

My comments relate to my three remaining concerns as a registered Interested Party. I am replying to comments made by the Applicant in REP3-025.

RR-095a

I don't believe I have been given a complete answer to my questions about the R&W Environmental Yard being a reasonable alternative to taking additional land from within the SDNP to provide construction compound areas. Given the R&W yard is either likely already in the Applicant's ownership (I did ask for this clarification at D2 but a response was not provided) or at least entirely within the bounds of the Applicant's existing soft estate, it is nearer the proposed construction site than the proposed construction compounds in the SDNP providing both the opportunity to reduce new land take and reduce construction vehicle trips. Therefore I argue it is a reasonable alternative regardless of ongoing operations matters. The fact a previous response from the Applicant noted the R&W yard was "deemed not to be a viable option" suggests it was considered and therefore should have been reported in the Alternatives chapter of the Environmental Statement. As an alternative in that chapter, the assessment of the environmental beneficial effects of this land parcel providing c.50% of the required construction compound area to the east of the site would be known and inform this line of comment.

Q. Will the Applicant give consideration to reducing land take in the SDNP and if not provide full justification why not.

My interest here is reduced land take from the SDNP.

(Incidentally, I could make no sense of the latter part of the response at D3 regarding left only turns from the proposed construction compound exit - I still maintain use of the R&W yard as an alternative to the furthest reaches of the proposed compounds will significantly reduce construction haulage).

RR-095b

I note the note in App A of 8.5 REP2-051, and while I find it unfortunate the schemes have not been combined I note HCC consultation is underway on the Cart and Horses junction. I shall not comment further on this element.

RR-095c

Thank you for the clarification on the timescales over which the Applicant will maintain assets it owns. On that basis, Q. will the Applicant commit to maintain mitigation areas within the soft estate, such as identified chalk grassland, appropriately and as chalk grassland, to be measured by appropriate monitoring and suitable targets, for the duration of ownership, without reference to any finite time limits in years (20, 25 years or otherwise).

My interest here is commitment to biodiversity and quality of landscape habitats within the Applicant's ownership, as an important network of ecosystem connectivity.