitat within this. Where access could not be obtained to habitat due to factors outside our control, we have identified such limitations within survey reports and use the precautionary principle where necessary to ensure the conclusions of ES Chapter 16 Onshore Ecology (APP-131) are robust. Surveys did not deliberately choose habitats unlikely to be occupied by ecological features such as great crested newts in order to bias their results.</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>Addendum</p> <p>My new Comments and additions to responses previously submitted by Portsmouth residents, myself and councillors (deadlines 4,5 and 6).</p> <p>I absolutely agree and support this statement by an fellow objector; [REDACTED] :</p> <p>It summarises everything I believe therefore I summarise my opposition to the plan, and the changes proposed because :</p> <p><i>I OBJECT TO Aquind destroying Portsmouth's (already minuscule) green space, polluting Portsmouth's (already dangerous) air, disrupting Portsmouth's (already overloaded) road network and endangering Portsmouth's (already threatened) wildlife... for up to 7 years.'</i></p> <p><i>I object to Aquind building what is effectively a huge power station on green belt land, 250 metres away from the boundary of the South Downs National Park.</i></p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>Although the Proposed Scheme passes through areas of that support ecological features (i.e. wildlife), the Applicant has placed a high level of importance on such features. The Applicant's design team has worked closely with ecologists to deliver proposals that are sensitive to ecological features, and measures put in place to offset potential effects on them. These have been assessed within Chapter 16 of the ES (APP-131), its addendum (REP1-139) and the Habitats Regulations Assessment (REP6-034). With avoidance and mitigation measures as put forward in these documents, informed by supporting surveys and plans forming appendices to them, there will be no significant residual effects on ecological features.</p> <p>Whilst the the Converter Station Area lies in proximity to the South Downs National Park the land in question is not Green Belt.</p> <p>Measures to address traffic disruption are set out within the Framework Traffic Management Strategy (FTMS) (REP6-030) and Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (FCTMP) (REP6-032) (which were both updated and submitted at Deadline 1 and are secured by Requirements 17 and 25 respectively of the dDCO (REP6-015)).</p> <p>Air quality has been robustly assessed and is reported in Chapter 23 of the Environmental Statement (REP1-033). The assessment included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An assessment of the risk of dust from construction; • An assessment of the impacts of construction traffic on the public highway; • An assessment of the impacts of diverted traffic during construction; and • An assessment of emissions from plant used for horizontal directional drilling during construction. <p>The assessment uses a number of conservative assumptions intended to provide worst-case predictions. The results show negligible predicted impacts at the vast majority of receptors with additional sensitivity testing reported in Appendix 23.8 (REP1-078) to present the effects of any additional queueing. Further, the impacts associated with diversions, road closures and construction traffic impacts are transitory and temporary in nature and are not predicted to impact on the ability of PCC to meet its obligations under the EU Ambient Air Quality Directive 2008/50/EC.</p> <p>The Applicant is a UK-registered company and it is not associated with any UK or European utilities or national electricity transmission system operators. All political donations made by the Applicant have complied with the relevant legislations and can be viewed on the Electoral Commission website. Corporate information for AQUIND Limited is available on www.aquind.co.uk and Companies House.</p> <p>By helping to integrate a greater proportion of non-fossil fuel energy sources and intermittent renewables generation into the GB energy mix, the Proposed Development will help UK Government meets its 2050 Net Zero target by reducing CO2 emissions by at least 1.5 million tonnes over the lifetime of the project. More information regarding the need for and benefits of the Proposed Development is included in the Needs and Benefits Report (APP-115) and Needs and Benefits Addendum (REP1-136). Further information in relation to the need for the project in light of new</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
		government policy contained in the Energy White Paper is provided within a second Needs and Benefits Addendum submitted at Deadline 7 (document reference 7.7.19).

Table 4.9 [redacted] and [redacted] (separate submission with the same content)

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	You said that you have the right to compulsory purchase properties along the proposed route, this is appalling and most certainly NOT acceptable.	The Applicant has not at any point sought any powers to acquire homes or gardens, and the powers to do so are not included in the Application as there are none within the Order limits to which the proposed powers of acquisition relate.
	You are threatening parks commons and other green spaces valuable for wildlife habitats and spaces used for recreation and sport and again this is NOT acceptable.	<p>The Applicant has, in the scheme design, sought to avoid greenspaces and recreational facilities wherever possible and it has made use of HDD where it can to avoid such impacts e.g. Milton Locks Nature Reserve, Milton Allotments, Eastney Beach. Where possible, it has also sought to avoid playing surfaces where open space needs to be crossed. The Applicant recognises that there will be some impacts and these are assessed in Chapter 25 of the ES (APP-140) with appropriate mitigation proposed. This includes the Framework Management Plan for Recreational Impacts (REP4-026). The Applicant continues to discuss the mitigation proposals to further reduce the identified significant residual impacts. Construction work within open space will be temporary and there will be no significant permanent effect on open spaces.</p> <p>Although the Proposed Scheme passes through areas that support ecological features (i.e. wildlife), the Applicant has placed a high level of importance on such features. The Applicant's design team has worked closely with ecologists to deliver proposals are sensitive to ecological features, and measures put in place to offset potential effects on them. These have been assessed within Chapter 16 of the ES (APP-131), its addendum (REP1-139) and the Habitats Regulations Assessment (REP6-034). With avoidance and mitigation measures as put forward in these documents, informed by supporting surveys and plans forming appendices to them, there will be no significant residual effects on ecological features.</p>
	If this was to proceed we would be subjected to years of disruption together with an increase in noise pollution, traffic congestion and air pollution.	<p>With respect to noise during the construction phase, the assessment presented in Chapter 24 of the ES (APP-139) and Chapter 17 of the ES Addendum (REP1-139) has concluded that there will be no significant adverse effects from works during Core Working Hours. The Applicant has acknowledged in the assessment that there is potential for short-term and temporary significant adverse effects from construction works outside of Core Working Hours in limited locations that may be required to minimise traffic impacts. The location of the works outside Core Working Hours are defined in Section 2.3 of the Onshore Outline CEMP (REP6-036). The effects will be mitigated as far as reasonably practicable through the measures secured in the Onshore Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan ().</p> <p>With respect to noise during the operational phase, the assessment has concluded that there will be no significant adverse effects. The operational noise criteria (REP1-129) for the Converter Station Area and Optical Regeneration Station (ORS) at Landfall are secured through Requirement 20 of the draft DCO (REP6-015), which will ensure that the effects do not exceed those presented in the assessment.</p> <p>Measures to address traffic disruption are set out within the Framework Traffic Management Strategy (FTMS) (REP6-030) and Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (FCTMP) (REP6-032) (which</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
		<p>were both updated and submitted at Deadline 1 and are secured by Requirements 17 and 25 respectively of the dDCO (REP6-015)).</p> <p>Air quality has been robustly assessed and is reported in Chapter 23 of the Environmental Statement (REP1-033). The assessment included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An assessment of the risk of dust from construction; • An assessment of the impacts of construction traffic on the public highway; • An assessment of the impacts of diverted traffic during construction; and • An assessment of emissions from plant used for horizontal directional drilling during construction. <p>The assessment uses a number of conservative assumptions intended to provide worst-case predictions. The results show negligible predicted impacts at the vast majority of receptors with additional sensitivity testing reported in Appendix 23.8 (REP1-078) to present the effects of any additional queuing. Further, the impacts associated with diversions, road closures and construction traffic impacts are transitory and temporary in nature and are not predicted to impact on the ability of PCC to meet its obligations under the EU Ambient Air Quality Directive 2008/50/EC.</p>

Table 4.10 - [REDACTED]

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>Please stop this ridiculous plan to disrupt Portsmouth and surrounding area for many months with this unwanted and unneeded cable.</p> <p>It's not needed as [REDACTED] we will be getting wind farms all around our coastline.</p> <p>Pollution, harm to wildlife, compulsory purchase, disruption to our way of life, diversions, roadclosures etc. All negative, so please stop.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>Although the Proposed Scheme passes through areas that support ecological features (i.e. wildlife), the Applicant has placed a high level of importance on such features. The Applicant's design team has worked closely with ecologists to deliver proposals that are sensitive to ecological features, and measures put in place to offset potential effects on them. These have been assessed within Chapter 16 of the ES (APP-131), its addendum (REP1-139) and the Habitats Regulations Assessment (REP6-034). With avoidance and mitigation measures as put forward in these documents, informed by supporting surveys and plans forming appendices to them, there will be no significant residual effects on ecological features.</p> <p>Measures to address traffic disruption are set out within the Framework Traffic Management Strategy (FTMS) (REP6-030) and Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (FCTMP) (REP6-032) (which were both updated and submitted at Deadline 1 and are secured by Requirements 17 and 25 respectively of the dDCO (REP6-015)).</p> <p>As is set out in paragraph 2.5.1.3. of the FTMS (REP6-030), full road closures are only proposed as a last resort, where installation of the Onshore Cable Corridor cannot be facilitated by other means of traffic management. Where full road closures are proposed, these are programming of works aims to minimise disruption as far as is practicably possible.</p> <p>Information regarding the needs and benefits of the Proposed Development is included in the Needs and Benefits Report (APP-115) and Needs and Benefits Addendum (REP1-136) submitted as part of the DCO application. Further information in relation to the need for the project in light of new government policy contained in the Energy White Paper is provided within a second Needs and Benefits Addendum submitted at Deadline 7 (document reference 7.7.19).</p>

Table 4.11 - [REDACTED]

