

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project

Consultation Report

Appendix G – Statutory Spring 2025 Consultation – 2 of 2 Documents

VOLUME NUMBER: 5

PLANNING INSPECTORATE SCHEME NUMBER: WA010002

APPLICATION DOCUMENT REFERENCE: 5.1

APFP REGULATION: 5(2)(q)

May 2026

Version 0



from
**Southern
Water.** 

Contents

G.25 The Applicant's response to feedback	366

G.25 The Applicant's response to feedback

Tables

Table G25-1	Summary of issues raised on the theme of principle of development and the Applicant's response.....	1
Table G25-2	Summary of issues raised on the theme of need case and the Applicant's response.....	7
Table G25-3	Summary of issues raised on the theme of alternatives and the Applicant's response.....	15
Table G25-4	Summary of issues raised on the theme of attitudes to water recycling and the Applicant's response.....	32
Table G25-5	Summary of issues raised on the theme of the water recycling process and the Applicant's response.....	41
Table G25-6	Summary of issues raised on the theme of the location of the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) and the Applicant's response.....	59
Table G25-7	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design of the WRP and the Applicant's response.....	65
Table G25-8	Summary of issues raised on the theme of the location of Above Ground Plant (AGP) and the Applicant's response.....	68
Table G25-9	Summary of issues raised on the theme of the location of the AGP and the Applicant's response.....	74
Table G25-10	Summary of issues raised on the theme of the process of developing the Project and the Applicant's response.....	75
Table G25-11	Summary of issues raised on the theme of location of the proposed pipeline routes and the Applicant's response.....	86
Table G25-12	Summary of issues raised on the theme of the process of developing the proposed pipeline routes and the Applicant's response.....	104
Table G25-13	Summary of issues raised on the theme of the process of the use of Havant Thicket Reservoir for the storage of recycled water and the Applicant's response.....	115
Table G25-14	Summary of issues raised on the theme of water quality at Havant Thicket Reservoir and the Applicant's response	127
Table G25-15	Summary of issues raised on the theme of Portsmouth Water's proposal and the Applicant's response	222
Table G25-16	Summary of issues raised on the theme of construction impacts and effects and the Applicant's response	228
Table G25-17	Summary of issues raised on the theme of construction compound location the Applicant's response	248
Table G25-18	Summary of issues raised on the theme of the Project legacy and benefits and the Applicant's response	257
Table G25-19	Summary of issues raised on the theme of consultation and the Applicant's response.....	258
Table G25-20	Summary of issues raised on the theme of the equality impact assessment and the Applicant's response.....	277
Table G25-21	Summary of issues raised on the theme of project finance and cost and the Applicant's response.....	281
Table G25-22	Summary of issues raised on the theme of Project timescales and programme and the Applicant's response.....	295
Table G25-23	Summary of issues raised on the theme of the Development Consent Order (DCO) and the Applicant's response	298

Table G25-24	Summary of issues raised on the theme of interface with the Applicant's existing infrastructure and assets and the Applicant's response	305
Table G25-25	Summary of issues raised on the theme of the EIA approach and methodology and the Applicant's response	307
Table G25-26	Summary of issues raised on the theme of air quality and odour and the Applicant's response	315
Table G25-27	Summary of issues raised on the theme of archaeology and cultural heritage and the Applicant's response	319
Table G25-28	Summary of issues raised on the theme of terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity and the Applicant's response	321
Table G25-29	Summary of issues raised on the theme of marine biodiversity and the Applicant's response	363
Table G25-30	Summary of issues raised on the theme of carbon and climate change and the Applicant's response	377
Table G25-31	Summary of issues raised on the theme of land quality and ground conditions and the Applicant's response	385
Table G25-32	Summary of issues raised on the theme of land use and agriculture and the Applicant's response	407
Table G25-33	Summary of issues raised on the theme of landscape and visual and the Applicant's response	431
Table G25-34	Summary of issues raised on the theme of major accidents and disasters and the Applicant's response	461
Table G25-35	Summary of issues raised on the theme of noise and vibration and the Applicant's response	468
Table G25-36	Summary of issues raised on the theme of resources and waste management and the Applicant's response	480
Table G25-37	Summary of issues raised on the theme of socio-economic, tourism and health and the Applicant's response	484
Table G25-38	Summary of issues raised on the theme of traffic and transport and the Applicant's response	494
Table G25-39	Summary of issues raised on the theme of water environment and the Applicant's response	506
Table G25-40	Summary of issues raised on the theme of cumulative effects and the Applicant's response	774
Table G25-41	Summary of issues raised on the theme of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and the Applicant's response	788
Table G25-42	Summary of issues raised on the theme of legislation, policy and permits and the Applicant's response	793
Table G25-43	Summary of issues raised on the theme of the Applicant's wider operations and Project interfaces and the Applicant's response...	798
Table G25-44	Summary of issues raised on the theme of landowner engagement and the Applicant's response	807
Table G25-45	Summary of issues raised on the theme of wider water industry challenges and the Applicant's response	839
Table G25-46	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 1 and the Applicant's response	845
Table G25-47	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 2 and the Applicant's response	854

Table G25-48	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 3 and the Applicant's response.....	861
Table G25-49	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 4 and the Applicant's response.....	873
Table G25-50	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 5 and the Applicant's response.....	878
Table G25-51	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 6 and the Applicant's response.....	881
Table G25-52	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 7 and the Applicant's response.....	891
Table G25-53	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 8 and the Applicant's response.....	891
Table G25-54	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 9 and the Applicant's response.....	892
Table G25-55	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 10 and the Applicant's response.....	896
Table G25-56	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 11 and the Applicant's response.....	898
Table G25-57	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 12 and the Applicant's response.....	899
Table G25-58	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 13 and the Applicant's response.....	902
Table G25-59	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 14 and the Applicant's response.....	906
Table G25-60	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 15 and the Applicant's response.....	914
Table G25-61	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 16 and the Applicant's response.....	916
Table G25-62	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 17 and the Applicant's response.....	917
Table G25-63	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 18 and the Applicant's response.....	920
Table G25-64	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 19 and the Applicant's response.....	923
Table G25-65	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 20 and the Applicant's response.....	924
Table G25-66	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 21, and the Applicant's response.....	930
Table G25-67	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 22 and the Applicant's response.....	931
Table G25-68	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 23 and the Applicant's response.....	934
Table G25-69	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 24 and the Applicant's response.....	934
Table G25-70	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 25 and the Applicant's response.....	941
Table G25-71	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinements (collective) and the Applicant's response.....	943
Table G25-72	Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinements (multiple) and the Applicant's response	944

Table G25-1 Summary of issues raised on the theme of principle of development and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
NATS En-Route Safeguarding, Colden Common Parish Council	POD20 1	Respondents acknowledged the consultation and noted no substantive comments or objection toward the consultation material provided.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Royal Mail, Portsmouth Water	POD20 2	Respondents expressed support for the principle of the development. It was noted that support for the Project was subject to satisfactory arrangements and mitigation measures, including liaison during construction phases, to inform and form part of future proposals for the Project.	Y	The Applicant has noted this comment. Relevant stakeholders have been closely engaged on Project impacts and proposed mitigation measures and have helped to inform these to improve the Project. Community liaison would be a key feature of the construction phase of the Project. The Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) sets out the community and stakeholder engagement measures that would be implemented prior to and during construction.
Wiltshire Council	POD20 3	The authority expressed support for the Project and noted that the aim of the Project aligned with the Council's own Local Plan aims toward improving water efficiency in its area and acknowledged the	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		benefits of the scheme in relation to reducing abstraction from the chalk streams. The respondent also noted the importance of continued stakeholder dialogue and monitoring of other water efficiency projects and requested that the Council be kept up to date on the Project.		
Langstone Harbour Board	POD204	The respondent noted that they did not object to the Project in principle, due to the acknowledged need to reduce river abstraction, however, there had not been sufficient evidence provided that would lead to their approval of the Project at that stage of consultation.	N	The Applicant has engaged with Langstone Harbour Board and consulted this statutory harbour authority on a regular basis through bilateral meetings and membership of the Water and Wildlife Interest Group during the pre-application stage. Findings of the marine biodiversity and water environment aspects of the Environmental Statement (ES) are contained within ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). It has been concluded that no likely significant effects are expected on the marine environment, and this has been presented to Langstone Harbour Board in the Water and Wildlife Interest Group meetings. The Applicant has also prepared a Scheme

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) which sets out the process that has been undertaken to consider alternatives and develop the design of the Project.
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PILs	POD205	Landowners raised objections to the Project's impacts on their land and welcomed ongoing discussions to resolve concerns raised.	Y	The Applicant has made significant efforts to maintain a constructive dialogue with landowners affected by the Project and to avoid and minimise impacts as far as reasonably practicable. The Applicant's consultations have highlighted its desire to refine the Project to address concerns raised. The Applicant has considered and had regard to all feedback received from landowners throughout the development of the Project. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the process that has been undertaken to develop the design of the Project. The Applicant will continue to work with landowners throughout the detailed design and pre-construction phase to further reduce impacts on landowners, where practicable.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	POD206	Respondents objected to the Project as a whole. It was argued that there was no need for the Project and the cost and energy required for it would be too high and not best value for customers. Concern was expressed over the use of the Havant Thicket Reservoir for storing recycled water and the knock-on effect this could have on both public health and the environment.		The Applicant's current Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP19) established the need for a new strategic water resource solution, in the form of a desalination plant, to address the significant water supply shortfall in Hampshire. As part of the RAPID regulatory process, an extensive options appraisal was undertaken by the Applicant which selected the Project as the preferred solution over the original desalination proposal. Informed by WRMP19, the options appraisal considered a range of alternative technologies and solutions, and assessed these against planning, environmental, socio-economic and cost criteria. This options appraisal process identified that integration with Havant Thicket Reservoir would provide regional resilience for future water supplies. Moreover, it delivers considerably better value for money for the quantity of water provided than for Havant Thicket Reservoir on its own. The Project was selected as the preferred option for the Hampshire supply area in the Applicant's WRMP19 Annual Review 2021-22, and is identified as the preferred option in its emerging WRMP24.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				For more information, please see the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5). Water quality would continue to meet strict regulatory standards relating to both discharges into the environment and drinking water quality. No likely significant effects have been identified on the biodiversity of Havant Thicket Reservoir as a result. Please refer to ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	POD207	Respondents approved of the Project as a whole. However, this was caveated by a need for fail safes to protect the public from control system errors. Support for the Project came from the understanding that it would not result in more sewage being added to the Solent. A further respondent noted the need to increase water security in the south of England, the Applicant's obligation to its shareholders, and constraints set by national government. The respondent also stated that, in this context, there is a need		The Applicant has noted this comment. Whilst the Project would reduce the amount of treated wastewater being released into the Solent compared to now, it is not connected to the storm water discharges, for which the Applicant is making significant investments elsewhere to reduce these. The Applicant has sought to provide assurances that appropriate measures and controls would be put in place to prevent possible malfunctions of the treatment process impacting on the environment and public health. The multi-stage water recycling

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		to forego short-term solutions, specified to be the next decade, to prioritise long-term solutions such as new reservoirs and winter rainfall collection.		process would feature numerous safeguards, including continuous monitoring, to ensure that significant deviations in expected water quality can be quickly spotted and rectified through partial or full system shutdowns. It would not be possible for treated wastewater to bypass this process and enter Havant Thicket Reservoir. These safeguards would be implemented by the Contractor appointed to construct and operate the Water Recycling Plant and would be a key specification for the plant to ensure water quality requirements would be met. In respect of long-term solutions, including reservoirs and winter rainfall collection, the Project is a long-term solution designed to augment the storage capability of Havant Thicket Reservoir and ensure more water is available for supply. Other solutions, including further new reservoirs, have been extensively considered but would not be available at the scale needed and in the timescales required.
Wider Community	POD208	Respondents supported the Project due to it helping to reduce increasing water demands and effects of climate change, whilst protecting Hampshire's chalk streams.		The Applicant has noted this comment.

Table G25-2 Summary of issues raised on the theme of need case and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Winchester City Council (WCC)	NCA201	The Council expressed an understanding of the need for the Project and appreciated that there are pressures to ensure a continued supply of fresh water.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
WCC, Environment Agency (EA)	NCA202	The Council reiterated an understanding for the need for the Project, which was accepted, however, concluded overall that there was a lack of information provided to make a comprehensive comment. The EA suggested that the information presented in section 7.1.1 of the Environmental Water Quality Report is slightly altered to ensure that the reference focuses on sustainable abstraction and protecting iconic chalk habitats rather than the current focus solely on licence reductions.	N	The need for the Project is identified in the Applicant's Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) which sets out the Applicant's plan for meeting future water resources demand. The DCO application includes a Case for the Project document (Document reference 5.6, DCO Volume 5), which sets out the need for the Project. The DCO application is supported by a wealth of documentation. The Guide to the Application (Document reference 1.3, DCO Volume 1) is an accessible guide which explains how the application is structured and the principal contents within each volume of the documents. The Environmental Water Quality Report published for Spring 2025 Consultation cannot be changed. However, this feedback has been reflected in the Case for the Project (Document reference 5.7, DCO Volume 5)

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				which provides a summary of the requirement and purpose of the Project.
Wickham and Knowle Parish Council	NCA203	The Council stated it understood the need for the Project. It was acknowledged that the Project team are making contact with landowners regarding specific parcels of land and thus no comment was made on the detail of the route.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Applicant has engaged with landowners affected by the Project and considered and had regard to feedback raised, which has informed the design of the Project. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) and the Consultation Report (Document reference 5.1, DCO Volume 5) set out the process that has been undertaken to design the Project and sets out how feedback from landowners and other stakeholders has been considered.
Langstone Harbour Board	NCA204	It was hoped that the Project could help to address the need to tackle waterborne pollution across the region, given the wide pollution sources affecting Langstone Harbour and the associated freshwater streams.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Project aims to address the water supply deficit in Hampshire's western supply area, rather than address existing local water pollution issues.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	NCA205	Respondents expressed general support for the Project, an appreciation that water is needed, and support for investing in water supplies in advance of projected demand increases.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	NCA206	It was suggested that there is no need for this scheme as there would be ample capacity of water when Havant Thicket Reservoir has been built. In addition, a respondent questioned why the Havant local community should put up with these works when the water is not for Havant.	N	Havant Thicket Reservoir was always intended to support the water supply deficit in the Applicant's Hampshire supply area. It is, however, insufficient on its own to tackle the scale of water supply deficit facing the area. The Project, through the use of water recycling, would augment the volume of water that can be supplied by Havant Thicket Reservoir alone by over 400%. Parts of the Project are located in the Havant area because it utilises both Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW), the Applicant's largest wastewater treatment works in the Hampshire area and would be in close proximity to Havant Thicket Reservoir, thereby reducing the need for extensive pipelines and increased costs if these components were located elsewhere. The DCO application includes a Case for the Project document (Document reference 5.6, DCO Volume 5) which sets out the need for the Project. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the process that the Applicant has undertaken to identify the Project.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	NCA207	Respondents acknowledged the need for the Project due to the requirement to reduce water stress on the south-east and it was stated that the Project would increase the availability of water resources and clean drinking water, prevent impacts from over abstraction, reduce reliance on drought order and permits, and underpin economic prosperity and environmental protection of the region. It was acknowledged that the Applicant's area is in serious water stress and that the Project proceeds without delay to offset climate change and population growth and protect the water and species in globally protected chalk stream rivers. It was stated that there was full confidence in the Applicant's ability to protect the environment with this Project and provide suitable clean drinking water. Water recycling was seen as an obvious and necessary step, the safety of which has been demonstrated globally.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Wider Community	NCA208	Respondents raised a number of questions and comments surrounding agricultural water access during and post construction and what the impacts/benefits might be on agriculture and food production from improved water management. Questions	N	Access to water (for any purpose) would not be impeded by the construction and operation of the Project. A full utility service survey would take place as part of the detailed design phase by the contractor post consent

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		were also raised on how much water will need to be regularly pumped to keep the water quality in the pipe at an appropriate level, and the scalability of the plant design from its going-live operation to its maximum peak capability.		to identify any services that need to be protected to ensure supply. Once operational, benefits to agriculture and the food production industry in Hampshire would be a more resilient water supply that meets daily supplies and mitigates against potentially debilitating restrictions in drought conditions. At maximum operation, the Project would enable the transfer approximately 60 megalitres per day (MI/d) of recycled water from the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) site to Havant Thicket Reservoir and 90MI/d of source water from Havant Thicket Reservoir to Otterbourne Water Supply Works (WSW). Once operational, the Project would be able to deliver this capability as and when required, with 90MI/d at Otterbourne only currently forecast to be required in an extreme drought. On average, the Project would transfer approximately 40MI/d of water to Otterbourne WSW to meet essential daily supplies. Such flows would ensure adequate water quality in the pipeline is maintained during transfer. Section 3.6 of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out the operating scenarios for the Project.

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Consultation Report Appendix G – Statutory Spring 2025 Consultation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	NCA209	Respondents supported the need for the Project on the basis that over abstraction of the chalk aquifers and rivers would be reduced and river flows protected in times of drought; something that was considered to become more likely due to population growth and climate change. It was noted desalination had been ruled out and suggested that the Abingdon Reservoir was a forlorn hope, and therefore this Project represented the only option to reduce over-abstraction.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Wider Community	NCA210	Respondents noted the Project's intention to address water supply scarcity in times of drought. More specifically, it was noted that many farmers rely on a secure public water supply which is essential (especially in drought) for food security, horticulture, viticulture, and crop and livestock production in the area.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Wider Community	NCA211	Respondents accepted that the local area has been identified as water-stressed and identified that future needs and increased water demands would therefore require consideration. However, a comment expressed confusion as to why rain collection in underground aquifers and	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. Using local aquifers for winter storage has previously been considered by the Applicant through its Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) process but carries a number of environmental and feasibility uncertainties and cannot deliver the quantity of water

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		storage during winter periods for use during dry periods had not been considered.		required. New reservoirs have also been considered within the Applicant's emerging WRMP24, but these take a significant amount of time to develop, carry their own environmental impacts, and cannot rely on rainfall alone to provide the necessary volumes in Hampshire, hence would need to rely on river abstractions that the Applicant is required to reduce. The Applicant is already investing significantly in Havant Thicket Reservoir and this plays a critical role in the Project by augmenting the volume of water that can be delivered to the Applicant's Otterbourne Water Supply Works (WSW). The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the process undertaken to select the Project which would address the specific water supply requirement in Hampshire's western supply zone.
Wider Community	NCA212	The respondent recognised the need to improve drought resilience and identify new water sources for Hampshire, however, considered that the project was flawed because of its specific technical approach and in the context of the UK water industry's historical failures.	N	The Applicant recognises that public perception and trust are essential, and it is committed to ongoing engagement to communicate how effective water recycling technology is in producing wholesome drinking water.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				With these measures, the public can have confidence in the safety and reliability of the water supplied. Water recycling is a well-established and internationally proven technology, successfully implemented in countries such as the United States, Australia and Singapore. In the UK, water recycling can be delivered safely, with robust regulatory requirements that need to be demonstrated by water companies before recycled water can be put into supply, as confirmed by the Drinking Water Inspectorate (DWI). Water supplied to the public would continue to meet the high safety and quality standards required by the DWI. The water recycling process would be subject to rigorous regulatory oversight, including comprehensive risk assessment, advanced multi-barrier treatment processes, and continuous monitoring to ensure compliance with the Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations 2016.
Wider Community	NCA213	Clarification was sought on whether there is likely to be any impact on existing abstraction licences for local farmers and availability of water for agricultural use, if	N	This Project does not propose any changes to agricultural abstractions.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		there will be guidance on how water will be allocated and advance communication of changes to licences.		

Table G25-3 Summary of issues raised on the theme of alternatives and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	ALT201	The respondent considered that there was plenty of groundwater in the north of Hampshire which could have been sourced at less cost and disruption to multiple private landowners.	N	Groundwater sources in Hampshire already make up a considerable proportion of the water used for public supplies. In planning for future water supplies in its emerging Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) 2024, the Applicant is bringing forward two new groundwater schemes, but these only deliver a combined 7 megalitres per day (Ml/d) of water, which falls well short of the quantity of new water required that this Project is required to deliver. Groundwater sources play an important role, but in delivering new water supplies for the future, they only play a small part of the overall solution. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the process the Applicant has taken to select the Project and explains how the Project is the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				only option available to deliver the scale of water resource required in the timescales needed.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	ALT202	The respondent suggested that there were several other ways of increasing water availability in an area that gets abundant rainfall. It was suggested that these other methods would use aquifers closer to the affected population, therefore not requiring the energy consumption related to the filtering and pumping of recycling water.	N	The Project has been identified through the Applicant's Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) and options appraisal processes as a crucial part of its strategy to respond to current and future water supply challenges in its Hampshire supply area both in drought and normal conditions. Other solutions have been extensively considered but are not available at the scale needed and in the timescales required. Using local aquifers, through both managed aquifer recharge and aquifer storage and recovery, has been considered by the Applicant in its emerging WRMP24, but these require specific geological conditions, require extensive testing and carry a number of environmental and feasibility uncertainties. One such scheme is proposed after 2035 but is only forecast to provide just over 5Ml/d of water into supply and would thus not be able deliver at the scale required to negate the need for the Project.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the process the Applicant has taken to select the Project and explains how the Project is the only option available to deliver the scale of water resource required in the timescales needed.
Wider Community	ALT203	Respondents clarified they did not support the Project and expressed concern that the scale of the Project was disproportionate and did not reflect value for money for customers nor the environment. It was suggested that water recycling was an energy demanding, costly, and experimental technology for dry climates and was inappropriate for the Applicant to take forward or be trusted with. Respondents suggested that rainwater capture should be more robustly considered and would represent a more sustainable alternative, which would better cope with the demands of climate change. It was additionally noted that if demand was growing, measures closer to the source of the issue would be needed - household water consumption restrictions, additional or extended reservoirs, moving	N	The scale of the Project is determined by the water supply need identified in the Applicant's WRMP. Water recycling is less energy-intensive and costly than alternatives that provide a comparable scale of water supply, such as desalination, and was determined as the best value solution as part of the Applicant's WRMP and options appraisal processes. Project costs, carbon emissions, energy usage, environmental impacts and delivering best value for customers have been key factors in the Applicant's assessment and consideration of alternative solutions. The Applicant's emerging WRMP24 and the Water Resources South East (WRSE) Regional Plan both select the Project as a key component of future water supply in the Hampshire area and wider South East. The water supply deficit facing Hampshire is such that the Project is required not only for

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		river abstractions, aquifer storage and freshwater harvesting were additionally listed as capture options. Respondents also raised concerns over the impact on human health and the local environment associated with the Project in the context of the alternative for additional reservoirs to function as rainwater capture options.		drought resilience but also for providing essential daily water supplies in normal weather. Other options considered through both the WRMP and options appraisal processes (including new reservoirs, moving river abstractions and aquifer storage) do not provide the scale of new water resource needed and in the timescales required. The Applicant offers water efficiency and wastewater management incentives to developers to promote more sustainable practices in new development. These include encouraging the installation of 'water capture' technologies such as greywater recycling and rainwater harvesting and attenuation. The Project continues to be identified as the preferred solution in delivering a new water resource for Hampshire alongside leakage and demand reduction measures. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the process the Applicant has taken to select the Project. The Environmental Statement (ES) (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out an assessment of the impacts of the Project on the environment and the local

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				community, including air quality, noise and vibration, socioeconomics, tourism and health. Where impacts are identified, mitigation to avoid or reduce these are identified and secured by the DCO, for example through an Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The Applicant has sought to avoid and reduce impacts on the environment and people (including health) in its approach to designing the Project, as set out in the Design Approach Document (Document reference 5.12, DCO Volume 5). The development of new reservoirs carry their own environmental impacts.
Wider Community	ALT204	Respondents expressed concern that alternatives had not been thoroughly investigated, including more sustainable environmentally responsible and cost-effective solutions such as moving river abstractions, new or expanded reservoirs and aquifer storage.	N	Please see response to ALT203 The Applicant's WRMP and options appraisal processes have extensively considered a range of options to address the water supply shortfall in Hampshire. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the process the Applicant has taken to select the Project and explains how the Project is the only option available to deliver the scale of water resource required in the timescales needed. This was determined through a

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				detailed options appraisal process which considered a range of environmental, economic and technical criteria.
Wider Community	ALT205	Respondents suggested that demand reduction and reducing leakage should be prioritised. They suggested alternatives such as universal metering and more storage for wetter winters, including tanks, water butts, aquifers, wetlands and reservoirs.	N	The Applicant recognises the importance of customer education, water efficiency, and leakage reduction in addressing water scarcity. These activities are already under way as part of a wider programme of works. The Applicant has committed to halving leakage by 2050, supported by targeted mains replacement and advanced detection technologies. Leakage and demand reduction measures remain a key part of the strategy to address Hampshire's water supply deficit, but these can only be part of the overall solution, which also requires a large new water resource to maintain supplies into the future. Other options considered through both the WRMP and options appraisal processes (including new reservoirs, and aquifer storage) do not provide the scale of new water resource needed and in the timescales required. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the process the Applicant has taken to select the Project and explains how the Project is the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				only option available to deliver the scale of water resource required in the timescales needed.
Wider Community	ALT206	Respondents encouraged the Applicant to explore other more simple, more economically viable, and sustainable options including aquifers located closer to the areas of demand. Moreover, it was suggested that the only reason the Applicant is pursuing the Project is to generate profit and the complexity of the Project means abstraction from rivers will continue longer than needed.	N	The Project was selected through the Applicant's WRMP and options appraisal processes as the best value solution to address the forecast water supply deficit in Hampshire. It has been extensively considered against a range of alternatives and is the only option available to deliver the scale of water resource required in the timescales needed. Using local aquifers, through both managed aquifer recharge and aquifer storage and recovery, has been considered by the Applicant in its emerging WRMP24, but these require specific geological conditions, require extensive testing and carry a number of environmental and feasibility uncertainties. One such scheme is proposed after 2035 but is only forecast to provide just over 5Ml/d of water into supply and would thus not be able deliver at the scale required to negate the need for the Project. As a regulated industry, the amount of return that the Applicant can make on its investment is controlled by the water industry economic regulator, Ofwat. Ofwat exists to protect the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				consumer and ensure water companies deliver value for money by controlling costs that water companies can charge customers. The Applicant is using its best endeavours to deliver the Project at the earliest opportunity. Any proposals to extend river abstractions beyond licence periods would require approval from environmental regulators. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the process the Applicant has taken to select the Project
Wider Community	ALT207	Respondents suggested that consideration should be given to recycling sewage from treatment works close to its own customers, using recycled wastewater in homes for non-potable purposes and collecting and using the spring water that arises within Bidbury Mead, which is stated to result in muddy conditions within the local children's play area. It was suggested such an approach could represent a significant 'planning gain'.	N	The Project utilises Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) in Havant as this is one of the Applicant's largest wastewater treatment works and therefore has the greatest capacity for supplying the treated wastewater required for a water recycling plant, producing approximately 60MI/d of recycled water. Its proximity to Havant Thicket Reservoir also makes it the preferred choice. The Applicant already offers water efficiency and wastewater management incentives to developers to promote more sustainable practices in new development. These include encouraging the installation of 'water capture'

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				technologies such as greywater recycling and rainwater harvesting and attenuation. Filling of Havant Thicket Reservoir would partly rely on utilising excess spring water, when available, from the more significant source at Bedhampton Springs during the winter months, rather than water from Bidbury Mead. But relying on spring water and efficiency measures alone will not address the scale of supply deficit facing the Hampshire area, and a range of measures are required, including a large, new sustainable source of water that the Project would provide.
Wider Community	ALT208	Respondents suggested that the proposed Project attempts to solve a supply problem through an expensive and environmentally intrusive option. Respondents considered that the Applicant should focus on more cost-effective and beneficial options, such as fixing and reducing leakage, better managing of existing assets, reducing demand, renewing mains, updating old water pipes, reducing rainwater going into the sewers, storing winter rain, increasing capability at Budds Farm, increasing reservoir storage capacity and improving	N	The Project was selected through the Applicant's WRMP and options appraisal processes as the best value solution to address the forecast water supply deficit in Hampshire. It has been extensively considered against a range of alternatives and is the only option available to deliver the scale of water resource required in the timescales needed. The Applicant is already investing in new reservoir storage and building a more resilient supply network throughout Hampshire. The Applicant has committed to halving leakage by 2050, supported by targeted mains replacement

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		connectivity and resilience through strategic transfers. A respondent stated that the Applicant was losing nearly as much water through leakage each day as the current Project proposed to supply. It was also suggested that the cost to consumers would rise as the Applicant would be making millions in profit.		and advanced detection technologies. Maintaining and repairing existing infrastructure, reducing leakage and investing in demand reduction and water efficiency measures are all key to addressing the water supply shortfall in Hampshire but these can only be part of the overall solution, which also requires a large new water resource to maintain supplies into the future. As a regulated industry, the amount of return that the Applicant can make on its investment is controlled by the water industry economic regulator, Ofwat. Ofwat exists to protect the consumer and ensure water companies deliver value for money by controlling costs that water companies can charge customers. The Applicant continues to make significant progress in reducing leakage - building on an overall network reduction in leakage of 18% in 2024/25. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the process the Applicant has taken to select the Project

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	ALT209	The respondent argued that peak summer demand needed to be better understood to ensure reservoir levels can be maintained.	N	The Project would supplement spring water inputs to Havant Thicket Reservoir which would ensure that water levels can be maintained. Normal operation of the Project would require the ongoing transfer of water into out of Havant Thicket Reservoir to maintain customer supplies, however it is not expected that this would result in significant variations in levels. In severe and extreme drought conditions, water levels could drop when other sources of input to Havant Thicket Reservoir are not available. Portsmouth Water will operate the reservoir and would be responsible for maintaining water levels.
Wider Community	ALT210	Respondents suggested that the need for more water and abstraction could be reduced, and the project may not be needed, if other measures to reduce demand are pursued, specifically suggesting smart metering to incentivise water saving, especially in summer, reducing leakage and unnecessary consumption, better managing customer demand and increasing storage.	N	Please see response to ALT203.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	ALT211	Respondents expressed concern around the lack of consideration of more sustainable alternatives that work with climate change, namely moving river abstractions, collecting and storing winter rainfall, and alternative reservoirs.	N	The Project was selected through the Applicant's WRMP and options appraisal processes as the best value solution to address the forecast water supply deficit in Hampshire. It has been extensively considered against a range of alternatives and is the only option available to deliver the scale of water resource required in the timescales needed. Project costs, carbon emissions, energy usage, environmental impacts and delivering best value for customers have been key factors in the Applicant's assessment and consideration of alternative solutions. Using local aquifers for winter storage has previously been considered by the Applicant through its WRMP process but carries a number of environmental and feasibility uncertainties and cannot deliver the quantity of water required. New reservoirs have also been considered within the Applicant's emerging WRMP24, but these take a significant amount of time to develop, carry their own environmental impacts, and cannot rely on rainfall alone to provide the necessary volumes in Hampshire, hence would need to rely on river abstractions that the Applicant is required to reduce. The Applicant is already

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				investing significantly in Havant Thicket Reservoir, and this plays a critical role in the Project by augmenting the volume of water that can be delivered to the Applicant's Otterbourne Water Supply Works. Moving abstractions closer to the tidal limit on the River Itchen has been looked at previously but not considered viable because of a number of environmental and feasibility constraints. There could be potentially significant implications on other water company abstractions and infrastructure, lower reaches of the river would still be subject to abstraction reductions, there was a likely impact on migratory fish and complications could arise from tidal effects on the duration of abstraction and on water quality. The construction of the necessary abstraction intake, pumping stations and connecting pipelines would also carry their own environmental impacts and this suggested option does not overcome the sustainability objective of reducing how much water the Applicant takes from the environment. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				process the Applicant has taken to select the Project.
Wider Community	ALT212	The respondent suggests that the priority should be to increase the quantity of available water by fixing existing leaks.	N	The Applicant has committed to halving leakage by 2050, supported by targeted mains replacement and advanced detection technologies. Maintaining and repairing existing infrastructure, reducing leakage and investing in demand reduction and water efficiency measures are all key to addressing the water supply shortfall in Hampshire but these can only be part of the overall solution, which also requires a large new water resource to maintain supplies into the future. The Project continues to be identified as the best overall solution in delivering a new water resource for Hampshire alongside leakage and demand reduction measures.
Wider Community	ALT213	The respondent urged for the Project to be stopped in favour of improving existing domestic water supplies through maintenance, prompt leak repairs and increasing rainwater collection options.	N	The Applicant offers water efficiency and wastewater management incentives to developers to promote more sustainable practices in new development. These include encouraging the installation of 'water capture' technologies such as greywater recycling and rainwater harvesting and attenuation. The Applicant has committed to halving leakage by 2050, supported by targeted mains replacement and advanced detection

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				technologies. Maintaining and repairing existing infrastructure, reducing leakage and investing in demand reduction and water efficiency measures are all key to addressing the water supply shortfall in Hampshire but these can only be part of the overall solution, which also requires a large new water resource to maintain supplies into the future. The Project continues to be identified as the best overall solution in delivering a new water resource for Hampshire alongside leakage and demand reduction measures.
Wider Community	ALT214	The respondent suggested that the Applicant should instead be investing in repairing current infrastructure.	N	Please see response to ALT212.
Wider Community	ALT215	The respondents stated their objection to the Project and cited an inadequate consideration of alternatives which had now forced the Project to be unsustainable, expensive and environmentally harmful. Moving river abstractions, as well as collection and storage of additional seasonal (winter) rainwater in additional new or extended reservoirs/ underground aquifers were mentioned as potential alternatives.	N	Please see response to ALT203.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		It was expressed that the objection raised was also intended for the attention of the Water Services Regulation Authority, citing the reasons above and the suggestion that there were many more sustainable alternatives closer to the residents who would be consuming the water.		
Wider Community	ALT216	The respondent urged the Applicant to reconsider the approach currently proposed and suggested more effective engagement to be undertaken with the community. The respondent stated that the project should not proceed until all the environmental, social and technical concerns had been addressed, and the project changed to one that protects the environment and customers.	N	At the time of the Spring 2025 Consultation, four stages of consultation had been held in respect of the Project, and the feedback received has been considered in its subsequent development and refinement. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the process the Applicant has taken to select the Project. The Project was selected as the preferred solution as it would deliver a new resilient and sustainable water supply whilst protecting the environment and delivering best value for customers. This was determined through a detailed options appraisal process which considered a range of environmental, economic and technical criteria. At the Summer 2024 Consultation, the Preliminary Environmental Information Report was presented and consulted on. The full

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) accompanying the DCO application is included in the ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) which sets out an assessment of the environmental and social impacts of the Project and identifies mitigation measures that would be implemented to reduce and avoid these.
Wider Community	ALT217	The respondent expressed that the Project was not close to be considered as the most ecological way to approach the issue.	N	Project costs, carbon emissions, energy usage, environmental impacts and delivering best value for customers have been key factors in the Applicant's assessment and consideration of alternative solutions. The Applicant's emerging WRMP24 and Water Resource South East (WRSE) Regional Plan both select the Project as a key component of future water supply in the Hampshire area and wider South East. The Project was selected as the preferred solution as it would deliver a new resilient and sustainable water supply whilst protecting the environment and delivering best value for customers. Reducing abstractions from Hampshire's precious chalk streams is a core ecological driver of the Project.

