



AQUIND Limited

AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR

Environmental Statement Addendum 3 – Appendix 4.1 Validity of desk-based data sources used in the onshore environmental topic chapters in the Environmental Statement

The Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations
2009 – Regulation 5(2)(a)

The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017

Document Ref: 7.8.3.7

PINS Ref.: EN020022

AQUIND Limited

AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR

Environmental Statement Addendum 3 –
Appendix 4.1 Validity of desk-based data
sources used in the onshore environmental topic
chapters in the Environmental Statement

PINS REF.: EN020022

DOCUMENT: 7.8.3.7

DATE: 28 APRIL 2023

WSP

WSP House

70 Chancery Lane

London

WC2A 1AF

+44 20 7314 5000





| | | | |
|----------------|---|------------------------|--------|
| TO | AQUIND Limited | FROM | WSP |
| DATE | 28 April 2023 | CONFIDENTIALITY | Public |
| SUBJECT | Validity of desk-based data sources used in the onshore environmental topic chapters in the Environmental Statement | | |

| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| Landscape and Visual Amenity | Relevant local planning authorities (WCC, PCC, HBC, EHDC, HCC), Parish Councils, South Downs National Park Authority, and Landscape Institute | Legislation, policy and guidance | Legislation adopted policy and guidance in the public domain relevant local authorities and statutory bodies. | No new relevant information has been published by the regulatory consultees since completion of the Examination period. | There has not been any significant change in the validity of the data employed in the existing assessment. |
| | Ordnance Survey (OS) | Mapping | Dwg. format | More recent data available from Ordnance Survey. | Whilst more recent OS data is available, the data utilised is still valid for the EIA. Accordingly, there are no changes to the impact assessment, and the conclusions and agreed mitigation measures reported in the ES remain valid. |
| | WSP | Zones of Theoretical Visibility mapping | Dwg format. Based on LIDAR data at the time of production. | Zone of Theoretical Visibility remains valid unless design changes (for example to building massing or heights). | There are not design changes to the proposed development. Accordingly, the conclusions made within Chapter 15 of the ES for the Proposed Development remain valid. |



| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/ SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|
| | WSP | 3D models of the location for the Converter Station based on the Parameter Plans | Dwg format | 3D model remains valid unless design changes (for example to building massing or heights). | There are not design changes to the proposed development. Accordingly, the conclusions made within Chapter 15 of the ES for the Proposed Development remain valid. |
| Onshore Ecology | Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre | Biological records | <p>Protected / notable species recorded within 2km of the Proposed Development. Details of Sites Important for Nature Conservation (SINCs) collected in 2019.</p> <p>The HBIS data provides context to the initial stages of ecological assessment but does not have equivalent value to on site baseline surveys data.</p> | Biological records centre updates their databases periodically so new information will be available on protected / notable species. SINC site details will be identical unless there have been newly designated areas. | Whilst the biological records data utilised is >3 years old, it is considered that there is negligible potential for any material changes to have occurred in respect of the protected / notable species. Accordingly, the conclusions and requirements for mitigation reported in Chapter 16 of the ES remain valid. |
| | Natural England habitat inventory / ancient woodland inventory | Priority habitats / Ancient Woodland inventory | Data of Habitats of Principal Importance (HPI) and ancient woodland within 100m of the Proposed Development | Ancient woodland data last updated in November 2022 | There are no additional areas within or immediately adjacent to the Order limits of the Proposed Development detailed in the ancient woodland inventory. The data used to inform the ES is therefore valid. |

| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/ SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|--------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|
| | British Trust for Ornithology | Wetland Bird Survey data | Annual / monthly counts of waterbirds associated with the Special Protection Area (SPA) | WeBS data is updated roughly a year in arrears. | WeBS data provides supporting context to baseline surveys undertaken by WSP, so in isolation this will not impact on the ES conclusions. Overview counts from Chichester and Langstone Harbours available from the WeBS Report Online suggests that the status of all species has remained the same within the SPA apart from Redshank and Sanderling, which do not now occur in numbers deemed to be nationally important (5 year mean 2015/16 – 2019/2020). There is a high level of confidence that conclusion made in the ES are therefore valid. |
| | SWBGS | Solent Wader and Brent Goose Strategy Sites | Shapefile of locations and type of SWBGS sites | Updated in 2020. | No additional SWBGS within or adjacent to the Order limits have been identified through a review of the current SWBGS map. The data used for the ES is therefore valid. |
| Arboriculture | Winchester City Council East Hampshire District Council Havant Borough Council Portsmouth City Council | TPO and conservation areas | Requires review as data collected approximately four years ago | TPO data sources reviewed. | There have not been any material changes to the status of protected trees relevant to the Proposed Development. The mitigations to be applied in relation to any affected TPO remain as previously secured, and accordingly, the conclusions within the ES in this regard remain valid. |
| | Woodland Trust | Ancient Tree Inventory - Veteran tree database | Data set is not a comprehensive data source | Ancient Tree Inventory checked (14.03.2023) with no change. | The data relied upon to inform the assessment remain valid and therefore the conclusions reported in the ES remain valid. |

| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/ SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--|--|---|
| Soils and Agricultural Land Use | BGS | Online resource | Geology of Britain Viewer. | N/A | The data relied upon to inform the assessment remain valid and therefore the conclusions reported in the ES remain valid. |
| | Defra (2009). | Guidance document | Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites. | N/A | The data relied upon to inform the assessment remain valid and therefore the conclusions reported in the ES remain valid. |
| | Jarvis et al (1984). | Article | Soils and Their Use in South East England. Soil Survey of England and Wales Bulletin 15, Harpenden. | N/A | The data relied upon to inform the assessment remain valid and therefore the conclusions reported in the ES remain valid. |
| | MAFF (1988). | Guidance document | Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales, Revised guidelines and criteria for grading the quality of agricultural land. | N/A | The data relied upon to inform the assessment remain valid and therefore the conclusions reported in the ES remain valid. |
| | Met Office (1989). | Online database | Agroclimatic database for Agricultural Land Classification. | N/A | The data relied upon to inform the assessment remain valid and therefore the conclusions reported in the ES remain valid. |
| | Natural England (2012). | Guidance document | Technical Information Note 049. | N/A | The data relied upon to inform the assessment remain valid and therefore the conclusions reported in the ES remain valid. |
| | NHBS | Maps | Soil Survey of England and Wales, Soils of South East England (1:250,000), Sheet 6. | N/A | The data relied upon to inform the assessment remain valid and therefore the conclusions reported in the ES remain valid. |



| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/ SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| | Defra | Online resource | Provisional Agricultural Land Classification data (from defra.magic.gov.uk). | N/A | The data relied upon to inform the assessment remain valid and therefore the conclusions reported in the ES remain valid. |
| | ADAS (1995). | Detailed ALC surveys | Winchester District Local Plan, Land at Denmead, Hampshire, Agricultural Land Classification. Ref 1513/059/95 | N/A | The data relied upon to inform the assessment remain valid and therefore the conclusions reported in the ES remain valid. |
| | FRCA (1998). | LPA Local Plan | Havant Borough Council Local Plan, Objector Sites: Area 1, Cowplain, Hampshire, Agricultural Land Classification. | N/A | The data relied upon to inform the assessment remain valid and therefore the conclusions reported in the ES remain valid. |
| | Ground Investigation Contractor | Project GI borehole data | Soils information extracted from the Ground Investigation results | N/A | The data relied upon to inform the assessment remain valid and therefore the conclusions reported in the ES remain valid. |
| Ground Conditions | Relevant local planning authorities (WCC, PCC, HBC, EHDC, HCC) and Environment Agency | Consultation data Anecdotal data Legislation, policy and guidance | Information relating to potential contamination along the route of the Proposed Development could have been updated. | Not aware of any material updates to information in respect of contaminated land.. | Any material change in the validity of the data employed in the existing assessment is unlikely, and in any event the mitigations for any contaminated land are secured by Requirement 13 of the DCO which ensures any ground contamination is appropriately dealt with as part of construction. As such there will be no change to the residual effects reported in the ES. |
| Groundwater | Portsmouth Water | Drinking water abstraction data and potential recent water | Drinking water abstraction detail, Source Protection Zone boundaries and experience from previous | Such information would need to be obtained from Portsmouth Water. | There is a high level of confidence that the overall data remain valid and that the conclusions made within Chapter 19 of the ES for the Proposed Development remain the |



| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | quality issues | pollution incidents obtained during consultation. | | <p>same, and in any event a comprehensive set of mitigation measures relating to the construction and protection of water resources are secured by Requirement 6 (Detailed Design) which must be complied with and as such there will be no change to the residual effects reported in the ES.</p> <p>Requirement 13 also ensures any groundwater contamination is appropriately dealt with as part of construction and as such there will be no change to the residual effects reported in the ES in this regard.</p> |
| Surface Water Resources and Flood Risk | Environment Agency and LLFA | Flood risk mapping and desk-based sources. | <p>Check completed to identify changes to desk-based sources including EA indicative flood maps and SFRA.</p> <p>Check completed to identify changes to governing policy and guidance.</p> <p>.</p> | <p>No identified changes to desk-based sources of data used to inform the FRA.</p> <p>Review identified changes to policy and guidance as follows: NPPF 2021; PPG 2022 including updates on Climate change allowances</p> | <p>Sequential Test used in current FRA follows the NPPF 2019 guidance. NPPF 2021 and PPG 2022 require the Sequential Test to be undertaken for all sources of flooding plus climate change allowance (previously this just required consideration of fluvial and tidal flood risk, without climate change). The position in respect of these updates was addressed in the Applicant's Response to the Third Information Request dated 18 November 2021 at Section 4.</p> <p>As noted therein, given the minor nature of the changes made to the NPPF in this regard and that the Applicant has in any event undertaken a robust assessment of flood risk which considered all sources of flooding, we are entirely content that the assessment of flood risk is valid and that the Sequential and Exception Tests are evidenced to be satisfied in relation to the Proposed Development.</p> |



| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|---------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| Water Framework Directive | Environment Agency Catchment Data Explorer | WFD classification data | Classification data for WFD quality elements, reasons for not achieving good status, hazardous and priority substances classification. | <p>For surface water WFD water bodies, the updated WFD classification data (2019 data) has downgraded the classification of WFD quality elements from Good to Moderate status for the Potwell tributary water body overall physio-chemical status and phosphate. In addition, the priority hazardous substances classification has been downgraded from Good to Fail for both the Potwell tributary and Langstone Harbour WFD water bodies.</p> <p>For Langstone Harbour, the overall biological classification has been also downgraded from Good to Moderate status.</p> <p>Specific pollutants changed from no data to High status, and priority substances from does not need assessment to Good status.</p> <p>For Groundwater, several of the status objectives dates have been changed in the new classification data, with many dates having been changed from a target date of 2027 to a new target date of 2060. This therefore provides a considerably longer timescale for WFD objectives to be met.</p> <p>In addition, some classification data for the groundwater bodies has been upgraded from Poor to Good status. Where the Good status is now achieved, the target date for meeting the status objective has been downward revised</p> | Data utilised is still valid for the WFD assessment. The updates to the WFD classification data do not alter the outcome of the WFD assessment given that the detailed WFD assessment concluded no deterioration as a result of the Proposed Development, and any changes to the classification data would not result in a change to the conclusions of the assessment of potential impacts. |



| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>from a target date of 2027 to either 2015 or 2021, to reflect that the status objective has already been met.</p> | |
| Heritage and Archaeology | <p>Hampshire County Council</p> <p>Portsmouth City Council</p> <p>Winchester City Council</p> <p>Historic England</p> | <p>Historic Environment Record (HER) data</p> <p>National Heritage List (NHLE) data</p> | <p>Updates could have been made to the HER data held by the individual councils (Hampshire County and Portsmouth City Council).</p> <p>The National Heritage List data (NHLE) is a regularly updated dataset and is available a download from Historic England to ensure that it is current.</p> | <p>A review of the NHLE dataset has not identified any additional designated heritage assets within the order limits or wider study area.</p> <p>There are no new designated LPA Conservation Areas within the assessment study area(s).</p> <p>Neither East District Council nor Winchester City Council (WCC) currently hold a local list of historic buildings. Following a review of the Portsmouth City Council (PCC) Local List of Buildings (updated May 2021), there are no additional buildings/structures identified within the previous assessment study area.</p> <p>Using publicly available information, it is uncertain whether the Havant Borough Council's 'List of buildings of local interest' has been updated since the DCO submission. A review of the current list has not identified any further assets which would affect the scope, nor conclusions of the ES.</p> | <p>No updates have been identified relating to historic environment that alter the conclusions of the assessment.</p> <p>Such data would in any event, data relating to the historic environment would be confirmed by the applicant as part of the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) post DCO consent when works are to be undertaken, to meet Requirement 14 of the draft DCO (archaeological trial trench investigation and subsequent mitigation fieldwork). Whilst further information could therefore be available regarding the potential archaeological resources, unless remains are of very high significance (which is very rare), the previous impact assessment would not change.</p> <p>There is a high level of confidence that any minor changes to the HER datasets will not affect the conclusions of the ES assessment, which d therefore remain valid.</p> <p>No additional designated above ground heritage assets have been identified within the Order limits or wider study that would affect the previous scope or impact assessment. As such, the conclusions of the ES remain valid in respect of built heritage setting.</p> |

| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Traffic and Transport | Hampshire Constabulary | Accident Data | 1st October 2014 – 30th September 2019 | N/A | Previous accident data is considered robust as the review of accident data was conducted for a five-year period. If this was repeated, it would include two years of COVID lockdowns, and thus would not be representative. Data therefore remains valid and the conclusions made within Chapter 22 of the ES for the Proposed Development remain the same. |
| | Ordnance Survey | Mapping | Dwg. format | More recent data available from Ordnance Survey. | Minor changes to highway layout may have occurred in time elapsed. However, whilst specifics of data may have changed, this is unlikely to be of a scale which would change the conclusions of the ES. |
| | Google Maps | Baseline conditions, including: -Location of Sensitive Receptors (e.g. Schools, GP surgery's, Hospitals, Care Homes) -General Highway Conditions | Used to conduct desktop review of study area. | Available online. | A review has been undertaken of locations of sensitive receptors and general highway conditions using the most recently available Google Maps dataset. Whilst there have been minor changes to the specifics of existing conditions of the study area, this is not of a scale which would change the conclusions of the ES. There is a high level of confidence that no changes are anticipated to the impact assessment. |
| | Hampshire County Council | Highway Boundary Data Local Policy Documents | PDF of Highway Land, PROW, Policy Documents, Signal Specifications | Updated documents partially available online or from Council directly. | Minor changes to policy documents, PRoW and the timetabling of local events have occurred in the time elapsed since the original assessment, but this is not of a scale which would change the conclusions of the ES. There is a high level |

| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/ SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | PROW mapping Traffic Signal Specifications Timetables of Local events, (including school holidays) | | | <p>of confidence that no changes are anticipated to the impact assessment.</p> <p>It is expected that any minor changes which could have occurred to traffic signal specifications, and highway boundary data would not change the conclusions of the ES. There is a high level of confidence that no changes are anticipated to the impact assessment.</p> |
| | Portsmouth City Council | Highway Boundary Data Local Policy Documents PROW mapping Traffic Signal Specifications Timetables of Local events, (including school holidays) | PDF of Highway Land, PROW, Policy Documents, Signal Specifications | Updated documents partially available online or from Council directly. | <p>Minor changes to policy documents, PROW and the timetabling of local events have occurred in the time elapsed since the original assessment this is not of a scale which would change the conclusions of the ES. There is a high level of confidence that no changes are anticipated to the impact assessment.</p> <p>It is expected that any minor changes which could have occurred to traffic signal specifications, and highway boundary data would not change the conclusions of the ES. There is a high level of confidence that no changes are anticipated to the impact assessment.</p> |
| | Sustrans | Active Travel Networks | Last reviewed 2019 | Updated information available online | Minor changes to active travel networks have occurred since 2019, however these are not of a scale which would change the conclusions of the ES. There is a high level of confidence that no changes are anticipated to the impact assessment. |

| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/ SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| | First Hampshire and the Isle of Wight / Stagecoach | Bus Routes / Timetables | Last reviewed 2019 | Updated information available online | Minor changes to bus route numbering and timetabling undertaken in time elapsed since the original assessment. Minor changes to routing, but this is not of a scale which would change the conclusions of the ES. There is a high level of confidence that no changes are anticipated to the impact assessment. |
| Noise and Vibration | WSP | Noise survey data | 2017 - The data were gathered in 2017 for the purpose of understanding the background (underlying) noise levels at residential properties close to the converter station. 2019 – baseline noise survey for the landfall. | More recent data are not available. | The data gathered in 2017 and 2019 are still valid. The underlying background noise levels are used in the assessment of converter station and ORS noise and, considering the lack of any significant development in the area since 2017, these are considered unlikely to have changed in the intervening period to the point where the assessment outcomes would change. |
| | Various sources | Designations for ecologically sensitive areas | Designated sites as used in the Ecology section | Please see Onshore Ecology Section. | There have been no changes to the designations of ecologically sensitive receptors, therefore, the conclusions of Chapter 24 of the ES remain valid with respect to noise levels in these areas. |
| | WSP Traffic and Transport | Construction phase and operational phase traffic flow data | SRTM flows including committed developments were provided. Please see Traffic and Transport section. | Please see Traffic and Transport section. | All project specific traffic counts in areas sensitive to noise were undertaken pre-COVID 19 and have been proven to be higher than the post-COVID traffic flows. The traffic data used for the ES are in the region of 5% higher than the actual post-COVID 19 flows. |



| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/ SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Air Quality | Portsmouth City Council | Air quality monitoring data | Annual monitoring data is available as part of the Environment Act 1995 obligations on the council to monitor and report to the SoS on local air quality | Data is produced by Portsmouth City Council annually in arrears. | As the change in traffic flows are small (in the region of -5%), and therefore unlikely to change the conclusions of the ES. |
| | Portsmouth City Council | Air quality action plan measures | Actions currently published in the Annual Status Report and Air Quality Local Plan | Actions may be updated in the latest Annual Status Report (not available on Portsmouth City Council website) | Whilst the Annual Status Report will (when published) provide updated information, given there have been no significant changes in the receiving environment in the intervening period and the mitigations secured in relation to construction and minimising impacts on air quality apply in any event, as secured through OOCEMP (REP9-005), the ES conclusions remain valid. |

| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | UK Government | Legislation | The regulatory regime under which the ES assessment was undertaken has been superseded. | The Environmental (Miscellaneous Amendments) (EU Exit) Regulations 2020 HM Government Environmental Improvement Plan 2023 | The PM _{2.5} objective is now more stringent following The Environment (Miscellaneous Amendments) (EU Exit) Regulations 2020 however the existing assessment complies with this new objective. |
| | UK Government | Technical guidance | TG(16) guidance has been superseded by TG(22). | TG(22) guidance available. | TG(22) includes findings from updated studies on the relationship between annual and hourly NO ₂ and the relationship between PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} however this does not affect the conclusions of the air quality assessment which remain valid. |
| | Portsmouth City Council | Clean Air Zone location | The Clean Air Zone boundary supplied is not known to have changed. | The Clean Air Zone boundary supplied is not known to have changed. | The Clean Air Zone boundary supplied is not known to have changed. On the basis that there have been no changes, the data used in the ES remains valid. |
| | Defra | Background air quality archive | 2018-base year datasets are still available and considered valid for use. | 2018-base year datasets are still available and considered valid for use | 2018-base year datasets are still available and considered valid for use. |
| | Ordnance Survey | Mastermap Topography and AddressBase Plus | The supplied data is now out of licence. | Mastermap topography is updated with a frequency of a maximum of 6 months. AddressBase Plus is updated monthly. | Whilst the supplied data is now out of licence, it is known that there have not been any relevant material changes in the receiving environment. The data utilised for known receptors at time of reporting is still considered to be valid. |

| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/ SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|
| | WSP Traffic and Transport | Construction phase and operational phase traffic flow data | SRTM flows including committed developments were provided and remain robust and valid. Please see Traffic and Transport section. | Please see Traffic and Transport section. | <p>The Department of Transport traffic growth assumptions used within the SRTM for the 2019 to 2026 forecast were much higher than current predictions for traffic growth over the same period, due to the impact of COVID-19 on traffic patterns.</p> <p>Therefore, the worst-case traffic flows from the SRTM used in the air quality assessment are considered to remain valid as the SRTM continues to provide a robust traffic forecast for assessment purposes.</p> |
| Socio-economics | Office for National Statistics ('ONS') Population and demographic data from Census information (2011) | Statistical data | Statistics related to population, society and the labour market at national, regional and local levels. | Census 2021 datasets are now available | The more recent datasets are likely to change the baseline information. However, it is anticipated that the changes in the population and labour market would not be sufficient to change the conclusions of the socio-economic assessment. |
| | Local Authority Public Right of Way (PRoW) mapping | PRoW data | Hampshire County Council's definitive map provides the location and type of PRoW in Hampshire. | Hampshire County Council's definitive map was last updated. | <p>Following submission of the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) application, two additional permissive paths through Milton Common and one through Bransbury Park were identified. The draft DCO and Access Rights of Way plans were updated in 2021 to include these additional permissive paths in respect of which stopping up powers are sought.</p> <p>In addition, two additional Public Rights of Way (PRoW) were identified from reviewing the latest version of the Hampshire County Council's definitive map. The PRoW include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Footpath 064/503/1 which is located along the eastern boundary of Denmead Junior |



| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|--------------------------|--|------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>School; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Footpath 279/734/3 which is situated to the west of Purbrook, in close proximity to PRow 18, 739 and 33b as shown on Figure 25.2 the Environmental Statement (ES) of the draft DCO. <p>The mitigation measures outlined in Chapter 25: Socio-economics of the ES for the Draft DCO would be applied to the above permissive paths and footpaths. With this mitigation in place, there are not anticipated to be any effects of greater significance than that outlined in Chapter 25: Socio-economics of the ES.</p> |
| | ONS Business Register and Employment Survey ('BRES') | Statistical data | The BRES is the official source of employee and employment estimates by detailed geography and industry. | The latest BRES data release was 13 th October 2022. | The more recent datasets may change the assumptions on which the construction employment calculations are based. However, given the short period of time which has passed it is anticipated that these changes would not be sufficient to change the conclusions of the assessment and therefore the data are still considered valid. |
| | Google Maps | Mapping | The mapping shows aerial imagery of the area within the socio-economics study area. | It is unclear when Google Maps was last updated. | New receptors along the length of the Proposed Development have been identified since the 2019 submission including, for example, Touch and Go Agility, Lovedean Granary B&B Berewood Skatepark and the Artillery Arms. However, the mitigation set out in Chapter 25: Socio-economics of the ES of the Draft DCO would be applied to these new receptors. With this mitigation in place, it is anticipated there would not be any effects of greater significance than that outlined in Chapter 25: Socio- |



| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/ SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|--|---|------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>economics of the ES.</p> <p>With specific regard to the Touch and Go Agility centre, whilst the Order limits are approximately 350m west of the fields that are likely to be used for agility training the area of land to the west of the business will be used for hedgerow improvements and the land to the south of the business encompasses the existing sub-station. Therefore, it is expected that the Proposed Development would not lead to significant effects on this receptor during construction and operation.</p> |
| | Partnership for Urban South Hampshire ('PUSH') Green Infrastructure Strategy 2017 | Strategy | The strategy sets out the vision and framework for the delivery of an integrated network of strategic green infrastructure across the South Hampshire sub-region. | The strategy covers the period 2016 to 2034. | N/A |
| | Portsmouth City Council Official Visitor Guide 2019 | Visitor guide | The visitor guide sets out what things there are to see and do in Portsmouth. | Portsmouth Visitor Guide 2023 is available | There may be new receptors that have been identified since the 2019 submission detailed within the guide; though data utilised is considered to be valid for the EIA and any updates would not affect the ES conclusions given the mitigations secured. |
| Human Health <i>(NB: the Human Health Assessment is informed by other Environmental</i> | Office for National Statistics ('ONS') Population and demographic data from Census information (2011) | Statistical data | Statistics related to population, society and the labour market at national, regional and local levels. | Census 2021 datasets are now available | The more recent datasets are likely to change the baseline information. However, it is expected that the changes in the population would not be sufficient to change the conclusions of the human health assessment. |

| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/ SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| <i>Discipline topic assessments including Air Quality, Noise and vibration, Socio-economics, Landscape and visual Amenity, Traffic and transport)</i> | Office for Health Improvement and Disparities (previously Public Health England) | Local Authority Health Profiles, Public Health Profiles | Statistics and indicators related to population health at national, regional and local levels. | Datasets are updated annually with the most recently available information. | The more recent datasets are likely to change the baseline information. However, it is expected that the changes in population health would not be sufficient to change the conclusions of the human health assessment. |
| Waste and Material Resources | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, 2019 South East England Aggregate Working Party, 2018 Mineral Products Association, 2018; House of Commons Library, 2018 London Aggregates Working Party, 2017 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly statistics of Building Materials and Components South East England Aggregates Monitoring report 2017 Profile of the UK Mineral Products Industry UK Steel Industry: Statistics and Policy London Aggregates Monitoring | <p>1 - 7: Quantities of stocks, production, sales or consumption of construction materials relevant to the scheme. Data was typically provided for the year 2017 as the latest reported year, although some data was available for 2018 whilst other data was only available for 2014 or 2016.</p> <p>8: Hampshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Policies Map used to identify mineral safeguarding areas.</p> <p>9: National and Regional Guidelines for Aggregates Provision in England 2005 – 2020 used to identify the average recycling content target for South East</p> | <p>1-7: This data is updated periodically. New data will be available for item numbers:</p> <p>1: (published monthly with annual data used for the ES assessment)</p> <p>2: (2019 version published in 2021)</p> <p>3: (2020 version currently the latest data available)</p> <p>4: (data for 2019 available)</p> <p>5: (the 2019 monitoring report is available)</p> <p>6: (2020 data is available)</p> <p>7: (2019 data is available)</p> <p>Item numbers 8 and 9 have undergone no changes.</p> <p>Item 10 has been updated to include recovery rates in England to 2020 and in the UK to 2018.</p> <p>The Environment Agency data (item</p> | <p>Data for the assessment of material availability (item numbers 1-7) will have likely been updated, however, based on the assessment criteria used, the significance of effect is unlikely to have changed due sourcing of material outside of the UK.</p> <p>Data for the location of mineral safeguarding areas (item number 8) remains the same.</p> <p>Data for the assessment of waste transfer, materials recovery and metal recycling (item numbers 9-10 and some of no. 11) will have likely been updated, however, this data does not directly inform the significance of effect, and is used to indicate the potential for waste diversion from landfill. As such, no change to the ES would be expected as a consequence of any updates.</p> <p>Data on remaining landfill capacity (item number 11) will have been updated since the original waste and material resources chapter of the ES. Furthermore, the waste and material resources 2019 ES chapter assumed a construction end date of 2024. Given that the</p> |



| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/ SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|--------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|
| | 6. British Plastics Federation, 2017 7. Statista, 2016; 8. Hampshire Authorities, 2013 9. Department for Communities and Local Government, 2009. 10. Defra, 2019 11. Environment Agency, 2018 | Report 2017 6. The UK Plastics Industry at A Glance 7. Approximate unwrought copper consumption volume in the United Kingdom (UK) from 2009 to 2014 8. The Hampshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Policies Map 9. National and Regional Guidelines for Aggregates Provision in England 2005 – 2020 10. ENV23 - UK Statistics on Waste 11. Waste Management | Region. 10: UK Statistics on Waste used to identify non-hazardous construction and demolition arisings recovery in England 11: Environment Agency data used to identify trends in waste transfer, recovery and metal recycling; remaining capacity of landfill sites. Data was available up to the year 2018. | number 11) is updated annually with the latest available data for the year 2021. | <p>Proposed Development was anticipated to generate approximately 26,000 tonnes of waste to landfill, which equated to 0.05% of forecast available regional landfill capacity, it is anticipated that the Proposed Development will in any event remain under the 1% threshold of the assessment criteria set out in the methodology at the time of writing the ES.</p> <p>There is a high level of confidence that the overall data remain valid and that the conclusions made within Chapter 27 of the ES for the Proposed Development remain the same.</p> |

| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/ SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| | | data for England; Waste Data Interrogator 2017; Remaining Landfill Capacity | | | |
| | Highways England IAN153/11 | Guidance on the Environmental Assessment of Material Resources | At the time of writing the waste and material resources ES chapter, the guidance available was IAN153/11, to inform the methodology and assessment criteria. This has since been withdrawn. | The IEMA guide to materials and waste in Environmental Impacts Assessment (2020) and Highways England DMRB LA110 Material Assets and Waste (2019) have both been published since the time of writing the waste and material resources chapter of the ES. These guidance document have different methodologies and assessment criteria to IAN153//11. | The IEMA methodology and assessment criteria for materials is focused on the availability of natural resources for the Proposed Development, rather than the proximity of the material resource as outlined in IAN153/11. However, based on the approach used at the time of writing (IAN 153/11), the conclusions made within Chapter 27 of the ES for the Proposed Development remain valid. |
| Climate Resilience | Met Office weather station data Met Office UK Climate Projections (UKCP18) | Met Office weather station (1981-2010) UK Climate Projections (UKCP18) Probabilistic Projections and Regional Projections | The probabilistic projections allow for a better illustration of the full range of uncertainties to be explored under future scenarios of climate change, however they may not capture all possible future outcomes. | UK Weather Station data is now available for 1991-2020. The Met Office issued a statement in July 2021 that included an update to UK Climate Projections due to discrepancies in temperature data. UK Climate Resilience programme has established additional data sources to use for climate risk assessment purposes. | The current baseline would continue to use 1981-2010 for the weather station as this aligns with the reference time period to which the UKCP18 projections have been based. As the climate system evolves and our ability to understand and model these changes improves, it is likely that the climate projections will be refined. However, this does not hinder the results of the assessment, as the trends in climate data remain valid. Under both versions of UKCP18 (that released in 2019 and updated in 2021-2022) the headline messages remain the same – the UK is expected to have warmer wetter winters and hotter drier summers, with |



| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>an increase in the intensity and frequency of extreme events (including temperature, heatwaves, drought, heavy rainfall and storms), with an increase in sea level rise.</p> <p>The assessment has been conducted using the precautionary principle approach: Under Article 3 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) “parties should take precautionary measures to anticipate, prevent, or minimize the causes of climate change and mitigate its adverse effects.” It continues by affirming that a lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent serious or irreversible damage.</p> <p>The design measures proposed in ES chapter 28 remain valid in reducing the climate change risks identified.</p> |
| Carbon and Climate Change | Department for Business Energy and Industrial Strategy now Department for Energy Security & Net Zero | Emissions factors (Data) | Department for Energy Security & Net Zero publishes Emissions factors annually – 2019 emissions factors were therefore used | Department for Energy Security & Net Zero has now published 2022 emissions factors | The BEIS emissions factors were used for a limited set of calculations. They have also decreased (less carbon is now associated with certain activities such as transport). The impact of this is expected to be limited and would not be expected to impact upon the conclusion in the ES. |
| | Climate Change Committee | Contextual (Data) | The Climate Change Committee produces 5-year carbon budgets for the UK (which become legally binding through the climate change act). At the time of writing only budgets 1-5 had been published. | The Climate Change Committee has published the 6th carbon budget and it has been adopted (2033- 2037) through the climate change act. | The contextual information from the Climate Change Committee shows the carbon budgets tightening. Given the project is forecast to avoid emissions this additional tightening is not expected to impact upon the conclusions in the ES. |



| ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE | ORGANISATION/SOURCE | DATA TYPE | DETAILS OF DATA AVAILABLE AND DATA LIMITATIONS | MORE RECENT INFORMATION OR DATA (IF AVAILABLE) | NOTES ON DATA VALIDITY USED FOR THE ES AND IMPACT OF USING MORE RECENT DATA |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|---|--|---|
| | Climate Change Committee | Contextual (Data) | Department for Energy Security & Net Zero publishes emissions data for the UK on an annual basis lagging 2 years. Therefore 2017 data was used. | Department for Energy Security & Net Zero has now published data for 2020. | The contextual information published by the Department for Energy Security & Net Zero has not changed significantly between 2017 and 2020 and therefore is not expected to impact upon the conclusions in the ES. |