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>I am writing to state my objection to the application. The work required to undertake this project would cause a substantial increase in air pollution in a highly-populated area. I have seen nothing in the plans so far to convince me of otherwise. I feel that the recent case of Ella Kissi-Debrah should be taken into consideration. The vast majority of Portsmouth children have to walk along main transit routes in and out of the city to get to their schools. Many of these lie within meters of these routes and children are also exposed to dangerous levels of harmful particulates even within their classrooms. I would like to see evidence (and clear evidence that is available to those of us that do not hold Masters degree in Environmental Engineering) that shows how this serious risk will be mitigated.</p>	<p>A comprehensive assessment of the air quality impacts of the Proposed Development was undertaken and is reported in Chapter 23 of the ES (REP1-033). This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An assessment of the risk of dust from construction; • An assessment of the impacts of construction traffic on the public highway; • An assessment of the impacts of diverted traffic during construction; and • An assessment of emissions from plant used for horizontal directional drilling during construction. <p>The results of the assessments of emissions were also combined to provide an overall amalgamated impact from all aspects of the construction on local air quality. The impacts were modelled at 71,031 receptors over the whole study area including 144 schools or nurseries within 200 m of the affected roads, with negligible impacts predicted at 92% of receptors. Only a single receptor near to the M275 was predicted to experience a significant impact, however this was due to concentrations in the area already being high as a result of pre-existing traffic, with the actual predicted change being 0.7 µg/m³ which is an additional 1.8% of the annual mean objective for nitrogen dioxide.</p> <p>These predictions were made on a worst-case basis which assumed the very highest flows of traffic in the current Solent Regional Traffic Model, also used by Portsmouth City Council, for the year 2026 which includes four years of additional traffic growth over the 2022 anticipated construction year. The model also assumed works would be undertaken continuously for 52 weeks throughout the year, which is not the case in reality. The project will incorporate mitigation of air emissions through strict works scheduling as contained within the Framework Traffic Management Strategy (REP6-030). This schedule determines that works on the A2030 Eastern Road on Portsea Island will only take place during school holidays, June or July when traffic flows are generally lower than other times of the year. Should the Milton Common route be used for the final alignment of the Onshore Cable Route, construction along the A2030 Eastern Road will not last for more than 7 weeks per circuit.</p> <p>An assessment of the impacts of emergency backup generators during operation of the Proposed Development was also undertaken, however the infrequent nature of the operation of backup generators led to negligible predicted impacts.</p> <p>Through successive court actions brought by ClientEarth and previous financial sanctions brought by the EU the UK Government has been required to reassess the actions it is taking to improve air quality in the country in the shortest possible time period. One of these actions is the introduction of Clean Air Zones, in relation to which the City of Portsmouth is to be a recipient of funding to implement. The Clean Air Zone is intended to help with the improvement of air quality in the city by restricting the most polluting vehicles. Monitoring for 2019 published by Portsmouth City Council in 2020 shows that, whilst there are some areas of the city with stubbornly high concentrations of air pollutants, air quality in the city is showing clear signs of improvement. The modelling reported in the Air Quality Assessment (REP1-033) shows that the construction period of the Proposed Development will not impact on this general improvement and will not affect the ability of Portsmouth City Council to improve air quality within the time period stipulated by the Ministerial Directives.</p> <p>At no locations in the city are concentrations of particulates predicted to exceed the legal limit or objective values either in the modelling reported in Chapter 23 (REP1-033) or the Portsmouth City</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
		Council 2019 Air Quality Action Plan. This is also reflected in the Council's 2019 monitoring, published in 2020.
	Any works along these major arteries will cause stationary traffic, worse than is already apparent in the city. I have seen no proof that there will be the cessation of works on the projects for days when air pollution rise above significant levels.	<p>In addition to the modelling reported in Chapter 23 (REP1-033), detailed sensitivity testing was undertaken on Eastern Road, Velder Road and Milton Avenue. This included queue lengths on each of the roads of the junctions and minimum vehicle speeds to simulate queueing traffic as is reported in Appendix 23.8 (REP1-078). In contrast to the modelling in Chapter 23, the modelling in Appendix 23.8 was undertaken using traffic flow data that assumed less traffic would redistribute away from roadworks and would instead remain in the roadworks area. The detailed modelling showed the vast majority of effects were predicted to be negligible in this area as a result of the increased queueing, and the results of this sensitivity modelling are valid for the wider city.</p> <p>The Portsmouth City Council Air Quality Annual Status Report for 2020 which reports the results of 2019 monitoring provides a summary of the continuous monitoring undertaken at automatic monitoring stations. These stations provide air quality readings typically on an hourly basis, however, this can be more frequent for certain pollutants. Nitrogen dioxide concentrations are reported on an hourly basis as there is an hour legal limit value of 200 µg/m³ for this pollutant which must not be exceeded on more than 18 occasions in one calendar year. The monitoring shows that there were no occasions when the hourly concentration of nitrogen dioxide exceeded the 200 µg/m³ limit in 2019. The modelling reported in Chapter 23 (REP1-033) also shows that there are no predicted exceedances of this limit value.</p> <p>Mitigation measures such as the immediate cessation of works against short-term air pollution concentration spikes are not proposed as they have been evidenced to not be required in connection with the Proposed Development.</p>
	I do not feel that the health of the children of this city have been considered in the slightest and this project will lead to many unnecessary deaths.	<p>The assessment of effects arising from the Proposed Development on human health is included within Chapter 26 (Human Health) of the ES (APP-131). The assessment has identified that vulnerable groups, including children and young people, exist within the study area, and that these groups are more sensitive to change (para 26.4.2.2). For the purpose of the assessment, vulnerable groups were assumed to be distributed throughout the general population. Where a group within the population was deemed to be particularly vulnerable to an effect, a note was made within the assessment.</p> <p>Children and young people have been identified as being particularly sensitive to a reduction in social contact and physical activity, which could result from changes to the landscape and green space in the Converter Station Area during constructions (para 26.6.2.12). This effect was assessed as temporary minor adverse (not significant) for the study area population (para 26.6.2.14). Similar effects were identified for children and young people due to changes to landscape and green space during construction of the Onshore Cable Corridor (para 26.6.3.41), assessed as a temporary minor adverse effect (not significant).</p> <p>An explanation of the Air Quality assessment undertaken and the predicted impacts in this respect is explained above.</p>
	I also feel that the way that the risks of this project have been communicated is shameful. Members of the public should not be required to read through 100 of pages of risk assessments. I contest that this application has followed appropriate procedures.	The Applicant has complied with all the relevant procedures as outlined in the Planning Act 2008 and relevant regulations. The Applicant has been through an extensive consultation process as outlined in the consultation report (APP-025). The Applicant has also updated the project website as and when required to ensure the progress of the application is clearly outlined and accessible to members of the public.

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
		As the application is currently being examined by the Examining Authority all information submitted into the Examination is made publicly available on the PINS website. Where additional amendments have been made to the application the Applicant has directly communicated with stakeholders where necessary, and copies of all correspondence are publicly available on the PINS website.

Table 4.12 - National Grid Electricity Transmission

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	National Grid remains in discussions with the Applicant to confirm whether the Environmental Statement submitted with the Application sufficiently covers the description of Work No. 1 (as amended). At the time of this representation these discussions are ongoing but it is expected that both parties will be in a position to update the Examining Authority on this matter alongside the submission of the amended DCO as set out above.	The Applicant can now confirm that these discussions have concluded and the outcome is described in the Statement of Common Ground between NGET and the Applicant at Deadline 6.

Table 4.13 - Ian Judd and partners on behalf of [REDACTED]

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	Our client is listed as "Heads of term in negotiation", however the Applicant is not negotiating with [REDACTED]. The Applicant's stance to date can be paraphrased as "These are the terms accept them or we will rely on CPO Powers". They are unwilling to enter any form of discussion on how figures have been reached.	<p>The Applicant confirms that it is seeking to negotiate with [REDACTED] for the land and rights required for the Proposed Development. Having identified the land and rights required and necessary for the Proposed Development, these are the land and rights which the Applicant is seeking to acquire.</p> <p>The Applicant's representatives, in correspondence issued on 03 November 2020 (which included revised Heads of Terms), proposed that a recurring weekly meeting be set up to progress matters and requested the Landowner's representatives suggest dates for the first meeting. Despite a number of further chases on this matter, the Applicant is yet to receive a date to progress discussions from the Landowner's representatives, apart from a discussion taking place between the parties respective agents on 12 November 2020. As such, it would appear that the lack of willingness to engage is not on the part of the Applicant and it's representatives.</p> <p>Further updated and improved Heads of Terms were issued to the Landowner's representatives at Deadline 6 and the Applicant is yet to receive any feedback from the Landowner's representatives and would welcome feedback on these from the Landowner's representatives in due course.</p>
	If 70 out of 73 affected parties have not been willing (to date) to agree terms and no parties have completed a Legal Option, it is a good indicator that the terms being offered by the Applicant are unreasonable and not acceptable to the "average" affected landowner. This is evidence that the Applicant has not sufficiently explored all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition	The Landowner's representative is incorrect as the Applicant has completed legal agreements in relation to the rights required for th Proposed Development. It should also be noted that negotiations are at an advanced stage with numerous parties.