Table G25-4 Summary of issues raised on the theme of attitudes to water recycling and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	WRA201	A respondent raised concerns about the quality of drinking water.	N	Water recycling is a well-established and internationally proven technology that has been successfully implemented in countries such as the United States, Australia, and Singapore for over 40 years. The Drinking Water Inspectorate (DWI) has confirmed that water recycling can be delivered safely, outlining the robust regulatory requirements that water companies must demonstrate before recycled water can be put into supply. Under the Project, purified recycled water will be produced following an advanced multi-barrier treatment process and be blended with spring water before final treatment at Otterbourne Water Supply Works. This rigorous treatment regime will ensure that all water entering the public supply meets the requirements of The Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations 2016. All water supplied to customers, regardless of its source, will continue to meet the highest standards for safety, taste, and quality, as required by the DWI. The Applicant remains committed to transparency, rigorous monitoring, and full compliance with all

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				relevant regulations throughout the development and operation of the Project.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	WRA202	Respondents objected to water recycling due to the perceived lack of testing that has been done on the technology used within the UK. Respondents stated that the lack of research would lead to poor water quality after the water has been treated and poses a risk to safety for the public. In addition, the respondents stated that the Applicant's poor reputation raises concerns over its ability to treat water to an acceptable standard. A further respondent also asked what mitigation was in place to prevent a malfunction within the process.	N	Water recycling is a well-established and internationally proven technology that has been successfully implemented in countries such as the United States, Australia, and Singapore for over 40 years. The development of the Project has included input from specialists who have worked on or collaborated with others on these well-established international schemes, ensuring that best practice has been embedded throughout the design and development of the Project. Additionally, the Applicant has conducted extensive testing through its water recycling pilot plant with experts from the University of Brighton. Testing has included analysis of pharmaceuticals and personal care products, pesticides, trace organic contaminants (including forever chemicals), and volatile organic compounds. Data from the Applicant's pilot plant trials has shown that the purified recycled water produced would provide a safe and sustainable source of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				supply that, following further treatment to drinking water standards, will continue to meet the strict water quality standards required by the Drinking Water Inspectorate (DWI). The Applicant remains committed to transparency, rigorous monitoring, and full compliance with all relevant regulations throughout the development and operation of the Project. Regarding concerns related to the potential for malfunctions, appropriate measures and controls would be put in place to prevent possible malfunctions of the treatment process impacting on the environment. The multi-stage water recycling process would feature numerous safeguards, including continuous monitoring, to ensure that significant deviations in expected water quality can be quickly spotted and rectified through partial or full system shutdowns. It will not be possible for treated wastewater to bypass this process and enter Havant Thicket Reservoir. These safeguards will be implemented by the Contractor once appointed to construct and operate the Water Recycling Plant and will be a key specification

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				for the plant to ensure water quality requirements will be met.
Wider Community	WRA203	The respondents objected to the Project based on the views that sewage should not be turned into drinking water. The respondents stated that if 'shortcuts' are taken during the water treatment process, human health could be at risk as a result of drinking recycled water. Respondents were concerned that recycled water may contain forever chemicals and that the water treatment process is not fully supported by scientific research.	N	Water recycling is a well-established and internationally proven technology that has been successfully implemented in countries such as the United States, Australia, and Singapore for over 40 years. The development of the Project has included input from specialists who have worked on or collaborated with others on these well-established international schemes, ensuring that best practice has been embedded throughout the design and development of the Project. Additionally, the Applicant has conducted extensive testing through its water recycling pilot plant with experts from the University of Brighton. Testing has included analysis of pharmaceuticals and personal care products, pesticides, trace organic contaminants (including so-called "forever chemicals"), and volatile organic compounds. Data from the Applicant's pilot plant trials has shown that the purified recycled water produced would provide a safe and sustainable source of supply that, following further treatment to drinking water standards, will continue to

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				meet the strict water quality standards required by the DWI. Under the Project, purified recycled water would undergo advanced multi-barrier treatment processes and be blended with spring water before final treatment to drinking water standards at Otterbourne Water Supply Works. This treatment regime ensures that all water entering the public supply meets the requirements of The Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations 2016. All water supplied to customers, regardless of its source, will continue to meet the highest standards for safety, taste, and quality, as required by the DWI. The Applicant remains committed to transparency, rigorous monitoring, and full compliance with all relevant regulations throughout the development and operation of the Project.
Wider Community	WRA204	The respondents expressed disappointment at the perceived lack of engagement with customers as to the acceptability of recycling effluent to produce drinking water. The respondents stated that the lack of meaningful consultation undermines the legitimacy of	N	The Applicant recognises the importance of engaging with customers ahead of any change in water source. To date, it has engaged with customers on the need for the Project, focusing on current and future water scarcity and the reasons why new sources are required. This has included targeted customer research, such as a 2023 survey of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		the proposal of recycled water and adds to the existing distrust in the Applicant. Respondents stated that water recycling should not proceed until all concerns have been addressed to a satisfactory standard		over 1,900 customers across the Applicant's region, which showed that around 60% of customers supported water recycling as part of their future water supplies. Furthermore, customers living in proximity to the Project have been notified and had the opportunity to participate in the non-statutory and statutory public consultations undertaken to inform the development of the Project. The Applicant's future engagement regarding a change in source will be phased and targeted, providing clear information about water quality and safety. This engagement will occur closer to the implementation of the change in source. This approach is informed by industry research, including work by BritainThinks (2022), which found that most customers prefer to be notified of a change in water source three to six months in advance, with a single reminder closer to the time.
Wider Community	WRA205	A respondent sought clarification regarding the number of similar water recycling plants already in operation on the South Coast.	N	The Applicant confirms that there are currently no water recycling plants in operation on the South Coast. The Isle of Wight Water Recycling Project is planned to be the first full-scale facility of its kind in the region, and this Project, if permitted, would follow. Both projects are being developed as

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				part of a broader programme to secure resilient water supplies for the future.
Wider Community	WRA206	A respondent was supportive of water recycling and stated that the Project may 'pave the way forward' for other water companies to utilise the same methods.	N	The Applicant welcomes the support for water recycling. Other water companies are also developing water recycling proposals as part of their Water Resources Management Plans (WRMP), with the shared aim of ensuring sustainable abstractions and addressing the significant water supply shortfall projected by the Environment Agency (EA). The Applicant's proposals, including the Isle of Wight Water Recycling Project and this Project, are advanced in their development, and lessons learned from these projects are being shared across the industry, supporting best practice and collaboration nationwide.
Wider Community	WRA207	A respondent raised awareness regarding a lobby group who oppose the Project. In addition, respondents questioned the risk to human health as a result of ingesting the recycled wastewater. A particular concern was raised in relation to the 'K' potassium levels and the permitted maximum levels in recycled water.	N	Water recycling is a well-established and internationally proven technology that has been successfully implemented in countries such as the United States, Australia, and Singapore for over 40 years. The development of the Project has included input from specialists who have worked on or collaborated with others on these well-established international schemes, ensuring that best practice has been embedded

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		A further respondent queried what studies had already been undertaken on this source of drinking water and how could the public potentially be affected by the different chemicals.		throughout the design and development of the Project. Extensive testing has been carried out through the Applicant's water recycling pilot plant, including analysis of pharmaceuticals, personal care products, pesticides, trace organic contaminants (including so-called "forever chemicals"), and volatile organic compounds. Data from the Applicant's pilot plant trials has shown that the purified recycled water produced would provide a safe and sustainable source of supply that, following further treatment to drinking water standards, will continue to meet the strict water quality standards required by the Drinking Water Inspectorate Maximum potassium concentration in the recycled water will be comparable to environmental concentrations such as typical river water. Potassium in UK drinking water is not formally regulated with a specific numerical standard by the DWI because it is an essential nutrient rarely found at levels of concern.
Wider Community	WRA208	Respondents objected to water recycling as it could result in customers using bottled water instead, rather than recycled water.	N	Water recycling is a well-established and internationally proven technology, successfully implemented in countries such

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Respondents suggested the potential change to bottled water would increase environmental issues, production and transport carbon emissions. A further respondent asked if there any other case studies from similar systems across the world, the strengths and weaknesses of these schemes and what challenges have they had to overcome.		as the United States, Australia and Singapore. The development of the Project has included input from specialists who have worked on or collaborated with others on these well-established international schemes, ensuring that best practice has been embedded throughout the design and development of the Project. In the UK, the DWI has confirmed that water recycling can be delivered safely, outlining the robust regulatory requirements that water companies must demonstrate before recycled water can be put into supply. Water supplied to the public will continue to meet these high safety and quality standards; notably being subject to rigorous regulatory oversight, including comprehensive risk assessment, advanced multi-barrier treatment processes, and continuous monitoring to ensure compliance with The Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations 2016. With these measures, the public can have confidence in the safety and reliability of the water supplied. Introducing recycled water is not expected to significantly increase bottled water consumption.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	WRA209	Respondents queried if there would be a different taste from the proposed dosing of chlorine and different minerals in the water. A further respondent stated that they had stopped drinking the water because it tasted of chlorine.	N	Customers may experience a slight change in taste due to the water coming from a different source, but not due to chlorine due to the very small amounts used to treat drinking water supplies. Chlorine has been used for over 100 years as a disinfectant and is harmless at the concentrations used in public water supplies. Chlorine is added to drinking water supplies because effective disinfection is essential to prevent waterborne diseases, ensure it is safe, free from harmful bacteria, and meet The Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations. It should be noted that the Project will not use chlorine in the advanced treatment process. If customers are concerned about the current taste of their water, the Applicant asks that it be reported to them so it can be investigated.

Table G25-5 Summary of issues raised on the theme of the water recycling process and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	WRP201	The respondent raised concerns over the reputation of the Applicant and how this led to public concern over the water recycling	N	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding trust and historical performance. Please refer to the response to WSWO202

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		process. The respondent was also concerned by the prediction of algal bloom due to phosphorous in the water. The respondent stated that the recycled water would be the source of pollution in the local area. The respondent stated that there was significant concern regarding the risk of algal bloom and how the inadequate water conditioning could reduce the water quality.		for a fuller response on how the Applicant is managing this issue. Extensive water quality modelling has demonstrated that, by using an High rejection membrane as part of the reverse osmosis stage of treatment, phosphorous concentrations in recycled water is significantly reduced to manage risk of algal blooms and prevent pollution. The results are presented and assessed in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Recycled water will be re-mineralised before it leaves the Water Recycling Plant (WRP), to ensure downstream infrastructure is protected and the quality of the blended water in Havant Thicket Reservoir does not subsequently pose any risks to the wholesomeness of drinking water supplied by Otterbourne Water Supply Works. All water supplied to customers, regardless of its source, will continue to meet the highest standards for safety, taste, and quality, as required by the Drinking Water Inspectorate (DWI). The

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Applicant remains committed to transparency, rigorous monitoring, and full compliance with all relevant regulations throughout the development and operation of the Project.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	WRP202	Respondents suggested that more information regarding the removal of forever chemicals and monitoring should have been made available. Respondents queried why reverse osmosis had not been used for water coming from the Solent. Respondents noted that the reverse osmosis process takes a great deal of energy and that it must be monitored consistently.	N	The water recycling treatment process is not an absolute barrier to hormones, pharmaceuticals and “forever chemicals”, so some trace amounts may still be found in the recycled water produced as they would in other drinking water sources, such as rivers. The WRP treatment, which utilises reverse osmosis, ultraviolet advanced oxidation and granular activated carbon, is more effective at removing these contaminants than conventional water or sewage treatment processes. Additionally, the Applicant has conducted extensive testing through its water recycling pilot plant with experts from the University of Brighton. Testing has included analysis of pharmaceuticals and personal care products, pesticides, trace organic contaminants (including forever chemicals), and volatile organic compounds. The Applicant's pilot plant data has shown that the purified

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				recycled water produced would provide a safe and sustainable source of supply that, following further treatment to drinking water standards, will continue to meet the strict water quality standards required by the Drinking Water Inspectorate. The release of recycled water into Havant Thicket Reservoir would be monitored in accordance with regulations and standards set out and enforced by the Environment Agency (EA). The Applicant remains committed to transparency, rigorous monitoring, and full compliance with all relevant regulations throughout the development and operation of the Project. This project would use highly treated wastewater from Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) that is currently released to the sea via the Eastney Long Sea Outfall (LSO). Seawater from the Solent would not be used or treated, this would be classed as desalination. Sustainability is a key consideration. Water recycling is less energy-intensive than alternatives that provide a comparable scale

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				of water supply, such as desalination. The Project was determined as the best value solution through both the Water Resource South East (WRSE) and the Applicant's emerging WRMP24 options appraisal processes.
Wider Community	WRP203	The respondent was concerned about accumulation of trace organics and the impact of this on the health of those ingesting potentially 'contaminated' water, or recycled water.	N	The water recycling treatment process is very effective at removing trace organics, although some traces may still be present in the purified recycled water, as they are in natural sources, such as rivers. Data from the Applicant's pilot plant trials has shown that the purified recycled water produced would provide a safe and sustainable source of supply that, following further treatment to drinking water standards, will continue to meet the strict water quality standards for safety, taste and quality as required by the DWI. The Applicant remains committed to transparency, rigorous monitoring, and full compliance with all relevant regulations throughout the development and operation of the Project.
Wider Community	WRP204	Respondents questioned the likelihood of the water being remineralised during the treatment process, as it has been stated in the consultation material that the water	N	Remineralisation is an essential part of the water recycling treatment process in order to add essential minerals back into the water. This will protect downstream infrastructure

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		recycling process would 'strip' the water of its mineral content. The respondents were also concerned about the untested nature of the recycling process and the impact this could have on the water quality and the subsequent health of the consumers and the environment. A respondent stated that not all of the impurities would be removed by the treatment process, and that the level of remineralisation the recycled effluent would be subject to remained unclear. Another respondent noted their view that mixing freshwater with treated sewage would not be an appropriate solution and that it would only be done to save the sewage from being dumped in the sea or inland waterways.		and ensure that the overall water quality characteristics and health benefits of the source water that is transferred and stored at Havant Thicket Reservoir would not be significantly different to the current water quality profile of water treated at Otterbourne Water Supply Works (WSW) prior to going into supply. The release of recycled water into HTR and reject water from the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) into the Solent would be monitored in accordance with regulations and standards set out and enforced by the EA. The Environmental Permit would specify the provide strict requirements necessary to protect tests to prevent potential impacts to the environment and achieve water quality standards. Modelling has been undertaken which assesses the potential impacts of a number of key water quality parameters and this has demonstrated that no adverse environmental impacts are predicted. Further information can be found in ES Chapter 19 Water environment Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Water recycling is a well-established and internationally proven technology,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				successfully implemented in countries such as the United States, Australia and Singapore. The development of the Project has included input from specialists who have worked on or collaborated with others on these well-established international schemes, ensuring that best practice has been embedded throughout the design and development of the Project. In the UK, the Drinking Water Inspectorate (DWI) has confirmed that water recycling can be delivered safely, outlining the robust regulatory requirements that water companies must demonstrate before recycled water can be put into supply. This Project should not be confused with storm releases - the Project will turn highly treated wastewater into purified recycled water, which will then be mixed with spring water in Havant Thicket Reservoir, before subsequent treatment at Otterbourne WSW to strict drinking water standards before going into supply. Water supplied to the public will continue to meet these high safety and quality standards; notably being subject to rigorous regulatory oversight, including comprehensive risk assessment, advanced multi-barrier treatment processes, and continuous

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				monitoring to ensure compliance with The Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations 2016.
Wider Community	WRP20 5	The respondent asked for clarification regarding the fate of the sludge from the Water Recycling Process (WRP), as well as how and when the environmental impacts of this sludge would be evaluated. The respondent added that the proposed phosphate treatment is likely to increase sludge levels.	N	The proposed treatment process at the WRP does not produce a solid stream and sludge management would not be required.
Wider Community	WRP20 6	Respondents questioned how the reject water from the water recycling process would be dealt with, in relation to its final location, especially if this is to be discharged into the Solent. Respondents also requested clarification on how this had been considered within the Water Quality Environmental Report and associated modelling.	N	The reject stream would be blended with treated wastewater flows from Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) before release into the Solent via the Long Sea Outfall (LSO). The water quality modelling has demonstrated that adverse environmental impacts are not predicted from release of the reject water into the Solent. Details of the water quality modelling is summarised in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WRP20 7	Respondents stated that there was inadequate consideration pertaining to the risks and impacts of sedimentation of contaminants which currently takes place	N	Water quality modelling and assessment has demonstrated that there would be insignificant changes between the existing release at the Eastney LSO and the proposed

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		from the existing effluent discharge plume. Clarification was sought on the impacts of this. Additionally, respondents were concerned about a perceived lack of information regarding risks to the harbour from pipeline construction and the disposal of any associated sludge. The respondents also stated that the forecast deterioration in water quality proposed by the Applicant to add a phosphate treatment process/plant which would need to operate daily, as recycled effluent would be discharged into Havant Thicket Reservoir every day.		combined release which includes reject water from the WRP. The results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling demonstrates that there would be no change to the existing effect the Eastney LSO has on the Solent and adjoining water bodies such as Langstone Harbour. Construction activities associated with the Project, such as the installation of pipelines between Budds Farm WTW and the proposed WRP, and the construction of a new sustainable drainage system (SuDS) outfall from the WRP drainage system into the Hermitage Stream are not predicted to have any impact on Langstone harbour or the marine environment generally. The assessment presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) demonstrates that the construction and operation of the new outfall would not adversely affect water quality or the geomorphology of the tidal Hermitage Stream.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The WRP does not produce a sludge stream, therefore disposal of sludge will not be required. The proposed treatment process at the WRP includes integrated membrane technology to reduce phosphate levels to a low concentration, this will be integral to the process and in operation for all flows transferred to Havant Thicket Reservoir. The release of recycled water into HTR and the waste stream via Eastney LSO would be monitored in accordance with regulations and standards set out and enforced by the EA under a new Environmental Permit.
Wider Community	WRP208	Respondents were concerned about the capability of the reverse osmosis process to remove chemicals and contaminants to produce safe drinking water. The respondents also noted the reported lack of trust the public have in the Applicant; and queried its ability to manage, clean and maintain a technology such as reverse osmosis.	N	The treatment proposed at the WRP is not an absolute barrier to all chemicals, so some trace amounts may still be found in the recycled water produced as they would in other drinking water sources, such as rivers. The water treatment process, which utilises reverse osmosis, ultraviolet advanced oxidation and granular activated carbon, is more effective at removing these contaminants than conventional water or sewage treatment processes.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Data from the Applicant's pilot plant trials has shown that the purified recycled water produced would provide a safe and sustainable source of supply that, following further treatment to drinking water standards, will continue to meet the strict water quality standards required by the Drinking Water Inspectorate The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding trust and historical performance. Please refer to the response to WSWO202 for a fuller response on how the Applicant is managing this issue. Water recycling is a well-established and internationally proven technology, successfully implemented in countries such as the United States, Australia and Singapore. The development of the Project has included input from specialists who have worked on or collaborated with others on these well-established international schemes, ensuring that best practice has been embedded throughout the design and development of the Project. In the UK, the DWI has confirmed that water recycling can be delivered safely, outlining the robust regulatory requirements that water companies

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				must demonstrate before recycled water can be put into supply. Maintaining and repairing existing infrastructure is a core part of the Applicant's operation. The multi-stage water recycling process will feature numerous safeguards, including continuous monitoring, to ensure that in the unlikely event of a significant deviation in expected water quality occurs, these can be quickly spotted and rectified through partial or full system shutdowns. It will not be possible for treated wastewater to bypass this process and enter Havant Thicket Reservoir. These safeguards will be implemented by the Contractor once appointed to construct and operate the WRP and will be a key specification for the plant to ensure water quality requirements will be met.
Wider Community	WRP209	Respondents raised concerns about the contaminants which would still be present in the treated wastewater after the water recycling process. The respondents were alarmed that chlorine would be added back into the water to combat the bacteria. This was perceived as not being in line with the Drinking Water Safety Plan.	N	The treatment proposed at the WRP is not an absolute barrier to all chemicals and contaminants so some trace amounts may still be found in the recycled water produced as they would in other drinking water sources, such as rivers. The water recycling process, which utilises reverse osmosis, ultraviolet advanced oxidation and granular activated carbon, is

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				more effective at removing these contaminants than conventional water or sewage treatment processes. Additionally, the Applicant has conducted extensive testing through its water recycling pilot plant with experts from the University of Brighton. Testing has included analysis of pharmaceuticals and personal care products, pesticides, trace organic contaminants (including forever chemicals), and volatile organic compounds. Data from the pilot plant trials has shown that the purified recycled water produced would provide a safe and sustainable source of supply that, following further treatment to drinking water standards, will continue to It should be noted that the Project will not use chlorine in the advanced treatment process at the WRP. Chlorine will only be added after subsequent treatment at Otterbourne WSW prior to going into supply, as per the current water treatment process at Otterbourne WSW. Chlorine has been used for over 100 years as a disinfectant and is harmless at the concentrations used in public water supplies. Chlorine is added to drinking water supplies

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				because effective disinfection is essential to prevent waterborne diseases, ensure it is safe, free from harmful bacteria, and meet The Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations.
Wider Community	WRP210	A respondent sought clarification on the expected life of a phosphate treatment plant and how quickly it is likely to need replacing or requiring 'major maintenance'. Respondents further noted that whilst the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) is stated to be a drought resource but contended that it would need to be in operation for a significant portion of the year to keep the equipment, membranes and pipeline infrastructure in good condition. The respondents stated that some chemicals found in sewage did not degrade, or would take a long time to, which required accounting for within assessments. Respondents stated that in order to mitigate the risk of eutrophication caused by increased phosphorous levels from the effluent discharge, the report proposed adding a phosphate removal process. Respondents understood that the process would operate daily which would increase	N	The current proposal is to use a higher rejection membrane as part of the proposed treatment process to reduce the phosphate concentration in the recycled water. The reverse osmosis membrane elements, including the higher rejection membranes, have an estimated life of 5 to 7 years. Replacement would be implemented by the Contractor appointed to construct and operate the Water Recycling Plant and would be a key specification for the plant. The treatment process, and the wider Project, will need to operate at all times, given the need to bolster daily supplies of water at Otterbourne WSW. The Project is not just required to deal with water shortages during a drought The Applicant has conducted extensive testing through its water recycling pilot plant with experts from the University of Brighton. Testing has included analysis of pharmaceuticals and personal care products,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		cost, energy consumption and carbon emissions, which would be complicated by the location of the WRP. In addition, respondents stated that additional sludge would be generated and there was no information on what would happen to this extra sludge. It was suggested by respondents that additional chemical storage would be likely, and this would not be best value for customers or the environment.		pesticides, trace organic contaminants (including forever chemicals), and volatile organic compounds. Data from the Applicant's pilot plant trials has shown that the purified recycled water produced would provide a safe and sustainable source of supply that, following further treatment to drinking water standards, will continue to meet the strict water quality standards required by the DWI. Details of the water quality modelling is summarised in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The use of high rejection membranes in the reverse osmosis stage of treatment to address phosphate removal will not require additional chemicals and will not materially increase costs, energy or carbon emissions of the water recycling process, which will still be required to operate on a continuous basis in order to address the water supply challenge facing the Applicant. Power consumption has been considered as part of the Carbon Assessment. Further information on the carbon assessment can be found in ES Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The release of recycled water into HTR and the waste stream via Eastney LSO to the Solent would be monitored in accordance with regulations and standards set out and enforced by the Environment Agency (EA) under a new Environmental Permit. The location of the WRP was selected to reduce pipeline lengths and associated pumping costs. As per the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5). The water recycling process does not produce a solid waste stream, therefore sludge management will not be required. Chemicals are required as part of the treatment process and will be suitably stored on site at the WRP. The Project has been determined as the best value solution to providing customers with a new sustainable source of water whilst protecting the environment.
Wider Community	WRP21 1	Respondents requested clarification on which process was used to treat the	N	The Applicant has adopted a globally recognise Full Advanced Treatment Process that includes an integrated membrane

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		wastewater and whether this treatment involved filtration or chemical purification. One respondent also questioned if the water recycling process would harness natural biological processes by using the 'Three Pond System'. A further respondent suggested the expected waste from the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) would have a further detrimental effect on the water outflow at Broadmarsh which is already a failure of the water companies.		process combined with Ultra-Violet and Advanced Oxidation Process. Carbon treatment has also been included to enhance the treatment process. The purified recycled water would also be remineralised to add minerals back into the water to stabilise it before transfer to Havant Thicket Reservoir. Natural biological processes are not suitable for this application due to quantity of flow being treated requiring a much larger footprint for treatment and the required high quality of water to protect public health and the environment. Water quality modelling of the potential changes in discharges of currently consented parameters and salinity (i.e. calculated change between the existing release and the release combined with the WRP reject water) at the Eastney LSO has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The model output demonstrates that the changes are insignificant and therefore there would be no change to the existing effect the Eastney LSO

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				has on the Solent and adjoining water bodies such as Langstone Harbour. The release of recycled water into Havant Thicket Reservoir and the waste stream via Eastney LSO to the Solent would be monitored in accordance with regulations and standards set out and enforced by the Environment Agency (EA) under a new Environmental Permit. The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding trust and historical performance. Please refer to the response to WSWO202 for a fuller response on how the Applicant is managing this issue.
Wider Community	WRP21 2	The respondent expressed a desire for further explanation of how the water would be cleaned and the 'science' behind it.	N	Summary information about the water recycling process has been made available in the Applicant's consultation brochures for both its Summer 2022 Consultation and its Summer 2024 Consultation. More information on the process is also available on the Applicant's Project page and on its Water for Life Hampshire page on its website.

Table G25-6 Summary of issues raised on the theme of the location of the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	LWRP2 01	The respondents stated their objections to the Project, specifically to the choice of site for the Water Recycling Plant (WRP). The respondents expressed that the Broadmarsh landfill would not be the most suitable site or the one with the least associated impact, and that it would carry many significant risks. One respondent argued that the location of the WRP should not be in the local area at all, as the scheme isn't benefitting residents. Respondents clarified that they did not consider the previous alternative site assessment to have been robust.	N	The Applicant has undertaken an extensive site selection process for the WRP site, which was presented at the Summer 2022 Consultation, and a further review of the site selection process was presented at the Summer 2024 Consultation. This site selection process considered a range of technical, environmental and planning criteria, which evaluated a range of sites within a 1.5km search area from Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW). The Project utilises the Budds Farm WTW in Havant as this is one of the Applicant's largest wastewater treatment works and therefore has the greatest capacity for supplying the necessary quantity of fully treated wastewater required for a WRP producing approximately 60 megalitres per day (Ml/d) of recycled water. Locating the WRP as close as possible to Budds Farm WTW minimises the length of interconnecting pipelines between the two facilities and associated costs, energy and carbon emissions from pumping water over greater distances. The WRP site's proximity to

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Havant Thicket Reservoir, which is required as an environmental buffer for storing the recycled water, also makes it a preferred choice, again by minimising pipelines lengths and associated costs. The site selection process identified that the WRP site at Broadmarsh performed best overall against the criteria considered and that any risks associated with the former landfill site could be adequately mitigated. For more information, please refer to the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5). The construction methods used to construct the WRP site and associated pipelines would seek to avoid mobilising contaminants at the historic landfill site. The design of the WRP within the site has also sought to reduce disturbance to the landfill. An assessment of the potential for impacts as a result of construction of the WRP site is set out in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). This also sets out the mitigation measures that would be implemented during the construction phase, which are secured in the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). This approach has been provisionally agreed with Havant Borough Council (HBC), the Environment Agency (EA) and Natural England (NE).
Wider Community	LWRP2 02	The respondents expressed views of opposition regarding the choice of site for the WRP, particularly based on environmental and heritage reasons as well as the disruption expected to be caused to local residents. A further respondent queried what safety assurances can be offered by the Applicant considering the land was a former landfill site.	N	The Applicant has undertaken an extensive site selection process for the WRP site, which was presented at the Summer 2022 Consultation, and a further review of the site selection process was presented at the Summer 2024 Consultation. This site selection process considered a range of technical, environmental and planning criteria, which evaluated a range of sites within a 1.5km search area from Budds Farm WTW. The selected site for the WRP was considered to perform best against these criteria. For more information, please refer to the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5). The construction methods used to construct the WRP site and associated pipelines would seek to avoid mobilising contaminants at the historic landfill site. The design of the WRP within the site has also sought to reduce disturbance to the landfill.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Section 11.8 of ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of the potential impacts on land quality and ground conditions receptors as a result of construction and operation activities within the WRP site (including impacts associated with the migration of ground gas). Mitigation measures for the WRP site in relation to ground gas are outlined in ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and secured within the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). Mitigation measures to ensure protection of adjacent land uses and receptors are also outlined in ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and secured within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The proposed approach to managing potential contaminations risks associated with construction works at the WRP site has been provisionally agreed with Havant Borough

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Council (HBC), the Environment Agency (EA) and Natural England (NE). Section 14.4 of ES Chapter 14 Major accidents and disasters, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) also sets out the mitigation for the risk of fire from landfill ground gas during construction, further demonstrating consideration of safety in the delivery of the Project.
Wider Community	LWRP2 03	Respondents objected to the WRP's location, linking it to an eyesore and increased urbanisation.	N	ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of the landscape and visual impacts of the WRP site. A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce visual effects. Through the implementation of mitigation, no long term likely significant adverse effects on views are anticipated. Aside from reinforcing existing planting, primary mitigation measures include limiting building height and the use of materials and a colour palette appropriate to the local context. A full visual assessment is provided in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), supported by ES Appendix 13.4 Visual baseline and effects, Volume II.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				As per Design Principle WRP_13, the green/brown roof at the WRP main process building would help reduce impacts on key views from the south. Further, Design Principles WRP_8 and WRP_9 set out measures that would be adopted to integrate the WRP site within the landscape and ensure the detailed design of buildings (including finishes) and fencing has regard to local context. Design Principles WRP_3 to WRP_7 set out the controls for building and structure footprints and heights. Please refer to Design Principles (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). The location of the WRP has been subject to an extensive site selection process, which has considered a range of sites in the proximity of Budds Farm WTW. This process is set out in the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5).