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	and they are solely relying on Compulsory Purchase Powers. The Applicant is being unreasonable with the terms offered and do not want to reach agreement, as they could get land "cheaper" by Compulsory Powers.	
	We strongly question if the Applicant has allowed sufficient funds within their £4.9million to compulsory purchases all the land they require.	The Applicant confirms the estimated land acquisition costs is both sound and accurate and includes for the acquisition of all relevant land and interests required for the Proposed Development. Further information in this regard is contained within the Funding Statement (REP6-021).
Paragraph 7.3.6		
7.3.6	The Applicant has confirmed that the Applicant's land is solely required for landscaping purposes and have only been proposed to appease South Downs National Park and that the only reason that these rights could not be granted under Landscaping Rights is to ensure that landscaping ecological enhancement remains undisturbed. It has a particularly poor argument taking the freehold ownership of [REDACTED] property purely so that the landscaping and ecological enhancement remains undisturbed.	<p>The Applicant's Response to Deadline 3 - Table 2.13 (REP4-027) refers to Plot 1-29, however the Applicant understands that the interested party is referring more specifically to new landscaping rights associated with Plot 1-26, Plot 1-29b, Plot 1-29c and Plot 1-30 on Land Plans Rev 004 (REP6-004) which form strong tree belts running west- east. Such tree belts are referred to under the management prescriptions as EH- 12 and EH-13 on Figure 1 and Figure 2 Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy Management Plan for Option B(i) and Option B(ii) respectively (REP6-038).</p> <p>The Applicant refers to the Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submission (REP6-067) which responds under Table 1.1 Compulsory Acquisition – Proportionality to the interested parties comment that “the Applicant has failed to justify the need for permanent landscaping rights over the hedgerows in plots 1-26 and 1-30, because those hedgerows run perpendicular to the Converter Station and offer no screening value”. The reasons for the landscaping rights relate to the extensive engagement with and feedback received from LPAs including the SDNPA who are concerned over the potential loss of vegetation in this area because of the landscape screening, landscape character and landscape and ecological connectivity benefits the vegetation contributes towards. Aside from being important in terms of connectivity, Plot 1-26 and Plot 1-30 are important landscape features. They add to the visual screening function of adjacent hedgerows. Plot 1-26 and Plot 1-29b form part of HR06, whilst Plot 1-30 and Plot 1-29c form part of HR-09, both of which are identified as important hedgerows through the Hedgerow Regulations. Gapping-up, maintenance and management are required to maintain their value in the longer term.</p> <p>The freehold acquisition of land and the application of New Landscaping Rights to the plots as identified in the Land Plans Rev 004 (REP6-004) ensures the landscaping and ecological enhancements can be implemented and maintained and so as to ensure their benefit is realised.</p> <p>This response is also reiterated in the Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submission Table 2.7 paragraph 3.5 (REP3-014) which states that the proposals reflect the extensive engagement with, and feedback received from LPAs who are concerned over the potential loss of vegetation in this area. The Applicant's proposals will significantly strengthen the landscape features in this area providing an important and necessary screening function, to address the feedback received.</p>
7.3.6	We still firmly believe that these rights could be achieved for landscaping rights only and that the Applicant does not need to compulsorily acquire the freehold from our [REDACTED]. We argue that the landscaping and planting is to only offered by the Applicant to appease the South Downs National Park and Winchester Local Authority and little beneficial impact on the	<p>The Applicant understands that the interested party is referring to Plot 1-29 on Land Plans Rev 004 (REP6-004) which is also referred to as PW-7 on Figure 1 and Figure 2 Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy Management Plan for Option B(i) and Option B(ii) respectively (REP6-038).</p> <p>The Applicant's response is as follows:</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>ecology and biodiversity and offer limited screening to a 20m high + industrial building and do not believe that Compulsory Purchase Powers should be used to acquire such land.</p>	<p>Extensive opportunities to maximise ecology and biodiversity have been captured in the Outline Biodiversity and Landscape Plan (REP6-038). These measures have focussed on where permanent change will occur at the Lovedean Converter Station Area. Measures include management/ extension of ancient woodland, extension of additional woodland and tree belts, new native woodland belts and copses, native scrub and hedgerow planting, creation of calcareous / species rich grassland, attenuation ponds and swales with marginal planting. These measures will provide a clear enhancement to this area for a suite of biodiversity features.</p> <p>The planting will increase the importance of habitats at the Converter Station where currently agricultural land uses are dominant, limiting their biodiversity value. This is demonstrated by the Biodiversity Position Paper (REP1-138) and will meet the objective set out in the updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (REP6-038) for the Proposed Development to go beyond mitigating for its effects and provide ecological enhancements.</p> <p>Visual screening: The Applicant's Response to Deadline 3, Table 2.13 para 5.3.6 / 5.3.15, (REP4-027) and the Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submission, Table 1.1 (REP6-067) explain that the Applicant requires the plot to ensure adequate visual screening. The landscaping proposals also respond to the extensive engagement with, and feedback received from LPAs, who are concerned over the potential loss of vegetation in this area and the screening benefit it currently provides[. The mitigation planting will significantly strengthen the visual screening function and provide a depth of screening to minimise views at eye level of the Converter Station from Old Mill Lane, including views appreciated by recreational receptors using the lane as part of a cycle route.</p> <p>Compulsory acquisition: The restrictions to be applied to ensure the landscaping and ecological enhancements are maintained and otherwise remain undisturbed so as to ensure their benefit is realised would prevent any activities being undertaken on this land subject to those restrictions by the landowner, and the position would be akin to exclusive possession. Therefore, for the reasons explained, freehold acquisition of this land is required for the Proposed Development and is the appropriate approach to take in relation to this land.</p>
<p>5.3.8</p>	<p>If security fencing is provided around the Converter Site and the telecommunications building, we do not understand why a secondary fence is required around the entire property for a deterrent for trespassers as the land is only going to be used for landscaping purposes. It will not be possible to interfere with the apparatus which will be beyond a security fence. If the security fence is not sufficient to deter trespassers from entering the Converter Station and Telecoms building then there is little point of a second fence.</p>	<p>The perimeter security (fencing and gates) has been designed to National Grid Technical Specifications which state that the overall height of the perimeter fence (external fence) should be 3 m above base level with an electric pulse fence installed within the security fence (internal fence) (paragraph 5.2.7.3 of the Design and Access Statement, REP6-025). In order to comply with security and health and safety requirements, the Converter Station and telecommunications buildings will have their own strict access requirements, hence the separate location of the Telecommunications Buildings.</p> <p>Whilst these measures provide a robust level of security, it is not the case that persons may not still seek to breach the perimeter of the Converter Station and the Telecommunications Building.</p> <p>Should the Applicant not own land surrounding the Converter Station and the Telecommunications Buildings, it would have no legal right to remove people from the land in close proximity to them. As such, it would not be able to deter persons from approaching the perimeters of either or remove them from the land where they present a threat to security. By having control over the surrounding land, it is the case that the Undertaker will be able to prevent persons from trespassing on land in their ownership where such persons are doing so for the purpose of seeking to breach the security</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
		<p>perimeter fences. As such, by having control over the land the Undertaker is afforded additional, and necessary, powers of control over the land for the purpose of deterrence.</p> <p>The second fence referred to is not a security fence, it is a fence to demarcate land ownership.</p>
5.3.8	<p>This is the first time we have been made aware of deer and rabbit fencing on the boundary of our property. Can the Applicant confirm sufficient budget to manage this fencing for the life time of the Scheme? It would be helpful for a specification of the fencing, as this has not been shared with ██████ to date.</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm sufficient budget to manage this fencing for the life time of the Scheme. The specification of the fencing will be chosen as part of the detailed design of the Proposed Development.</p>
5.3.8	<p>The principal reason that the Applicant has stated to acquire the freehold of the landscaping area is so that the landscaping in the local areas remain undisturbed. However, with a deer and rabbit fence around the perimeter there will be no wildlife within these landscaping areas to be disturbed and therefore they do not need to acquire the freehold interest.</p>	<p>As outlined above the restrictions to be applied to ensure the landscaping and ecological enhancements are maintained and otherwise remain undisturbed so as to ensure their benefit is realised would prevent any activities being undertaken on this land subject to those restrictions by the landowner, and the position would be akin to exclusive possession. Therefore, for the reasons explained, freehold acquisition of this land is required for the Proposed Development and is the appropriate approach to take in relation to this land.</p> <p>A deer and rabbit fence will be erected around larger areas of new woodland planting to ensure the successful establishment of plant stock. Once established and at a height which avoids damage by grazing the fencing will be removed.</p> <p>The updated OLBS (REP6-038) paragraph 1.1.1.57 states that "Infill planting to existing hedgerows would receive protective tree or shrub guards to prevent damage from rabbits and deer. Larger areas of new proposed woodland planting would be protected by an appropriate deer fence until trees are sufficiently established and mature to warrant removal. Guidance relating to fencing specification can be found in Forestry Commission Technical Guide (2006) (Forestry Commission, 2006). If required, suitable fencing details would be drawn up to accommodate badger gates."</p>
5.3.9	<p>We can confirm a virtual meeting was held on the 12th November 2020. However, no attempt was made by the Applicant to progress matters. It remains our opinion that the terms currently offered are significantly worse than what would be awarded at a CPO Tribunal and therefore ██████ has been put in a position by the Applicant where they are not capable of reaching an agreement, without going to Tribunal in the future and incurring further costs.</p>	<p>The Applicant issued further revised and improved Heads of Terms to the landowner at Deadline 6 and does not agree with the Landowner's representative's opinion that the terms offered are significantly worse than what would be awarded at a CPO Tribunal. The Applicant is yet to receive feedback from the landowner's representatives on the Heads of Terms issued at Deadline 6.</p>
<p>Document 2.2 Land Plans</p>		
	<p>There have been changes made to Plots 1-29 splitting the plot into to 1-29, 1-29a, 1-29b and 1-29c. We have not been informed of this change before Deadline 5 and there has been no communication with ██████. No justification has been given for this change.</p>	<p>As stated under 31(c) of the Applicant's responses to Deadline 5 submissions (REP6-069), a justification for this change has been provided under paragraphs 4.24.3 and 4.24.4 of the Applicant's Transcript of Oral Submissions for CAH1 (REP5-034) submitted at Deadline 5 which outlines the changes made to the Land Plans (APP-008 Rev03) also submitted at Deadline 5.</p> <p>In relation to engagement, the Applicant's representatives, in correspondence issued on 03 November 2020, proposed that a recurring weekly meeting be set up to progress matters and requested the</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
		Landowner's representatives suggest dates for the first meeting. Despite a number of further chases on this matter, the Applicant is yet to receive a date to progress discussions from the Landowner's representatives.
	No revised Heads of Terms have been issued and yet again the Applicant and their Agents have failed to communicate with [REDACTED]. Why was the split not proposed from the start of the DCO process? Further evidence the Applicant had not given full consideration to the Application when it was submitted.	Revised and improved Heads of Terms incorporating the changes were sent to the Landowner's representatives at Deadline 6. In relation to engagement, the Applicant's representatives, in correspondence issued on 03 November 2020, proposed that a recurring weekly meeting be set up to progress matters and requested the Landowner's representatives suggest dates for the first meeting. Despite a number of further chases on this matter, the Applicant is yet to receive a date to progress discussions from the Landowner's representatives.
	At what point will the Applicant be able to provide a conclusive decision between option Bi and Bii? This late change provides further uncertainty for [REDACTED].	At this time, the Applicant is seeking an Order which includes for both options. It is on this basis that Requirement 4 at Schedule 2 to the dDCO requires the Applicant to confirm which converter station perimeter option shown on the Converter Station Parameter Plan with reference EN020022-2.6-PARA-Sheet 1 listed in Schedule 7 to the Order the converter station will be constructed within prior to the commencement of any works within Work No.2 or the carrying out of any onshore site preparation works in respect of the area where the converter station is to be located. Whilst the Applicant is continuing to engage with NGET to acquire an option for the land required, it is not necessarily the case that this will be resolved before the end of the Examination.

Table 4.14 - South Downs National Park Authority

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
SDNPA comments on the Applicant's Document 'Response to Deadline 3 Submissions' (reference REP4-027)		
	The applicant states, in table 2.14 at point 1, that the South Downs Local Plan is unclear in its application of references to Special Qualities as some areas include specific reference to tranquillity whilst others do not, including both the Dip Slope and the Scarp Slope.	The Applicant considers that the comments made by the SDNPA have been superseded by responses made at Deadline 5 and 6 as referred to below under ISH e). The Applicant refers to the Applicant's Transcript of Oral Submissions - ISH3 on Environmental Matters Question 4G (REP5-069) and the Applicant's Response to Deadline 5 Submissions ISH Agenda Item 4G) (ii) (REP6-069). The Applicant, as previously stated in the Applicant's Responses to Deadline 3 Submissions (REP4-027), acknowledges tranquillity is a Special Quality of the South Downs National Park.
	We understand that the applicant is referring to the 'Spatial Portrait' from page 14 onwards of the South Downs Local Plan. The Spatial Portrait is a new way of looking at the South Downs National Park as a single entity; arising from its geology, geography and settlement pattern. It is designed to be broad brush, not least as it is a relatively short chapter in our Local Plan and as it has to cover over 1,600 square kilometres of the National Park which is home to some 117,000 residents.	Please refer to the comments above.

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>The Spatial Portrait is not to be considered as a 'photograph' and is just an impression of the National Park at a very high level. Where a Special Quality of the National Park isn't mentioned within the Portrait it does not mean that it is not important. It remains a matter of fact that tranquillity is a Special Quality of the whole National Park. Any impact of the development proposal on the tranquillity of the National Park is a material planning consideration, not least given that the National Park benefits from the highest level of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.</p>	<p>See comments above</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges this is the case but also notes that the Proposed Development sits outside of the National Park as referred to in paragraph 1 of Table 2.14 to The Applicant's Response to Deadline 3 submissions (REP4-027), which states that the special qualities were used to define the boundaries of the National Park, and the Converter Station Area was not regarded worthy of inclusion.</p>
<p>SDNPA comments on the Indicative Landscape Mitigation Plans Option B (ii) (reference REP5-032)</p>		
	<p>This submission from the applicant does little to address the concerns raised by the SDNPA about the landscape mitigation proposed. The additional areas proposed for woodland planting are very small and located solely to the south of the Converter Station.</p>	<p>The indicative landscape mitigation plans submitted at Deadline 6 (REP6-054) have been revised to reflect changes to the Order limits and now include two new areas of woodland in response to the ash dieback survey (AS-054) and further woodland planting to the south of Mill Copse.</p> <p>Whilst SDNPA states that only additional planting has been introduced to the south, this is incorrect as per the revised plans. Further scrub planting has been introduced to the south east of the Converter Station to connect with Stoneacre Copse and planting extended and widened to the north of the Converter Station. In addition, a new area of woodland planting has been introduced to the north of the gated link road, and planting extended around the northern attenuation pond.</p>
	<p>Our concerns on the landscaping mitigation put forward by the applicant are set out in our Deadline 1 responses (including our answers to ExQ1), our deadline 5 response and are also summarised below in the verbal comments we made at Issue Specific Hearing 3.</p>	<p>The Applicant as referred to in responses below considers that the extent of mitigation is appropriate and proportionate to the Proposed Development. This is reiterated in the Applicant's Transcript of Oral Submissions – ISH3 on Environmental Matters Question 4F.1 and 4F.2 Landscape mitigation proposals (REP5-069) and the Applicant's Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at ISH1, 2 and 3, and CAH1 and 2 Question 4F.2 (REP6- 062).</p>
<p>SDNPA comments on the letter from National Grid Electricity Systems Operators Limited, dated 30 November 2020 (reference REP5-101)</p>		
	<p>Unfortunately, the deadline 5 response from National Grid does not elaborate (or indeed mention) the other 7 substation locations and why these were not taken forward to a shortlist. The SDNPA requests that a short explanation should be provided as to why these potential 7 locations were not taken forward. Without this explanation, and despite some time pursuing this point, it is perhaps difficult to conclude other than the substation selection process was a solely commercial decision.</p>	<p>The Applicant understands that this matter has been presented to National Grid ESO and we expect that NGESO will provide additional information in their response.</p> <p>The suggestion that without understanding further the reasons for the discounting of the other substation locations by NGESO when undertaking their assessments would mean the only conclusion that can be drawn is the selection of the Lovedean Substation by the Applicant was solely a commercial decision is made without any logical or evidential basis.</p> <p>The Applicant has clearly set out the reasons why Lovedean Substation was selected within Chapter 2 (Consideration of Alternatives) (APP-117) and the Supplementary Alternatives Chapter (REP1-152), including the reasons why connections to Bramley and Chickerell were discounted. Indeed, the SDNPA has accepted there was a logical and reasonable rationale for selecting Lovedean as the grid connection point (i.e. it is agreed it is preferable to locate the Converter Station at Lovedean than to route through the National Park).</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>Without this additional detail it is not possible to determine whether National Grid had regard to the statutory purposes of the National Park when determining the substation location as required by Section 62 of the Environment Act, 1995.</p>	<p>This statement is not correct. The response already provided by NGESO (REP5-101) confirms that contributing factors to the CION discussed included the South Down designation as a National Park, and that the identification of Lovedean Substation being preferable for a connection was made with it being acknowledged that the Lovdean Substation is located south of the National Park, therefore avoiding the need to pass through it, whereas other options may have required a connection through the National Park. In considering the potential for a connection to Lovedean Substation to impact on the National Park, and in making a logical conclusion with regard to the impacts a connection to Lovedean Substation would avoid as opposed to another connection which may have required a connection through the National Park, it is clear NGESO has had regard to the purposes of the National Park and based its selection, in part, on the preference of avoiding impacts on the National Park (thereby conserving its natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage).</p>
<p>A summary of the points made by the Authority at Issue Specific Hearing 1 on 9 December 2020</p>		
	<p>a) We requested that proposed DCO requirement 17 relating to the Construction Traffic Management Plan be discharged by Local Planning Authorities and not by Highways Authorities as currently put forward. We suggested that Local Planning Authorities were best placed to do this given that these documents give rise to local planning considerations that are ordinarily dealt with by them, such as potential impact on residential amenity or the tranquillity of the National Park.</p>	<p>The Applicant has confirmed that all discussions to date regarding the Framework Construction Management Plan have been held with the highway authorities, and it is these authorities who should be responsible for discharging Requirement 17 of the dDCO (REP6-015). The relevant planning considerations are, in any event, matters which are to be considered now, rather than at the point at which the Requirement is discharged, which will be following the grant of consent.</p>
	<p>Post hearing note: The applicant identified that having the CTMP approved by the Local Highways Authority and the Local Planning Authority would be an unnecessary level of approval. We agree and this is not what we were suggesting in the hearing. For the avoidance of doubt SDNPA requests that the CTMP be solely determined by the Local Planning Authorities, after consultation with the Local Highway Authorities.</p>	<p>The Applicant, for the reasons set out, is not agreeable to this suggestion.</p>
	<p>The argument advanced by the applicant that discussions have already been held with Hampshire County Council and that therefore this suggestion is, essentially, inconvenient is not a position to which much weight can be attributed. In any case such discussions are not wasted as the Local Highways Authorities would be consulted on the discharge of this Requirement under the SDNPA's suggestion.</p>	<p>It is not a matter of inconvenience, it is a case of the most appropriate authority being the discharging authority, which in relation to the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and the approval of the construction traffic management plan, is the highway authority.</p>
	<p>b) In relation to decommissioning of the proposed development at the end of its operational life we welcomed at the hearing the inclusion by the applicant of new DCO requirement 24 that requires a written scheme of decommissioning to be approved by the relevant local planning</p>	<p>Requirement 24 as drafted in the dDCO submitted at Deadline 6 (REP6-015) requires the submission of a written scheme of decommissioning for that part authorised development landwards of MHWS which the Undertaker has decided to decommission within 12 months of the date that the undertaker decides to decommission any part of the authorised development.</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>authority. We noted however that there was no timescale for compliance with this requirement.</p>	
	<p>Post hearing note: We suggest that this written scheme of decommissioning should be submitted to the local planning authority within 6 months of any part of the development (excluding the marine elements) being decommissioned. As it stands Requirement 24 is considered to be unacceptable in our view as it is open ended and does not apply any timescale for the written scheme of decommissioning to be undertaken and submitted to the local planning authority.</p>	<p>As explained above, a period of 12 months to submit a written scheme of decommissioning has been provided for at Requirement 24, which the Applicant considers to be appropriate and which aligns with precedent examples of similar requirements included within other made DCO's.</p>
	<p>c) We made the point, in respect of Article 10 relating to the power to alter streets, that 20 working days was a short period of time for the street authority to determine the acceptability or otherwise of the works. This is particularly the case given that the entrance to the Converter Station is adjacent to the National Park boundary and the SDNPA would expect to be notified in such instances, given that there is the potential for impact on the setting of the National Park.</p>	<p>The time period provided for in in the dDCO submitted at Deadline 6 (REP6-015) is 42 days (see Article 10(4)).</p>
	<p>Post Hearing Note: The applicant explained that details of the vehicular access are controlled by Requirement 6 and this is accepted. However, in response, we wish to note that Broadway Lane and Day Lane form the boundary of the National Park and further alterations may well be proposed to these roads under Article 10. It is therefore requested that the street authority be given 40 working days to determine such requests.</p>	<p>Please see the response above.</p>
<p>A summary of the points made by the Authority at Issue Specific Hearing 3 on 15 December 2020</p>		
	<p>a) The SDNPA confirmed that, as per its Deadline 5 submission, it had reached common ground with the applicant in respect of Dark Night Skies and impact on the International Dark Night Skies Reserve.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and agrees that common ground has been reached in respect to Dark Night Skies and the impact on the International Dark Night Skies Reserve. This is confirmed in the updated SoCG with SDNPA submitted at Deadline 7 (document reference 7.5.7 Rev003) paragraph 4.3.3.</p>
	<p>b) In response to question 4 e) ii) from the Examining Authority we confirmed that we had sought two additional viewpoints from the applicant, one being a viewpoint from the east of Prew's Hanger, and one being to the east of the proposed access to the Converter Station. The justification for seeking these additional viewpoints was given in detail on pages 8 and 9 of our Deadline 5 submission (REP5-091) and we summarised these points in our verbal answer to the hearing. We</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to the Applicant's Transcript of Oral Submissions – ISH3 on Environmental Matters Question 4E.2 (REP5-069) which states that whilst viewpoints have been previously agreed with the local planning authorities and the SDNPA, the Applicant has agreed to take additional viewpoint photography based on SDNPA more recent requests. This is reiterated in the Applicant's Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at ISH1, 2 and 3, and CAH 1 and 2 Question 4E.2 (REP6-062).</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>also made the following additional points verbally within the hearing that were not included within our written submission at Deadline 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the requested view from east of Prew's Hanger is of a very different nature to viewpoints 1, 12, 17. The viewpoint requested is approximately 1km closer to the Converter Station than viewpoint 1 and approximately 30m lower. It also shows the Converter Station set against the more distant landform of Portsdown Hill, a key element in views out of the South Downs National Park. Viewpoint 12 is much closer to the Converter Station and at a lower elevation than the additional viewpoint we have requested. Viewpoint 12 also looks at the Converter Station through a line of trees. Viewpoint 17 is from Butser Hill and gives a far more distant view of the Converter Station. • The second viewpoint sought is on the boundary with the South Downs National Park and the development proposal at this point gives rise to considerable landscape and visual changes alongside a busy road. • In response to a question from the Examining Authority we confirmed that the first viewpoint sought was a refinement of a view we had asked for previously but which had not been provided • In response to a further question from the Examining Authority we confirmed that in relation to the second viewpoint sought SDNPA's concern was both in respect of i) the setting of the National Park and ii) that the access to the Converter Station is adjacent to one of the roads that brings visitors into the South Downs National Park. 	<p>Additional viewpoints including one from a Public Right of Way near Prew's Hanger (Viewpoint 1b) and around the entranceway to the Converter Station (Viewpoint 3a, 3b and 3c) were taken and submitted at Deadline 6, referred to as Additional Viewpoints Location Plan and Additional Viewpoints – Part A, Part B and Part C (REP6-055 to REP6-057).</p> <p>In response to the Examining Authority in their Further Written Questions (ExQ2) LV2.9.1 (document reference 7.4.3) wirelines visualisations of Option B(i) and Option B(ii) alongside the baseline images have been prepared for new viewpoint 1b on private land adjacent to the Monarch's Way and new viewpoint 2 Prew's Hanger alongside an additional assessment. The wireline visualisations are presented in the following documents submitted at Deadline 7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional Viewpoint Location Plan and Additional Viewpoints Part A ((REP6-055, Rev02). Figures 15.59 A, B and C of Viewpoint 1b; and • Additional Viewpoint Location Plan and Additional Viewpoints Part B (REP6-055, Rev02). Figures 15.60 A, B and C of Viewpoint 2. <p>The additional assessment is presented in ES Addendum 2 (document reference no 7.8.2) and also reflected in the Applicant's Responses to ExA second written questions LV2.9.1 (document reference 7.4.1). It concludes that there would be significant effects experienced by receptors from both viewpoints during construction. In year 0 of operation, receptors appreciating a view from viewpoint 1b would experience a minor-moderate (not significant) effect which would diminish to minor-moderate to negligible adverse by year 20. For viewpoint 2, receptors would experience at year 0 and year 10 a minor-moderate adverse (significant) effect which would reduce to minor-moderate to negligible adverse (not significant) by year 20 and as planting matures.</p>
	<p>c) Given the position, height and movement of cranes during construction this matter is considered to be an important consideration in the landscape and visual impact assessment, notably in views from distance but also in close views from the Monarchs Way, for example, where the cranes will be highly visible above vegetation and above the general construction working area. We would therefore like to see the LVIA updated to include an assessment of the impact of the cranes.</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to the Applicant's Hearing Transcript for ISH3 in relation to 4E (REP5-069) and the Applicant's Response to action points raised at ISH1, 2 and 3 (REP6-063) Question 4E-3 – Request for post hearing note which confirms that tower cranes are not required, how this is secured, and the position in relation to overnight position and how this is secured in the dDCO (REP6-015).</p> <p>The response includes a specific explanation of how the LVIA considered the development during construction and states that the conclusion drawn over the use of mobile cranes would not alter the findings of the LVIA. The post hearing note provides additional explanation based on two viewpoints; viewpoint 3 PRow near Broadway Lane (Monarch's Way) and 16 Old Butser Hill.</p>
	<p>d) In response to question 4 f) i) we confirmed that we had reached common ground with the applicant in relation to land for mitigation outside of the applicant's ownership. SDNPA's Deadline 5 submission details our position on this matter.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment which has now been agreed in the updated SoCG with SDNPA submitted at Deadline 5 (REP5-026) see Table 4-6 SDNPA reference 4.6.5. See below summary:</p> <p><i>The Applicant has responded that a deed of grant of easement is being sought with the appropriate landowners for the long-term maintenance and management of existing planting and retained hedgerows, and powers of compulsory purchase acquisition are sought to acquire the rights and impose restrictions to do so for in the event a voluntary agreement is not reached with those persons.</i></p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
		<p><i>A copy of a precedent deed of grant of easement has been provided to SDNPA so that the legal documentation proposed to be used is known and understood. Having reviewed this legal agreement SDNPA are content that such an agreement would secure suitable access for the applicant to the land to plant, manage and maintain landscaping for the duration of the operation of the development and that this would be secured by proposed draft DCO requirements 7 and 8. The matter is therefore agreed.</i></p>
	<p>e) In relation to the landscape mitigation proposals the SDNPA confirmed that its concerns with the applicant's landscape mitigation proposals remained. The SDNPA ran through its concerns with the proposals on three grounds: i) the inadequate additional woodland and hedgerow planting, ii) the strategy to deal with Ash die back and iii) the use of a bigger range of planting sizes to help provide screening at an earlier stage. SDNPA ran through its position in relation to these concerns in accordance with the detailed points it made on this matter in its Deadline 5 submission.</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to the Applicant's Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at ISH1, 2 and 3, and CAH1 and 2 (REP6-062) Question 4F.2, which responds to additional woodland and hedgerow planting, ash dieback and the range of planting sizes. With regards to the latter, Appendix 15.7 Landscape Schedules, Planting Heights and Image Board – Rev002 has been revised to omit references to plant sizes and was submitted at Deadline 6 (REP6-026).</p>
	<p>Post hearing note: Whilst the applicant has stated in their deadline 5 response that a comprehensive landscape mitigation package is provided, the applicant also stated in the Hearing that these proposals are still indicative and that revised plans will be submitted in due course which also take account of the further work on the Ash Dieback issue. The SDNPA will review the revised submission once received and provide further comment as required in a proactive manner.</p>	<p>Following on from the Applicant's comments above, in terms of the Applicant's comment that the plans are indicative, this is the case in so far as they will be refined post consent and presented as detailed landscape mitigation plans for approval by WCC and in consultation with SDNPA. Furthermore Requirement 7 of the draft DCO requires a detailed landscape scheme to be submitted and approved at the post- consent stage. This was agreed with SDNPA in the updated SoCG submitted at Deadline 5 (REP5-026) see Table 4-6 reference 4.6.4.</p> <p>The detailed landscaping scheme and accompanying mitigation plans will show a looser woodland edge providing a range of woodland habitats and enhancing the understorey and ground flora (and not the rectilinear form which SDNPA expressed concern over) as tabled in the Applicant's Response to Deadline 5 Submissions (REP6-069).</p> <p>The updated indicative landscape mitigation plans for Option B(i) north and south (REP6-027 and REP6-028) and Deadline 6 Submission – 7.7.8 Indicative Landscape Mitigation Plan Option B(ii) (REP6-054) have been revised to reflect changes to the Order limits and now includes two new areas of woodland in response to the ash die back survey and further woodland planting to the south of Mill Copse.</p>
	<p>The SDNPA understand the operational constraints relating to planting in close proximity to the Converter Station, but is still concerned at the lack of more substantial woodland planting in areas further away from the Converter Station, which would also assist in combatting the likely degradation of the landscape through the creation of smaller field areas not viable for agricultural purposes.</p>	<p>As outlined in the Applicant's Response to Deadline 5 Submissions ISH Agenda item 4 f) (ii) (REP6-069) the Applicant has taken an appropriate and proportionate approach to the extent of mitigation planting and considers that this is sufficient to acceptably mitigate the landscape and visual effects of the development.</p> <p>With regards to the creation of smaller field areas, the Applicant maintains its position that the smaller agricultural fields will remain suitable for agricultural use.</p>
	<p>f) In relation to tranquillity the SDNPA confirmed that common ground had not been reached with the applicant on the matter. We set out at</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to the Applicant's Transcript of Oral Submissions - ISH3 on Environmental Matters Question 4G (REP5-069) and the Applicant's Response to Deadline 5 Submissions ISH Agenda Item</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>the hearing that during construction, in particular, there will be significant impacts on tranquillity including from the movement of plant and vehicles (including cranes) and from the provision and use of a car park with over 200 car parking spaces.</p>	<p>4g) (ii) (REP6-069) which explains that there will be moderate to minor localised significant effects on tranquillity (as a local landscape feature) during the construction period arising from construction activity and traffic. Effects will vary depending on the nature and focus of activities as well as programme.</p> <p>The ExA noted that there was a disagreement over the different interpretation of “tranquillity” and this continues to be an area of disagreement. The Applicant has based the LVIA on the Glossary in the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, Third Edition, 2013, which provides that tranquillity is “a state of calm and quietude associated with peace, considered to be a significant asset of landscape”. This differs from SNDPA’s interpretation of tranquillity, which is specific to the SDNP being taken from policy documents which relate to it (and not outside of it), which includes references to the presence of buildings in the landscape.</p>
	<p>g) The SDNPA outlined that tranquillity is one of the Special Qualities of the South Downs National Park and applies to the whole National Park, and not just part of it.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this is the case but also notes that the Proposed Development sits outside of the National Park as referred to in paragraph 1 of Table 2.14 The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 3 Submission (REP4-027), which notes that the special qualities were used to define the boundaries of the National Park, and the Converter Station Area was not regarded worthy of inclusion.</p>
	<p>h) In relation to Design (agenda point h) the SDNPA agreed to come back in writing at Deadline 6 on the applicant’s revised General Design Principle 7 (Access). The SDNPA does not agree with this General Design Principle as currently drafted and asks that it is changed as follows (suggested change in red and italics):</p> <p>‘The access road will be designed and configured to allow maintenance access and include the movement of abnormal indivisible loads, whilst minimising environmental impact, including on the setting of the South Downs National Park. Permanent surfacing and landscaping will take account of the local context and be detailed in accordance with the ‘Landscape Design Principles’.</p> <p>This is considered appropriate given the consequential nature of the works to the access and given the location of this access adjacent to the boundary of the National Park. This wording suggestion is made without prejudice to this Authority’s view that the current access arrangements do not minimise impacts, because of the loss of agricultural land and hedging and on account of the industrialisation of this currently rural lane. The additional viewpoint provided by the applicant at Deadline 6 will aid discussions on this matter.</p>	<p>The Applicant agrees to the revision of this clause subject to agreement with WCC and EHDC.</p>
	<p>i) In respect of Building Design Principle 3 the SDNPA confirmed that it did not agree, contrary to the applicant’s assertions, to the RAL colours outlined in a meeting of 3rd December and rather that SDNPA had</p>	<p>The Applicant would like to clarify that the Applicant did not state that the SDNPA agreed to the RAL colours, but rather that they agreed to the remaining text in relation to Building Design Principle 3.</p> <p>The Applicant has revised Building Design Principle 3 to read as follows:</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>listened to what had been said and that it would take the matter away and consider it. The SDNPA also acknowledged that there was a difference of opinion between it and Winchester City Council on the RAL colours to be included within the colour palette for the Converter Station. SDNPA confirmed at the hearing that it would work with all parties to try and seek agreement on this matter and that it had been suggested that the applicant provide visualisations of the Converter Station in a number of views to aid further discussions.</p>	<p><i>Colours will be selected from a palette of contextual colours (which are primarily dark recessive colours) within the ranges below chosen to complement the surrounding landscape. A contextual study will be undertaken to review the colour ratios for each elevation from the below colour range. The roofing will be in a dark recessive non-reflective colour to minimise visual impact.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RAL 8022; 6009; 8019; 6015; 6020; 6014; 7022; 7013; 8025; 6003; 1020; • RAL 8015; 8012; 7008; 6011; 7040; 1002; 1014; 7035 <p>There remains a difference of opinion between LPA's and SDNPA in respect of the colour palette and it does not appear that a consensus can be reached.</p> <p>The Applicant has therefore included a broader range of colours in the colour palette which will be tested through an onsite contextual study as part of the detailed design to determine the colour ratios and transition of darker to lighter colours for each elevation of the Converter Buildings. By doing so the Applicant seeks to ensure the lighter colours favoured by the SDNPA for in some views which break the skyline are considered as part of the study, without precluding the approval of a darker colour palette where that is shown to be favourable. The Applicant does not intend to amend this Building Design Principle any further.</p>
	<p>j) In relation to Landscape Design Principle 6 the SDNPA is content with the wording of this principle as revised.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and is seeking agreement with SDNPA to confirm whether the Authority agrees with the design principles as referred to in Applicant's Transcript of Oral Submission (REP5-069) and summarised in the Applicant's Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at ISH1, 2 and 3, and CAH1 and 2 (REP6-062) Question 4H as well as the suggested addition detailed under i) above.</p>
	<p>Post hearing note: Note this is without prejudice to the SDNPA's view that the indicative landscape mitigation plans put forward by the applicant are inadequate (See above).</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to its comments in relation to point e) above.</p>