Table G25-7 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design of the WRP and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DWRP2 01	The respondents expressed discontent with the design of the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) and suggested it would be an 'eyesore' for miles around, disrupting what is currently a considered a beautiful area, which is undesirable. In addition, one respondent stated that there was inadequate information on which to comment on anything other than the height of the plant.	N	The outline design of the proposed Water Recycling Plant (WRP) has been informed by the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), which is summarised in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Reference has been made to the assessment of local landscape character and views, including from Broadmarsh Coastal Park and Langstone Harbour to the south. Tree and shrub planting is proposed to reinforce the visual screening provided by existing vegetation around the boundaries of the site. A green/brown roof is also proposed to provide habitat and to assist in integrating the building into the landscape and views. This is consistent with the criteria for good design set out in section 3.6 of the National Policy Statement for Water Resources Infrastructure (NPSWRI). Detailed designs for the WRP will be submitted post-DCO consent and would be guided by site specific design principles that are set out in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	DWRP2 02	The respondent expressed their view that the height of the plant should be kept to a minimum, as a taller building will require deeper piles, giving rise to new pathways being created for contaminated leachate to drain into the chalk aquifer and harbour.	N	The absolute maximum height of buildings has been specified in zones within the Design Principles, (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). This will limit how tall buildings can be designed during detailed design as an absolute worst case. Zone 1 is proposed to have the tallest building, with a maximum height of 14.5m. However, this is proposed to have a green roof to limit visual impact. Zones 2 and 3 are proposed to have maximum heights of 9.85m and 5m. The design of the piled foundations is based on loadings imparted by the structure rather than height, so a large diameter tank holding water would require more piles than a tall office building for example. The depth of piling is likely to be consistent across the entire site as the requirement will be for the piles to found in competent bedrock as there is no competent strata at shallow depth. All piles are proposed to be cast in-situ. This decision has been made to prevent the creation of vertical migration pathways. The design of the piles is described in the Outline Foundation Works Risk Assessment (Document reference 7.4, DCO Volume 7).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	DWRP203	Respondents suggested the provision of PV solar panels for the roof to provide some offset for the high energy/carbon use at the WRP. A further respondent noted that the proposed green roof is less likely to add value as there is already grassland at the site and that solar panels would provide power during daylight hours.	N	As part of the design development to date, the Applicant has evaluated opportunities for renewable energy provision through self-generation. The self-generation options were evaluated through a detailed examination of potential renewable energy options within the draft Order Limits as summarised in the Outline Carbon Management Plan (Document reference 7.8, DCO Volume 7). The evaluation of self-generation options concluded that there are insufficient viable generation opportunities available within the draft Order Limits to provide meaningful and efficient renewable energy contribution to the Project power demand. Following these findings, the Applicant set out a process to evaluate what energy procurement routes are more efficient to achieve optimal decarbonisation of power demand. Post consent, an updated energy strategy will be provided for the Project in a second iteration of the Outline Carbon Management Plan (Document reference 7.8, DCO Volume 7) that will confirm the specific strategy for the supply of power to the site and the impact on operational phase carbon emissions. These proposals will provide evidence of how the Project will use renewable energy sources.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The green roof has been proposed as, in line with the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5), it helps to integrate the building into the landscape, thereby reducing any visual impact. It also provides important replacement habitat for that lost to the new buildings and structures on the site.

Table G25-8 Summary of issues raised on the theme of the location of Above Ground Plant (AGP) and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Wickham and Knowle Parish Council	LAG201	Wickham and Knowle Parish Council requested further details on what Pumping Station G would look like and the impact it would have on neighbouring properties. The Council had also asked if an alternative site for Pumping Station G had been investigated. The Council provided a plan to support its comment.	N	The Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) sets out the proposals for the design of Intermediate Pumping Station G. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) explains the process that was undertaken to select the location of Intermediate Pumping Station G and the alternative sites that were considered. Three other options were considered in the area surrounding Titchfield Lane. The proposed Intermediate Pumping Station G site was progressed due to its proximity to the existing

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				built environment including existing industrial/farm buildings and access and as it is 1km away from the South Downs National Park (SDNP), compared to the alternatives which are situated between 20m and 650m from the SDNP. This process was set out in the Scheme Development Summary which was consulted on at the Summer 2024 Consultation.
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PILs	LAG202	Respondents raised concerns over the proposed siting of Intermediate Pumping Station F alongside the proposed mitigation and its potential impact to the existing Albany Business Park and the Welborne Garden Village development. It was suggested that further detailed design should be undertaken to consider appropriate mitigation for future residents. A respondent also noted that it had not been clear from the consultation materials if on-site characteristics had been adequately taken into account within the Project. It was suggested that Intermediate Pumping Station F, mitigation planting, and compound should be moved to the east,	N	The location for Intermediate Pumping Station F (IPS-F) has been selected due to the reduced environmental impact and the ability to integrate the site into the existing and future landscape. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) explains the process that was undertaken to select the location of Intermediate Pumping Station F. Intermediate Pumping Station F has been sited to avoid Welborne Garden Village land identified for allotments/recreation and avoid overhead power lines. It was identified to benefit from existing access and natural screening from an adjacent copse of trees and was considered to be less visually prominent in this location. Moving IPS F further east would make the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		with all works and mitigation located outside the Welborne Garden Village boundary. The respondent expressed concerns that no information had been provided in relation to the impacts of the mitigation planting proposed alongside Intermediate Pumping Station F.		site more visually prominent which would have a greater impact on the landscape. IPS-F has been designed considering the Welborne Garden Village development. As per Design Principle IPS-F_2 (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) opportunities for a holistic approach on environmental enhancement and connectivity would be sought in collaboration with the Welborne Garden Village development at the detailed design stage. The ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out an assessment of the impacts of IPS-F during construction and operation. The Spring 2025 Consultation materials explained that an environmental mitigation and enhancement area (EMEA) had been identified at Intermediate Pumping Station F to help integrate it into the landscape and reduce visual impacts, the extent of this area was displayed on a map. It was also explained that further details would be set out in the DCO application. The Design Principles for EMEA-F-1 (see Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5)) include proposals for woodland

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				and scrub planting and hedgerow enhancement. These proposals will help to provide visual screening for future residents of Welborne Garden Village, integrate Intermediate Pumping Station F within the landscape and improve habitat connectivity for example.
PILs	LAG203	The respondents raised concerns regarding the proposed siting of Intermediate Pumping Station G, as it would reduce developable land and the ability to deliver needed residential development. It was suggested that it would be mutually beneficial to push the water main towards the northern boundary, and said further discussion with the Applicant regarding this suggestion was welcomed.	N	The site selection process for the Above Ground Plant (AGP) considered approved or consented residential developments and residential allocations in local authorities' adopted and emerging Local Plans. In many locations, landowners have highlighted to the Applicant that land is being promoted for residential development, however in the absence of an allocation in a local plan or a planning application, the Applicant does not have certainty that the residential development would materialise. The Applicant has considered this and the pipeline route in this location cannot be moved to align with the boundary of the field without introducing bends to the pipeline. This would impact the hydraulics which could require additional pumping. The Applicant has considered various pipeline routes in this area and has selected a route that limits impacts on protected species, the highway network

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				and the historic environment. This process is set out in the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5).
PIL	LAG204	The respondent objected to the proposed siting of Intermediate Pumping Station F as its visual impact would affect future residential development, as well as rendering the remaining field unusable for agricultural production. The respondent suggested that Intermediate Pumping Station F should be moved to a more suitable location. The respondent expressed the desire for further clarification on the proposed use of the pumping station, proposed access, traffic figures, and mitigation plans for traffic and noise pollution.	N	The location for Intermediate Pumping Station F (IPS-F) has been selected due to the reduced environmental impact and the ability to integrate the site into the existing and future landscape. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) explains the process that was undertaken to select the location of Intermediate Pumping Station F. Intermediate Pumping Station F has been sited to avoid Welborne Garden Village land identified for allotments/recreation and avoid overhead power lines. It was identified to benefit from existing access and natural screening from an adjacent copse of trees and was considered to be less visually prominent in this location. The Design Principles for EMEA-F-1 (see Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5)) include proposals for woodland and scrub planting and hedgerow enhancement. These proposals will help to provide visual screening for future residents of Welborne Garden Village, integrate IPS-F within the landscape and improve habitat connectivity for example.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Section 3.3 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes information on what an Intermediate Pumping Station is and how it would be used, and the access proposals. The DCO application includes a Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) which sets out the mitigation measures to reduce impacts on the highway network associated with construction traffic. This management plan has been developed in consultation with Hampshire County Council. The operational traffic impacts of IPS-F are assessed in the Transport Assessment (Appendix 18.1 of the ES Document reference 6.2 DCO Volume 6) and concluded to be negligible. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) sets out mitigation measures to reduce noise and vibration during construction. Detailed design would also seek to reduce operational noise and vibration as per design principle IPS-F 3 (Design

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5).

Table G25-9 Summary of issues raised on the theme of the location of the AGP and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DAG201	The respondent expressed their view that the design of the Above Ground Plant (AGP) must avoid an industrial appearance within a rural landscape.	N	The design of the proposed Above Ground Plant (AGP) sites has been informed by the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), which is summarised in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). This assessment has fed into the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) to guide the detailed design. The detailed design would deliver the AGP and operational requirements for the sites at a scale, density, and layout that is sensitive to the historical and landscape context. Consideration will be given to green roofs and walls, and screening with landforms and hedgerows to reduce visual impacts. In addition, buildings and finishes will respect and reinforce the local character by using

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				materials and a colour palette appropriate to local context. Please refer to the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) for further information.

Table G25-10 Summary of issues raised on the theme of the process of developing the Project and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
UK Health Security Agency, Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC), Portsmouth Water, Portsmouth City Council (PCC)	SDGP2 01	EBC, PCC and UK Health Security Agency made references to earlier comments provided on the 2024 consultation and advised that Spring 2025 Consultation representations should be read in conjunction with previously submitted Summer 2024 Consultation feedback.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Applicant has considered all feedback and prepared responses to the Summer 2024 Consultation as set out in Appendix F.25 The Applicant's response to feedback (Document reference 5.1, DCO Volume 5).
Portsmouth Water	SDGP2 02	Portsmouth Water expanded on the linkage of their 2024 and 2025 comments and specifically highlighted that these included comments made to the 2024		The Applicant has noted this comment. The Applicant has undertaken further engagement with Portsmouth Water to seek to reduce impacts on groundwater. Following the Spring

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Consultation Report Appendix G – Statutory Spring 2025 Consultation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		consultation on groundwater protection and quality impacts and that their response in the 2025 consultation incorporates the new design refinements into the conversation regarding the groundwater protection and quality impacts. Portsmouth Water also confirmed that feedback provided at Summer 2024 Consultation should be taken as representing Portsmouth Water's overall position.		2025 Consultation, the back-up option for the Pipeline between the WRP site and Havant Thicket Reservoir was no longer progressed as the Project would utilise pipelines that are being separately delivered by Portsmouth Water between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir. This removed the need for tunnelling works through the Source Protection Zone associated with groundwater abstractions at Bedhampton Springs.
Winchester City Council (WCC)	SDGP2 03	WCC stated that they will continue to assess the technical aspects of the scheme to ensure it can be completed without significant adverse harm to the environment, local residents and special interests of the district.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
PCC	SDGP2 04	The respondent hoped, as was echoed in the 2024 consultation, that workshops would continue to be held with the Applicant, to develop visual and ecological mitigation.	N	The scheme development process has been undertaken alongside engagement with various stakeholders including local authorities and Natural England (NE), to ensure that ecological and landscape impacts are avoided and reduced. For more details, please refer to the Statement of Engagement (Document reference 5.9, DCO Volume 5). The Applicant has engaged with PCC on the design principles set out in the Design Principles Document (Document reference

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				5.11, DCO Volume 5), which control the detailed design of the Project, including the mitigation and enhancement proposals. Local authority involvement in developing the design principles is described in the Design Approach Document (Document reference 5.12, DCO Volume 5).
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PILs	SDGP2 05	The respondents stated that their 2024 responses to the scheme development were enclosed as they had not received an adequate response during the last round of consultation. Respondents expressed disappointment that comments and concerns made to the 2024 consultation had remained unresolved or misinterpreted and stated that responses from the Applicant had been inadequate or not received to their 2024 consultation submissions and landowner's requests for feedback that had been made.	N	Following the Summer 2024 Consultation, the Applicant wrote to landowners in December 2024 to provide the opportunity to meet and discuss their comments further, to better understand possible impacts. As part of the Spring 2025 Consultation, the Applicant also contacted landowners and/or their representatives who were impacted by design refinements to ensure they were aware of the consultation timescales, where information would be available on the website and offered meetings to discuss the Project changes. The Applicant then provided written responses to landowners who provided feedback to the Summer 2024 and Spring 2025 Consultations via letters which were sent to landowners and their representatives in December 2025 and January 2026.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The Applicant has carefully evaluated site and route options against a range of planning and environmental criteria, including potential impacts on land use. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) and the Environmental Statement Chapter 3 (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out the process the Applicant has taken to refine the pipeline route, whilst ES Chapter 4 Consideration of alternatives (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) details the other options considered. The Applicant has had regard to all feedback received. In some cases, it has not been possible to implement design changes proposed by stakeholders without introducing additional technical challenges or environmental impacts. All design refinements have been made considering potential technical and environmental implications.
PIL	SDGP2 06	The respondent stated they were pleased that the proposed pipeline had moved west, adjacent to the existing tree line. They expressed their preference that they	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		wanted the pipeline as close to the treeline as possible.		
PIL	SDGP207	The respondent noted their previous meeting held with the Applicant's appointed land agents and expressed their disappointment in respect of the changes to the proposed route on their property which was stated to now affect a significant amount of land.	Y	The Applicant has engaged with affected parties to understand the potential impacts of the construction and operation of the Project on them and discuss their individual circumstances. Engagement will continue with affected parties to address ongoing concerns and reach voluntary agreements where possible. Following the Summer 2024 Consultation, the Applicant amended the pipeline route to that shown in the Spring 2025 Consultation to avoid impacting a residential garden and various equestrian paddocks. However, following feedback received at the Spring 2025 Consultation and meetings with the landowners, which highlighted that construction of the pipeline along this amended route would adversely impact business operations and arable fields, the pipeline route was changed back to the route shown in the Summer 2024 Consultation. Trenchless construction methods are now proposed to tunnel the pipeline under the residential garden and equestrian paddocks

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				rather than across it, to avoid works and disruption at surface level in these areas. The Applicant has carefully evaluated site and route options against a range of planning and environmental criteria, including potential impacts on land use. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) and the ES Chapter 3 Description of Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out the process the Applicant has taken to refine the pipeline route.
PIL	SDGP208	The respondent provided a drawing of a request for a change in the area of the scheme which runs adjacent to their land. They stated that they were happy to meet with engineers to take them through what they thought was the most appropriate route.	N	Following the Summer 2024 Consultation, the Applicant wrote to landowners in December 2024 to provide the opportunity to meet and discuss their comments further, to better understand possible impacts. As part of the Spring 2025 Consultation, the Applicant also contacted landowners and/or their representatives who were impacted by design refinements to ensure they were aware of the consultation timescales, where information would be available on the website and offered meetings to discuss the Project changes. The Applicant's then provided written responses to landowners who provided feedback to the Summer 2024 and Spring 2025 Consultations via letters which were sent to landowners and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				their representatives in December 2025 and January 2026. Where feasible, the Applicant has aligned the proposed pipeline route with existing field boundaries to minimise disruption to land use and agricultural operations. However, in some locations this has not been achievable due to overriding technical requirements such as topography, access and constructability, and engineering constraints. The Applicant has had regard to all feedback received. In some cases it has not been possible to implement design changes proposed by stakeholders without introducing additional technical or environmental impacts. All design refinements have been made considering potential technical and environmental implications.
PIL	SDGP209	The respondent suggested that the Project should drill into their neighbour's property to the south of their land, to avoid the flood meadow entirely.	N	The Applicant has had regard to all feedback received. In some cases it has not been possible to implement design changes proposed by stakeholders without introducing additional technical or environmental impacts. All design refinements have been made considering potential technical and environmental implications.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				In this location, the trenchless crossing of Winchester Road (B3354) needs to be as close to a perpendicular angle as practicable to comply with highway standards. The trenchless construction shaft on the west side of Winchester Road (B3354) cannot be moved south due to the presence of ancient woodland and electricity pylons.
PIL	SDGP2 10	The respondent provided a number of drawings in relation to scheme development in the vicinity of their property which they thought may be of use.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The drawings provided by this respondent were the drawings that were produced by the Applicant and included in the Book of Maps at the Summer 2024 Consultation.
PIL	SDGP2 11	A respondent stated they were pleased to see that some of their comments from the 2024 consultation had been taken on board. However, respondents still believed that there remained concerns or matters outstanding from those raised in the prior consultation and that further refinement was required to the scheme.	N	The Applicant has had regard to all feedback received. In some cases it has not been possible to implement design changes proposed by stakeholders without introducing additional technical or environmental impacts. All design refinements have been made considering potential technical and environmental implications. Following the Summer 2024 Consultation, the Applicant wrote to landowners in December 2024 to provide the opportunity to meet and discuss their comments further, to better understand possible impacts. As part of the Spring 2025 Consultation, the Applicant also

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				contacted landowners and/or their representatives who were impacted by design refinements to ensure they were aware of the consultation timescales, where information would be available on the website and offered meetings to discuss the Project changes. The Applicant's then provided written responses to landowners who provided feedback to the Summer 2024 and Spring 2025 Consultations via letters which were sent to landowners and their representatives in December 2025 and January 2026. The Applicant has engaged with affected parties to understand the potential impacts of the construction and operation of the Project on them and discuss their individual circumstances. Engagement will continue with affected parties to address ongoing concerns and reach voluntary agreements where possible. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the status of negotiations of voluntary land agreements with affected landowners.
PIL	SDGP2 12	The respondent observed that the Applicant had altered the crossing point of	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. Following the Summer 2022 Consultation,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		the pipeline over the River Itchen. Initially, the original route, as shown in the Book of Maps from Summer 2022 (page 25), depicted the pipe following a pronounced curve. The Scheme Development Summary from Summer 2024 (Figure 44, page 104) included several Southern Options, among which the curved option from the earlier map was still present. However, in the revised route, as detailed in the Book of Plans from Summer 2024 (Section L&M, page 31, sheet 25 of 30), the pipeline was shown running straight from Highbridge Road across the river and the railway line. This change meant that the pipeline now crossed the River Itchen approximately 100 metres further upstream and the respondent was concerned that the geology was unsuitable and that nearby groundwater resources would be at risk. The respondent also suggested that the original crossing point made more sense from an angler's point of view and historically. The respondent stated that downstream there was a large pool belonging to the Bishopstoke Fishing Club and upstream (in the 100m between the		further environmental surveys and engineering investigations were undertaken to identify which option to progress in order to cross the River Itchen. As reported in the Summer 2024 Scheme Development Summary, this considered different crossing locations. The proposed crossing of the River Itchen has been informed by surveys of ground conditions to ensure that impacts to the River Itchen are reduced, as the River Itchen is a groundwater-dependent watercourse. As the pipeline would be constructed under the River Itchen using trenchless construction, there would be no direct impacts to the watercourse and surrounding habitats that form part of the River Itchen SSSI and Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The Environmental Statement (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of vibration on species in the River Itchen. The terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity chapter of the ES sets out that no significant effects on the fish population of the Itchen catchment are envisioned due to the use of trenchless construction on any Main Rivers or larger Ordinary watercourses where significant fish activity exists.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		original and revised crossing points) where there were deep pools holding salmon and trout.		The locations of shafts for the Pipeline have also considered environmental criteria to ensure impacts on existing habitats are reduced. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out details of the design development of the River Itchen crossing.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	SDGP2 13	The respondents felt aggrieved that their responses to the previous consultation did not appear to have been addressed with any feedback or amendments to the plan. Respondents expressed their position that there had been a lack of respect from the Applicant and that this had resulted in an increased level of distrust.	N	The Applicant has had regard to all feedback received. In some cases it has not been possible to implement design changes proposed by stakeholders without introducing additional technical or environmental impacts. All design refinements have been made considering potential technical and environmental implications.
Wider Community	SDGP2 14	The respondent listed a number of concerns regarding associated infrastructure and proposed land take for the Project including the amount of land required for the pipeline and associated infrastructure, the location and design of water intake points, treatment plants and pipelines, and the depth of pipelines and associated above ground infrastructure.	N	The Applicant notes these comments. As per preliminary Design Principle PDP_1 (see the Design Approach Document (Document reference 5.12, DCO Volume 5)), the Applicant has taken the approach to minimise land take, whilst ensuring sufficient space and access for efficient construction and operation, through route and site selection and optimising site layouts. The Project has been sited and designed considering a range of environmental, technical and planning

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				criteria. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the process that has been undertaken to develop the proposals and the alternatives that have been considered. The pipelines would be installed at the minimum depths set out in Design Principle PL_4.

Table G25-11 Summary of issues raised on the theme of location of the proposed pipeline routes and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Portsmouth City Council (PCC)	PPRS2 01	The respondent noted that the tunnel depth (40m plus) along Pipeline Section D, would pose very little surface water flood risk as a result of the development. However, the respondent expressed concerns that groundwater would likely be encountered and clarification on the proposed mitigation measures was needed.	N	The design of this section of the Pipeline has been informed by detailed ground investigations and considered the interface with Source Protection Zones and geology. An assessment of the impact of the construction and operation of the Pipeline on groundwater is set out in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). ES Chapter 19 Water environment Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) concludes that there would be no significant residual effects to the water environment (including groundwater) and sets out the proposed mitigation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				measures in relation to groundwater at section 19.4. Further information is provided in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) and Design Principle PL_3 (Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5)).
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	PPRS2 02	The respondent stated that their client, Wickham Park Golf Club, would be affected by the proposed pipeline route.	N	The Applicant has aimed to reduce the impacts of temporary construction activity on landowner's existing operations through the design of the pipelines. However, in some locations this has not been practicable due to other technical or environmental constraints.
PIL	PPRS2 03	The respondent raised concerns that the proposed amendment to the Pipeline at Grayswood Carriage Driving Centre would now affect two entire field parcels including two access tracks.	Y	Following the Spring 2025 Consultation, further design refinements were made in this location to take into account landowner feedback. The pipeline route was amended, and trenchless construction was extended to reduce impact on existing land uses. Section 7 and Appendix G of the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) set out this design refinement.
PIL	PPRS2 04	A respondent expressed disappointment that the proposed amendment to the Pipeline now affected a significant amount	Y	The design of the Project was amended in this location to align with field and paddock

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		of the landowner's land at Ash House Farm.		boundaries, so that the construction works would have a lesser effect on existing operations compared to the design presented at the Summer 2024 Consultation. Construction works will not take place in all land within the Order Limits. A maximum working width of 40m will be used to construct the pipeline, as set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7).
PIL	PPRS2 05	It was acknowledged that while the pipeline closest to the residential and commercial properties at Leylands Farm has been moved south towards the field boundary, the pipeline to the west has moved further north. The respondent noted potential issues with the alignment as the amended pipeline now crosses land both allocated for development. The revised construction access at Church Lane was said to be unacceptable, however, an alternative access from the B3354 and B2177 junction was proposed.	Y	The Applicant has had regard to all feedback received. In some cases it has not been possible to implement design changes proposed by stakeholders without introducing additional technical or environmental impacts. All design refinements have been made considering potential technical and environmental implications. In this location, the Applicant has aimed to locate the pipeline route to reduce impact on the landowners' operations where practicable, whilst reducing impacts on hedgerows and trees. Following this consultation response and engagement with landowners in this area, the Order Limits were refined further to

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				follow field boundaries more closely at the west of the respondent's land. The Applicant has also sought to avoid or reduce intersects with development sites that are subject to a live or approved planning application or allocated in local authority adopted or emerging Local Plans. Accessing this area of the pipeline from the Winchester Road (B3354) and Portsmouth Road (B2177) junction would not be practicable, as this is a busy junction and Hampshire County Council (HCC) would likely object to this proposal. Therefore, accessing via Church Lane is the preferred approach.
PIL	PPRS2 06	A respondent referred to Section D of the proposed pipeline route and said the pipeline should follow the road on the south side and not cut through what was considered valuable agricultural land on the northern side of Portsdown Hill, or through gardens of houses.	N	Section D of the Pipeline would be constructed using tunnelling and therefore would not involve any construction works at surface level outside of construction compound D-1 or construction compound E-1. As tunnelling is proposed, the impacts that are mentioned on agricultural land and gardens would be avoided.
PIL	PPRS2 07	The respondent suggested that in order for the pipeline to have less impact on	Y	Following the Spring 2025 Consultation, further design refinements were made in this

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		residents of Low Hill Farm, and to save the Applicant money, drilling should be used under the garden of Quest Lodge and the access track, rather than under the stream as currently proposed. The respondent provided a plan indicating the suggestion.		location to take into account landowner feedback, so that the pipeline would be installed using trenchless construction under the residential garden and paddocks. This avoids crossing under the stream mentioned and aligns the route with the suggestion proposed by the landowner.
PIL	PPRS2 08	A respondent suggested that there is a gantry on the railway line near the River Itchen which should be avoided, and in their consideration that the original crossing point was potentially more appropriate, they reasoned that the curved pipeline would cross the railway line at a more perpendicular angle which the respondent considered would be safer.		Trenchless construction would be used to install the pipeline under the River Itchen and the railway line. This would avoid works at surface level, and therefore there would be no impact to railway infrastructure. The location of the pipeline has been determined by environmental and technical investigations, particularly considering geology and groundwater so that the construction works do not indirectly impact the River Itchen. The process to locate the pipeline is set out in the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5).
PIL	PPRS2 09	The respondent raised concerns about the Pipeline crossing their land at Meadow View Farm. They requested that the alignment be adjusted so the entire stretch runs through their neighbour's property n, noting that this change would avoid any impact on their own land.	N	In this location the pipeline has been designed to follow field boundaries as far as practicable, to reduce impacts on landowners' existing operations.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
PIL	PPRS2 10	The respondent expressed support for the overall Project but raised concerns about the pipeline running closest to their property and a neighbour on Castle Farm Lane.	N	The pipeline is in the location proposed so that construction works through residential areas including Wickham and Welborne Garden Village are avoided. A pipeline route to the south of Castle Farm Lane was considered, however this would require additional woodland loss and works would be in close proximity to a veteran tree. The ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out an assessment of the potential environmental impacts of the Project and identifies mitigation measures to reduce or avoid these. Construction of the Project would be managed by an Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), which sets out the measures that would be implemented to avoid and reduce environmental impacts which may cause disruption. Further detail on landowner protection and property impact mitigation is set out in the Land Plans (Document reference 2.2, DCO Volume 2), Book of Reference (Document reference 4.3, DCO Volume 4), and Statement of Reasons (Document reference

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				4.1, DCO Volume 4) submitted alongside the Applicant's DCO submission.
PIL	PPRS2 11	For Section G, the respondent stated that the affected parcel has been identified through WCC SHELAA process as developable and deliverable, with developer interest for potential housing on the southern edge of Wickham. It was stated that the proposed route would significantly constrain future development by sterilising land and severing a productive arable field, creating parcels that would be difficult to farm with modern machinery during and after construction. The landowner requested that the route be moved as far south as possible adjacent to Castle Farm Lane, with the permanent easement and construction working widths minimised to reduce land take and protect future development potential.	N	Where the Project has intersected with development that is subject to a live planning application, or land that is allocated for development in an adopted or emerging local plan, the design has been amended to avoid these. The Applicant has not amended the design of the Project if the land is not subject to these conditions as there is not a high level of certainty that the development will come forward; this is the case for both parcels of land in question. Amending the design of the Project without this certainty would unreasonably introduce technical implications for the delivery of the Project. The Applicant has had regard to all feedback received. In some cases it has not been possible to implement design changes proposed by stakeholders without introducing additional technical or environmental impacts. All design refinements have been made considering potential technical and environmental implications. Where feasible, the Applicant has aligned the proposed pipeline route with existing field boundaries to minimise disruption to land use

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				and agricultural operations. However, in some locations this has not been achievable due to overriding technical requirements such as topography, access and constructability, and engineering constraints. It is not possible to use a reduced working width (RWW) for long stretches of the pipeline. This would require additional construction compounds as there is no space available to store excavated material where a RWW is implemented. Further information is provided section 3.5 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
PIL	PPRS2 12	In relation to Section H, the respondent objected to a change from the originally proposed route north of Blind Lane and queried the rationale for the revised alignment, noting that the affected land is actively promoted through the SHELAA process and considered suitable for future housing. The site's strategic location adjacent to existing and proposed community infrastructure was highlighted. Concerns were also raised regarding the severance of productive arable land and associated losses to the tenant farmer. The		Where the Project has intersected with development that is subject to a live planning application, or land that is allocated for development in an adopted or emerging local plan, the design has been amended to avoid these. The Applicant has not amended the design of the Project if the land is not subject to these conditions as there is not a high level of certainty that the development will come forward; this is the case for both parcels of land in question. Amending the design of the Project without this certainty would

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		landowner requested that the route be moved as far north as possible adjacent to residential gardens along Blind Lane, with easement and working widths minimised to limit land sterilisation and maintain arable use during construction.		unreasonably introduce technical implications for the delivery of the Project. The Applicant has had regard to all feedback received. In some cases it has not been possible to implement design changes proposed by stakeholders without introducing additional technical or environmental impacts. All design refinements have been made considering potential technical and environmental implications. Where feasible, the Applicant has aligned the proposed pipeline route with existing field boundaries to minimise disruption to land use and agricultural operations. However, in some locations this has not been achievable due to overriding technical requirements such as topography, access and constructability, and engineering constraints. It is not possible to use a reduced working width (RWW) for long stretches of the pipeline. This would require additional construction compounds as there is no space available to store excavated material where a RWW is implemented. Further information is provided section 3.5 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Regarding the land in Section G, the Project was initially sited to the north of Blind Lane however evaluations identified the risk of displacing two existing businesses. As such, alternatives in the area were identified and assessed. The current location was identified to be the best performing. Further information is provided in section 5.12.5 of the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5). Further engagement with affected parties and landowners would be undertaken ahead of construction.
PIL	PPRS2 13	The respondent stated their objection to the location of Section J of the pipeline, stating that the refinement to move the route further eastwards would have serious repercussions on their land. The respondent expressed their desire for this section of the pipeline to be moved to the original location or elsewhere, but stated that if this was not possible, that the following amendments should be sought. The amendments were for the pipeline to be located as close to the eastern boundary of their land as possible, for the working area to be kept as narrow as	N	Where feasible, the Applicant has aligned the proposed pipeline route with existing field boundaries to minimise disruption to land use and agricultural operations. However, in some locations this has not been achievable due to overriding technical requirements such as topography, access and constructability, and engineering constraints. It is not possible to use a RWW for long stretches of the pipeline. This would require additional construction compounds as there is no space available to store excavated material where a RWW is implemented.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		possible and for open cutting pipeline over Botley Road to be considered rather than tunnelling as this would reduce the working area required on their land.		Further information is provided section 3.5 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Further engagement with affected parties and landowners would be undertaken ahead of construction. Open cut construction at Botley Road and the River Hamble would not be acceptable from a highways or environmental perspective. This is because it would result in disruption to the highway and there would be construction works directly within the watercourse which is upstream of designated ecological sites. The design of the pipeline at Botley Road and the River Hamble has been determined by the presence of veteran trees on the northern side of the watercourse, and approved plans for a development comprising new polytunnels. Further information is provided under Design Refinement 18 – The River Hamble and Ford Farm, section 6.10 of the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5).
PIL	PPRS2 14	The respondent stated their wishes that the Pipeline would not affect their property at all. The respondent acknowledged the	N	Where feasible, the Applicant has aligned the proposed pipeline route with existing field boundaries to minimise disruption to land use