Table 4.15 - Southern Water

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>I enclose a spreadsheet listing the SWS's assets/easements in proximity to the proposed works, including approximate Grid references. You will need to obtain copies of SWS's records to ascertain the full extent of plant affected.</p>	<p>The Applicant has requested and received copies of SWS records on 9th October 2020 and again on 13th November 2020. The Applicant will continue to periodically request updated records to ensure that project information remains current.</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>Appropriate protective provisions will be required to ensure the protection of SWS's assets and ensure that necessary provisions are in place to ensure that the apparatus can be maintained in perpetuity. Without such provisions the proposed application will have an unacceptable impact on SWS's assets.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing from you in due course, ideally to agree protective provisions in advance of the submission of your application for a Development Consent Order. Correspondence relating to this response should be sent to the address shown in the footer of this document.</p>	<p>Since SWS provided a relevant representation to this examination in February 2020 they have not been available to the Applicant to discuss their representation or appropriate protective provisions. The Applicant has been continually seeking engagement with Southern Water on the protective provisions which are applicable to them. This has included following the Deadline 6 submission submitted by Southern Water, with that submission not being cognisant of the Applicant's engagement with Southern Water to date. Despite repeated efforts by the Applicant, meaningful engagement on the protective provisions with Southern Water has not been forthcoming.</p> <p>The Applicant is content the protective provisions for the benefit of water undertakers apparatus (included at Part 1 of Schedule 13 to the DCO) provide adequate protections. It is relevant in this regard that the protective provisions align with the form included in many made DCO's.</p>