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		possibility of their land at Otterbourne needing to be used, however repeated their desire that the Project does not disturb the main farm unit. The respondent objected to the amendment to the previous plan which resulted in the pipe moving northward and affecting more of their land (within Section M of the route) and affecting farm operations and logistics. The respondent expressed their desire for the pipeline route to revert to the original positioning to avoid their land being severed in half, to reduce the potential impact of the pipeline on possible future development and to have regard to future farm diversification. In addition, the respondent proposed that the route runs to the east as close to the field boundary with Manor Farm as possible which would minimise the amount of unusable grass lost and aid in the access of farm machinery. The respondent provided plans of proposed route amendments stating that these would assist in minimising impacts on their respective land.		and agricultural operations. However, in some locations this has not been achievable due to overriding technical requirements such as topography, access and constructability, and engineering constraints. The Applicant will continue to engage with affected parties to understand the potential effects of construction, operation and maintenance activities, and will develop appropriate mitigation measures to reduce these impacts where reasonably practicable. At Upper Brambridge Farm, the Applicant has amended the pipeline route to follow field boundaries as far as practicable and avoid severing the field. South of Kiln Lane, the pipeline could not be located further to the west as this would move the Project closer to ancient woodland which is afforded a high level of protection by environmental and planning policy. Moving the pipeline to the east would adversely impact the hydraulics of the pipeline by introducing a bend in the pipeline following the crossing of the River Itchen. The areas for construction compounds have been identified considering the required construction activities, and as such cannot be

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		The respondent sought clarification to see if the area required for the drilling rig could be reduced further.		reduced further without restricting construction works or requiring additional land elsewhere. As per preliminary Design Principle PDP_1 (see the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5)), the Applicant has taken the approach to minimise land take, whilst ensuring sufficient space and access for efficient construction and operation, through route and site selection and optimising site layouts.
PILs	PPRS2 15	The respondents strongly objected to the scale of the proposed draft Order Limits and noted these seemed 'excessive' and this change would impact agricultural areas unfavourably. Respondents noted that the Summer 2024 Consultation Summary of Feedback had claimed that 40m is industry best practice for a pipe this size, however, this claim was queried. A justification was requested as well as the formal document supporting the 40m working width claim. One respondent referred to the PA 2008 to support its claim by stating land can only be compulsory required if it is necessary to the Project.	N	The working width has been determined considering the size of the pipeline, the trench and the space needed to store and separate material so it can be reinstated properly. Additionally, sufficient space to accommodate construction vehicles and plant is required. If the working width was reduced, construction works may take longer as a result of constraining the space available for construction. The maximum working width for trenched open-cut construction of the Pipeline would be 40m (secured through the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7)). This would provide space for a haul road, construction working areas, storage areas,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				pipeline trench and soil storage areas. When intersecting sensitive constraints such as vegetation and roads, a reduced working width (RWW) of 20m would be utilised as secured by the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). Where a RWW is used, there would be no space available to store excavated material. Therefore, the working width either side of the length that is reduced may need to be widened up to 50m. Further information, including a cross section of the 40m construction working width, is provided section 3.5 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). As per preliminary Design Principle PDP_1 (see the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5)), the Applicant has taken the approach to minimise land take, whilst ensuring sufficient space and access for efficient construction and operation, through route and site selection and optimising site layouts. The Statement of Reasons (Document reference 4.1, DCO Volume 4) sets out the case for why the Applicant is justified in

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				seeking compulsory acquisition powers where these are required.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	PPRS2 16	The respondent raised concerns as their house is situated on a private road which is accessed from Kiln Lane, and it appeared that the Pipeline would be routed under this lane, affecting access to their house. The respondent stated that blocking access to their house would cost them time and money and sought reassurance that a lack of access would not materialise.	N	Road closure at Kiln Lane is expected to last up to seven days and is not expected to last longer than 21 days. Access to properties will not be blocked. The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) and Traffic Management Strategy (Document reference 7.3, DCO Volume 7) set out how construction works will interface with the highway network. This has been developed in consultation with HCC as the relevant highway authority.
Wider Community	PPRS2 17	The respondent raised the concern that Section K of the pipeline runs directly through the flying site take-off and landing area for the model flying group at Tangier View Farm.	N	Design refinement 19 at Tangier View Farm presented at the Spring 2025 Consultation set out that the pipeline route and construction working area had been amended to avoid the flying site take-off and landing area. The land in question is not included in the Order Limits for the DCO application.
Wider Community	PPRS2 18	Responses included concerns regarding damage and disruption caused by the pipeline. A respondent expressed the view that if this pipeline had to go ahead, that it	N	The Project has been designed to avoid and minimise impacts as far as reasonably practicable. Construction of the Project will also be managed by an Outline Construction

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		should only be laid once, should be dual directional and should not carry anything other than rainwater. It was noted within a response that there were difficulties commenting on Sections A and B of the Pipeline whilst viewing consultation material showing numbered Design Refinements.		Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), which sets out the measures that will be implemented to avoid and reduce environmental impacts which may cause disruption. The Pipeline between the water recycling plant (WRP) site and Otterbourne Water Supply Works (WSW) would be installed once and will transfer source water from Havant Thicket Reservoir, which would predominantly be a blend of spring water and recycled water. This section of pipeline is not required to be bi-directional. The Applicant's consultation documents, accessible through the dedicated Project website, were developed as part of a robust consultation process and were designed to be clear, accessible and effective in informing consultees about the Project. The Applicant was not consulting on all elements of the Project at this consultation, instead the Applicant was consulting on specific refinements to the design in response to feedback from the Summer 2024 Consultation and further Project development, including to Sections A and B. It was

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				necessary to number the refinements in order to aid identification and feedback analysis.
Wider Community	PPRS2 19	A respondent stated that Section D was hard to decipher on the map, and another considered that the route now seems to pass below two sites of importance for nature conservation, located at the western end of the section which is characterised by steep slopes. One respondent suggested that storage should be sited closer to demand and that this would mitigate the permanent environmental damage which would be caused in the nature conservation areas surrounding Section D of the Pipeline.	N	Section D will be tunnelled and therefore will not directly impact Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation as the works would be below ground level and do not require surface level works. The Project utilises the Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) in Havant as this is one of the Applicant's largest wastewater treatment works and therefore has the greatest capacity for supplying the necessary quantity of fully treated wastewater required for a WRP producing approximately 60MI/d of recycled water. The Project seeks to supplement Havant Thicket Reservoir by providing an additional source of water. Siting storage closer to demand would require the Applicant to construct an additional new storage reservoir closer to Otterbourne. This option, termed Option B.5, has been considered by the Applicant but was not progressed due to issues which surround deliverability, flexibility, land take, consenting, timescales and carbon. Further information can be found at section

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				3.10 of the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5).
Wider Community	PPRS2 20	The respondent objected to the addition of the new pipeline regardless of the route.	N	The Pipelines form a key part of the Project which will provide a new source of water to address reductions in the amount of water the Applicant can abstract from the Rivers Test and Itchen and enable the Applicant to continue to meet its statutory duty to supply water. The Project has been identified in the Applicant's WRMP19 and emerging WRMP24 as a key component of future water supply in the Applicant's western supply area.
Wider Community	PPRS2 21	The respondent stated that a Pipeline to allow recycled water originating from Budd's Farm WTW to be pumped into Havant Thicket Reservoir would not be needed and considered that it should not be allowed to be built.	N	The Project has been identified in the Applicant's WRMP19 and emerging WRMP24 as a key component of future water supply in the Applicant's western supply area. The DCO application includes a Case for the Project document (Document reference 5.6, DCO Volume 5) which sets out the need for the Project. The Pipelines form a key part of the Project which will provide a new source of water to address reductions in the amount of water the Applicant can abstract from the Rivers Test and Itchen and enable the Applicant to continue to meet its statutory duty to supply water.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	PPRS2 22	The respondent required clarification regarding how deep the pipeline in Section A and Section B would be, as they have an 8ft deep lake in their garden which is fed by the Brookside Road stream.	N	As the Project is no longer proposing a pipeline between the WRP site and Havant Thicket Reservoir and will instead use Portsmouth Water's pipelines between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir, the lake in question is avoided by the Project.

Table G25-12 Summary of issues raised on the theme of the process of developing the proposed pipeline routes and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
UK Health Security Agency, Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC), Portsmouth Water, Portsmouth City Council (PCC)	SDGP2 01	EBC, PCC and UK Health Security Agency made references to earlier comments provided on the 2024 consultation and advised that Spring 2025 Consultation representations should be read in conjunction with previously submitted Summer 2024 Consultation feedback.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Applicant has considered all feedback and prepared responses to the Summer 2024 Consultation as set out in Appendix F.25 The Applicant's response to feedback (Document reference 5.1, DCO Volume 5).

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Consultation Report Appendix G – Statutory Spring 2025 Consultation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Portsmouth Water	SDGP2 02	Portsmouth Water expanded on the linkage of their 2024 and 2025 comments and specifically highlighted that these included comments made to the 2024 consultation on groundwater protection and quality impacts and that their response in the 2025 consultation incorporates the new design refinements into the conversation regarding the groundwater protection and quality impacts. Portsmouth Water also confirmed that feedback provided at Summer 2024 Consultation should be taken as representing Portsmouth Water's overall position.		The Applicant has noted this comment. The Applicant has undertaken further engagement with Portsmouth Water to seek to reduce impacts on groundwater. Following the Spring 2025 Consultation, the back-up option for the Pipeline between the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) site and Havant Thicket Reservoir was no longer progressed as the Project would utilise pipelines that are being separately delivered by Portsmouth Water between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir. This removed the need for tunnelling works through the Source Protection Zone associated with groundwater abstractions at Bedhampton Springs.
Winchester City Council (WCC)	SDGP2 03	WCC stated that they will continue to assess the technical aspects of the scheme to ensure it can be completed without significant adverse harm to the environment, local residents and special interests of the district.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
PCC	SDGP2 04	The respondent hoped, as was echoed in the 2024 consultation, that workshops would continue to be held with the Applicant, to develop visual and ecological mitigation.	N	The scheme development process has been undertaken alongside engagement with various stakeholders including local authorities and Natural England (NE), to ensure that ecological and landscape impacts are avoided and reduced. For more details,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				please refer to the Statement of Engagement (Document reference 5.9, DCO Volume 5). The Applicant has engaged with PCC on the design principles set out in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5), which control the detailed design of the Project, including the mitigation and enhancement proposals. Local authority involvement in developing the design principles is described in the Design Approach Document (Document reference 5.12, DCO Volume 5).
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PILs	SDGP2 05	The respondents stated that their 2024 responses to the scheme development were enclosed as they had not received an adequate response during the last round of consultation. Respondents expressed disappointment that comments and concerns made to the 2024 consultation had remained unresolved or misinterpreted and stated that responses from the Applicant had been inadequate or not received to their 2024 consultation submissions and landowner's requests for feedback that had been made.	N	Following the Summer 2024 Consultation, the Applicant wrote to landowners in December 2024 to provide the opportunity to meet and discuss their comments further, to better understand possible impacts. As part of the Statutory Spring 2025 Consultation, the Applicant also contacted landowners and/or their representatives who were impacted by design refinements to ensure they were aware of the consultation timescales, where information would be available on the website and offered meetings to discuss the Project changes. The Applicant then provided written responses to landowners who provided

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				feedback to the Summer 2024 and Spring 2025 Consultations via letters which were sent to landowners and their representatives in December 2025 and January 2026. The Applicant has carefully evaluated site and route options against a range of planning and environmental criteria, including potential impacts on land use. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) and the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3 (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out the process the Applicant has taken to refine the pipeline route, whilst ES Chapter 4 Consideration of alternatives (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) details the other options considered. The Applicant has had regard to all feedback received. In some cases, it has not been possible to implement design changes proposed by stakeholders without introducing additional technical challenges or environmental impacts. All design refinements have been made considering potential technical and environmental implications.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
PIL	SDGP2 06	The respondent stated they were pleased that the proposed pipeline had moved west, adjacent to the existing tree line. They expressed their preference that they wanted the pipeline as close to the treeline as possible.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
PIL	SDGP2 07	The respondent noted their previous meeting held with the Applicant's appointed land agents and expressed their disappointment in respect of the changes to the proposed route on their property which was stated to now affect a significant amount of land.	Y	The Applicant has engaged with affected parties to understand the potential impacts of the construction and operation of the Project on them and discuss their individual circumstances. Engagement will continue with affected parties to address ongoing concerns and reach voluntary agreements where possible. Following the Summer 2024 Consultation, the Applicant amended the pipeline route to that shown in the Spring 2025 Consultation to avoid impacting a residential garden and various equestrian paddocks. However, following feedback received at the Spring 2025 Consultation and meetings with the landowners, which highlighted that construction of the pipeline along this amended route would adversely impact business operations and arable fields, the pipeline route was changed back to the route shown in the Summer 2024 Consultation.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Trenchless construction methods are now proposed to tunnel the pipeline under the residential garden and equestrian paddocks rather than across it, to avoid works and disruption at surface level in these areas. The Applicant has carefully evaluated site and route options against a range of planning and environmental criteria, including potential impacts on land use. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) and the ES Chapter 3 Description of Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out the process the Applicant has taken to refine the pipeline route.
PIL	SDGP2 08	The respondent provided a drawing of a request for a change in the area of the scheme which runs adjacent to their land. They stated that they were happy to meet with engineers to take them through what they thought was the most appropriate route.	N	Following the Summer 2024 Consultation, the Applicant wrote to landowners in December 2024 to provide the opportunity to meet and discuss their comments further, to better understand possible impacts. As part of the Spring 2025 Consultation, the Applicant also contacted landowners and/or their representatives who were impacted by design refinements to ensure they were aware of the consultation timescales, where information would be available on the website and offered meetings to discuss the Project changes. The Applicant's then provided written responses

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				to landowners who provided feedback to the Summer 2024 and Spring 2025 Consultations via letters which were sent to landowners and their representatives in December 2025 and January 2026. Where feasible, the Applicant has aligned the proposed pipeline route with existing field boundaries to minimise disruption to land use and agricultural operations. However, in some locations this has not been achievable due to overriding technical requirements such as topography, access and constructability, and engineering constraints. The Applicant has had regard to all feedback received. In some cases it has not been possible to implement design changes proposed by stakeholders without introducing additional technical or environmental impacts. All design refinements have been made considering potential technical and environmental implications.
PIL	SDGP209	The respondent suggested that the Project should drill into their neighbour's property to the south of their land, to avoid the flood meadow entirely.	N	The Applicant has had regard to all feedback received. In some cases it has not been possible to implement design changes proposed by stakeholders without introducing additional technical or environmental impacts. All design refinements have been made

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				considering potential technical and environmental implications. In this location, the trenchless crossing of Winchester Road (B3354) needs to be as close to a perpendicular angle as practicable to comply with highway standards. The trenchless construction shaft on the west side of Winchester Road (B3354) cannot be moved south due to the presence of ancient woodland and electricity pylons.
PIL	SDGP2 10	The respondent provided a number of drawings in relation to scheme development in the vicinity of their property which they thought may be of use.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The drawings provided by this respondent were the drawings that were produced by the Applicant and included in the Book of Maps at the Summer 2024 Consultation.
PIL	SDGP2 11	A respondent stated they were pleased to see that some of their comments from the 2024 consultation had been taken on board. However, respondents still believed that there remained concerns or matters outstanding from those raised in the prior consultation and that further refinement was required to the scheme.	N	The Applicant has had regard to all feedback received. In some cases it has not been possible to implement design changes proposed by stakeholders without introducing additional technical or environmental impacts. All design refinements have been made considering potential technical and environmental implications. Following the Summer 2024 Consultation, the Applicant wrote to landowners in December 2024 to provide the opportunity to meet and discuss their comments further, to better

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				understand possible impacts. As part of the Spring 2025 Consultation, the Applicant also contacted landowners and/or their representatives who were impacted by design refinements to ensure they were aware of the consultation timescales, where information would be available on the website and offered meetings to discuss the Project changes. The Applicant's then provided written responses to landowners who provided feedback to the Summer 2024 and Spring 2025 Consultations via letters which were sent to landowners and their representatives in December 2025 and January 2026. The Applicant has engaged with affected parties to understand the potential impacts of the construction and operation of the Project on them and discuss their individual circumstances. Engagement will continue with affected parties to address ongoing concerns and reach voluntary agreements where possible. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the status of negotiations of voluntary land agreements with affected landowners.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
PIL	SDGP2 12	The respondent observed that the Applicant had altered the crossing point of the pipeline over the River Itchen. Initially, the original route, as shown in the Book of Maps from Summer 2022 (page 25), depicted the pipe following a pronounced curve. The Scheme Development Summary from Summer 2024 (Figure 44, page 104) included several Southern Options, among which the curved option from the earlier map was still present. However, in the revised route, as detailed in the Book of Plans from Summer 2024 (Section L&M, page 31, sheet 25 of 30), the pipeline was shown running straight from Highbridge Road across the river and the railway line. This change meant that the pipeline now crossed the River Itchen approximately 100 metres further upstream and the respondent was concerned that the geology was unsuitable and that nearby groundwater resources would be at risk. The respondent also suggested that the original crossing point made more sense from an angler's point of view and historically. The respondent stated that downstream there was a large pool	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. Following the Summer 2022 Consultation, further environmental surveys and engineering investigations were undertaken to identify which option to progress in order to cross the River Itchen. As reported in the Summer 2024 Scheme Development Summary, this considered different crossing locations. The proposed crossing of the River Itchen has been informed by surveys of ground conditions to ensure that impacts to the River Itchen are reduced, as the River Itchen is a groundwater-dependent watercourse. As the pipeline would be constructed under the River Itchen using trenchless construction, there would be no direct impacts to the watercourse and surrounding habitats that form part of the River Itchen Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The Environmental Statement (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of vibration on species in the River Itchen. The terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity chapter of the ES sets out that no significant effects on the fish population of the Itchen catchment are envisioned due to the use of trenchless construction on any Main Rivers or larger

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		belonging to the Bishopstoke Fishing Club and upstream (in the 100m between the original and revised crossing points) where there were deep pools holding salmon and trout.		Ordinary watercourses where significant fish activity exists. The locations of shafts for the Pipeline have also considered environmental criteria to ensure impacts on existing habitats are reduced. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out details of the design development of the River Itchen crossing.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	SDGP2 13	The respondents felt aggrieved that their responses to the previous consultation did not appear to have been addressed with any feedback or amendments to the plan. Respondents expressed their position that there had been a lack of respect from the Applicant and that this had resulted in an increased level of distrust.	N	The Applicant has had regard to all feedback received. In some cases it has not been possible to implement design changes proposed by stakeholders without introducing additional technical or environmental impacts. All design refinements have been made considering potential technical and environmental implications.
Wider Community	SDGP2 14	The respondent listed a number of concerns regarding associated infrastructure and proposed land take for the Project including the amount of land required for the pipeline and associated infrastructure, the location and design of water intake points, treatment plants and	N	The Applicant notes these comments. As per preliminary Design Principle PDP_1 (see the Design Approach Document (Document reference 5.12, DCO Volume 5)), the Applicant has taken the approach to minimise land take, whilst ensuring sufficient space and access for efficient construction and operation, through route and site selection and optimising site layouts. The Project has

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		pipelines, and the depth of pipelines and associated above ground infrastructure.		been sited and designed considering a range of environmental, technical and planning criteria. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the process that has been undertaken to develop the proposals and the alternatives that have been considered. The pipelines would be installed at the minimum depths set out in Design Principle PL_4.

Table G25-13 Summary of issues raised on the theme of the process of the use of Havant Thicket Reservoir for the storage of recycled water and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	UHTR2 01	Respondents stated a general objection to the use of Havant Thicket Reservoir for the storage of recycled water. Respondents expressed discontent towards the Applicant's Project and referred to Portsmouth Water's 'original planning permission' (APP/20/00990) that did not include this usage and argued that Havant Thicket Reservoir should only store rainwater. Respondents were also concerned about the possible public health impact of storing recycled water in Havant	N	The original planning permission for Havant Thicket Reservoir allows for the storage of source water only in Havant Thicket Reservoir, which would largely come from Bedhampton Springs. The Applicant's Development Consent Order (DCO) application seeks consent for the storage of purified recycled water in Havant Thicket Reservoir – this additional source of water would augment the storage capability of Havant Thicket Reservoir, enabling a drought-proof and resilient supply of water for

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Thicket Reservoir, and whether this would increase the energy usage of the project. A respondent argued that a number of design refinements could be removed if Havant Thicket Reservoir remained as a store for freshwater.		the Applicant's Hampshire supply area. This large new source of water is required to address the scale of the water supply deficit facing Hampshire – relying on spring water sources alone, or indeed rainwater, will not meet that need. Producing a new source of water, such as the Project, will require additional energy for water treatment and pumping, but this would be inherent in any solution to produce a new source of water that is not from the environment. The purified recycled water would be treated to a very high standard before it reaches Havant Thicket Reservoir and would be further treated to strict drinking water standards before going into supply. Health impacts are not expected either from storing recycled water in the reservoir or from using purified recycled water as a source for drinking water supplies given the monitoring and safeguards that would be in place to ensure these strict water quality standards are achieved. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the process undertaken to select the Project, which utilises Havant Thicket Reservoir. This option was selected as integration with Havant Thicket Reservoir provided additional

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				resilience and flexibility, whilst avoiding the need to construct an additional environmental buffer or reservoir between the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) site and Otterbourne Water Supply Works (WSW). Water quality modelling results for Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream watercourses are presented in the ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This shows that with the implementation of additional phosphorus removal measures at WRP operation of the Project would not change the predicted ecological status of the reservoir under the Water Environment Regulations.
Wider Community	UHTR2 02	Respondents stated that they opposed the environmental impacts that were suggested would be a result of the storage of recycled water. It was stated that there would not be a need for algal growth mitigation if recycled water was not mixed with the spring water. A respondent raised a concern regarding the planning permission (APP/20/00990), initially secured from Havant Borough Council	N	Augmenting the storage capability of Havant Thicket Reservoir by adding purified recycled water is necessary to ensure a drought-proof and resilient future water supply for the Hampshire area. A spring-fed reservoir alone, as originally consented, will not meet that need, and would require the Applicant to construct another storage reservoir.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		(HBC) and the respondent suggested that they expected the Council would object to the proposed Project.		Water quality modelling results for Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream watercourses are presented in the ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This shows that with the implementation of additional phosphorus removal at the WRP, operation of the Project would not change the predicted ecological status of the reservoir under the Water Environment Regulations. Storing recycled water would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir, nor would it be the cause of algal blooms.
Wider Community	UHTR2 03	Respondents raised concerns regarding the contamination that could occur as a result of the mixing of fresh and recycled water, and argued that this would change the geochemistry, salinity and temperature of Havant Thicket Reservoir. Respondents believed that there had been little investigation into other options of storing the recycled water.	N	Modelling of water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream compensation flows to Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour includes a suite of geochemical parameters, including temperature and salinity. Updated modelling shows that, with the implementation of additional phosphorus removal measures at the water recycling plant, operation of the Project would not

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Responses included comments on a process using reverse osmosis and that this would be supported if it completely removed pollutants or close to such level, however, raised their objection to the Project in the absence thereof. Respondents raised that notwithstanding a successful construction, the risk of human or infrastructure failure and resultant consequence during operation of the Project was a concern.		change the predicted ecological status or biological quality elements of the reservoir under the Water Environment Regulations, nor would there be any detrimental effects on biodiversity potential. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir. The Havant Thicket Reservoir modelling includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. This shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Reverse Osmosis membranes are highly effective at removing bacteria and significant percentage of viruses. The process also includes UV-Advanced Oxidation Process (UVAOP) to eliminate any additional viral

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				loads, and further treatment using Granular Activated Carbon would help with removal of any byproducts that may be formed during UVAOP. This multi-barrier treatment approach would provide a greater protection to public health. The multi-stage water recycling process would feature numerous safeguards, including continuous monitoring, to ensure that significant deviations in expected water quality can be quickly spotted and rectified through partial or full system shutdowns. It would not be possible for treated wastewater to bypass this process and enter Havant Thicket Reservoir. These safeguards would be implemented by the Contractor appointed to construct and operate the WRP and would be a key specification for the plant to ensure water quality requirements would be met. A detailed options appraisal process was undertaken to select the Project, and this considered a range of environmental, technical and value for money criteria. The Project is the only option available to deliver the scale of water resource required in the timescales needed. The options appraisal process is set out in the Scheme Development Report (Document reference

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				5.10, DCO Volume 5). One alternative approach to storing recycled water was to construct an additional storage reservoir in another location. This would however result in further environmental impacts and costs compared to using Havant Thicket Reservoir, which the Applicant is already funding.
Wider Community	UHTR204	One respondent raised concerns that the updated proposal could alter key aspects of Portsmouth Water's consented Havant Thicket Reservoir scheme, particularly the expected seasonal variation in water levels. They argued that maintaining consistently high water levels would undermine biodiversity benefits that they associate with the original design, and they expressed scepticism about the environmental justification for the updated approach. A respondent stated that Havant Thicket Reservoir should be retained for leisure uses as set out in the original planning consent (APP/20/00990). Respondents also stated that a reservoir was sold to them which promised publicly available, such as the ability to swim, sail and fish	N	The Project is required to address increasing water scarcity in the face of climate change, population growth and the need to reduce abstractions from Hampshire's precious chalk streams. Augmenting the storage capability of Havant Thicket Reservoir by adding purified recycled water is necessary to ensure a drought-proof and resilient future water supply for the Hampshire area. A spring-fed reservoir alone, as originally consented, will not meet that need, and would require the Applicant to construct another storage reservoir, which would not represent best value for customers. Storing recycled water in Havant Thicket Reservoir would not impact the recreational plans that Portsmouth Water would put in place for Havant Thicket Reservoir. The Applicant's water quality assessments have also shown that, subject to additional phosphorous treatment, adding recycled water would not impact on water

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		and now queried what would result from the pumping of effluent into Havant Thicket Reservoir over its lifetime. Another respondent stated that the use of Havant Thicket Reservoir was meant to be for the growing population. Respondents referred to the Applicant's Ofwat RAPID Gate 3 (Strategic regional water resource solutions: detailed feasibility and concept design) Report (July 2024). In reference to the Gate 3 Report, respondents stated that seasonal water level fluctuation was vital for biodiversity and that keeping water levels at a winter level would be detrimental to this. There was concern surrounding the public impacts of adding recycled water to Havant Thicket Reservoir both in terms of health and leisure. Moreover, further concern was raised about the energy cost of this element of the project.		quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir. As the operator of Havant Thicket Reservoir, Portsmouth Water would control any variations in seasonal water levels whilst ensuring supply requirements are maintained for the Applicant's Hampshire supply area. Using water recycling technology to produce a new source of water would be inherently more energy intensive compared to the established practice of abstracting water from Hampshire's rivers, however, this has been determined through the Applicant's options appraisal and WRMP processes as the best value solution to addressing the water shortfall in the Hampshire area. Water quality modelling results for Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream watercourses are presented in the ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	UHTR2 05	The respondent stated that it was their understanding (referencing section 3.1.5 of the Environmental Water Quality Report)	N	The stabilisation effect (occurrence of high in-reservoir dissolved inorganic and organic matter, and low dissolved oxygen, from the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		that recycled water would be introduced into Havant Thicket Reservoir before it was stabilised. The respondent suggested that this indicated that the period would be predicted to include some stabilisation effects. The respondent requested clarification to what the potential stabilisation effects would be in relation to the water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir.		decomposition and mineralisation of inundated above and below ground terrestrial organic matter) during the initial four years of reservoir filling was estimated and modelled. Stabilisation effects on reservoir water quality are forecast to only be material during the first year of filing. As filling of Havant Thicket Reservoir is planned to be over three consecutive winters, the supply of freshly inundated soils and terrestrial biomass are staggered in time. Additionally, because much of the inundation area is comprised of borrow pits to source material to construct the embankments, the remnant terrestrial organic biomass (and its contribution to the stabilisation effect) would be relatively low. Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	UHTR2 06	The respondents objected to the use of Havant Thicket Reservoir for the storage of recycled water as they argued that planning permission (APP/20/00990) was	N	The original proposal for a spring-fed reservoir was consented on the basis of enabling additional water supplies to be provided to the Applicant's Hampshire supply area to address its water supply shortfall,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		given with the understanding that recreational facilities would be kept, however expressed dissatisfaction and objection to the Project's proposed changes stated to affect the planning permission gained. Respondents stated that if the current proposal would have been outlined in the initial stages, considered to be Portsmouth Water's application for planning permission, that they thought more people would have objected. Another respondent stated that due to the proposed changes to use recycled wastewater, they now expressed opposition to the proposed amendments being requested by the Applicant.		hence why Havant Thicket Reservoir project is being funded by the Applicant over the long-term. The current proposal to add recycled water to Havant Thicket Reservoir was not part of the original planning application albeit it was known at the time that plans for this were under consideration and any such proposal would need to be consented separately. This proposal is not expected to change any of Portsmouth Water's recreational plans for Havant Thicket Reservoir. The Applicant acknowledges the comment about objecting to the use of recycled water, however, this proposal has always been central to the Project and has been communicated clearly during previous consultations. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out how the Applicant has considered alternatives to the Project.
Wider Community	UHTR2 07	The respondent stated that in their view, the stripping of phosphates from the recycled water entering the Havant Thicket Reservoir would be welcome.	N	Additional phosphorous removal at the WRP would ensure phosphates are effectively stripped from the recycled water inflows to Havant Thicket Reservoir. This means that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				'high' status for a lake water body under the Water Environment Regulations.
Wider Community	UHTR208	The respondent questioned why Havant Thicket Reservoir could not just be filled up with spring water instead of mixing in recycled water. They stated that they believed that the site was located on one of the largest natural spring reservoirs in Europe.	N	The Project has been developed in response to long-term regional water supply challenges, including the need to reduce abstraction from sensitive chalk streams and to provide a resilient supply for a growing population. While the site is located near significant natural spring sources, these are already heavily relied upon for existing public water supply and are subject to environmental constraints, particularly during periods of drought or low flow. The introduction of purified recycled water from the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) is a strategic solution that enables Havant Thicket Reservoir to be used more flexibly and sustainably, without placing additional pressure on natural spring sources. This approach has been assessed through detailed feasibility studies, including the Ofwat RAPID programme, and is designed to meet stringent water quality and environmental standards. The Project and the use of Havant Thicket Reservoir is a key element of the Applicant's WRMP in addressing the significant water

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				supply shortfall faced in its western supply area. A spring-fed only reservoir will not meet that need.
Wider Community	UHTR2 09	The respondent suggested that the spring water already present in Havant Thicket Reservoir should be the only water that should be in Havant Thicket Reservoir.	N	The Project has been developed in response to long-term regional water supply challenges, including the need to reduce abstraction from sensitive chalk streams and to provide a resilient supply for a growing population. The Project would supplement the spring-fed reservoir with recycled water to ensure that supplies to the Applicant's customers can be maintained during normal and drought conditions in response to the significant water supply shortfall facing the Applicant's Hampshire area. A spring-fed only reservoir will not meet that need as it would not be able to provide the resilient and drought-proof source required to maintain customer supplies.
Wider Community	UHTR2 10	The respondent stated that in their view, there appeared to be significant mistrust regarding the use of recycled water. They stated that if the use of recycled water would help protect chalk streams by reducing abstraction, that this should not be dismissed. The respondent stated that they would be happy to have recycled	N	The Applicant notes this comment and recognises that public perception and trust are essential, and it is committed to ongoing engagement to communicate how effective water recycling technology is in providing a safe new source of water for customer supplies. The Applicant would highlight however that over time, recycled water would

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		water introduced into Havant Thicket Reservoir as they understood the majority of the water would come from the springs.		become the predominant source of water in Havant Thicket Reservoir as it would be continuously supplied into Havant Thicket Reservoir, whereby the spring water source would only be provided from excess spring water available during the winter months.