Table 4.16 - Freeths on behalf of University of Portsmouth

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
CAH Post Hearing Note		
5	<p>Following the CAH, the University wishes to record that it still feels that it has not been given sufficient detail regarding the land to be acquired from its playing fields. In our previous representations dated 6th October 2020 and 30th November 2020, we have set out the particular difficulties that this will cause. The University does not believe these representations have been properly taken into account in assessing the amount of land required from the University for either the period of construction or the period of operation.</p>	<p>Further clarification in relation to the extent of rights sought by the Applicant has been provided to the University on 22 January 2021 and the Applicant looks forward to further engagement with the University to progress matters and secure a voluntary agreement. Surveys to inform the approach to reinstatement have also been undertaken in January 2021 and the outputs from these surveys will be shared with the University when they are available.</p>
6	<p>The University feels that even though the construction period (where the largest land take is required) is temporary, the significance of the impact for the University and the wider sport pitch provision in the area means that further consideration is needed and further detail should be provided.</p>	<p>The Applicant is engaging with the University of Portsmouth regarding impact to the pitches, including likely use during the period of construction. The Framework Management Plan for Recreational Impacts has been produced to provide this information (REP4-026) and is being updated as more detail becomes available following surveys undertaken in January. The Applicant intends to submit the updated version prior to Deadline 8. The total number of pitches impacted and duration of impacts including reinstatement will then be confirmed. It is currently understood the loss of the pitches will affect principally summer school use and University Sports Teams at the end of the season (from April onwards).</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
7	From previous Hearings, we understand that clarification is to be provided by the Applicant as part of Deadline 6 in relation to protective easement strips and we would ask that the University's land be considered explicitly as part of this. We would also like the Applicant to consider further whether the land take in this area can be minimised and to provide a full explanation if not.	<p>The Applicant has provided further information to the University on 22 January 2021 in relation to the extent of land over which rights are to be acquired, focusing on an approach to installing the Onshore Cable Route at the Eastern verge of the University's land at Langstone Campus and also confirming that should a joint bay be required on the University's land it would be located in the south east corner of the University's land to minimise impacts.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to minimising the impacts on the University by keeping the Onshore Cable Route as far east as technically feasible, subject to detailed design.</p>
8	It was noted during the Hearing that the Applicant listed the amount of engagement they have sought with the University, listing 4 attempts to meet and provide Heads of Terms back in December 2019. The University's Director of Campus Services & Estates has no record of any requests being received from the Applicant's team during the period between their very early meetings in 2018 and 11th November 2020 when an email was sent received via a Spam box. There were no letters or received phone calls.	The Applicant issued Heads of Terms to the University's Director of Campus Services & Estates on 09 December 2019. Further emails were sent requesting engagement to discuss the Heads of Terms and the Relevant Representation made by the University on 03 March 2020, 04 April 2020, 21 April 2020, 12 June 2020, 02 July 2020, 13 July 2020, 23 July 2020, 01 September 2020, 14 September 2020, 25 September 2020 and 11 November 2020. The University responded to the email dated 02 July 2020 and offered to provide dates for a call but did not provide any further correspondence in this regard. Further engagement with the University was only possible after the University responded to the correspondence sent to them on 11 November 2020.

Table 4.17 - Atkins on behalf of Vodafone

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	We confirm that Vodafone has apparatus in the area and advises that we have a qualified objection to the order unless you, or your applicant, provides WS Atkins with written assurances, quoting our reference above, as to the safeguarding of Vodafone apparatus and the reimbursement of costs for any works necessary. As-built records showing our apparatus are enclosed	The Applicant is engaged in discussions with Osbourne Clark in relation to entering into a protective provisions agreement for the protection of Vodafone assets, following engagement from Osbourne Clark on 21 December 2020. Heads of terms have been provided and the Applicant has agreed to Osbourne Clark producing the first draft. The Applicant confirms it is not aware of any reason why this agreement will not be capable of being completed before the close of the examination. Should that agreement not be completed for any reasons, the Applicant confirms it is content the protective provisions included at Part 2 of Schedule 13 to the Order, provide adequate protections for Vodafone's apparatus within the Order limits.
	Where Vodafone's apparatus is to remain in the stopped-up area we shall also require an undertaking that the applicant will grant a wayleave agreement to Vodafone on terms and conditions acceptable to Vodafone and the reimbursement of our (WS Atkins') costs associated with the negotiation of the said wayleave. A copy of Vodafone's standard stopping-up wayleave proforma is available on request.	Please see the response above. It is also relevant that no permanent stopping up is proposed in connection with the Proposed Development.

Table 4.18 - Cllr Judith Clementson on behalf of Ward Member for Winchester City Council

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>There have been several public comments about the lack of public consultation by Aquind. I am the treasurer of the Waterlooville Community Centre which is located in the main car park of Asda in Waterlooville and I noticed a 'flapping' piece of paper attached to the Centre's fence. Naturally, I looked to see who had attached this document (which no-one else was taking any notice of) and was surprised to see it was an Aquind "Public Notice". A copy is attached for your information</p> <p>This very poorly placed document seems to justify complaints made about the very poor level and quality of public consultations carried out by Aquind.</p>	<p>The Applicant has complied with all the relevant procedures as outlined in the PA, 2008. The Applicant has been through an extensive consultation process as outlined in the consultation report (APP-025).</p> <p>In relation to the notice attached to the comments, this is a notification (under s91,92 and 93 of the PA, 2008) issued as part of the Examination to notify all parties of the details of the Hearings. The notice was placed in an appropriate public location with a reasonably high footfall and secured to ensure that it was visible to members of the public.</p> <p>The Applicant has at every stage complied with the requirements of the PA, 2008 in relation to consultation and ensuring that details of the Examination are well publicised.</p>
<p>https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN020022/EN020022-003284-Cllr%20Judith%20Clementson.pdf</p>		