Table G25-14 Summary of issues raised on the theme of water quality at Havant Thicket Reservoir and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Portsmouth Water (PW), Environment Agency (EA)	WQHTR 201	PW noted discussions had been ongoing with the Applicant to establish the effect of adding recycled water as a second source of supply into Havant Thicket Reservoir. The EA recognised continuing discussions with the Applicant to consider Total Phosphorus concentrations and emphasised the importance of engagement with the EA on this matter, and engagement needed to continue to ensure the issue of Total Phosphorous concentrations would not only be addressed in a satisfactory manner, but	N	Water quality modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir and compensation flows has been completed, and the results are presented and assessed in ES Chapter 19 Water environment Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		also to enable relevant measures to be implemented in a timely way.		'high' status for a lake water body under the Water Framework Directory (WFD) Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality or biodiversity in Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within the reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. The Project has undertaken extensive engagement with the EA and other key stakeholders regarding water environment issues. Regular engagement with the EA, Natural England (NE), and Marine Management Organisation (MMO) has occurred through the Technical Working Group since 2023 and remains ongoing, particularly regarding discharges to the water environment, which will require permits under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016.
EA	WQHTR 202	The EA confirmed and expressed agreement with the Applicant that, following a review of the Environmental	N	Water quality modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir and compensation flows has been completed, and the results are presented and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Water Quality Report, published as part of the Spring 2025 Consultation, the main water quality risk of the Project would be from phosphorous concentrations within the recycled water entering Havant Thicket Reservoir and that, as referred to in the Environmental Water Quality Report, increased phosphorous may encourage excess algal growth and limit the potential for Havant Thicket Reservoir to support diverse biodiversity.		assessed in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, Volume 6). Updated modelling that includes the use of a HRRM at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality or biodiversity in Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the associated risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. Water quality would also be subject to permit limits. The Project would require discharges to the water environment that would be permitted under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Langstone Harbour Board	WQHTR 203	The Langstone Harbour Board repeated their comments noting that the modelling for Havant Thicket Reservoir did not include soluble parameters, such as pharmaceuticals, PFAS, and VOCs, and that the existing Environmental Water Quality Report stated that adding recycled effluent to Havant Thicket Reservoir would result in a net increase of orthophosphate, which would have a significant effect on low trophic biodiversity within Havant Thicket Reservoir. The Langstone Harbour Board acknowledged that the Applicant recognised such an outcome would not be acceptable and would increase phosphorus treatment at the Water Recycling Plan to eliminate this risk. However, the Board noted that there was no mention of how much additional phosphorus would be removed at the 2025 consultation stage. Langstone Harbour Board stated that the water feeding Havant Thicket Reservoir, from the Water Recycling Plant, should be of the standard as the original spring fed reservoir water.	N	The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the EA guidance Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit, which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Langstone Harbour Board further stated that no modelling of the seasonal variations within Havant Thicket Reservoir had been completed and queried how Havant Thicket Reservoir would respond when groundwater sources are lower, and thus the ratio of natural spring water to recycled water will differ.		therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by the University of Brighton (Mayor-Smith, 2024). The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024). Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour;

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				(Uhlhorn et al., 2025), Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP. Updated modelling includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP; this is shown in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and includes a summary of selected water quality parameters for the spring (in Tables 4.3 and 4.4) and recycled water (Table 4.5). The modelling includes a comparison with the consented spring fed reservoir, referred to as the “classic operational phase”. Initial modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir without the HRRM (GHD, 2024) showed an average total phosphorus concentration of 0.07 mg/L compared to 0.017 mg/l of phosphorus with the HRRM. Modelling shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality or biodiversity in Havant Thicket Reservoir. This shows that with the implementation of additional phosphorus removal measures at the WRP, operation of the Project would not result in the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir, preventing a change to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. Reservoir modelling has comprised developing a withdrawal water quality envelope. The envelope establishes worst case limits for each of the modelled water quality parameters, to represent the water withdrawn from the reservoir and released as compensatory flows to downstream watercourses. This includes an emergency drawdown drought scenario over five years when there would be a large increase in the operational discharges into and from Havant Thicket Reservoir and reduced volumes of spring water. Compensation flows modelling is presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This shows that, with the implementation of additional phosphorus removal measures at the Water Recycling Plant, operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream.
Soberton Parish Council and Havant Borough Council (HBC)	WQHTR 204	Soberton Parish Council stated little detail had been provided on how 'forever chemicals' in wastewater would be handled. HBC provided the Council's position that based on the understanding of the Environmental Water Quality Report the predicted impact of the Project resulting in the eutrophication within Havant Thicket Reservoir was unacceptable to the Council. HBC noted continued exploration being undertaken between the Applicant and regulators in respect measures to further treat recycled water before release into Havant Thicket Reservoir.	N	The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the EA guidance Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit, which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standards (EQS). Where one or more test was failed, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		HBC expressed the Council's strong support for the efforts to establish further measures to treat recycled water prior to release into Havant Thicket Reservoir as a solution to address any predicted negative effects on Thicket Reservoir.		integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by the University of Brighton (Mayor-Smith, 2024). The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP. Modelling of water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies that would receive compensatory flows has been completed. Modelling shows that with the High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) in place at the WRP, water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. This shows that with the implementation of additional phosphorus removal measures at the WRP,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				operation of the Project would not change the predicted ecological status of the reservoir under the Water Environment Regulations. In addition, Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. This shows that, with the implementation of additional phosphorus removal measures at the WRP, operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. Further modelling details are set out in: - ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). - ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	WQHTR 205	The respondents noted that the Environmental Water Quality Report confirmed that phosphate levels would rise	N	Water quality modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir and compensation flows has been completed, and the results are presented and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		due to the input of water from the recycling system to Havant Thicket Reservoir but suggested Havant Thicket Reservoir would have a limited capacity for phosphates and that serious legacy issues could result from phosphorous collections in the sediment of Havant Thicket Reservoir and raise issues in the warmer seasons of the year. Respondents stated the assessment acknowledged that the discharge of recycled effluent into Havant Thicket Reservoir would likely result in algal blooms, whilst raising concerns of the expected degradation of water quality, reduced biodiversity, and resultant significant ecological impacts. It was suggested that there was evidence that diverting the excess spring water into Havant Thicket Reservoir as proposed, would reduce nitrate levels, thus improving biodiversity in the Harbour however, if Havant Thicket Reservoir were to be topped up with recycled effluent, more spring water would be released into the Harbour, thus reducing this nitrate benefit.		assessed in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). A range of water quality variables for Havant Thicket Reservoir were modelled, including temperature and salinity. In the model, water temperature data of treated wastewater was provided by the Applicant, and Portsmouth Water provided spring water temperature data. Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the associated risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. Furthermore, concentrations of nitrate, dissolved inorganic carbon and alkalinity are all predicted to

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Respondents stated that many pharmaceuticals, 'forever chemicals', pesticides and volatile organic compounds had not been assessed and that the effects of water treatment chemicals and disinfection by-products on the water chemistry had not been given enough robust consideration. Responses included queries as to why the impact on the environment of all these potential contaminants had not been assessed and contended that the Environment Water Quality Report's conclusions of the Project's environmental impact were flawed in the absence of such further assessments. Respondents also queried the effects of the bioaccumulation of contaminants in Havant Thicket Reservoir and their impacts and raised concerns over modelling showing Havant Thicket Reservoir would become eutrophic without the removal of the phosphate whereas Havant Thicket Reservoir was originally thought to be oligotrophic. The respondents stated that if the EA general water standards on		decrease slightly in Havant Thicket Reservoir once water from the WRP is introduced. Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality has been assessed against the Water Framework Directive (Standards and Classification) Directions (England and Wales) 2015 – specifically for a lake water body. Water in Havant Thicket Reservoir is not assessed against drinking water standards because the water is transferred to Otterbourne Water Supply Works for treatment to drinking water standards. Modelling shows water in Havant Thicket Reservoir meets the 'high' WFD category for a lake water body. Havant Thicket Reservoir models include a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. The results of this process are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Updated modelling that includes the HRRM at the WRP shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		phosphates as opposed to drinking water standards were being applied to Havant Thicket Reservoir, then Havant Thicket Reservoir would not be adequately protected. Respondents suggested risk assessments be made for every contaminant present in recycled effluent and its potential impact on water quality and ecology assessed. It was stated that there existed overlooked environmental impacts of increasing phosphorus concentrations and that these had not been thoroughly assessed and addressed by application of a narrow view. The respondents requested information on the impact of salinity and temperature changes, within Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream. Concern was also raised with how modelling had been undertaken of downstream concentrations, suggesting this made input of recycled effluent appear less significant and overall responses further questioned the reliability of the Environmental Water Quality Report.		Concentrations of nitrate, dissolved inorganic carbon and alkalinity are all predicted to decrease slightly in the water bodies that would receive compensatory follows from Havant Thicket Reservoir once water from the WRP is introduced. The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the EA guidance Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit, which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm Water Treatment Works (WTW) (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that would be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output would be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that would be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WQHTR 206	The respondents noted their dissatisfaction with the reliance and use of the bubbler system to control water quality suggesting there would be no guarantee that treatment would be entirely effective in reducing phosphates and that this could result in the build-up of additional sludge in Havant Thicket Reservoir. Respondents queried the cost and carbon footprint associated with the use of the bubbler system, expected to be in use from	N	Operation of the bubbler system ensures mixing of the water column and improves water quality. All scenarios were simulated with nighttime (1800-0600, operational cost reduction measure) bubbler operations to demonstrate the effectiveness of this in-reservoir control measure across a number of operational scenarios. Additionally, the 12-year baseline scenario was run without bubbler operations to forecast water quality within the Havant Thicket Reservoir and that withdrawn and released as compensatory flows in the absence of this control measure.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		April to August, to increase mixing and avoid the deterioration of water quality. Reference was made to section 5.2.13 of the Environmental Water Quality Report in respect of the bubbler system's effect on reducing the risk of posed to human and animal health, with concerns raised that this is reliant on the efficiency of water mixing within the water column by the bubbler, and even with the system in place it may still result in blue-green algae (cyanobacteria) issues within Havant Thicket Reservoir.		Nighttime bubbler operations from April-August (seasonal stratification period) are an effective 'in-reservoir' control measure to maintain a well-mixed and well-oxygenated water column with low bottom water concentrations of dissolved metals, and dissolved inorganic and organic matter. Bubbler operations are the primary in-reservoir control measure. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. Low concentrations of organic matter would prevent sludge build up in Havant Thicket Reservoir. Updated modelling that includes the use of a HRRM at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the associated risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water.
Wider Community	WQHTR 207	The respondents stated there were uncertainties surrounding the recycling plant efficacy and its business case and the potential impact upon the ultimate Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality, the criterion that is required to be met on the outflow to the ultimate purification plant, and the potential impact upon waterways downstream of Havant Thicket Reservoir. The respondents stated that seasonal fluctuations in the Havant Thicket Reservoir water level would have to be maintained if the scheme were to go ahead to ensure the optimum level of biodiversity would be retained. Respondents suggested the modelling was out of date due to the movement of the inlet position in Havant Thicket Reservoir and suggested multiple operating scenarios needed to be modelled to assess the impact, along with further sensitivity analysis to determine the effect of changes in the inputs and operating	N	Water quality modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir and compensation flows has been completed, and the results are presented and assessed in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Once operational, Portsmouth Water is responsible for maintaining water levels within the reservoir. Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality at Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		scenarios stating a current lack of information utilised in the present modelling. Responses also stated that the Environmental Water Quality Report be thoroughly reviewed by an independent appointed expert in the field, and for water quality parameters and criterion at all stages to be determined and specified urgently by the relevant regulator, the EA and also by the UK Drinking Water Inspectorate.		Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the associated risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. Water quality modelling is robust and was carried out by the Applicant and Portsmouth Water. Portsmouth Water have also been involved in validating the water quality modelling methodology and outputs. Modelling incorporates multiple scenarios; ▪ Baseline: Includes the fill stage, operation without recycled water, and operation with recycled water. ▪ Extended stabilisation: Baseline conditions plus a four-year stabilisation period following construction and Havant Thicket Reservoir filling. ▪ Operational variations: Adjustments to recycled water release, spring inflows, and withdrawal rates. ▪ High withdrawals: Significant reductions in water levels during drought conditions due to elevated withdrawal demands. The updated model also reflects the change in position of the recycled water and spring inlet location into Havant Thicket Reservoir from the north basin (eastern borrow pit) to

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				the south basin (western borrow pit), in closer proximity to the withdrawal infrastructure. Reservoir modelling includes a withdrawal water quality envelope defined as the range of the maximum and minimum simulated values across all scenarios in this investigation. Compensation flows modelling, which is based on the withdrawal envelope data, is presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This shows that the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. The Project has undertaken extensive engagement, with the EA, Natural England (NE), and Marine Management Organisation (MMO) through a regular Technical Working Group since 2023 and engagement remains ongoing, particularly regarding discharges to the water environment, which would require permits under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016. Havant Thicket Reservoir modelling work has been updated to reflect the fact that the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				recycled water and spring inlet location into the reservoir has moved from the north basin (eastern borrow pit) to the south basin (western borrow pit) in closer proximity to the withdrawal infrastructure. For further detail see ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). A drinking water safety plan was produced and submitted to the Drinking Water Inspectorate using a 'worst' case consideration, i.e, various hazards and water quality from Havant Thicket Reservoir, and further revision of the Drinking Water Safety Plan would be produced during the Havant Thicket Reservoir filling period and stabilisation period to help assess the downstream mitigation process at the Water treatment plants operated by Portsmouth Water and the Applicant.
Wider Community	WQHTR 208	The respondent stated they were satisfied and expressed encouragement that new information from the Applicant identified that the effects of increased phosphorous from recycled water on the ecology at Havant Thicket could be mitigated through oxygenation from a 'bubbler system' and permitted additional phosphorus treatment	N	The Applicant confirms that the bubbler system and phosphorus reduction measures are being retained and that no deterioration in water quality or impacts on Havant Thicket Reservoir biodiversity are predicted.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		measures as part of the water recycling processes to reduce levels to a point that they would not have a negative effect on Havant Thicket Reservoir biodiversity.		
Wider Community	WQHTR 209	A respondent stated that there was inadequate consideration of risk of treatment chemicals and disinfection by-products being discharged into Havant Thicket Reservoir and their potential impact. The respondent also stated that it was their understanding that the only treatment chemical may be chlorine and that this had already been discussed. Responses also stated that current modelling did not account for potential higher variations of water quality with the input of recycled water therefore affecting the ratio of spring water to recycled water in Havant Thicket Reservoir at different times of the year and that this was dependent on which water is used to fill Havant Thicket Reservoir under different operating scenarios.	N	Recycled water from the WRP would be treated using a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process (incorporating microfiltration/ultrafiltration (MF/UF), reverse osmosis (RO), an advanced oxidation process using ultraviolet (UV-AOP)/hydrogen peroxide, granular activated carbon adsorption and remineralisation). The updated reservoir model includes improved characterisation of recycled water quality with the planned implementation of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) that substantially decreases nutrient concentrations of this water source. The Applicant and Portsmouth Water conducted robust Havant Thicket Reservoir modelling, incorporating multiple scenario simulations: ▪ Baseline: Includes the fill stage, operation without recycled water, and operation with recycled water. ▪ Extended stabilisation: Baseline conditions plus a four-year stabilisation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				period following construction and Havant Thicket Reservoir filling. - Operational variations: Adjustments to recycled water release, spring inflows, and withdrawal rates. - High withdrawals: Significant reductions in water levels during drought conditions due to elevated withdrawal demands. Portsmouth Water have also been involved in validating the water quality modelling methodology and outputs. Several scenarios were run with operational variations over a three-year period (2037-2040). Simulations used different inputs of recycled water inputs, spring inflows and Havant Thicket Reservoir withdrawals, followed by an additional year of baseline hydrology to evaluate stabilised conditions. Modelling examined the sensitivity of water quality to operational changes and the time required to return to baseline conditions. Updated modelling shows that water quality in the Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality.
Wider Community	WQHTR 210	Respondents stated algal blooms could result in Havant Thicket Reservoir as recycled effluent, although reducing nitrates, would result in higher levels of phosphates, in the form of orthophosphates entering Havant Thicket Reservoir shifting the status of Havant Thicket Reservoir to eutrophic. A response referred to claims made by a local interest group that the trophic status change to eutrophic would result in increased risk of algal blooms and stated that Phosphates would be removed in accordance with the EA standards. The same response referred to suggestions that the proposed treatment to remove phosphate would not guarantee water quality to be maintained to the levels of the original spring fed reservoir and stated thereafter that this position was disputable and noted that natural spring waters often have high levels of	N	Water quality modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir and compensation flows has been completed, and the results are presented and assessed in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		phosphates and nitrates due to historic agriculture practices with fertiliser use. Other respondents queried how phosphates could be removed from the water without a large cost and carbon footprint.		The addition of the HRRM would result in a small increase in operational costs and carbon emissions for the WRP due to additional power consumption. However, this impact has been fully mitigated by power demand reductions for other components of the WRP due to design refinements – resulting in a small net reduction in power related operational costs and carbon emissions for the WRP, even with the HRRM, compared to the gate 3a estimates. Both the capital cost and embodied carbon emissions for the HRRM solution have been assessed and found to be similar to those for the non-HRRM design.
Wider Community	WQHTR 211	The respondent referred to assertions that the salinity and temperature changes in Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream had not adequately been considered. In this context the respondent expressed that they were uncertain why this was considered an issue and stated that it was a water storage reservoir and that temperatures would change with the ambient temperature.	N	A range of water quality variables for Havant Thicket Reservoir were modelled, including temperature and salinity. In the model, water temperature data of treated wastewater as provided by the Applicant and Portsmouth Water provided spring water temperature data. Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir.
Wider Community	WQHTR 212	The respondent referred to assertions that no assessment of the impact of effluent recycling on water quality in wetland and in Havant Thicket Reservoir shallows had been carried out and stated that the purpose of Havant Thicket Reservoir was to store water for human use.	N	Reservoir modelling simulated water quality in two different areas of Havant Thicket Reservoir: the relatively deep south basin and larger and shallower north basin. The model included representation of retention structures between the four wetland compartments and the open water. In this way the wetlands were included in the modelling. Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality at Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the associated risk of algal blooms).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	WQHTR 213	The respondent referred to concerns regarding the potential increased risk of blue-green algae and stated that phosphates should be removed in accordance with the EA standards.	N	Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality at Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms). Engagement remains ongoing with the EA, particularly regarding discharges to the water environment, which would require permits under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016.
Wider Community	WQHTR 214	The respondent stated additional risks to the water quality and biodiversity in Havant Thicket Reservoir, streams and sea had not been adequately considered to account for changes to geochemistry, salinity, temperature, accumulation of chemicals in	N	Water quality modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir has been completed, and the results are presented and assessed in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		algae and in the food chain, sedimentation and remobilisation. The respondent suggested Portsmouth University studies had confirmed that forever chemicals (PFAS and PFOS) do accumulate in algae, and studies of other marine species were ongoing. The respondent stated that all contaminants needed to be considered, not just those for which a water quality standard existed. The respondent queried if the mixing of contaminants or higher temperatures could amplify the impacts. The respondent also queried if the discharge of recycled effluent could result in new compounds being formed and have an impact on water quality or the local ecology.		Modelling simulated changes in chemical parameters as well as temperature and salinity. Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the associated risk of algal blooms). Updated modelling that includes the HRRM at the WRP shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. The model was also run with and without bubbler operations. Nighttime bubbler operations from April-August (seasonal stratification period) are an effective 'in-reservoir' control measure to maintain a well-mixed and well-oxygenated water column with low bottom water concentrations of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				dissolved metals, and dissolved inorganic and organic matter. Low concentrations of organic matter would prevent sludge build up and its remobilisation in Havant Thicket Reservoir. The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the EA Surface water pollution risk assessment, which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that would be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by the University of Brighton (Mayor-Smith, 2024). The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WQHTR 215	The respondent stated Portsmouth Water had publicly committed to ensuring no loss of biodiversity benefit when compared to the original spring-fed Havant Thicket Reservoir proposal, if effluent recycling proposals were to proceed. It was however suggested that the changes in geochemistry, including increased salinity, temperature, and the introduction of additional contaminants into Havant Thicket Reservoir, would likely have detrimental effects on the biodiversity potential of Havant Thicket Reservoir. The respondent stated that due to these risks, Portsmouth Water should not permit the discharge of recycled effluent into Havant Thicket Reservoir.	N	Water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir and in downstream water bodies has been modelled in detail. Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. This includes ecological status and biological quality elements. There would be no detrimental effects on biodiversity potential. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. In addition, the Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. The results of this process are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream.
Wider Community	WQHTR 216	The respondent stated that the spring-fed Havant Thicket Reservoir offered a significant advantage for Langstone Harbour by reducing nitrate inputs that would cause harmful algal blooms, thereby negatively affecting the Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Special Protection Area (SPA). The respondent suggested that according to the 2011 water quality modelling report, this reduction was estimated at 61 kg/day, equating to a 21%	N	The Project would not adversely affect nutrient and nitrates in the Havant Thicket Reservoir or in downstream water bodies. An assessment of the impact of the Project on nutrient loads in the Solent and other nutrient-sensitive protected sites is presented in ES Appendix 19.7 Nutrient Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The nutrient assessment concludes that, on the basis of nutrient management measures embedded within the Project, no additional mitigation would be required to achieve

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		decrease and that the EA had reviewed and validated the calculation methodology. The respondent stated that the greatest reduction in nitrate flow to Langstone Harbour occurred when Bedhampton spring water was used to refill Havant Thicket Reservoir after construction and followed a drought drawdown event. However, they also noted that if an effluent recycling plant were to be used to supplement Havant Thicket Reservoir during droughts, Havant Thicket Reservoir's water level post-drought would likely be higher resulting in a reduced use of spring water. It was stated that the consequence would result in elevated nitrate levels and diminishing the nitrate reduction benefit to the harbour.		nutrient neutrality during the construction and operational phases. Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. In addition, the Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream into Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour. The results of this process are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This shows that operation of the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or adversely impact the ecological status of water bodies downstream of Havant Thicket Reservoir (including designated SAC and SPA habitats in Langstone Harbour and the Solent). Modelling shows that drought conditions have minimal impacts on water quality. Modelling tested extreme drought operations with very high withdrawals and falling water levels. Results showed minimal water-quality change, with retention times staying above 50 days and no signs of short-circuiting under the reservoir's most extreme scenario.
Wider Community	WQHTR 217	The respondents stated that the spring fed Havant Thicket Reservoir would dilute and buffer the effects of high concentrations of iron, manganese and magnesium from the head water streams. It was claimed that concentrated discharge reject water would have more of an effect. Respondents expressed scepticism with respect to the forecasted decrease in the predicted concentrations and queried how the predicted concentration for all seven parameters that were modelled in the	N	Modelling shows that releases of recycled water into the reservoir would not adversely affect water quality. Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in the Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. This includes ecological status and biological quality elements. There would be no detrimental effects on biodiversity potential. Operation of the Project

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Solent could decrease as a result of the Project. The respondents further queried where and at what depth within the Long Sea Outfall (LSO) discharge to the Solent these water quality predictions were made, how the daily addition of recycled effluent into Havant Thicket Reservoir would impact water quality in the long and short term, as well as how often drought drawdown and associated filling was expected to occur. Feedback demonstrated appreciation toward the Applicant's acknowledgment of respondent's concerns and stated that a negative impact on water quality may ensue in Havant Thicket Reservoir. However, a respondent suggested that putting treated water into Havant Thicket Reservoir could potentially damage chalk streams. Respondents suggested that the EA agreed that compensation flows from Havant Thicket Reservoir should operate throughout the year.		would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir. In addition, the Havant Thicket reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. This shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). In the Solent, releases from the LSO have been modelled in detail. Water quality in the Solent was modelled at the surface down to 20 to 24 m. Model outputs show that the differences in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		A respondent also questioned the Environmental Water Quality Report's appropriateness and suggested a failure to account for matters such as downstream flow impacts, impacts on the stream south-east of Havant Thicket Reservoir, and water quality.		modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as Langstone Harbour or the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream. Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent Dispersion Modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.8 Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project Eastney Long Sea Outfall - CORMIX Modelling for Chemicals Screened in via the Surface Water Risk Assessment Process, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Modelling simulations of discharges for the currently consented parameters from Eastney LSO were set to a duration of one month; to cover several tidal cycles (to assess potential accumulation of the discharged pollutants) and various wind conditions were included in sensitivity tests to evaluate how plumes were changed by the wind. It is unclear which stream southeast of Havant Thicket Reservoir is being referred to. There are several ordinary watercourses in this area. Some are outside the Order Limits and hydrologically upstream of the Project. They would not receive compensation flows or be affected by construction, so there is no pathway for effect. There are also some small drains that connect to the Lavant catchment. Some of these fall just within the Order Limits and could be affected by construction of Havant Thicket Reservoir, but they would not receive compensation flows. Potential impacts from construction are assessed in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, section 19.8, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). No chalk streams will receive compensation flows from the Havant Thicket Reservoir.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	WQHTR 218	The respondents raised concern over potential blue-green algae, which they stated had less chlorophyll-a than green algae making them harder to detect when forming and blooming, and suggested the treatment to remove the phosphorus in an attempt to prevent algal blooms is not guaranteed to maintain water quality to spring fed levels thus potentially impacting the biodiversity of Havant Thicket Reservoir. The respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the addition of effluent into Havant Thicket Reservoir and suggested alternative options be considered.	N	Updated modelling that includes vertical mixing and the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP. Initial modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir without the HRRM (GHD, 2024) showed an average total phosphorus concentration of 0.07 mg/L compared to 0.017 mg/l of phosphorus with the HRRM. Water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. The implementation of additional phosphorus removal measures at the Water Recycling Plant would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and alongside measures to promote vertical mixing, prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. This shows that, with the implementation of additional phosphorus removal measures at the Water Recycling Plant, operation of the Project would not change the predicted ecological status of the Havant Thicket Reservoir under The Water Environment

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				(Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017.
Wider Community	WQHTR 219	The respondent stated it was not credible for the Environmental Water Quality Report to conclude that there were no potential environmental effects from the discharge and storage of effluent into Havant Thicket Reservoir, due to the suggested change of the water to a eutrophic state in addition to the concentration of reject water being four times greater than the present levels in the Solent.	N	The storage and release of recycled water in Havant Thicket Reservoir, in downstream water bodies and in the Solent related to the Eastney LSO release, has been modelled in detail. Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir. The implementation of additional phosphorus removal measures at the WRP would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent it switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. In addition, the Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. This shows that operation of the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. The impact of releases from Eastney LSO on Solent water quality has been modelled. Results showing changes to consented parameters are provided in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessment of chemicals within the release from the Eastney LSO has been undertaken in line with EA guidance Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit. Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as Langstone Harbour or the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream. Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.8 Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project Eastney Long Sea Outfall - CORMIX Modelling for Chemicals Screened in via the Surface Water Risk Assessment Process, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	WQHTR 220	The respondent stated that the extension of Havant Thicket Reservoir inlet pipe further into Havant Thicket Reservoir meant that the water quality modelling was already out of date, as that was based on the previous shorter inlet pipeline discharge point and stated it was not clear if the inlet would release the recycled effluent as a point discharge at the end of the pipe, or at a number of points, and whether diffusers are to be used.	N	Updated modelling for Havant Thicket Reservoir has now been completed. The updated model incorporates the change of the inlet pipe location. The recycled water spring inlet location into Havant Thicket Reservoir has moved from the north basin (eastern borrow pit) to the south basin (western borrow pit) in closer proximity to the withdrawal infrastructure. The inlet pipe is being designed by Portsmouth Water and is currently proposed as a single point release. A bubbler system is to be utilised for diffusion. The model also includes: ▪ An updated bubble plume destratification system design, in particular the layout of the bubbler lines in the south basin. ▪ Improved characterisation of the recycled water quality with the planned implementation of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) that substantially decreases nutrient concentrations of this water source. Updated modelling that includes the use of a HRRM at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir.
Wider Community	WQHTR 221	The respondent stated that salinity changes in Havant Thicket Reservoir or downstream had not adequately been assessed. The respondent stated the pressure used in the reverse osmosis treatment process was not as high as that of a desalination plant and as a result, the recycled effluent discharged into Havant Thicket Reservoir would have a higher salinity than the spring water which the respondent suggested would have an adverse impact on the water quality and ecology.		Salinity in Havant Thicket Reservoir has been modelled. To estimate salinity and other water quality measures of the incoming water, a mass balance method was used in the model. This method looked at water quality and the known concentrations of substances in the spring and recycled water. Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. The Project would not adversely affect salinity in Havant Thicket Reservoir or result in a deterioration in water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir. In addition, the Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. This shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream
Wider Community	WQHTR 222	The respondent suggested the Environmental Water Quality Report was dismissive of the risks to the water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir, Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour and the Solent. The respondent commented that the water quality assessment should consider the risk of 'out of specification' or contaminated recycled effluent reaching Havant Thicket Reservoir and suggested that live monitoring of the effluent recycling process would primarily be for surrogate parameters and would not guarantee prevention of high concentration of certain contaminants reaching Havant Thicket Reservoir. The respondent stated that thousands of contaminants would be discharged with the reject water into the Solent at levels up to four times more concentrated than the current effluent, however that only seven parameters had been modelled. The respondent queried why new contaminants	N	The Applicant is working with Portsmouth Water to establish the use of online measurable surrogate compounds that would be used for daily operation of the WRP. The multi-barrier treatment process will be equipped with online monitors to ensure the efficacy of various treatment processes. However, in the same way that drinking water supply works are controlled the WRP will also have a set of online monitors to control the transfer of flow into Havant Thicket Reservoir. The EA is expecting regular sampling of the recycled water and test for compounds with an EQS and it is understood that not all of these can be measured online. A water monitoring plan will be produced post-consent and ES Appendix 19.9 Outline Water Monitoring Plan, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) is submitted with the DCO application. The water monitoring plan would include general quantity (flows/levels) and quality monitoring requirements, together with specific monitoring requirements at particular component of the Project, geographic locations, and/or receptors susceptible to

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		related to the effluent had not been modelled in 2025.		specific or increased risks. The monitoring plan would outline trigger levels and action plans during construction (to be agreed with stakeholders) to mitigate any observed impacts. In addition, engagement with the EA remains ongoing, particularly regarding discharges to the water environment, which will be secured through the appropriate licence and permitting regimes under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016. Water quality modelling has been undertaken to understand the impact of blending recycled and spring water on water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir, as well as potential water quality effects on downstream water bodies receiving flows from Havant Thicket Reservoir (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour), and the Solent (releases or reject water from the water recycling process from Eastney LSO). Outputs from the detailed water quality modelling and assessment of effects is fully reported in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) submitted with the DCO application.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. In addition, Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. The results of this process are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Updated modelling that includes the HRRM at the WRP shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				(i.e. Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour). Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters from the Eastney Long Sea Outfall has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA guidance Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project Eastney Long Sea Outfall - CORMIX Modelling for Chemicals Screened in via the Surface Water Risk Assessment Process, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) , and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) at the LSO with regard to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as Langstone Harbour or the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream. The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the guidance, which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				(2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WQHTR 223	Respondents stated the change in geochemistry in Havant Thicket Reservoir and the associated impacts had not been adequately assessed.	N	The Environmental Impact Assessment and relevant regulations require the Applicant to assess water quality (not specifically the term 'geochemistry') and biodiversity. Water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir and in downstream water bodies has been modelled in detail. Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. This includes ecological status and biological quality elements. There would be no detrimental effects on biodiversity potential. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. In addition, the Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. This shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WQHTR 224	The respondent stated that there was a two stage drop in the trophic status of Havant Thicket Reservoir as a result of effluent recycling and that this was not acceptable. It was stated that the modelling (2011 and 2020) noted that the spring fed Havant Thicket Reservoir was likely to be oligotrophic to mesotrophic with minimal risk of being eutrophic, however the 2025	N	Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in the water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		modelling was stated to have confirmed increases in phosphate as a result of discharging the recycled effluent, which could result in the deterioration of the water to a eutrophic status. The respondent stated the increase was predicted to stimulate the growth of algae in Havant Thicket Reservoir having a negative impact on the biodiversity in turn to the spring fed Havant Thicket Reservoir. The respondent referenced the Environmental Water Quality Report section 5.2.15 stating that the Project's proposed phosphate removal measures were predicted to improve the ecological potential of Havant Thicket Reservoir 'closer' to previous spring fed Havant Thicket Reservoir modelled mesotrophic conditions. The respondent expressed disapproval and stated that this would still represent a deterioration in water quality. The respondent stated that although contaminants might not result in an overall change of the water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir from 'good' to 'bad', it would not mean there would not be		The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. Initial modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir without the HRRM (GHD, 2024) showed an average total phosphorus concentration of 0.07 mg/L compared to 0.017 mg P/L with the HRRM.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		adverse impacts that required consideration.		
Wider Community	WQHTR 225	The respondent stated the in-combination effects of the various contaminants in Havant Thicket Reservoir water had to be considered.	N	Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling is robust and simulates chemical interactions in the water body. This means the 'in-combination' effects of different parameters have been modelled. Modelling shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir.
Wider Community	WQHTR 226	The respondent stated that where model outputs for the 'classic' reservoir differed from that reported in 2011 and 2020, a robust assessment had to be undertaken to justify the changes and comparisons to previous modelling. The respondent queried why the assumption on frequency of drawdown was not provided in the report despite being provided in the 2011 and 2020 water quality reports or why fewer contaminants were modelled in 2025 in comparison to that in 2011 and 2020.	N	The initial modelling water quality modelling presented by Portsmouth Water in support of the planning application for Havant Thicket Reservoir used a mass balance approach, which was informed by the data available at the time. This has now been superseded by the more detailed 3D water quality modelling presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This was informed by detailed information on reservoir bathymetry and water quality from