Table 4.19 - Winchester City Council - Statement on Biodiversity

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
<p>Lovedean</p>		
	<p>How will the calcareous grassland be established on what is a clay/loam soil and sub soil base with a combined average depth of 1m?</p> <p>The latest response to this question has generated two options. Either, the removal of the top soil and sub soil down to the chalk bed, or the inversion of the soil/clay and chalk. Both actions would seem to place a heavy use on construction plant and equipment.</p>	<p>The Applicant for clarification would like to reiterate that is not the intention that a 1m depth of topsoil and subsoil base is removed throughout the whole Converter Station Area, only works associated with the creation of the Converter Station platform and part of the access road as well as a temporary car park and laydown area would require a depth of cut greater than 1m. The details of how species-rich grassland will be established on this site will be determined at Detailed Design stage, once conditions such as soil depth and existing soil composition have been determined by ground investigation works, soil sampling and testing as well as reviewing the implications on surface water / drainage and ground levels.</p> <p>At this stage the Applicant considers that soil inversion followed by normal cultivation to form a fine tilth of impoverished base-rich soil is most likely with 150 mm topsoil scraped off and mixed with subsoil (resulting from excess fill associated with the creation of the Converter Station platform) to create an impoverished substrate as opposed to removing subsoil off site.</p> <p>All decisions about techniques at detail design stage will take into account the whole environmental cost / benefit of such works: the potential environmental cost of off-site disposal would weigh heavily against large-scale soil removal.</p> <p>It is standard practice in major civil engineering projects such as the Proposed Development to use various types of heavy construction machinery and equipment to be able to carry out different</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
		<p>construction activities such as; earthworks, road construction, building construction, placement of materials, etc. safely and efficiently.</p>
	<p>Considering that other priority habitats such as deciduous woodland could be formed on the site, why expend all the resources establishing a calcareous grassland?</p>	<p>The mix of habitats has been proposed to create a mosaic of ecologically important habitats which together are of greater value for their diversity than simply acting as extensions to existing habitat blocks. The grassland at Lovedean is botanically species-poor due to agricultural improvement and introduction of calcareous grassland would introduce a new, species-rich habitat into the area enhancing its overall ecological importance – refer to paragraph 3.1.23 of the Applicant's response to action points raised at ISH1,2 and 3, and CAH1 and 2 (REP6-063)</p> <p>Furthermore, and as referred to in the Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions Table 1.1 (REP6-067) the proposals seek to respond to LPAs management objectives in terms of landscape character.</p> <p>The SDNPA Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (LUC, December 2005) identifies for Landscape Type D Downland Mosaic that one of the key landscape sensitivities of this landscape type which is vulnerable to change are areas of chalk grassland and associated woody scrub and that in the short term there is likely to be "continued positive change in the form of conversion of arable land back to pasture and creation and management of chalk grassland habitats as a result of ongoing policies and incentives (D23)". Landscape management considerations include maintaining and increasing the species diversity of areas of semi-improved grassland, which act as a reservoir for more common chalk downland species.</p> <p>Landscape Character Area D2 Hambledon and Clanfield Downland Mosaic lies within Landscape Type D. Paragraph D2.2 Integrated key characteristics states that "a number of important chalk grassland and woodland sites occur within this character area including Butser Hill and Peake Wood" north of Old Winchester Hill. Whilst such locations are beyond the Converter Station area these are examples of where grassland habitats are notable and should not preclude proposals to respond to landscape management and development considerations specific to this area to "conserve the chalk grassland and hanger woodland".</p> <p>Paragraph D2.13 also makes it clear that all general landscape management considerations relevant to the landscape type also apply to the landscape character area.</p> <p>The Applicant therefore sees it as an opportunity to support changes to chalk grassland whilst also generating a positive gain in terms of biodiversity within the landscaping that is required to mitigate the impacts of the Proposed Development.</p>
	<p>Some of the parcels of land that are shown as grassland are small odd sizes; might these not be given over to other habitats?</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that some parcels of land allocated for grassland are small, however this is in response to a series of existing and proposed landscape, visual and ecological mitigation requirements and engineering and site constraints.</p> <p>Fixed offsets and standoffs around the Converter Station were informed by health and safety guidelines stipulated in Electricity Safety, Quality and Continuity Regulations 2002, as amended by the Health and Safety Executive (Health and Safety Executive, 2002) which seek to achieve a clear line of sight along the security fence around the Converter Station; that falling trees do not damage the security fence, and that vegetation does not aid an intruder to climb the security fence.</p> <p>National Grid overhead lines in line with NG operational requirements – Energy Network Technical Specification 43-8 issue 4:2015 "Overhead Line Clearances") also stipulates offsets for planting.</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
		<p>In addition, there are proposed underground cables, visibility splays, service corridors and existing utilities which constrain scrub or tree planting as referred to at paragraph 3.1.23 of the Applicant's response to action points raised at ISH1,2 and 3, and CAH1 and 2 (REP6-063) with further details in the updated OLBS (REP6-038) section 1.6.4.</p>
	<p>If the top soil and sub soil is removed, how would the spoil be disposed of?</p>	<p>The design of the Converter Station will seek to balance cut and fill of excavated earthworks as far as is reasonably possible in order to minimise the quantity of imported earthworks material and to maximise re-use of arisings. It is the Applicant intention to also re-use any surplus cut as far as is reasonably possible in reprofiling the landform, screening and landscaping. The remainder of the excavated soil will be suitable for off-site general or landscaping fill and will be transported off-site outside of the peak construction period in order to minimise the HGVs movement.</p>
	<p>With the first option, how would the differences in ground levels be accommodated on site where existing features such as hedges or trees and solid structures such as the base for pylons exist? Will landscape features not end up on top of banks with all the stress that can create to their survival or establishment in the case of new planting?</p>	<p>For clarification and as outlined above the Applicant would like to reiterate that it is not the intention that a 1m depth of topsoil and subsoil base is removed throughout the whole Converter Station Area and which is referred to as the first option by the interested party.</p> <p>The second option as outlined above refers to an inversion of soil which would for grassland most likely entail 150 mm topsoil scraped off and mixed with subsoil (resulting from excess fill associated with the creation of the Converter Station platform) to create an impoverished substrate as opposed to removing subsoil off site.</p> <p>As a consequence, apart from specific locations where there would be a change in level, ground levels would not alter such that it would cause stress on existing landscape features or physical structures. Where changes in levels are required new levels will be blended with existing in accordance with the design principles in a sympathetic manner to create smooth flowing and naturalistic landforms and subject to approval by the relevant discharging authority. Careful consideration will be given to how new and existing contours marry ensuring that they avoid impacting on existing features - as cited that landscape features will not end up on top of banks that cause stress for their survival or establishment. The exact detail of reprofiling in specific locations will be determined at detailed design.</p> <p>Measures will be taken through the detailed landscaping scheme (which will include detailed specifications, management, maintenance and monitoring plans) to minimise failure of planting in accordance with the updated OLBS (REP-038) and secured through Requirement 7 and 8 in the draft DCO (REP6-015).</p>
	<p>Following on from the above will the resultant topography not appear erratic ?</p>	<p>As outlined above the landscape will be graded in sensitively to blend into the surrounding topography.</p>
	<p>Regarding both options, have the implications on surface water drainage been taken into consideration?</p>	<p>For clarification, the Applicant would like to reiterate that it is not the intention that a 1m depth of topsoil and subsoil base is removed throughout the whole Converter Station Area. Only works associated with the creation of the Converter Station platform and part of the access road, as well as a temporary car park and laydown area, would require a greater depth of cut.</p> <p>The details of how species-rich grassland will be established on this site will be determined at Detailed Design stage once conditions such as soil depth and existing soil composition have been determined by ground investigation works, soil sampling and testing. This design process will review the implications on surface water / drainage within these soft landscaping areas, and where proposed reinstatement of soil types could affect the soft landscaping / existing surface water drainage regime the proposed reinstatement shall form part of the surface water drainage strategy.</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
Denmead Meadows		
3	WCC notes the reference to technical issues with the use of the southern compound, which it is understood, relate to the cable achieving a bend to enter the underground drill section to then be pulled through. If a jointing bay were located at this point, would that not allow the cables to make a more acute change in direction? Whilst this may result in more connections between lengths of the cable than desired, it has to be considered against the acknowledged harm that will result to the biodiversity value of the land on the north side of the road if the compound is located there.	The assessment completed on ecological features has assumed a worst case of the HDD launch compound north of Hambledon Road and has also taken into consideration the ecological features and biodiversity north and south of Hambledon Road. However, since the position paper regarding Denmead Meadows was submitted at Deadline 6 (REP6-072) the Applicant has undertaken further confirmatory investigations with regard to the technical issues associated with siting the compound south of Hambledon Road. This exercise has confirmed the southern compound will be utilised. The Applicant is therefore removing the northern option. This update is captured in the ES Addendum 2 submitted at Deadline 7 (document reference 7.8.2) and in updates to the revised Outline Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (REP6-036) and the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (REP6-038).
4	The cable exit from the Hambledon Road into a compound on the south side of the road may impact a longer section of hedge. However, on balance this is preferable if it retains the full integrity of the land on the north side of the road.	Noted. Whilst the Applicant placed a high degree of confidence in the mitigation strategy proposed for the compound being placed north of Hambledon Road so that integrity of the habitat would be maintained, this option has now been removed in light of the difficulties reaching agreement of this.
	When does the applicant anticipate making the decision on the choice of the location of the launch compound?	The Applicant has now determined the compound will be located south of Hambledon Road. This update is captured in the ES Addendum 2 submitted at Deadline 7 (document reference 7.8.2) and in updates to the revised Outline Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (REP6-036) and the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (REP6-038).
5	If there are over whelming and fundamental technical reasons why the HDD launch compound cannot be located on the south side of the road these should be clearly set out by the applicant at this stage of the Examination. Until the above is considered and set out in detail together with a full outline of the implications of a compound located on the north side of the road, the Council does not consider that the assessment of one site against the other can take place.	The Applicant has now confirmed the compound will be located south of Hambledon Road. This update will be captured in the ES Addendum 2 (document reference 7.8.2) and in updates to the revised Outline Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (REP6-036) and the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (REP6-038).
6	The Council considers that this assessment must form part of the current Examination Process.	As detailed above, the Applicant has now determined the compound will be located south of Hambledon Road.
The following points are offered on the understanding the north side is shown to be the only option available		
7	On the north side of the road, the Council would like the applicant to affirm that no trees on the Hambledon Road frontage will be lost when the cable or vehicle access enters Field 3. This should be accomplished by the identification and further analysis of the proposed access points.	The Applicant can advise that the trees north of Hambledon road, T290, T300, T302, T303, T306, T307 and T312 inclusive will not be lost. As such, TPO number 2290 to 2020 which affords protection to the trees have been excluded from Schedule 11 of the dDCO (REP6-015).

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
8	A tree preservation order has been imposed of trees on the road frontage and one tree back into Field 3. The applicant should review the access point and cable run into this land in the light of the new TPO.	It is understood this refers to TPO number 2290 of 2020 "Land at Hambledon Road, Denmead, Hampshire" and therefore this point is covered above.
9	WCC continues to express concern over the presence of the access rights strip that runs up the western side of the Order limits through Denmead Meadows parcels 3-12a & 3-13a as shown on Land Plans rev003 REP5-003. The most recent response says that was an error and it will not be a haul route.	For the avoidance of doubt, New Access Rights Class (a) which provides the rights 'to construct, build, use, maintain, surface and improve a permanent means of access including visibility splays' is not being sought over these plots. The Applicant will not be installing a haul road on these plots and further to this has updated the Outline Onshore Construction and Environmental Management Plan (OOCEMP) to be submitted at Deadline 7 to explicitly state that access will not be taken over these plots with vehicles but on foot only. Please refer to paragraph 6.4.1.3 of the revised OOCEMP in this regard.
	If vehicles are not to use this strip where is this stated, given the broad nature of uses set out under the definition of "access rights" as detailed in the Book of Reference (REP5-015).	Please refer to response above.
10	At the northern end, in addition to the access being cut through the roadside hedge there will also be a separate section cut out for the cable corridor. Allowing for the existing gate at Anmore Road the estimated loss is 20m + of hedge here.	As per embedded mitigation described in the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (REP6-038, paragraph 1.5.3.2), following construction hedgerow planting will be undertaken to repair gaps where the onshore cable corridor requires their removal. Replanting will use native plant species, and will provide a diverse range of woody species to maintain the species-rich nature of hedgerows.
	Is that a fair estimate? This will have a significant effect on the appearance of the boundary between Anmore Road and Denmead Meadows particularly in the short medium term whilst any new hedge establishes.	There would be a localised moderate adverse effect on landscape features including the loss of hedgerow and consequential appearance of the boundary between Anmore Road and Denmead Meadows, however this would be temporary short to medium term. Native hedgerows lost would be replaced with like-for-like species where practicable.
	It appears there is at least one tree in this vegetation. Where will the replacement be located?	Replacement planting or compensation for tree loss will be agreed at detailed design stage with the local planning authority as agreed in the statement of common ground. This will be secured via requirement 15 of the dDCO (REP6-015).
	What is the access route on the local road network for HGVs to get to the northern compound?	<p>The construction traffic route for accessing works within Kings Pond Meadow is identified within Section 3.4.4 of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (REP6-032). HGV construction traffic to/from Anmore Road and Kings Pond will be routed either via the Converter Station Area and A3 London Road, B2150 Hambledon Road and Mill Lane or directly from junction 3 A3(M), Hulbert Road, A3 London Road, B2150 Hambledon Road and Mill Road.</p> <p>No construction traffic will use routes along Broadway Lane south of the Converter Station Area or Soake Road. This will be managed and enforced by provision of route planning information by the contractor.</p>
11	It would appear that no special measures are proposed in Field 8 although this is part of a SINC. The Council is of the view that the poor condition of the habitat value in Field 8 is a result of its management regime and that if this	The Applicant does not have control of the current management regime of the portion of Field 8 within the Order limits, this control resting with the current landowners, and rights secured through the DCO will allow construction of the Proposed Development and mitigation of its impacts. This allows for the

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>changed the vegetation may well I recover. The applicants approach would remove that regeneration ability forever and should be addressed. The applicant should address the impact on what is part of a designated site.</p>	<p>proposed 5 year post-construction management and monitoring period. Following restoration of habitats immediately post-construction, this period will be used to monitor the condition of the portion of Field 8 within the Order Limits to ensure it is effective, with management interventions made where necessary. Longer term management of Field 8 will remain the responsibility of the landowner.</p> <p>Impacts of Kings Pond Meadows SINC have been assessed within ES Chapter 16 Onshore Ecology (APP-131) and mitigation has been proposed within this document to offset impacts of the Proposed Development. There will therefore be a negligible effect on the SINC.</p>
	<p>As Field 8 east is part of the designated SINC the applicant needs to justify the above approach in more detail.</p>	<p>The response provided above details the strategy to be applied to mitigate any impacts on Field 8 east and to return it to its current condition immediately post-construction.</p>
<p>12</p>	<p>Regarding Field 3 a strategy (expanding on the mitigation identified in sections 16.8.2 to 16.8.4 of ES Chapter 16 Onshore Ecology (APP-131)) seeks to avoid potential effects through controlling working practices.</p> <p>Whilst acknowledging the seed collection activity, is lifting the turfs for storage off site not putting all the main effort into one course of action. If for any reason that should fail then the risks to the plant population is significant.</p> <p>Has consideration been given to any other actions (even if discounted) that would spread the risk?</p>	<p>The Applicant has now determined the compound will be located south of Hambledon Road. This mitigation will therefore not be required and will be removed from the revised Outline Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (REP6-037) and the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (REP6-038).</p>
<p>13</p>	<p>The timing of the work associated with Field 3 at the southern end would avoid the growing season so work is to be undertaken between August and November. The SoCG with Portsmouth Water or the Environment Agency says work at the northern end has to take place in the summer (June-August) due to hydrological issues associated with the pond.</p>	<p>The Applicant has now determined the southern compound of the HDD5 will be located south of Hambledon Road. Work in Field 3, also referred to as north of Hambledon Road, will therefore not be required. The works at the northern end of Denmead Meadows will also need to take place between August and November as detailed under 6.4.1.4 in the Outline Onshore Construction and Environmental Management Plan (OOCEMP; REP6-036). This provides a 16 week weather window in order to complete the HDD and trenching activities in both areas.</p>
	<p>If the work will take around 13 weeks the available window that satisfies the constraints at both ends seems very short.</p> <p>Is there a chronology of events for Denmead Meadows that works within the above restrictions at both ends?</p>	<p>The HDD installation is anticipated to take a duration of 13 weeks which includes, enabling works, haul road construction, HDD installation, haul road removal, and reinstatement. These works will be completed within a 16 week weather window. Works with Field 3 will now not be required due to the siting of the compound south of Hambledon Road.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Monitoring and management – Three years light touch management in years 1,3 & 5 of Fields 3, 8 and 13 (areas within Order Limits) in order to maintain diversity. Botanical survey to take place once yearly to inform any changes to management prescriptions e.g. grazing.</p> <p>What is the definition of a successful reinstatement?</p>	<p>Restoration of habitat within Fields 8 and 13 to its state prior to commencement of construction. It is further noted that through siting the compound south of Hambledon Road Field 3 will be unaffected and no monitoring will be proposed in the revised Outline Onshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (REP-xxx).</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	What happens if at the end of year 5 the vegetation is not as strong as it was before? Will continued management take place or will some other compensation be offered?	Provision of the 5 year management period, and any interventions that may be made during this time, are considered to be sufficient to return the vegetation to its pre-construction state. After this time management responsibility will fully return to the current landowner. No provision for compensation is warranted as the monitoring measures proposed are appropriate and in line with best practice.
	How will this eventuality be addressed and secured through the dDCO?	The 5 year management period proposed is addressed within the current dDCO (REP6-015) through Requirement 9 (Biodiversity Management Plan).
	Where is the mitigation for the residual loss of habitat from that which originally existing.	No residual loss of habitat from that is existing is expected at Denmead Meadows. As described in Chapter 16 Onshore Ecology, mitigation in Fields 3, 8 and 13 will offset temporary impacts, leading to no residual effects. Thus, no mitigation for residual loss of habitat is proposed.
	Habitat enhancement (net gain) measures are proposed up at Lovedean, but where is the equivalent for the Denmead Meadows section?	No residual habitat loss will occur at Denmead as work will be temporary and mitigation will restore lowland meadow habitat. The Applicant will be required to return the land to its state prior to construction and return it to the landowner in that condition as is appropriate; the applicant will not have control over long term management of Denmead Meadows, as it is not appropriate for them to do so.

Table 4.20 - Winchester City Council Response to Recent Changes to the Order Limits

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
Ash Dieback		
	<p>The supporting statement indicates that the applicant has considered the implications of ash dieback on the landscape screening and in recognition of the potential reduction in screening it is proposed to add two additional areas of woodland to the Oder Limits. These are identified in the submission as Mill Copse and Stoneacre Copse.</p> <p>The Council is supportive of this change to the scheme as far as they go. However, it would like some clarification why the assessment does not appear to have consider the potential dieback implications on the existing landscape screening that lies to the west of the site for the proposed converter station. Having considered the Tree Constraints Plans (REP1-101) and the descriptive tables that set out the Tree Survey Schedule Rev 002 (REP3-007) it appears that ash does form an important part of the makeup of some of the landscape features on this side of the site. Attached below is a cut and paste of sheet 6 of 41 from the Tree Constraint Plans. The tree survey schedule records the following examples of ash trees in some of the features recorded on this plan :</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered ash dieback throughout the updated Order limits and this includes the effects of ash dieback to the west of the Converter Station. The Ash dieback findings are presented in Appendix 3 of Deadline 6 Submission 7.7.17 Request for Changes to the Order limits (Change Request 2) (AS-054) and in the ES Addendum 2 (document reference 7.8.2). Figure 1 Ash dieback survey in Appendix 3 of AS-054 shows that the extent of the disease is limited to the west of the Converter Station. The extent based on the referred tree /hedgerow groups which lie within the Order limits is as follows:</p>

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6 Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
	<p>G639 Boundary group of large mature ash. Some very large specimens at southern end.</p> <p>G689 is mature ash and oak overstorey.....</p> <p>G705 Group of mature large ash and oak.....</p> <p>H879 Large ash standards to 15m.....</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G639 - east of Old Mill Lane (running north south) – this has some evidence of ash dieback in G9 and G11 with 25-50% remaining leaf cover with remaining affected trees (T27, T28 and T40) retaining 75-100% leaf cover. • G689 east of Old Mill Lane - out of this group of trees G7 and T23 have between 25-50% remaining leaf cover and G8 and T22 between 50-75%. • G705 running at 90 degrees to Old Mill Lane - the survey indicates that there are two trees (T42 and T56) which is suffering from ash dieback with 75-100% remaining leaf cover. • H879 east of Old Mill Lane – no trees have been identified as being affected by the disease. <p>Whilst the current situation is presented in the above bullet points, the ash dieback survey indicates that conditions may well worsen over time, therefore affecting the future baseline. As a consequence, the updated OLBS (REP6-038) has been revised to take account of the ash dieback findings with reference to a woodland management plan and replacement planting.</p> <p>The woodland management plan for existing woodland, individual and hedgerow trees within the revised Order limits would form part of the detailed landscaping scheme. Management proposals within the plan will include selective felling, replacement with alternative species such as oak with some standing deadwood remaining. Some areas will be allowed to regenerate naturally to increase the density of understorey and encourage further ground flora to establish. The woodland management plan will include annual monitoring plans to review yearly actions and progress of ash dieback as well as the success of new and replacement planting and of natural regeneration. Replacement planting will take place where required.</p>
	<p>The assessment undertaken does not appear to give any weight to the implication of ash loss to features on this side of the development. On the basis that ash dieback has been accepted as potentially reducing the effectiveness of the existing landscape screening, what measures are proposed to consider and address the implications on this side of the proposed development?</p>	<p>Individual trees, woodland and hedgerow trees to the western side of the Converter Station (including those identified above) and which lie within the Order limits are covered by the updated OLBS (REP6-038) which refers to a woodland management plan forming part of the detailed landscaping scheme. The woodland management plan (as referred to above) will include annual monitoring plans to review the progress of ash dieback and determine the necessary course of action. Replacement planting will take place including the replacement of trees lost as a consequence of ash dieback with alternative species in agreement with the discharging authority.</p>

Table 4.21 - The Tudor Sailing Club Responses to Recent Changes to the Order Limits (Change Request 1)

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6a Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
Tudor Sailing Club		
	<p>Tudor Sailing Club wish to strongly object to the proposed use of the southern end of our compound (outlined in red on drawing 62100616-WSP-POST-TC14 rev 01) for laydown and car parking. This area of our compound is used in the winter for storage of members yachts ashore and in the summer for storage of members tenders, rowing gigs and kayaks, with some room for members parking. The proposed use of this are would leave our members with nowhere to store their tenders, rowing gigs and kayaks and would also be a security risk for the sailing dinghies and kayaks stored in the norther end of the compound.</p> <p>The Club is normally unmanned and the compound is fenced and locked; the proposed use would necessitate many non-members being issued with keys and having to be relied on to lock the compound and avoid loss and damage to members property.</p>	<p>The Applicant has submitted Change Request 3 at Deadline 7. This change request provides for the removal of the land occupied by Tudor Sailing Club from the Order limits. The Applicant has communicated this to the club's Commodore in advance of the change being made and he was very supportive of the change being made.</p>

Table 4.22 - Portsmouth City Council Responses to Recent Changes to the Order Limits (Change Request 1)

Para No.	Summary of Deadline 6a Submission	Applicant's Response at Deadline 7
Portsmouth City Council		
	<p>PCC welcomes the reduction in Order limits and encourages the Applicant to have further consideration on Order limits and the rights sought along the line of the Proposed Development. PCC requests that further refinements of the Order limits are undertaken to reduce further the Order limits, especially over Special Category Land, areas of allotment and highway land.</p> <p>Where the Applicant is seeking to increase the Order limits, at Baffins Milton Rovers F.C.'s ground, PCC understands this is in response to engagement with Baffins Milton Rovers F.C., the occupier of the land and tenant to PCC. Therefore, PCC supports the proposed change as it mitigates impacts on the occupier, but PCC maintains that any private treaty agreement reached with the Applicant for the rights sought will be subject to both PCC tenants and PCC as freehold owner. It is PCC's hope that the Applicant continues to work with PCC tenants to mitigate the impacts of the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that where the Applicant is seeking to increase the Order limits at Baffins Milton Rovers F.C.'s ground, the Applicant has had engagement with Baffins Milton Rovers F.C. in relation to the change.</p> <p>With regards to further refinements of the Order Limits, the Applicant has submitted a further Change Request at Deadline 7 which removes a further area of PCC land from the Order limits at Farlington Playing Fields (Plot 7-12) and also removes the land owned by the Council and leased to Tudor Sailing Club at Kendall's Wharf (Plots 8-03c and 8-03d) along with Plot 8-03b which is used to access the other plots referenced. The Applicant confirms its commitment to working with PCC and its tenants to agree a voluntary agreement in relation to the land rights required and also commits to working collaboratively with the Council to minimise the impacts of the Proposed Development.</p>