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				the incoming spring, river and recycled water quality. The modelling focussed on water quality parameters for which Environmental Quality Standards have been set under the Water Framework Directive Directions 2015.
Wider Community	WQHTR 227	The respondent stated that the risk associated with effluent recycling on water quality did not exist with the spring fed reservoir scenario and that this had to be justly considered in the Environmental Water Quality Report. The respondent expressed dissatisfaction with the Applicant's maintenance of existing water assets and that taking this into account it was stated that the presumption should be that maintenance failures and incidents that would negatively impact the water quality would occur and needed to be robustly taken into account. The respondent stated that once contaminants were in Havant Thicket Reservoir that these could not be removed.	N	Updated modelling that includes the use of a HRRM at the WRP site shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. Recycled water from the WRP site would be monitored to ensure it meets quality standards and maintenance failures are identified. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. During operation, compensation flows from Havant Thicket Reservoir would be directed into Riders Lane Stream, under the terms of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				an Impoundment Licence by Portsmouth Water. Due to the spatial and temporal variability of the water environment, monitoring of receptors susceptible to potential impacts is critical; particularly when working in or proximal to high value receptors, or where there is increased uncertainty/risk such as within the karstic chalk aquifer. The Contractor once appointed would produce a Water Monitoring Plan in line with ES Appendix 19.9 Outline Water Monitoring Plan, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This would include general quantity (flows/levels) and quality monitoring requirements, together with specific monitoring requirements at particular components of the Project, geographic locations, and/or receptors susceptible to specific or increased risks. The monitoring plan would outline trigger levels and action plans (to be agreed with stakeholders) to mitigate any observed impacts.
Wider Community	WQHTR 228	The respondent stated that analysis for most contaminants could not be undertaken 'live' and that samples would	N	Due to the spatial and temporal variability of the water environment, monitoring of receptors susceptible to potential impacts is

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		be taken periodically for laboratory analysis with results suggested to not be available for 28 days, by which point the problem contaminant detected would already be in Havant Thicket Reservoir with no way of removing it.		critical; particularly when working in or proximal to high value receptors, or where there is increased uncertainty/risk such as within the karstic chalk aquifer. The Applicant is working with Portsmouth Water to establish the use of online measurable surrogate compounds that would be used for daily operation of the WRP. The multi-barrier treatment process will be equipped with online monitors to ensure the efficacy of various treatment processes. However, in the same way that drinking water supply works are controlled the WRP will also have a set of online monitors to control the transfer of flow into Havant Thicket Reservoir. The EA is expecting regular sampling of the recycled water and test for compounds with an Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) and it is understood that not all of these can be measured online. A water monitoring plan would be produced post DCO consent, and ES Appendix 19.9 Outline Water Monitoring Plan, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) is submitted with the DCO application. The water monitoring plan would include general quantity (flows/levels) and quality monitoring requirements, together with specific monitoring requirements at particular

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				component of the Project, geographic locations, and/or receptors susceptible to specific or increased risks. The water monitoring plan would outline trigger levels and action plans during construction (to be agreed with stakeholders) to mitigate any observed impacts. In addition, engagement with the EA remains ongoing, particularly regarding discharges to the water environment, which will be secured through the appropriate licence and permitting regimes under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016.
Wider Community	WQHTR 229	Respondents stated that water quality had been on the decline in the harbour due to the Applicant's discharge of sewage and that increased construction in the catchment area would inevitably result in increased pressure on the infrastructure. A respondent suggested builders were not contributing to improving the infrastructure they are placing increased pressure on, and that the Applicant had not maintained their infrastructure. Respondents stated that the use of recycled sewage water would have adverse effects on the quality of the water	N	Budds Farm WTW complies with its permit issued by the EA. Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in the reservoir Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in chemistry or physico-chemistry status of water quality the reservoir Havant Thicket Reservoir.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		stored in Havant Thicket Reservoir, and the Project would represent a major change in use citing plans for Havant Thicket Reservoir that had been approved over numerous years on the basis that it would be used for drinking water. The respondents stated that forcing effluent through semi-permeable membranes and other filters to remove some of the contaminants was energy intensive, required chemicals to be added back (therefore requiring the phosphate plant) and would not remove small molecules some pharmaceuticals and potentially harmful viruses or bacterial DNA/plasmids which could confer multiple antibiotic resistances and other harmful traits on the E.coli cells naturally populating the gut of all humans consuming the recycled water.		The results of water quality modelling presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Updated modelling that includes the HRRM at the WRP shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality (which includes overall water body ecological status or potential and ecological quality elements) or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour). Further details can be found in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The addition of HRRM would result in a small increase in operational costs and carbon emissions for the WRP due to additional power consumption. However, this impact has been fully mitigated by power demand reductions for other components of the WRP due to design refinements – resulting in a small net reduction in power related operational costs and carbon emissions for

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				the WRP, even with HRRM, compared to the gate 3a estimates. Both the capital cost and embodied carbon emissions for the HRRM solution have been assessed and found to be similar to those for the non-HRRM design. It should be noted the reverse osmosis process removes important minerals from water (calcium and magnesium mainly) that will be added back to stabilise the water for transfer as well as for water's nutritional value. While lime in combination with carbon dioxide are used in the remineralisation process, a dedicated phosphate plant will not be required in the design (albeit as a High Rejection Membrane is included within the design which reduce phosphorus). RO membranes are highly effective at removing bacteria and significant percentage of viruses. The process also includes UV-Advanced Oxidation Process to eliminate any additional viral loads, and further treatment using Granular Activated Carbon will help with removal of any byproducts that may be formed during UVAOP. This multi-barrier

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				treatment approach will provide protection to public health. The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the Environment Agency's guidance Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit, which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals, where the laboratory has been able to test them chemicals, has been provided to the EA for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and against what thresholds. Following receipt of this advice, the assessment will be undertaken and submitted to the EA as part of the environmental permit application required for the Project. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs)

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given that the full treatment process would be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WQHTR 230	The respondent stated that changes to the temperature of Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream waterbodies had not been adequately considered, as it was not clear	N	A range of water quality variables for Havant Thicket Reservoir were modelled, including appropriate consideration of temperature. In the model, water temperature data of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		how changes had been assessed in the 2025 Environmental Water Quality Report. The respondent noted that temperature can have a significant impact on a number of parameters including geochemical and ecological processes such as the amount of dissolved oxygen. The respondent noted the EA had previously raised concerns about the risk of temperature changes in Havant Thicket Reservoir for the 'classic' spring fed reservoir scenario. The respondent stated that there would be an impact of the mixing ratios in terms of assessing temperature change and this information needed to be taken into account when assessing temperature changes in the water. Potential changes in the water temperature were stated to have been considered in both the 2011 and 2020 Water Quality Reports where changes to the downstream water bodies were assessed to be less than 3oC. The respondent stated that such a change was indicated to represent a significant change by the Water Framework Directive and Freshwater Fish Directive.		wastewater was provided by the Applicant, and Portsmouth Water provided spring water temperature data. The temperature of compensatory flows from Havant Thicket Reservoir was explicitly modelled as it mixed with the ambient receiving water, to show the change in temperature of water throughout Riders Lane Stream and the wider receiving water bodies due to release of water with and without the input of the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir. Temperature data were derived from the Havant Reservoir Modelling study completed by Portsmouth Water, where both average winter and summer values were used for this dispersion modelling study to understand the seasonal variations in the impact on surrounding water quality. Water quality modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir is presented and assessed in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Updated modelling that includes the use of a HRRM at the WRP shows that water quality

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water.
Wider Community	WQHTR 231	The respondent queried what the expected life of the bubbler system was, if it would be located in the borrow pit near the inlet or over a wider area, if there would be a limited curtain line or something more extensive in each basin and whether it would only be used for water deeper than 6m where stratification is more likely. The respondent noted that due to the unclear location of the bubbler system, the impacts were difficult to assess.	N	Updated water quality modelling is contained within ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) reflects the change in recycled water and spring water inlet location into Havant Thicket Reservoir from the north basin (eastern borrow pit) to the south basin (western borrow pit) in closer proximity to the withdrawal infrastructure. Appendix G.2 (Environmental Water Quality Report) was informed by a previous iteration of the reservoir water quality modelling undertaken by the Applicant in July 2024. This assumed that there will be two lines of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				bubblers, one each in the deepest basins. The updated modelling is presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) refined the design to include two lines each with a length of 360m at a height of 0.3m above the reservoir bed, with 180 openings at 2m intervals and a free air flow rate of 87.5 L/s. Water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir has been modelled with and without the use of the bubbler system. Additionally, the 12 year baseline scenario was run without bubbler operations to forecast reservoir and withdrawal water quality in the absence of this control measure. Results show that bubbler operations from April-August (i.e. seasonal stratification period) are an effective 'in-reservoir' control measure to maintain a well-mixed and well-oxygenated water column. The Applicant notes that the detailed design of the bubbler system has not yet been completed and would be the responsibility of Portsmouth Water. The updated modelling that includes the use of a HRRM at the WRP site shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir.
Wider Community	WQHTR 232	The respondent stated that due to the confined nature of Havant Thicket Reservoir water body, the impact of pollution incidents would need to be assessed, especially as there was no previous risk of this nature to the spring-fed reservoir.	N	The quality of recycled water released from the WRP and entering Havant Thicket Reservoir would be routinely monitored and regulated by the EA through an Environmental Permit to reduce the risk of pollution incidents. This would include general quantity (flows/levels) and quality monitoring requirements, together with specific monitoring requirements at particular component of the Project, geographic locations, and/or receptors susceptible to specific or increased risks. The monitoring plan will outline trigger levels and action plans (to be agreed with stakeholders) to mitigate any observed impacts. Water quality modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir (Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II) and compensation flows (Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir compensatory flows water quality modelling, Volume II) are

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				assessed in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The water quality of compensation flows to downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour) has also been modelled (ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This modelling also includes the HRRM at the WRP and shows that operation of the Project would not result in significant adverse effects or a deterioration in the chemical or physico-chemical status of downstream water bodies. For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals, where the laboratory has been able to test them has, has been provided to the EA for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and against what thresholds. Following receipt of this advice, the assessment will be undertaken and submitted to the EA as part of the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				environmental permit application required for the Project. Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in: - ES Appendix 19.5: Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent Dispersion Modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) - ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) - ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) - ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WQHTR 233	The respondent referenced Section 6.2.9 of the Environmental Water Quality Report and stated that adequate baseline information on water quality and habitats was not available and that further work would require the addition of baseline concentrations from marine water quality sampling towards the modelled outputs.	N	The Applicant consulted on baseline water environment information as part of the PEI Report during the Summer 2024 Consultation, which included spatial and temporal baseline datasets appropriate to the stage of environmental assessment and enabled consultees to understand the likely

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				effects of the Project and provide informed feedback. The Environmental Water Quality Report presented at the Spring 2025 Consultation provided updated modelling outputs building on this baseline evidence. The approach reflects the iterative development of the environmental assessment as the Project progressed through the pre-application stage. Consultation was therefore adequate and the baseline was in the PEIR. A comprehensive spatial and temporal baseline is provided in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), including baseline information for Langstone Harbour and the Solent. Further detail is set out in Section 19.7 ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), supported by modelling presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling – Chemicals, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The Applicant considers that sufficient baseline information was made available at each stage of consultation to enable consultees to understand the likely environmental effects of the Project and provide informed responses.
Wider Community	WQHTR 234	The respondent stated the cumulative impact of day-on-day discharges into Havant Thicket Reservoir needs to have been adequately considered by the Environmental Water Quality Report.	N	As stated in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), the model uses a 12-year baseline scenario of filling (~2 years over 3 winters, 'fill' stage) and maintaining reservoir at/near top water level (~1 year, the 'classic' stage) and after the onset of recycled water inputs (~9 years, the 'recycled' stage). The recycled stage of day-to-day inputs has therefore been modelled in detail. The modelling shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir.
Wider Community	WQHTR 235	The respondents stated there had been inadequate consideration of the benefit of the current spring fed reservoir		Water quality of Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies has been

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		downstream. The respondents suggested the assessment of water quality lacked the necessary detail to properly assess the quality of the modelling and did not cover adequate contaminants, and that therefore the Environmental Water Quality Report was considered to be dismissive of the risks to the water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir as well as downstream.		modelled and assessed in considerable detail. Updated modelling that includes the use of a HRRM at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. The results of water quality modelling presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Updated modelling that includes the HRRM at the WRP shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Regarding the chemicals that have been assessed, the assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for environmental permit guidance, which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its EQS. Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has, has been provided to the EA for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and submitted to the EA as part of the environmental permit application required for the Project. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm Water Treatment Works (WTW) (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that would be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output would be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that would be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WQHTR 236	The respondent suggested lower Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) and higher calcium concentrations would be beneficial to creating a more diverse fauna and flora.	N	Updated modelling that includes the use of a HRRM at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. BOD is predicted to increase slightly, and alkalinity is predicted to decrease slightly following the release of recycled water into the WRP. However, the limited change will

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				not be sufficient to adversely affect the ecology of Havant Thicket Reservoir. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. This includes overall ecological status of Havant Thicket Reservoir and biological quality elements assess by the WFD Directions. Adverse impacts on flora and fauna will not occur.
Wider Community	WQHTR 237	The respondents queried which data was used in the modelling as this remained unclear, asking if the data from the effluent trial plant was utilised and if not, why. The respondents also suggested an expectation that the water quality assessments had been carried out independently of the Applicant and if this has not been done, it was suggested that another independent assessment was required. The respondents stated that the impact of introducing the recycled effluent into the improved water catchment had to be fully assessed, as improvements were planned to occur prior to the start of the effluent recycling scheme. A further respondent stated that too much	N	Detailed modelling of water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir is presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The quality of recycled water used in the model was based on the measured performance of the pilot plant installed at Budds Farm WTW. Modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir was undertaken by independent consultants appointed by the Applicant and Portsmouth Water. The experts that advised on the original reservoir proposal for Portsmouth Water have also been involved in validating the water quality modelling methodology and outputs. Water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir and in downstream water bodies has been

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		uncertainty exists within the updated environmental water quality information. The respondent questioned how the Project would be dealt with in the event expectations are not accurate, and how the processes would be reversed to avoid environmental damage.		modelled in detail and a summary is provided below. Updated modelling that includes the use of a HRRM at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. This includes ecological status and biological quality elements. There would be no detrimental effects on biodiversity potential. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. In addition, Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. This shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in: - ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). - ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Operation of the Project would not affect the Regulation 19 measures and planning conditions agreed with the EA to deliver geomorphological and habitat improvements in Hermitage Stream, Riders Lane Stream and Park Lane Stream (to be implemented by Portsmouth Water). These measures are discussed in section 19.7 of ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WQHTR 238	The respondent stated that data used for the modelling of the impact of the Project had to be representative of a realistic and	N	Detailed modelling of water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir is presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		comparable scenario and not just data provided as usual by the manufacturer of the WRP. The respondent also stated that there was only one set of model outputs which suggest a variety of operational scenarios had not been modelled, and furthermore, that the modelling only applied to open water areas which did not aid in determining the impact of the recycled effluent into shallower waters of Havant Thicket Reservoir or wetlands. The respondent queried the assumptions used in the modelling. The respondent highlighted Section 3.1.10 of the Environmental Water Quality Report and queried what the key assumptions were that had been agreed between the Applicant and Portsmouth Water that the modelling was based on. The respondent provided examples that could be considered for modelling of operational uses, including different figures of recycled effluent input, or different time-		water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). All assumptions used in Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling and summarised in Appendix 19.11 were agreed by both the Applicant and Portsmouth Water. This includes input water quality data (including water from Bedhampton Springs, recycled water and water from the headwaters of Riders Lane Stream) and likely operational scenarios. The reservoir water quality modelling uses a 12-year baseline operational scenario of filling (~2 years over 3 winters, 'fill' stage) and maintaining reservoir at/near top water level (~1 year, the 'classic' stage) and after the onset of recycled water inputs (~9 years, the 'recycled' stage). In addition to the baseline operational scenario, multiple other scenarios were modelled to take account of: - Stabilisation effects - Variations in the release of recycled water and spring water inputs and withdrawals from Havant Thicket Reservoir

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		periods or varied annual weather (drought) conditions.		- Operational variations with a very high withdrawal period with concomitant sizeable decreases in water levels during drought conditions - Forecasts of long-term reservoir and withdrawal water quality in the absence of recycled water inputs. Reservoir modelling simulated water quality in two different areas of Havant Thicket Reservoir: the relatively deep south basin and larger and shallower north basin. The model used a 'levee' function to represent retention structures between the four wetland compartments and the open water. In this way the wetlands were included in the modelling. The updated reservoir modelling includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP and shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	WQHTR 239	The respondents queried if the risk of pollution incidents in Havant Thicket Reservoir had been fully assessed. Respondents raised concern about the risk of contamination of the water and stated the introduction of recycled effluent would inevitably change the chemistry of the water including the potential for contaminants, despite Portsmouth Water's pledge for there to be no loss of benefit to Havant Thicket Reservoir from the Project when compared to the previous original intention of a solely spring fed proposal.	N	Due to the spatial and temporal variability of the water environment, monitoring of receptors susceptible to potential impacts is critical; particularly when working in or proximal to high value receptors, or where there is increased uncertainty/risk such as within the karstic chalk aquifer. A Water Monitoring Plan would be produced post-DCO consent and ES Appendix 19.9 Outline Water Monitoring Plan, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) is submitted with the DCO application. The quality of recycled water released from the WRP and entering Havant Thicket Reservoir would be routinely monitored and regulated by the EA through an Environmental Permit to reduce the risk of pollution incidents. This would include general quantity (flows/levels) and quality monitoring requirements, together with specific monitoring requirements at particular component of the Project, geographic locations, and/or receptors susceptible to specific or increased risks. The monitoring plan would outline trigger levels and action

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				plans (to be agreed with stakeholders) to mitigate any observed impacts. An Operational Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7) has been produced which includes the requirements for an Emergency Response Plan to be completed by the Contractor. This would need to consider pollution event management procedures to prevent and respond to pollution incidents, detailing resources, timescales, and notification steps, escalation protocols. Measures to prevent the spread of Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS) in Havant Thicket Reservoir during operation are set out in Portsmouth Water's INNS Biosecurity Plan for Havant Thicket Reservoir. Measures to prevent the spread of INNS during operation of the Project as a whole are set out in the INNS Biosecurity Plan (Document reference 7.10, DCO Volume 7). Updated modelling that includes the use of a HRRM at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water.
Wider Community	WQHTR 240	The respondents stated the recycled effluent would result in changes to the geochemistry of Havant Thicket Reservoir and concerns were raised about the chemicals in the water in attempts to mitigate the algae issues. The respondents suggested the importance of the changes in the water chemistry were being down-played given that only around 85% of some chemicals would be able to be removed. It was also expressed that the Applicant was not acknowledging customer concerns in respect to forever chemicals and pharma products.	N	Updated modelling that includes the use of a HRRM at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance which

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its EQS. Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has, has been provided to the EA for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and submitted to the EA as part of the environmental permit application required for the Project. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm Water Treatment Works (WTW) (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that would be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output would be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that would be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WQHTR 241	The respondents suggested sample numbers for the critical contaminants were low and that most contaminants of concern had not been considered in the effluent recycling trial plant which operated at Budds Farm WTW for a period in 2023. These chemicals include forever chemicals, pesticides and volatile organic compounds and the risk of discharging them into Havant Thicket Reservoir had not been adequately considered. It was emphasised that all contaminants had to be considered and that it was not considered acceptable that a limited	N	The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm Water Treatment Works (WTW) (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that would be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		number of parameters for which water quality thresholds existed would be tested and that this was currently the approach pursued by the Project.		GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output would be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that would be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WQHTR 242	The respondent stated the impact of salinity and temperature change on both Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream had not adequately been considered.	N	Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for 18 determinands for compensatory flows released downstream. Temperature and salinity are included in the withdrawal water quality envelope. The results of this process are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Modelling shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. Updated modelling that includes the use of a HRRM at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir.
Wider Community	WQHTR 243	The respondent expressed suspicion of the baseline data and modelling outputs presented in 2025 in comparison to previous independent modelling reports as fewer parameters were stated to have been modelled. The respondent suggested there was a lack of information on the inputs and assumptions being used to model and assess the impacts of effluent recycling and that multiple operating scenarios needed to be modelled alongside sensitivity analysis. The respondent queried who undertook the water quality modelling and assessment whilst noting that it was not acceptable for the Applicant to conduct their own assessment due to the Applicant's bias which would reduce the credibility of the results.	N	Detailed modelling of water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir is presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling was undertaken by an independent consultant acting on behalf of the Applicant. All assumptions used in Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling are summarised in Appendix 19.11. These were agreed by both the Applicant and Portsmouth Water. This includes input water quality data (including water from Bedhampton Springs, recycled water and water from the headwaters of Riders Lane Stream) and likely operational scenarios. The quality of recycled water used in the model was based on the measured performance of the pilot plant installed at Budds Farm WTW. There is additional information now available online regarding

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				the performance of water recycling technology (Mayor-Smith (2024)). Multiple scenarios were modelled for Havant Thicket Reservoir. These scenarios accounted for: ▪ Stabilisation effects ▪ Variations in the release of recycled water and spring water inputs and withdrawals from Havant Thicket Reservoir ▪ Operational variations with a very high withdrawal period with concomitant sizeable decreases in water levels during drought conditions ▪ Extended classic phase (i.e. forecast long-term reservoir and withdrawals water quality in the absence of recycled water inputs) As described in Appendix 19.11, Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling considered a range of parameters, including basic indicators of water quality (e.g. temperature, pH, dissolved oxygen, Biochemical Oxygen Demand), nutrients (e.g. nitrate, ammonia, phosphate) and carbon compounds (inorganic and organic). Parameters with Environmental Quality

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Standards under the Water Framework Directive (Standards and Classification) Directions (England and Wales) 2015 have been used to allow the effects of any changes to water quality to be assessed. These parameters have been followed through into the modelling of compensatory flows from Havant Thicket Reservoir into downstream water bodies, as described in Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir compensatory flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir was undertaken by independent consultants appointed by the Applicant and Portsmouth Water. The experts that advised on the original reservoir proposal for Portsmouth Water have also been involved in validating the water quality modelling methodology and outputs. Modelling of compensatory flows and discharges from Eastney LSO was undertaken by independent consultants on behalf of the Applicant.
Wider Community	WQHTR 244	The respondents stated the water quality assessment carried out had not been done thoroughly, as a wider range of contaminants should have been assessed	N	The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the EA's guidance which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		especially in respect to water quality, ecology and bioaccumulation. The respondents noted pharmaceuticals, forever chemicals, volatile organic compounds and pesticides, found in output from 2023 trial plant, at Budds farm, were not included, nor was the assessment of the effect of these chemicals including the risk of chemicals from sewer catchments. The respondents suggested there had been inadequate consideration of the treated effluent, as adding phosphates would create additional sludge and the additional treatment proposed would not be guaranteed to maintain water quality to spring-fed levels and prevent algal blooms which in themselves were stated to be toxic. The respondents suggested accumulation of the 'forever' chemicals and other contaminants would inevitably collect in the wetland margins quite apart from their entry into this vital water reservoir.		Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has, has been provided to the EA for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and submitted to the EA as part of the environmental permit application required for the Project. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that would be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour;

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output would be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that would be in place at the WRP. Updated modelling that includes the use of a HRRM at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. The proposed treatment train in the reference design for DCO submission does not produce

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				a solid stream and sludge management will not be required.
Wider Community	WQHTR 245	A respondent stated that they understood that further measures to reduce Total Phosphorus concentrations were intended for the recycled water, but that this would be considered later in the DCO application where the Applicant would work 'with the EA to determine how the measures were best introduced'. Another respondent stated that they understood that the EA would set the water quality requirements of the recycled water that can be discharged into Havant Thicket Reservoir, however, contended that these requirements should be set at level that would adequately prevent any deterioration of the water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir when compared to that of the spring fed reservoir scenario, which was suggested would likely need a more stringent standard of phosphate removal to be prescribed than what the EA would accept.		Water quality modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir and compensation flows, and the results are presented and assessed in ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Modelling shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definitions of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in chemistry or physico-chemistry status of Havant Thicket Reservoir.

Table G25-15 Summary of issues raised on the theme of Portsmouth Water’s proposal and the Applicant’s response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant’s response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Portsmouth Water	PWP201	Portsmouth Water stated that it is constructing a new reservoir to protect Hampshire’s renowned chalk streams - the River Test and the River Itchen - by establishing a sustainable water source. Located adjacent to Havant Thicket near Rowlands Castle, Leigh Park, and Staunton Country Park, the new reservoir aims to preserve rare river habitats while also providing green leisure spaces for local communities. Portsmouth Water stated that this initiative marks the first new reservoir in southeastern England since the 1970s and is being developed in collaboration with the Applicant. Portsmouth Water stated that recent developments included the approval of key planning applications and the commencement of main construction work. Additionally, a pipeline linking Havant Thicket Reservoir to Bedhampton Springs and the Pumping Station was in the advanced planning stages, with a decision anticipated in April 2025. Portsmouth Water expressed that the pipeline features	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. As set out in section 10 of the Statement of Engagement (Document reference 5.9, DCO Volume 5), the Project has been developed in partnership with Portsmouth Water to provide a new strategic water resource for the region, enabling the already consented Havant Thicket Reservoir to provide a further 90 million litres of water per day in order to maintain customer supplies and protect Hampshire’s chalk streams. Collaboration between the Applicant and Portsmouth Water is ongoing to manage the commercial, operational and delivery interfaces between the Project and Havant Thicket Reservoir. Following the approval in 2025 of Portsmouth Water’s application for two new pipelines between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir, the Applicant’s backup option for pipelines between the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) site and Havant Thicket Reservoir was not progressed any further. Therefore, no works are proposed between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir as part of the Project. The

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		innovative construction techniques, and a dual-pipeline system designed to increase resilience, allowing Portsmouth Water to pump spring water to Havant Thicket Reservoir and draw it out as needed, ensuring continuous operation even during maintenance.		Applicant's DCO application will seek to authorise the use of Portsmouth Water's Pipelines to transfer recycled water between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir. Further information on the removal of the backup option is contained in section 5 of the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5).
Portsmouth Water	PWP202	Portsmouth Water highlighted that the pipelines could be potentially used by the Applicant in the future if it received development consent for the Project. Portsmouth Water expressed that a combined approach would mean that residents would avoid additional disruption from installing a new pipeline between Bedhampton and Havant Thicket Reservoir. It would also have reduced environmental impact, with estimates suggesting significant cost savings for water customers compared to future separate infrastructure. Portsmouth Water further noted that the proposed tunnel alignment through the Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) had been scaled down, likely avoiding direct contact with the underground reservoirs. This localised adjustment was welcomed.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Project has been developed in collaboration with Portsmouth Water, and engagement is ongoing to manage the commercial, operational and delivery interfaces between the Project and Havant Thicket Reservoir. Following the approval in 2025 of Portsmouth Water's planning application for two new pipelines between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir, the Applicant's backup option for pipelines between the WRP site and Havant Thicket Reservoir was not progressed any further. Therefore, no works are proposed between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir as part of the Project. The Applicant's DCO application will seek to authorise the use of Portsmouth Water's Pipelines to transfer recycled water between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir. Further information on the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		However, Portsmouth Water emphasised the continued need for suitable protection of its assets during the construction and operation of this pipeline section.		removal of the backup option is contained in section 5 of the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5). Any underground assets will be taken into account during the detailed design carried out by the contractor post consent, this will include any underground assets at the Farlington WTW. Further consultation will take place during the detail design to ensure suitable protection is in place during the construction and operation of the pipeline.
Portsmouth Water	PWP203	Portsmouth Water stated that Farlington WTW was one of its most strategic sites and was also subject to a number of strategically significant planned operational developments. Portsmouth Water emphasised that it was crucial that the construction and operation of these projects were not compromised by the Project and that ongoing discussions would be required with the Applicant to ensure any interfaces would be avoided or suitably mitigated. Portsmouth Water confirmed that assurances would be sought through the DCO process on these matters.	N	Collaboration between the Applicant and Portsmouth Water has taken place throughout the development of the Project and is ongoing to manage the commercial, operational and delivery interfaces between the Project and Havant Thicket Reservoir. The Applicant has sought to avoid and minimise any impacts on Portsmouth Water's operational assets, and construction timelines for both projects confirm no expected conflicts. Collaboration will continue throughout the detailed design stage to avoid any conflicts in construction activities. The Development Consent Order (DCO) (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3) will include protective

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Portsmouth Water expressed that it had not accounted for the potential use of the pipelines by the Applicant, which would depend on the Applicant obtaining any necessary consents in the future. They also stated that their support for the Project was contingent upon reaching a satisfactory agreement on the operational control arrangements for Havant Thicket Reservoir. Portsmouth Water emphasised that critical matters included water quality, reservoir safety, and maintaining sufficient control over Havant Thicket Reservoir. Portsmouth Water welcomed productive discussions on these issues before submitting the application. Additionally, Portsmouth Water noted that discussions with the Applicant to progress the commercial arrangements for the Project began in July 2023 and were nearing resolution.		provisions to safeguard statutory undertaker's assets and provide for further engagement during the detailed design and construction phase. The Project has been developed in consultation with Portsmouth Water, and engagement is ongoing. The DCO application for the Project seeks consent to utilise Portsmouth Water's pipelines between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir, which were approved in 2025 for the transfer of source (spring) water only.
The Environment Agency (EA)	PWP204	The EA reiterated the sentiments written in the Environmental Water Quality Report and echoed its support and the continued collaboration between the Applicant and Portsmouth Water to consider the impact these works would have on the future ecological condition of the catchment. The	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out an assessment of the impacts of the Project on Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream waterbodies. This builds on water quality modelling jointly commissioned by the Applicant and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		EA understood that these findings would be presented in the ES.		Portsmouth Water, that was presented at the Spring 2025 Consultation. The water quality modelling shows that following the addition of recycled water, the water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the Water Environment Regulations. Storing recycled water would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	PWP205	The respondent expressed their understanding that Portsmouth Water, as part of the Project, wanted to build a pumping station meters away from residential houses at the Farlington site. The respondent was concerned about the noise and light pollution that this would result in, and the negative effect it would have on those closest to it.	N	The proposals referred to relate to works being carried out by Portsmouth Water and do not form part of the Project, therefore the Applicant is unable to comment.
Wider Community	PWP206	The respondent objected to the Applicant proposing to use the already agreed Portsmouth Water pipelines due to the reported risk of polluting the stream water with untreated, or poorly treated sewage.	N	Portsmouth Water's pipelines between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir would be used by the Project for the transfer of purified recycled water to Havant Thicket Reservoir, not untreated sewage.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Water produced by the WRP will be subject to rigorous regulatory oversight, including comprehensive risk assessment, advanced multi-barrier treatment processes, and continuous monitoring to ensure compliance with the Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations 2016. It will not be possible for untreated sewage to bypass the normal waste treatment process at Budds Farm WTW and enter into the pipelines proposed for the Project. Extensive water quality assessments undertaken as part of Project demonstrate that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water courses will not be impacted by the Project. Water quality modelling results for Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream watercourses are presented in the ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	PWP207	Respondents raised concerns over the safety, security, and risk of contamination at the Havant Thicket Reservoir, and suggested that CCTV would be appropriate to support surveillance for safety reasons.		Portsmouth Water is responsible for constructing Havant Thicket Reservoir and will be responsible for its operation, management and safety, including installation of any relevant security measures, such as

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		A further respondent raised concerns that members of the public may attempt to swim in Havant Thicket Reservoir. Respondents sought reassurance that security measures would be in place.		CCTV, in accordance with regulatory requirements and guidance. To address health and safety risks, CCTV measures will be designed to protect the operational areas of the site, and physical deterrents and clear signage will be employed to discourage unsafe and prohibited activities.

Table G25-16 Summary of issues raised on the theme of construction impacts and effects and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
National Highways (NH)	CIE201	NH stated that it anticipated the development of construction methodology statements for proposals at this site adjacent to the A27.	N	The Applicant is continuing engagement with NH, as appropriate, as the project progresses. The detail of the construction methodology, which would be in accordance with the guidance set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), will be developed by the contractor during the detail design phase. The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) has been shared in draft with NH for comment.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
NH	CIE202	NH advised that geotechnical risk assessments in accordance with CD622 were carried out to inform options/locations for routing of the pipeline/tunnelling where it would pass under any part of the Strategic Road Network. It was stated that geotechnical certification from NH would be required to facilitate this and therefore recommended early engagement with geotechnical specialists at NH.	N	On-going engagement regarding the approval process is continuing to align NH procedures including CD622 with DCO requirements. See Outline Foundation Works Risk Assessment (Document reference 7.4, DCO Volume 7) Engagement has been undertaken with the Local Highway Authorities and NH regarding the locations of trenchless crossings of highway assets and provides summary of the process of following NH standards regarding addressing geotechnical risks within CD622 and technical approval of highway structures (CG300).
NH	CIE203	NH stated that due to the size of construction at some sections beneath the A27, that there was a requirement to gain structural approval in accordance with CG300. They stated that they remained engaged with the site promoter to develop the 'Trenchless Crossings Technical Note' which set out the intended approach to gain the required technical approvals.	N	The Applicant continues to engage with NH on the development of the Project including the development of the 'Trenchless Crossing Technical Note', which will summarise the approach in complying with CDD622 and GC300.
Royal Mail	CIE204	Royal mail expressed that notwithstanding the measures contained in the Draft Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Outline Construction Environmental Management	N	The Applicant has undertaken significant liaison with the local highways authorities to minimise impacts on the local traffic network, please see ES Appendix 18.1 Transport Assessment, Volume II (Document reference

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Plan, that the construction works for the Project would be of a scale, nature, and duration that has the potential to impact Royal Mail's road-based distribution and delivery services.		6.2, DCO Volume 6) for further details. A Traffic Management Strategy (Document Reference 7.3, DCO Volume 7) and Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan, (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) have also been submitted as part of the DCO application. These Plans outline the need for a detailed communication strategy to be developed post-DCO consent for works planned in the public highway, which would be secured through the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). This communication strategy would seek to reduce potential impacts on Royal Mail's operations and operation of the network generally.
Wickham and Knowle Parish Council	CIE205	Wickham and Knowle Parish Council expressed concern regarding the proposed construction work, including noise, vibration, dust, dirt, emissions and lighting which would impact the community, as some housing developments were within meters of the work. The Council provided a plan to support its comments.		The environmental impact of the construction works has been considered throughout the development of the Project design to avoid and reduce impacts in the first instance. Best practice construction measures would be employed throughout the constructions areas to reduce the risks of any impacts, see the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). Community impacts from construction activities including noise, vibration, dust, dirt,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				emissions and lighting, are summarised in ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET)	CIE206	NGET provided the following information regarding their overhead lines (OLH): 4YE 400KV OHL Batley Wood – Lovedean Fawley – Lovedean 4CY 400kV OHL Lovedean – Mannington – Nursling Lovedean – Nursling NGET also enclosed a plan showing the location of NGET's apparatus in the scoping area. NGET expressed its willingness to provide further information if needed. NGET added that drilling or excavation works should not be undertaken if it had the potential to disturb or adversely affect the foundations or "pillars of support" of any existing tower. These foundations always extend beyond the base area of the existing tower and foundation ("pillar of	N	In accordance with NGET Technical Guidance Note 287, if works are proposed within 30m of a tower foundation then NGET would be consulted to ensure the proposed works would not affect the stability of the pylon. All works in the vicinity of the overhead lines will be undertaken in accordance with ENA TS43:8, HSE GS6, HSE HSG47 and any NGET specific guidelines.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		support”) drawings can be obtained by contacting NGET.		
NGET	CIE207	NGET stated that statutory electrical safety clearances must be maintained at all times and that any proposed buildings must not be closer than 5.3m to the lowest conductor. In addition, they noted that Nation Grid recommended that no permanent structures are built directly beneath overhead lines, as is set out in EN 43-8 Technical Specification for overhead line clearances Issue 3 (2004). NGET also stated that plant machinery, equipment, buildings or scaffolding should not encroach within 5.3m of any of its high voltage conductors when those conductors were under their worst conditions of maximum sag and swing, and overhead line profile drawings should have been obtained.	N	In accordance with NGET guidance Technical Guidance Note 287 if works are proposed within 30m of a tower foundation then NGET would be consulted to ensure the proposed works would not affect the stability of the pylon. All works in the vicinity of the overhead lines will be undertaken in accordance with ENA TS43:8, HSE GS6, HSE HSG47 and any NGET specific guidelines.
NGET	CIE208	NGET expressed the view that if any changes in ground levels were proposed either beneath or in close proximity to their existing overhead lines, then that would serve to reduce the safety clearances for such overhead lines. They added that safe	N	All works in the vicinity of the overhead lines would be undertaken in accordance with ENA TS43:8, HSE GS6, HSE HSG47 and any NGET specific guidelines.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		clearances for existing overhead lines must be maintained in all circumstances.		
NGET	CIE209	NGET stated that its high voltage underground cables are protected by a Deed of Grant, Easement, Wayleave Agreement or the provisions of the New Roads and Street Works Act. It was stated that these provisions provide them with the full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect their assets. It also added no permanent/temporary structures are to be built over its cables or within the easement strip and that any such proposals should be discussed with National Grid.	N	The Applicant would ensure that the deed of Grant, Easement and Wayleave Agreements are not compromised during the works and that NGET still have full rights of access to its assets. If there are instances where this may be temporarily affected due to construction activities, these would be advised and agreed in advance with NGET.
NGET	CIE210	NGET expressed that ground levels above its cables must not be altered in any way, and that any alterations would alter the rating of the circuit and could compromise the reliability, efficiency, and safety of its electricity network. National Grid requested that the Applicant consults National Grid on any changes in both level and construction proposed.	N	The Applicant would engage with NGET to seek the necessary approvals if there would be changes to the existing ground levels above its cables, or if the proposed method of construction is changed. All works in the vicinity of the cables should be undertaken in accordance with HSE HSG47 and NGET specific guidelines.
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
PIL	CIE211	The respondent confirmed that concerns over the potential impacts from construction on Wickham Golf Club's operations remain.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The draft Order Limits have been kept wider across the Wickham Golf Club at this stage to allow for flexibility and ongoing engagement to ensure that the detailed design can be developed once the contractor is appointed to minimise disturbance to the Golf Club's operations. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the current status of negotiations of voluntary land agreements with affected landowners.
PILs	CIE212	The respondent expressed a need for clarification regarding how the land at Sciviers Lane Farm would be drained post works, as a result of the soil being disturbed due to open cut works. A further respondent raised concerns about the risk to the geotechnical integrity of the site at Little Park Farm, as construction access could weaken the soil structure or result in contamination. The respondent was concerned that this could delay future farming and income and could require abnormal foundations, resulting in increased development costs.	N	As per the Flood Risk Assessment (ES Appendix 19.1 Flood Risk Assessment, Volume 11 (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)), the detailed design would include the drainage requirements and what needs to be put in place to prevent a deterioration of the current arrangement. The importance of soil management and reinstatement is reflected in the Outline Soil Resource Management Plan (Outline SRMP) that is appended to the Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The Contractor, once appointed, would prepare and adhere to the detailed SRMP(s) in

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		The respondent requested pre-construction and post-construction surveys be undertaken as well as the request to ensure appropriate provisions are put in place to indemnify the landowners against any potential adverse ground conditions arising from the proposed works.		accordance with the Outline SRMP (appended to the Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7)). The Outline SRMP (appended to the Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7)) sets out the overall approach to managing soil resources affected by the Project and describes the measures and principles required to reduce potentially harmful impacts on soils, including: ▪ Relevant policy and guidance, especially the Department for Environmental Management Plan (Defra) Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites and the Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils. ▪ Description of soils on site. ▪ Characterisation of soils according to resilience to structural damage. ▪ Soil handling methods – timing of soil stripping and stockpiling according to soil type and moisture conditions; management of stockpiles; reinstatement of soils.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				- Monitoring procedures during and following construction. - Pre and post construction soil surveys would be carried out by competent soil specialists Sufficient room has been allowed for in the working width to segregate the various soil types/strata and good practice soil handling and storage procedures would be implemented on site to prevent mixing of soils. See Construction Environment Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) for further details. In combination with the Contractor adhering to the detailed SRMP(s) in accordance with the Outline SRMP (appended to the Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7)), those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				amount of land necessary to deliver the Project within the draft Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant would only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the Project. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted.
PILs	CIE213	Respondents raised concerns regarding the proposed working corridor of 40m/order limits and noted that the scale was too great. Respondents said that the Applicant had not provided any justification that the proposed working width of 40m was reasonably necessary or proportionate. Respondents suggested that the working width should be 18m wide and that if more area was needed, there should have been	N	The working width has been determined considering the size of the pipeline, the trench and the space needed to store and separate material so it can be reinstated properly. Additionally, sufficient space to accommodate construction vehicles and plant is required. If the working width was reduced, construction works may take longer as a result of constraining the space available for construction.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		an agreement with landowners outside of the Development Consent Order (DCO).		The maximum working width for trenched open-cut construction of the Pipeline would be 40m, secured through the Outline Construction Environment Management (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). This would provide space for a haul road, construction working areas, storage areas, pipeline trench and soil storage areas. When intersecting sensitive constraints such as vegetation and roads, a reduced working width (RWW) of 20m would be utilised as secured by the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). Where a reduced working width is used, there would be no space available to store excavated material. Therefore, the working width either side of the length that is reduced may need to be widened up to 50m. Further information, including a cross section of the 40m construction working width, is provided section 3.5 of ES Chapter 3 Description of Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
PILs	CIE214	Respondents requested the construction details of the proposed access and the ongoing access/haul road to the pumping station G proposed to the southeast of	N	The detailed design, including construction details, would be carried out in accordance with the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Titchfield Lane. The respondents asked for the construction details to include drawings, drainage, visibility splays and kerb lines. The respondents also expressed a desire for the Applicant to work with landowners prior to agreeing the exact access location. The respondents expressed the desire for the new access to be retained as a permanent feature upon completion of the works – thus mitigating the impact of the construction.		DCO Volume 7) and delivered by the Contractor, once appointed. In addition, the location of the site entrance into the site have has been discussed with Hampshire County Council (HCC) and this has informed the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plant (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7). The traffic flows into the site have been assessed within the ES Appendix 18.1 Transport Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The Applicant is continuing engagement with the respondents and landowner, as appropriate, as the Project progresses.
PIL	CIE215	The respondent expressed concerns regarding the reported lack of input they had in where the proposed pipeline crosses the River Itchen near Brambridge Park but trusted that the Applicant would ensure the crossing would not disturb the aquifers. The respondent stated that if this was not the case, the damage to the aquifers would be irreversible.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The location of the crossing point has been selected to minimise any impact to the Source Protection Zone. ES Chapter 19, Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out the assessment of potential effects on aquifers in this area, and concludes there would be no significant effect during construction or operation of the Project.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
PILs	CIE216	The respondents were concerned about the nature of the open corridor works impacting the security at their properties, including the concern around contractors potentially straying onto private land or surrounding properties. The respondents also raised concerns regarding the need they have for 24/7 access to different aspects of their property and how this was affected by the proposal. They sought clarification regarding how the Applicant would ensure that 24/7 access would be possible. The respondent noted concerns about accessing their house due to the construction that would take place and referenced Design Refinement 1, Design Refinement 2, and Design Refinement 3 as the basis for their concern.	N	Under the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015 the contractor, once appointed, must ensure the security of all work areas and its maintenance, this would include prevention of access to hazardous areas or equipment. Demarcation would restrict any activities to within the working areas. Site inductions and sites rules would dictate where the contractors can access. Any access points used or created during the works would be managed by the contractor, once appointed, with measures that could include gatemen, locked security gates, CCTV etc. Any access roads severed by the pipeline route would have crossing points installed to maintain access until the full reinstatement is complete. As detailed in the Framework Traffic Management Strategy (Document Reference 7.3, DCO Volume 7), access to properties would be retained during the construction period.
PILs	CIE217	The respondents suggested that the Applicant dig across the bank at an angle which would reduce sand run off, saving both the Applicant and the landowner money. Respondents also raised the	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The detail design would optimise the route to best suit the topography and geology of the land.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		suggestion that all items used during the pipeline construction must be removed and that any land drains damaged must be re-instated to maintain continuity of drainage across the backfilled trench/works. The respondents stated that they must be permitted to witness compliance with the above.		Reinstatement would include clearing of all temporary materials and restoring the land back to its original condition. Land drains would be surveyed prior to excavation. Any drains that need to be severed would be restored on completion of the pipe laying. The Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) sets out how the Project would avoid, reduce and mitigate effects on the environment and surrounding area during construction and the appended Outline Soil Resource Management Plan (SRMP) confirms that an Agricultural Liaison Officer would be appointed by the Contractor. Once appointed, they would be the primary contact for ongoing engagement with landowners, their agents and occupiers of the land about practical agricultural matters including liaison regarding drainage requirements.
PIL	CIE218	The respondent stated that during backfill, each soil type/strata type must be backfilled to match the ground soil type/strata in the ground, and that	N	Sufficient room has been allowed for in the working width to segregate the various soil types/strata. Good practice soil handling and storage procedures would be implemented on site to prevent mixing of soils. For further details please see the Outline Soil Resource

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		backfilled soil must be compacted to minimise settling. A further respondent noted that the avoidance of trees should be adduced for the change in crossing point because all the boring machines would dig tunnels well under the depth of the deepest root-balls of established trees. It was noted that the original curved proposed pipeline route stopped short and curved round before reaching Otterbourne Park Wood. Thus, the respondent stated that the potential damage to trees should not have been a point of concern.		Management Plan (SRMP) appended to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). Trenchless construction is proposed for the crossing of the River Itchen to avoid direct impacts to the watercourse and associated habitats. This therefore avoids impacts to trees. The design of the Project also avoids direct impacts to Otterbourne Park Wood which is designated as ancient woodland.
PIL	CIE219	The respondent noted that there were several services including water, electricity, gas and sewers that were running under/along the track. Care must be taken to avoid damage, and any damage must be promptly rectified.	N	During the detailed design and prior to any excavations taking place a full utility survey would be carried out by the contractor, once appointed, to locate any service in the vicinity of the pipeline route. For further details see the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). Engagement with the Statutory Undertakers is ongoing to seek acceptance in principle of the works and mitigations to its assets. Protective Provisions are being sought with each affected Statutory

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Undertaker which define protection measures to be provided.
PIL	CIE220	The respondent acknowledged rationale provided by the Applicant that a straight pipeline would be much cheaper, whereas the curved route required a 3.5m thermal boring machine which needed 24h manning. It was noted that the straight route required a pipe-jack boring machine and produced less earth of which to be disposed.	N	The Applicant has acknowledged this comment.
PIL	CIE221	The respondent stated that land affected is grazed by their brood mares and foals, which would not be considered safe adjacent to the working machinery. The respondent clarified that they were easily spooked and could get injured. The respondent noted that carriage horses and ponies were bred on the land with an expectation of around 7 foals a year.	N	The control measures to prevent unauthorised access to construction sites identified in the Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) would ensure that horses are kept a sufficient distance from the works to minimise the risk that they are scared by noise from the works. The Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) also identifies a range of mitigation measures that would be used to minimise construction noise emissions and effects on equestrian facilities. The assessment of noise impacts is reported in ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				DCO Volume 6) and effects are predicted to be not significant. The Outline Soil Resource Management Plan (SRMP) appended to the Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) also confirms that an Agricultural Liaison Officer would be appointed by the Contractor. Once appointed, they would be the primary contact for ongoing engagement with landowners, their agents and occupiers of the land about practical agricultural matters. The Applicant continues to engage with landowners and discuss their individual circumstances further. Following the statutory consultations, the Applicant invited landowners who raised feedback to meet and discuss their comments further, to better understand possible impacts. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiation Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the current status of negotiations of voluntary land agreements with affected landowners

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	CIE222	The respondent questioned how the proposed pipeline would be able to cross the Meon River valley and area of SNI without causing any environmental or operational disruptions.	N	The River Meon would be crossed using a trenchless technique which would pass at a suitable depth (minimum 2.5m cover) under the river and beyond. No construction or operational works would take place within the river or the area of Site of National Interest.
Wider Community	CIE223	A respondent requested more information regarding the plans for control, management and monitoring during the construction stages and what can be expected once the proposed pipeline is operational. A further respondent requested clarification on how the Project would affect them as they live nearby.	N	The Applicant has undertaken multiple stages of pre-application consultation which included four statutory consultation stages (Summer 2024 Consultation, Spring 2025 Consultation, Autumn 2025 Consultation and Spring 2026 Consultations) as well as consultation on the Applicant's emerging WRMP24 and its development. Consultation feedback has been considered throughout the development of the Project, and the Applicant has sought to communicate how impacts of the Project could impact communities through multiple rounds of public consultation and the consultation on 25 design refinements at Spring 2025 Consultation. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) provides guidelines for the Contractor, once appointed, to follow during construction.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	CIE224	The respondents raised concerns regarding the impact of the construction shaft, tunnel and pipeline construction on groundwater in the Bedhampton area, which is close to the springs used to supply Portsmouth Water customers. Another concern was that no shafts were shown between Mill Lane and the playing fields as well as the possible oversight of there not being a shaft on the borehole sites on Bidbury Mead.	N	The route into the Bedhampton Springs site has been developed to ensure there is no impact to the Source Protection Zone around the Bedhampton area. Portsmouth Water and the Environment Agency (EA) have been engaged closely in this aspect of project development, including specifically how the pipeline would cross the site at Bedhampton Springs. Following the approval in 2025 of Portsmouth Water's pipelines between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir, the Applicant did not continue to progress the proposal for direct pipelines between the WRP and Havant Thicket Reservoir. Instead, the Applicant is proposing to develop pipelines between the WRP and Bedhampton Springs, and connect into Portsmouth Water's pipelines. Therefore, no works are proposed at Bidbury Mead.
Wider Community	CIE225	The respondent suggested that the section of pipeline through the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area must be tunnelled throughout, and the spoil extracted from outside these limits to avoid volumes of heavy vehicles that would pass through the area.	N	Until the detailed design has been completed by the Contractor (once appointed), the actual construction technique is not confirmed. ES Chapter 3 Description of Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out the process the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Applicant has taken to refine the pipeline route. The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) includes management measures to minimise the impact of construction traffic on the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area, including restrictions on the access routes available to Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs). The Contractor, once appointed, must act in accordance with these restrictions.
Wider Community	CIE226	The respondent requested clarification regarding what problems were anticipated along the overall construction programme and requested if there was a 'backup plan' in place for any potential issues which could arise such as spillages, discharges, contamination of water, or a shortage of building materials.	N	A contractor would be appointed to deliver and operate the Project and would be responsible for managing any risks associated with the construction stage. The development of the Project for the DCO application has ensured that any identified impacts have been avoided or reduced, and where necessary mitigated, as far as reasonably practicable. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) provides guidelines for the Contractor, once appointed, to follow during construction to limit environmental impacts.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	CIE227	The respondent raised concerns regarding the settlement of land which was dismissed as not relevant. It was noted that tunnelling was likely to cause a degree of settlement under their buildings and garden. It was also noted that although there had been some operational changes that had been made to tunnelling, they added that there are works intended in riparian habitat.	N	The detailed design of all the tunnel sections would include consideration of settlement, and the design would be carried out to limit this to negligible levels. Minimum tunnel depths have been assigned in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). See also the Outline Foundation Works Risk Assessment (Document reference 7.4, DCO Volume 7). Mitigation measures for settlement are described in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7).

Table G25-17 Summary of issues raised on the theme of construction compound location the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Portsmouth City Council (PCC)	CCL201	PCC, in reference to Construction Compound E2 North of Portsdown Hill (B2177) and west of New Down Lane, stated that it was possible to circumnavigate the western field, and the uncultivated margin served as a wildlife corridor. This area was part of the network	N	Further engagement with PCC was undertaken on this matter which has confirmed that construction compound E-2 avoids the uncultivated field margin and footpaths. As per design principle BPT/IPS-E_15, there are proposals to create chalk grassland habitat within EMEA-E-2 which is

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		of paths on the north side of the hill. The walkways were separated from the current agricultural field by a stock fence. As such, the scheme aimed to ensure that the walkways would be retained, fenced, and publicly accessible. The Council further stated that the proposed chalk grass habitat enhancement in the field to the west was intended to be implemented on the east side of New Down Lane, as this was unclear in the consultation document. With regard to the proposed EMEA for chalk grassland the Council stated that any increase in the extent of chalk grassland on Portsdown was to be encouraged. The hill had historically been open grassland, but much had been lost to recreation, agriculture, development, etc. Restoring these fields to chalk grassland was expected to improve the resilience of the nearby SSSI by supporting larger populations of characteristic species and aligned well with the objectives of any Local Nature Recovery Strategy. It was recognised that establishing chalk grassland would take years of suitable management, such as grazing combined		to the west of New Down Lane to support the Portsdown SSSI to the south. The specification for the proposed chalk grassland enhancements is set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7), and the commitment to provide this is set out in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) and secured by the DCO (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		with cut and clear mowing. The suggestion that suitable seeds could be obtained from a list was considered insufficient; instead, any seeds or seed-rich material should have originated from adjacent areas of the hill. Additionally, soil fertility might have been too high for successful establishment without fertility reduction measures.		
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	CCL202	The respondent noted that Construction Compound K-2 is proposed to be on a steep wet bank which is considered unsuitable for a compound. The respondent also noted that there is a 10m fall over 100m in length and that this land was not suitable due to the compound slipping down the hill. The respondent suggested the other sites should have been considered.	N	The suitability of each compound site has been reviewed in consultation with technical specialists, and mitigation measures will be incorporated where necessary to ensure safe and stable construction. The location of construction compound K-2 was reviewed considering the issue raised, and it was confirmed that this location remained suitable for the construction compound. The initial site selection for the construction compounds was informed by environmental and technical reviews. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out how construction compounds have been sited and refined considering consultation feedback.
PIL	CCL203	The respondent expressed disappointment that the proposed change to construction	Y	Following evaluation, the design of construction compound L-1 was amended in

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		compound L-1 was on their property. It was explained that the irregular shape made the rest of the land 'unfarmable'. The respondent had previously suggested relocation of the compound to the northeast of the land, during the Summer 2024 Consultation but the respondent reported that this was 'ignored'.		response to this feedback and considered against environmental and technical factors. This resulted in moving elements of the construction compound further south and east and retaining additional land for the landowner's use during the construction phase. Further information is reported in section 7.11 of the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5).
PIL	CCL204	The respondent stated that construction compounds E-4b and E-4a were significant and intrusive. It was further noted that a hedge line had recently been gapped up beside the bypass, and the hedge line formed part of the ecosystem and thus should not be disturbed. In addition, the respondent objected to the size and location of compound sites E-6b and E-6a.	N	As per preliminary design principle PDP_1 (see the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5)), the Applicant has taken the approach to minimise land take, whilst ensuring sufficient space and access for efficient construction and operation, through route and site selection and optimising site layouts. It should be noted that only two of the four construction compounds mentioned (either E-4a or E-4b and either E-6a or E-6b) would be required to support construction of the Pipeline between the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) site and Otterbourne Water Supply Works (WSW), as set out in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3 Description of Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The Scheme

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5), section 5.10, sets out the process undertaken to identify and assess compound locations, including the consideration of topography, ground conditions, and existing land uses. The suitability of each compound site has been reviewed in consultation with technical specialists, and mitigation measures will be incorporated where necessary to ensure safe and stable construction. Further, Construction of the Project will be managed by an Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), which sets out the measures that will be implemented to avoid and reduce environmental impacts, including to vegetation.
PIL	CCL205	The respondent noted that the proposed pipeline route would run close to Offwell Farm which was let to a third party. In addition, the size and location of construction compound E-5 was not acceptable due to its close proximity to the aforementioned. It was also noted that the proposed pipeline route included an area which was	N	As per preliminary Design Principle PDP_1 (see the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5)), the Applicant has taken the approach to minimise land take, whilst ensuring sufficient space and access for efficient construction and operation, through route and site selection and optimising site layouts. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5), section 5.10,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		being utilised by the shoot on the Estate to the west of Crooked Walk Lane. The respondent suggested that the proposed pipeline route should be south of what is currently proposed.		sets out the process undertaken to identify and assess compound locations, including the consideration of topography, ground conditions, and existing land uses. The suitability of each compound site has been reviewed in consultation with technical specialists, and mitigation measures would be incorporated where necessary to ensure safe and stable construction. Construction of the Project would be managed by an Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), which sets out the measures that would be implemented to avoid and reduce impacts which may cause disruption. Moving the pipeline further south in this location would impact the hydraulic profile of the pipeline between the WRP and Havant Thicket Reservoir, requiring additional pumping. This would also bring the pipeline closer to the Palmerstone Forts located north of Portsdown Hill Road, which could result in additional or greater historic environment effects.
PIL	CCL206	The respondent stated that the location of construction compound F3 was not acceptable as the access route would		The existing access track through Albany Farm would not be used by construction vehicles to access construction compound F-

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		traverse directly through the land, including the business park therefore potentially resulting in a disturbance to the buildings' occupiers one of which was used for childcare and therefore it is of particular concern that heavy machinery would be used. The respondent stated that if this access was used, it should be limited to small vehicles and pedestrians, and that they were opposed to anything bigger being permitted access. The respondent also noted that the proposed pipeline route would also cut off access to Whitedell Farm which included three residential properties. Reconsideration on this was requested.		3. This access road is included in the Order Limits as an option for operational vehicles to access IPS-F once a week, once constructed. Construction vehicles would access construction compound F-3 directly from Chalk Lane to the north of Albany Farm. This is controlled through the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7), the Access and Rights of Way Plans (Document reference 2.4, DCO Volume 7) and Schedule 1 of the DCO (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3). Access to Whitedell Farm would be retained throughout the construction phase. This is set out in the Traffic Management Strategy (Document reference 7.3, DCO Volume 7). The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the process undertaken to identify and assess compound locations, including the consideration of topography, ground conditions, and existing land uses. The suitability of each compound site has been reviewed in consultation with technical specialists, and mitigation measures would be

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				incorporated where necessary to ensure safe and stable construction. The Applicant will continue to engage with affected parties to understand the potential effects of construction, operation and maintenance activities, and will develop appropriate mitigation measures to reduce these impacts where reasonably practicable.
PIL	CCL207	The respondent rejected the positioning of the draft Order Limits by Chalk Lane and opposed any works which were in close proximity of the ditch, hindering the effectiveness of the ditch. The respondent also noted concern surrounding the location of compounds F1 and F2 and their close proximity to the River Wallington.		Existing drainage features that are impacted by construction works would be reinstated following the completion of works. Commitments relating to the reinstatement of existing drainage are set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). Construction compound F-1 and F-2 have been sited to reduce impacts on the River Wallington, by avoiding the riparian corridor and associated vegetation, and moving the construction compounds outside of the associated flood plain as far as practicable. In addition, the measures set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) would be followed during construction to reduce risk of flooding as well as manage the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				consequences of flooding that may affect construction compounds. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the process undertaken to identify and assess compound locations.
PIL	CCL208	The respondent expressed concerns about the effect the current proposal would have on the pitches at the Havant Rugby Club. The respondent stated that the revised plans were not detailed enough to understand the precise impact of the proposed Compound B2-2 on pitch 3. The respondent also stated that if any part of the pitch is used for the compound area, the pitch would not be usable.	N	Following the approval in 2025 of Portsmouth Water's application for two new pipelines between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir, the Applicant's backup option for pipelines between the WRP site and Havant Thicket Reservoir was not progressed any further. Therefore, no works are proposed at Havant Rugby Club. The Applicant's DCO application will seek to authorise the use of Portsmouth Water's Pipelines to transfer recycled water between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir. Further information on the removal of the backup option is contained in section 5 of the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5).
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	CCL209	The respondent sought clarification on what a construction compound was.	N	ES Chapter 3 Description of Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes a description of the construction compounds required for the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Project. There are several different types of construction compound, for example, sectional site compounds are located at intervals along the Pipelines for storage, welfare and parking and Above Ground Plant (AGP) and WRP site construction compounds are required to facilitate construction of the AGP and WRP site.

Table G25-18 Summary of issues raised on the theme of the Project legacy and benefits and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Winchester City Council (WCC), Hampshire County Council (HCC)	PLB201	WCC considered it encouraging that the Applicant planned to engage directly with Parish Councils where applicable to support public benefits through the delivery of the pipeline.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Applicant has offered briefings to Parish Councils at key stages of the Project and has had regard to feedback received. In addition, the Applicant adopted an open approach by accepting requests for briefings and meetings as made by Parish Councils. Project benefits are discussed in the Planning Statement (Document reference 5.5, DCO Volume 5).
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	PLB202	The respondent suggested that the Applicant consider opportunities for multi-sectoral use of water connected with Havant Thicket Reservoir, considering either surplus water from Havant Thicket Reservoir or water not of sufficient quality for filling Havant Thicket Reservoir that could be used in alternative sectors. The respondent suggested that the Applicant works with multi-sectoral stakeholders for drought planning, using the additional resource that was available with Havant Thicket Reservoir.	N	The water transferred by the Project from Havant Thicket Reservoir to Otterbourne Water Supply Works (WSW) is currently only planned to be used to address the water supply shortfall in the Applicant's Hampshire supply area, both to meet essential daily needs and provide much needed resilience during a drought. The Project forms a key part of the Water Resources South East (WRSE) strategy for addressing water supply challenges in the wider south east region.

Table G25-19 Summary of issues raised on the theme of consultation and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Network Rail (NR), Health and Safety Executive (HSE), South Downs National Park Authority	CON201	Respondents stated their contact details, acknowledged receipt of the consultation materials and requested to be kept up to date on the Project.	N	The Applicant has noted these comments. Engagement is ongoing, including direct correspondence from the Applicant where necessary as requested, and updates via the dedicated consultation website. The Statement of Engagement (Document reference 5.9, DCO Volume 5) sets out, and evidences, how the Applicant has undertaken

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Consultation Report Appendix G – Statutory Spring 2025 Consultation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
(SDNPA), Soberton Parish Council, Natural England (NE), UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA), National Highways (NH), Royal Mail, East Hampshire District Council (EHDC), Wiltshire Council (WC), Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC), Portsmouth Water (PW), Havant				engagement with stakeholders throughout the Project. This document also outlines the Applicant's approach to engagement with stakeholders beyond granting development consent and provides a high-level description of how engagement would continue into the construction stage of the Project. The Applicant has established a number of working groups with stakeholders and, where required, would establish additional working groups with the aim of continuing to work collaboratively with stakeholders throughout the Project lifecycle.

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Consultation Report Appendix G – Statutory Spring 2025 Consultation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Borough Council (HBC), Winchester City Council (WCC), Hampshire County Council (HCC), Environment Agency (EA), Wickham and Knowle Parish Council, Marine Management Organisation (MMO), Fareham Borough Council (FBC), National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET), Langstone				

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Consultation Report Appendix G – Statutory Spring 2025 Consultation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Harbour Board, New Forest District Council, Canal & River Trust, Portsmouth City Council (PCC)				
SDNPA, Historic England (HE), NE, EHDC, WCC, EA	CON20 2	The respondents acknowledged that supplementary Spring 2025 Consultation had consulted on the Environmental Water Quality Report and the 25 design refinements.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. Please refer to Chapter 10.2 of the Consultation Report to find more information about how the Applicant approached the Spring 2025 Consultation.
Soberton Parish Council, UKHSA, NH Royal Mail, EHDC, Wiltshire Council, EBC, HBC, NGET, New Forest	CON20 3	The respondents gave further information regarding their role and their subsequent positioning in relation to the Project. The respondents appreciated the opportunity to be involved in the consultation process and welcomed further discussions with the Applicant as well as the opportunity to discuss feedback provided.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Statement of Engagement (Document reference 5.9, DCO Volume 5) sets out, and evidences, how the Applicant has undertaken engagement with stakeholders throughout the Project. This document also outlines the Applicant's approach to engagement with stakeholders beyond granting development consent and provides a high-level description of how engagement would continue into the construction stage of the Project.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
District Council, EA				The Applicant has established a number of working groups with stakeholders and, where required, would establish additional working groups with the aim of continuing to work collaboratively with stakeholders throughout the Project lifecycle.
Langstone Harbour Board	CON204	The Langstone Harbour Board stated that they carry a range of marine and navigational responsibilities, alongside a critical duty to safeguard and conserve the harbour's environment. Langstone Harbour Board stated that they endeavour to ensure that Langstone Harbour remains a safe, vibrant and ecologically thriving space for current and future development. They stated that to do this, they actively participate in planning and development consultations that would affect the harbours ecological integrity and conservation objectives and thus had been consulted on the Applicant's Water Resource Management Plan (WRMP) for the Project in the summer of 2022 and 2024. It was noted that the 2025 response sought to reiterate concerns raised by the Board in prior consultations.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. As part of the Spring 2025 Consultation material, the Applicant produced Appendix G.3 to the Consultation Report (Information Document) provides a high-level overview on how the Applicant had regard to feedback from the Summer 2024 Consultation and how that feedback helped shape the Spring 2025 Consultation. Appendix G.25 (The Applicant's response to feedback) describes how the Applicant had regard to all feedback received on the Summer 2024 Consultation. As part of the consultation material for Summer 2024 Consultation, the Applicant produced Appendix C.16 (Summer 2022 Consultation Response to Feedback Report) which presents how the Applicant had regard to feedback received on the Summer 2022 Consultation. Responses to feedback raised in respect of consultations on the Applicant's emerging

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Langstone Harbour Board welcomed the opportunity to provide feedback on the project during the pre-application stage of the DCO. The Langstone Harbour Board also commended the Applicant for their efforts to address stakeholder feedback from the non-statutory Summer 2022 Consultation and statutory Summer 2024 Consultation, particularly regarding updated water quality information.		WRMP24 can be found in the Applicant's Statement of Response to each consultation, available on its WRMP web pages.
Portsmouth County Council (PCC)	CON205	PCC said that there had been no formal response to its request for the Councils Property and Investment Team to be included within the Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) to fund its time in connection with this Project.	N	The Applicant has engaged with PCC regarding the PPA, property costs and voluntary agreements required over PCC land. Further details regarding the status of land related negotiations are included within the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4).
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)	CON206	Various landowners and various agents representing landowners acknowledged the Spring 2025 Consultation. It was also noted that respondents expressed a desire to be kept fully up to date regarding progress of the Project. Respondents also requested confirmation that feedback had	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. All feedback received during the Spring 2025 Consultation was logged and considered as part of the ongoing development of the Project. Engagement has been ongoing, including direct correspondence with landowners and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		been received and that it would be responded to by the Applicant.		agents where necessary, and updates via the dedicated consultation website. For more information regarding how the Applicant plans to continue engagement, please refer to the Statement of Engagement (DCO reference 5.9, DCO Volume 5). Further details regarding the status of negotiations and engagement with PILs are included within the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4).
PILs	CON207	The respondents expressed dissatisfaction on how consultation material was presented and cited that the plans were poor quality, and some noted they had difficulties identifying the property boundaries. One respondent stated that the consultation material did not cater for individuals who are dyslexic nor those who have difficulties using computers. The respondents stated that the supplementary Spring 2025 Consultation was a 'box ticking exercise' and that those	N	The Applicant has noted this feedback received on the presentation of consultation plans and will continue to consider how materials can be as clear and accessible as possible in future. All consultation materials were made available on the dedicated consultation website, and printed versions of the consultation materials were available on request. The Applicant sought to ensure that information was presented in a clear and accessible format. During the consultation period, interested parties were encouraged to contact the Applicant should they require assistance, or

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		who may be directly impacted hadn't been listened to.		have questions about the consultation materials and to enable any specific access needs to be met, such as difficulty with using computers or those with dyslexia. The Spring 2025 Consultation was undertaken to share updated environmental water quality information and 25 design refinements developed in response to earlier consultation and ongoing engagement. The Applicant consulted widely, and PILs were contacted directly to discuss property boundaries raised in the feedback. The Applicant has had full regard to all feedback received during the Spring 2025 Consultation, in accordance with Section 49 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008). This feedback has informed the refinement of the Project presented as part of the DCO application.
PILs	CON208	The respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the quality of the material and others said that the information presented was potentially misleading for landowners, and that sufficient information about the Spring 2025 Consultation had not been provided to make an informed response.	N	The Applicant has noted this feedback received on the presentation of consultation plans and will continue to consider how materials can be as clear and accessible as possible in future. As laid out in Chapter 10.2 Approach to the Spring 2025 Consultation, all consultation materials were made available on the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				dedicated consultation website, and paper copies of the documents were available on request. The Applicant sought to ensure that information was presented in a clear and accessible format. The Applicant responded where possible to land and landowner enquiries through phone calls, emails, and face-to-face meetings in the course of and subsequent to the consultation period to ensure that landowners had been provided with up-to-date information to make an informed response.
Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)	CON209	A respondent stated that there was an error on the Appendix F.5 (Book of Plans), Section J, drawing 71066-SWS-XX-XX-DR-Z-08017. It was noted that there was a box included in the word Wickham in the northeast corner, however this was incorrect. It was affirmed that it is instead in the village of Waltham Chase. A request was made to correct the error.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the mapping error identified on the Appendix F.5 (Book of Plans), Section J (drawing 71066-SWS-XX-XX-DR-Z-08017) and confirms that this has been rectified in the DCO application.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	CON210	The respondents objected to the short window of consultation in relation to the amount of information provided and that those who have responded felt that they	N	As described in Section 10.2 of the Consultation Report, the Applicant consulted local authorities and South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) on the draft

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		have been ignored. The respondents stated that the questioning was too narrow given the amount of data and came across as patronising – this reduced public satisfaction. The respondents expressed that Computer Generated Images would have given more of an idea of height and effect on the environment. Finally, the respondents stated that the consultation was too broad and that prior feedback was not considered when writing this year's consultation report.		Approach to Consultation document and had regard to the feedback provided. A four-week consultation period was considered proportionate given the technical and localised nature of the updates that were being consulted upon. The Spring 2025 Consultation was undertaken specifically to share updates developed in response to earlier feedback. The Applicant sought feedback on the updated environmental water quality information and the 25 design refinements and produced a feedback form to assist respondents. The Applicant confirms that it is committed to open dialogue with stakeholders and ongoing engagement. The Applicant notes the comment about Computer Generated Images (CGI) and notes that such imagery is to provide respondents with an illustrative visualisation of proposals, therefore the Applicant has produced 2D illustrative overarching plans, zoomed in sketch plans and sections. The Applicant has produced an Indicative Environmental Masterplan which is appended to the Design Approach Document (Document reference

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				5.12, DCO Volume 5) to view illustrations produced by the Applicant.
Wider Community	CON211	A respondent queried why the Project was also consulted on in September 2024 as part of the emerging Water Resource Management Plan (WRMP24) consultation process. The respondent queried why the supplementary Spring 2025 Consultation was not consolidated within the emerging WRMP24.	N	The emerging WRMP24 is a statutory, strategic water resource planning document that assesses long-term water supply and demand and identifies a programme of options to maintain supply resilience. Consultation on the emerging WRMP24 in September 2024 related to this wider water resources strategy, not to the design or consenting of any specific scheme. The supplementary Spring 2025 Consultation was undertaken under the PA 2008 and focussed specifically on the Project as part of its development towards a DCO application. Its purpose was to seek views on updated environmental water quality information and 25 design refinements ahead of submitting a DCO application. Consultation on a Project as part of a proposed DCO application is totally separate to, and must remain separate to, consultation on a WRMP. The Applicant has ensured this is the case between its consultations on its emerging WRMP and consultation on this Project

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	CON21 2	Respondents acknowledged the opportunity to provide feedback at the supplementary Spring 2025 Consultation.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Wider Community	CON21 3	Respondents said that some of the design refinements were difficult to visualise through the website, as well as some having said that the Environmental Water Quality Report seemingly lacked detail and was considered repetitive in areas. Some respondents stated that the consultation material was technical and focused on justifying a predetermined outcome rather than seeking public input. Finally, concerns were raised about the lack of appropriate references, such as information about consultants and Reverse Osmosis (RO).	N	As laid out in Chapter 10.2 Approach to the Spring 2025 Consultation, all documents, including the Environmental Water Quality Report, which can be found in Appendix G.2 (Environmental Water Quality Report) and the 25 design refinement information sheets, were made available through the dedicated consultation website, with paper copies provided on request. The materials were prepared to provide a clear explanation of the updated information while meeting technical requirements. The Applicant will continue to consider how technical information can be presented as clearly and accessibly as possible. The Applicant's dedicated consultation website and consultation materials included contact information which included the freephone number for the wider community, and other stakeholders to seek clarification, or request further explanation, on the consultation material. Respondents could also contact the Project team to request print versions of the consultation material via the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Project email address HampshireWTWRP@southernwater.co.uk, or by requesting via the freephone. The Applicant included a reference list within Appendix G.2 (Environmental Water Quality Report). For more information about the water recycling process and reverse osmosis, please refer to Table G.25-4 Summary of issues raised on the theme of attitudes to water recycling and the Applicant's response.
Wider Community	CON214	Respondents were positive about the information presented at supplementary Spring 2025 Consultation stating it was comprehensive and clearly articulated. In addition, respondents said that detailed information with regards to water quality was key to consumer confidence and stakeholder 'buy-in' in the context of the Project.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Wider Community	CON215	Respondents raised concerns about how feedback from statutory Summer 2024 Consultation was presented. Respondents noted disparities between the reported total number of respondents and the respondent count for each of the questions. Respondents stated this was misleading.	N	The total number of respondents reflects all individuals and organisations who submitted a response, while the counts for individual questions vary because not all respondents answered every question. This can result in

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Some stated that upwards of 350 emails were 'ignored' by the Applicant, which led to inaccurate and misleading information being published. Respondents questioned why the Applicant had continued with the Project when there were reportedly negative views about it.		different totals across questions but does not indicate that any responses were excluded. All feedback received through the different mechanisms available were logged, reviewed and analysed in accordance with the methodology set out in Chapter 9 Statutory Summer 2024 Consultation of the Consultation Report. The Project has been identified through the Applicant's Water Resource Management Plan (WRMP) and options appraisal processes as a crucial part of its strategy to respond to current and future water supply challenges in its Hampshire supply area both in drought and normal conditions. Other solutions have been extensively considered but are not available at the scale needed and in the timescales required. The Applicant has therefore continued to progress the Project while having full regard to all relevant feedback, including positive, neutral and negative, in line with Section 49 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008).
Wider Community	CON216	Respondents stated that they read the consultation information with interest, and that it was presented clearly, was easy to	N	As set out in Chapter 10 of the Consultation Report, the Applicant promoted the consultation using a range of methods. This included letters to landowners (Zone A),

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		navigate but was not promoted in a way whereby it could reach the right people.		postcards to all properties within 250 m of the draft Order Limits (Zone B), posters across Zones A–C, newspaper notices, social media advertising, and updates to the dedicated consultation website. These methods were selected as a proportionate approach given the localised nature of the design refinements. The Applicant prepared Appendix G.5 (Approach to Consultation Document) which was shared with local authorities to request feedback on the Applicant's approach to Spring 2025 Consultation. The Applicant also sought feedback on its approach to consultation feedback via its Joint Officer Group on 25 February 2025. Please refer to Chapter 10 of the Consultation Report for further information about how the Applicant approached the Spring 2025 Consultation. The purpose of this document was to set out how and when the consultation would be held, the information that would be included in the consultation, who would be consulted, and the approach and tools that would be used to reach consultees and gather views. This process was undertaken in accordance

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				with the 2024 Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC).
Wider Community	CON217	Respondents stated that the promotion of the consultation and the engagement with the wider community was poor and that it was badly advertised. The respondents stated that there had been no direct communication from the Applicant to customers, suggesting that the Applicant should ensure that all customers are fully informed about the Project through information sent with their bills, whether bills are received by post or online. It was added that members of the public reportedly took more interest in sharing the consultation than the Applicant did. The respondent stated that there had been inadequate engagement with customers throughout by the Applicant as it attempts to bring the Project to fruition, regardless of residents' views on the entire Project, with huge concerns on the environmental and customer costs long term.	N	The Applicant has undertaken multiple rounds of pre-application consultation which included three statutory consultations (Summer 2024 Consultation, Spring 2025 Consultation, and Autumn 2025 Consultation) as well as consultation on the Applicant's emerging WRMP24 and its development. Consultation feedback has been considered throughout the development of the Project, and the Applicant has sought to address concerns wherever reasonably practicable. As set out in Chapter 10 of the Consultation Report, the Applicant promoted the consultation using a range of methods. This included letters to landowners (Zone A), postcards to all properties within 250 m of the draft Order Limits (Zone B), posters across Zones A–C, newspaper notices, social media advertising, and updates to the dedicated consultation website. The Applicant also made materials available online and in hard copy on request and provided a freephone number and email address for further assistance. While noting the feedback received, the Applicant

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				considers that the consultation was appropriately promoted using a wide range of channels and in accordance with the 2024 Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC). Regarding environmental concerns, the principal driver of the Project is to meet the Applicant's duty to supply water whilst protecting the environment by reducing abstractions from Hampshire's precious chalk streams. The Project was selected as the preferred solution from an extensive options appraisal process which considered a number of alternative options against a range of criteria, including environmental impact and best value. Through developing the Project, the Applicant has made significant efforts to avoid and minimise the likely impacts of the Project, taking into account consultation feedback across all pre-application consultation stages. A comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process has been undertaken to assess potential effects and identify appropriate mitigation measures. For more information about the Applicant's EIA approach and methodology, please refer to ES Chapter 5

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				EIA approach and methodology, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Table G.25-21 Summary of issues raised on the theme of project finance and cost and the Applicant's response provides comprehensive responses to various issues raised about the cost of the Project, including how the Project continues to represent the best value solution and how costs are regulated in order to protect the customer and ensure value for money.
Wider Community	CON218	The respondents stated that there had been no interactive map to bring up the relevant design refinements and shafts. It was suggested that the statutory Summer 2024 Consultation and the supplementary Spring 2025 Consultation maps should have been presented so that they could be compared side by side. The respondents also stated that there was a lack of detail within the maps and how this made it difficult to form conclusions.	N	The Applicant made all consultation plans and mapping available on the dedicated consultation website during the Spring 2025 Consultation, including an interactive map showing the location of the 25 design refinements with links to supporting documents. Please see Chapter 10 of the Consultation Report for more information. Comparison plans were also provided within each design refinement information sheet, showing the Summer 2024 Consultation design alongside the proposed refinement, to support understanding of the changes. The Applicant notes the feedback regarding the level of map detail and will continue to

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				consider how mapping can be made as clear and accessible as possible in future.
Wider Community	CON219	Respondents stated that the consultation documents left many questions unanswered and lots of non-committal terms which made it clear that the Applicant did not know what the impacts may be. In addition, respondents stated that there was not enough detail to make any proper conclusions.	N	The Spring 2025 Consultation presented updated environmental water quality information and 25 design refinements with likely significant effects reported on. A precautionary approach was therefore applied when presenting the consultation material and the impacts of the Project and it was made clear that where detailed environmental assessments were ongoing at the time of the Spring 2025 Consultation, the full assessment of effects would be reported in ES. This approach ensured that consultees were provided with sufficient information on the potential extent and nature of impacts to enable proper consideration, understanding and an informed response to the Spring 2025 Consultation. As noted in Chapter 10 of the Consultation Report, the Spring 2025 Consultation material focused on sharing emerging findings and seeking views before finalisation. The Applicant has considered all feedback received, and the full environmental

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				assessments submitted with the DCO application provide more comprehensive detail on the potential impacts of the Project.
Wider Community	CON220	A respondent suggested that there had been a lack of reassurance on the safety and cost of recycled water from wastewater and suggested that more information should have been made available during the consultation.	N	The Applicant produced a Consultation Brochure as part of the Summer 2024 Consultation which contained information about water recycling and its use around the world. This information was available online throughout the consultation stages, including at Spring 2025 Consultation. Please refer to WRA202 for a detailed account on how the Applicant conducted extensive testing through its water recycling pilot plant with experts from the University of Brighton.

Table G25-20 Summary of issues raised on the theme of the equality impact assessment and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised		Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)					
PIL	EQIA201	The respondent indicated that a relative that resided with them has Alzheimer's disease and relies on carers visiting the property multiple times daily.		N	The Applicant recognises that individuals may have differing sensitivities, circumstances and needs, and acknowledges that people may be affected in varying ways by both the construction and operation of the Project. The Applicant encourages the respondent to

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised		Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		The respondent noted that their relative benefits mentally and physically from tending the livestock on their land as this creates a positive routine, and that changes to this could cause distress. The respondent expressed concerns about how the proposed works and interactions with site operatives could adversely impact their relative's wellbeing and specifically stated safety concerns.			continue engaging with the contractors throughout the construction period to ensure that any concerns can be discussed as the works progress, in line with the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) measures detailed below. Section 12.8 of ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) identifies several areas in which access to residential properties could be temporarily affected by road or lane closures during construction of the Project. Access to residential properties would be maintained at all times, and where road closures are proposed in proximity to each other a sequential approach would be adopted to reduce impacts on journey times and reduce disruption for road users. Additional information is provided in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) submitted with the DCO application. Impacts to residents on all affected roads are deemed to be minor or negligible adverse. While some protected characteristic groups may be more sensitive to delays, these effects are not considered to be significant in

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised		Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
					the context of the EqIA Regulations. Therefore, it is not anticipated that there would be any disproportionate or differential effects for protected characteristic groups in these areas. Section 12.8 of ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) also assesses in-combination effects on amenity for residential receptors, taking into account the findings of other relevant environmental assessments, including air quality, noise, landscape and visual, and traffic and transport. There are no in-combination effects on amenity identified for residential properties during construction, operation or decommissioning of the Project. Regardless of this, the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) includes the following commitments: ▪ The Contractor's community relations personnel shall notify affected communities and other relevant stakeholders prior to the commencement of potentially disruptive construction activities, to enable those affected to plan ahead and to reduce uncertainty

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised		Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
					particularly to align with actions set out in the EqlA Action Plan (Document reference 7.13, DCO Volume 7) that forms part of the EqlA submitted with the DCO application. Communication will include information about the nature and timing of the works and how any adverse effects will be managed. ▪ The Contractor's Stakeholder and Engagement Plan shall include appropriate strategies and tools to tailor engagement to local needs, including effective communicating with diverse and less heard groups. All communication shall be in plain English and translated information shall be provided where reasonable and upon request. ▪ The Contractor's Stakeholder and Engagement Plan shall consider the specific needs of protected characteristic groups (as defined in the Equality Act 2010). It shall include consideration of further engagement with impacted residents, especially in relation to the actions set out in the EqlA Action Plan (Document reference 7.13, DCO Volume 7). A range of tools will be used to achieve

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised		Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
					this that will tailor engagement to local needs. There are also measures in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) to reduce risk, and perceptions of risk, for protected characteristic groups around site compounds.

Table G25-21 Summary of issues raised on the theme of project finance and cost and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	PFC201	The respondent suggested that the level of public investment in the Project, as well as the level of impact on residents and landowners was enormous. The respondent further stated that the environmental and landscape impact of the Project was difficult to quantify. The respondent summarised that in those circumstances, to learn that the end quality of the water was anything less than the highest quality was considered unacceptable.	N	Any large-scale solution to addressing the water supply shortfall is likely to require substantial investment, however, the Project was selected as the preferred solution from an extensive options appraisal process which considered a number of alternative options against a range of criteria, including best value. Significant efforts have been made to avoid and minimise impacts on residents, landowners and the environment arising from the Project, including ensuring that water quality will continue to meet strict regulatory

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				standards relating to both discharges into the environment and drinking water quality, designing above ground buildings to integrate within the landscape to minimise visual impacts and designing the pipeline routes to avoid and reduce potential impacts on sensitive land uses and residents. More information about the options appraisal process and Project design can be found in the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5), and more information on the landscape and water quality effects of the Project can be found in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	PFC202	The respondents stated that the current method was not the cheapest and that they think the costs outweigh the benefits of the scheme and the Applicant should have looked at small scale cheaper solutions. It was suggested that most of the funds to build Havant Thicket Reservoir and the	N	The Project was selected as the preferred solution from an extensive options appraisal process which considered a number of alternative options against a range of criteria, including carbon emissions and best value. There are currently no other suitable options

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		recycling project had been provided by the Applicant to receive Portsmouth Water's support for the scheme, and therefore a respondent considered the views of Portsmouth Water had been compromised. A further respondent noted that changes to the design, including moving the inlet position within Havant Thicket Reservoir, the operation of the bubbler (April to August) and addition of phosphate treatment to address the deterioration in water quality from effluent recycling would add additional costs to construct and operate the Water Recycling Plant. Another respondent stated that the Project is a high cost, phosphate intensive solution, which will have a high carbon impact and ongoing running costs.		that meet the scale of demand required in the timescales needed. The Applicant is working in partnership with Portsmouth Water to deliver Havant Thicket Reservoir and this Project. Havant Thicket Reservoir was identified as a crucial water supply scheme in the Applicant's WRMP19 (Water Resources Management Plan) and its purpose has always been to enable additional supplies to be provided to the Applicant's Hampshire supply area. By augmenting the storage capability of the reservoir, the Project will enable a considerably greater, more sustainable, resilient, and better value long term water supply than the reservoir alone. Portsmouth Water objectively recognises the need for water supply resilience in Hampshire whilst protecting the County's precious chalk streams. Any solution to deliver a new source of water at the scale required will have relatively high capital and operational costs compared to current abstractions direct from the environment, and likely involve water transfers, reservoirs, recycling or desalination. The Project is one of a number

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				of large-scale new water recycling schemes being brought forward through the current round of water company WRMPs, highlighting the important role this type of solution will have in addressing water shortages in England and the south-east in particular. The Applicant's initial water quality modelling and assessments showed that additional phosphorous removal would be required to maintain water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir and meet regulatory requirements. This treatment will be incorporated into the water recycling process. More information about the options appraisal process can be found in the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) and more detail on how value for money is embedded in project selection through the WRMP process can be found in the Case for the Project (Document reference 5.6, DCO Volume 5).
Wider Community	PFC203	Respondents strongly objected to water bill increases, many noting rises of around 50%, and were concerned about dividends being paid to shareholders and executives instead of reinvesting into the water	N	The Project is essential to maintain water supplies to the Applicant's customers and provide future resilience whilst protecting the environment. As with all of the Applicant's costs, funding for new water supply

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		system. There was a suggestion that costs should be regulated and Ofwat should not allow the bill increases. Confirmation was sought that the cost of the project would not be funded by the public, whilst it was also commented that the project was hugely expensive and would present on ongoing cost to customers, with impacts on bills and the Applicant's financial stability. There were conversely some acceptances of bill increases to pay for new infrastructure, especially where this was for ethical and environmentally beneficial purposes, but solutions should protect the environment and customer interests, including sewage not being dumped in the sea. There was a lack of confidence that bill increases would stop the Applicant breaking rules around sewage pollution. It was suggested the benefit of the project appears to be for profit rather than for nature or customers. Respondents stated that there had still been no robust cost to benefit assessment for the scheme and noted that increased use of bottled water should form an element of such an assessment. It was		infrastructure will be averaged across water supply customers' bills and will be subject to approval by the water industry regulator, Ofwat. As a regulated industry, the amount of return that the Applicant can make on its investment is controlled by Ofwat. Ofwat exists to protect the consumer and ensure water companies deliver value for money by controlling costs that water companies can charge customers. The Applicant is investing record amounts to improve its performance for customers and the environment and has ambitious investment plans for the future, but ultimately the regulator will determine how much future bills can increase by to pay for this investment. Future investment plans include reducing storm overflows however these are not related to the Project. The Project was selected as the best value solution through the Applicant's WRMP and options appraisal processes. The extensive options appraisal process considered a number of alternative options against a range of criteria, including impacts on customers, society, the environment and affordability. This information was made available as part of the Applicant's Gate 2 submission to RAPID in 2021 and has continued to be

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		stated that the Applicant should prioritise more sustainable and cost-effective options where environmental and financial considerations form part of the decision-making process.		reviewed to ensure the Project remains the best value solution to addressing the water supply shortfall in Hampshire. No other solutions are available that can provide the scale of water needed within the timescales required. In the UK, the Drinking Water Inspectorate has confirmed that water recycling can be delivered safely, outlining the robust regulatory requirements that water companies must demonstrate before recycled water can be put into supply. Through full advanced treatment, continuous monitoring and rigorous regulatory oversight, the public can have confidence in the safety and reliability of the water supplied. Introducing recycled water is not expected to significantly increase bottled water consumption. More information about the options appraisal process can be found in, the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5). More information about why the Project is needed and its benefits can be found in the Case for the Project (Document reference 5.6, DCO Volume 5).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	PFC204	The respondent argued that the plans for other methods were being ignored because the Applicant will gain a huge amount of money for building the infrastructure for recycled water use.	N	The Project was selected as the preferred solution from an extensive options appraisal process which considered a number of alternative options against a range of criteria, including best value. Other solutions were also extensively considered through the development of the Applicant's WRMP 2019 prior to the options appraisal process and again through its emerging WRMP24. No other solutions are available that can provide the scale of water needed within the timescales required. As a regulated industry, the amount of return that the Applicant can make on its investment is controlled by Ofwat. Ofwat exists to protect the consumer and ensure water companies deliver value for money by controlling costs that water companies can charge customers. More information about the options appraisal process can be found in, the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5).
Wider Community	PFC205	The respondents expressed the view that this Project is the most expensive option and does not represent best value for money for the customers or the environment. It was suggested that latest	N	The Project was selected as the preferred solution through the Applicant's WRMP and options appraisal processes as a crucial part of its strategy to respond to current and future water supply challenges in its Hampshire

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		changes to the design and the need for phosphate treatment would add additional costs to construction and operation, causing costs, energy and carbon impacts to spiral further.		supply area both in drought and normal conditions. The options appraisal process, which has recently been updated to reflect Project changes since it was first undertaken in 2021, considered a number of alternative options against a range of criteria, including best value, and continues to select the Project as the preferred solution. Any solution to deliver a new source of water at the scale required will have relatively high capital and operational costs compared to current direct abstractions from the environment, and the solution chosen offers better value for money than the previous desalination proposal. No other solutions are available that can provide the scale of water needed within the timescales required. The changes to the Project outlined in the Spring 2025 Consultation are to improve the Project so that impacts on local communities and the environment can be avoided and minimised. The additional phosphorous removal may marginally increase the cost, energy and carbon emissions but this necessary mitigation does not materially change the overall construction and operational costs of the Project. It also does not change the position that this Project

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				continues to represent the best value and only solution to address the water supply challenge facing Hampshire, as evidenced through the Applicant's WRMP and options appraisal processes. To find out more information about the options appraisal process, refer to the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5).
Wider Community	PFC206	The respondents suggested that money would be better spent on correcting leaks and collecting heavy rainfall and questioned if using dirty water from Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) was cost effective and could be justified. It was queried how additional costs are being taken into account in reviewing whether the Project remained a best value solution, both in terms of construction and life-time operation of the water treatment plant.	N	The Project was selected through the Applicant's WRMP and options appraisal processes as a crucial part of its strategy to respond to current and future water supply challenges in its Hampshire supply area both in drought and normal conditions. The options appraisal process considered a number of alternative options against a range of criteria, including whole life costs and best value. The performance of the Project continues to be reviewed to ensure it remains the best value solution to addressing the water supply shortfall in Hampshire, and industry regulators as part of RAPID, including Ofwat, continue to provide regulatory oversight over the development of the Project. However, this new source of water will not solve Hampshire's water resources challenge

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				alone and the Applicant is developing a range of solutions to help meet the shortfall, including reducing leakage by up to 50% by 2050, improving water efficiency, and taking more water from neighbouring companies. Relying on rainfall collection will not provide the necessary volumes of water to provide a resilient and drought-proof source of water. More information about the options appraisal process can be found in the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5).
Wider Community	PFC207	It was questioned how much it would cost to build the new Pipeline between the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) site and Otterbourne Water Supply Works (WSW), pump the water between these two places, build the new treatment works, treat and produce 1 megalitre (Ml) of sewage water compared to 1Ml of river or ground water, and borrow the money to pay for all of this.	N	Capital and operational cost estimates for the Project have been provided in the Applicant's submissions to RAPID as part of the regulatory process, which continues to support the development of the Project. A further and final submission will be made to RAPID shortly after the DCO application is submitted. The construction and operation of the Project would be competitively tendered to ensure best value can continue be derived through the delivery phase of the Project. Any solution to deliver a new source of water at the scale required will have relatively high capital and operational costs compared to current direct abstractions from the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				environment, which are becoming increasingly constrained and for which new water sources must be found. The cost of this investment to customers is controlled by the water industry regulator, Ofwat, which exists to protect the consumer and ensure water companies deliver value for money.
Wider Community	PFC208	It was questioned what the cost increase would be for customers in the future for a cubic meter of water produced from recycled sewage and suggested the Applicant needs to be very transparent about the costs associated with the project and the likely increase in cost to customers.	N	Capital and operational cost estimates for the Project have been provided in the Applicant's submissions to RAPID, which continues to support the development of the Project. A further and final submission will be made to RAPID shortly after the DCO application is submitted. As part of the Applicant's Summer 2024 Consultation, it was estimated that the cost of the Project to each of its water supply customers would be approximately an additional £2.50 a month over a 20-year period. The cost of the Project will continue to evolve as the project progresses through the consenting, procurement and delivery phases. The cost of this investment to customers is controlled by the water industry regulator, Ofwat, which exists to protect the consumer and ensure water companies deliver value for money.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	PFC209	The respondents questioned the way in which the Project would be funded, stating this was expected to favour shareholders and that the project should be abandoned due to the focus on shareholder profit. It was stated that the Applicant's priority should be protecting the environment, and there should be a focus on local citizens, swimmers and wildlife instead of redirecting funds to shareholders, who should not have a say on how water quality is managed.	N	The principal driver for this Project is to meet the Applicant's duty to supply water whilst protecting the environment by reducing over-abstraction from Hampshire's precious chalk streams. As with all of the Applicant's costs, funding for new water supply infrastructure will be averaged across water supply customers' bills and will be subject to approval by the water industry regulator, Ofwat. As a regulated industry, the amount of return that the Applicant can make on its investment is controlled by Ofwat. Ofwat exists to protect the consumer and ensure water companies deliver value for money by controlling costs that water companies can charge customers. The Drinking Water Inspectorate (DWI) regulates public water quality, ensuring water companies supply safe, clean drinking water that meets legal standards. The Environment Agency (EA) regulates water quality in respect of abstractions from and discharges into the environment.
Wider Community	PFC210	The respondent noted that the increase in their bill to pay for this wouldn't affect their supply as they are supplied by Portsmouth Water.	N	Only the Applicant's supply customers are currently expected to pay for the Project given the need for the Project to address the water supply shortfall in its Hampshire supply area.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	PFC211	The respondent expressed concern that the proposals will increase water charges further.	N	The Applicant is investing record amounts to improve its performance for customers and the environment, and this Project is part of that overall investment. As with all of the Applicant's costs, funding for new water supply infrastructure will be averaged across water supply customers' bills and will be subject to approval by the water industry regulator, Ofwat.
Wider Community	PFC212	The respondent stated that the project is a white elephant and should be rejected, and alternative solutions investigated. They argued that the Project was driven by the need to make profits for shareholders rather than providing water.	N	The principal driver for this Project is to meet the Applicant's duty to supply water whilst protecting the environment by reducing over-abstraction from Hampshire's precious chalk streams. Alternative solutions have been thoroughly investigated. The Project was selected as the preferred solution from an extensive options appraisal process which considered a number of alternative options against a range of criteria, including best value. No other solutions are available that can deliver the scale of water required in the timescales necessary. To find out more information about the options appraisal process, refer to the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	PFC213	The respondent queried why they would be paying for something which few people were in favour of, and which would have a negative impact on water quality.	N	The Project is essential to maintain water supplies to the Applicant's customers and provide future resilience whilst protecting the environment. Significant efforts have been made to avoid and minimise impacts from the Project, and the water quality assessment as part of the ES has demonstrated that the Project can be delivered without adversely affecting environmental water quality. Water sent into supply will continue to meet strict regulatory standards relating to drinking water quality as regulated by the DWI. ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides an assessment of the likely significant effects on the water environment. No likely significant residual effects are identified for construction, operation or decommissioning of the Project.

Table G25-22 Summary of issues raised on the theme of Project timescales and programme and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Winchester City Council (WCC)	TPP201	WCC raised concern regarding the timetable for any post DCO approval to undertake and report on archaeological evaluation, design appropriate archaeological mitigation works and complete these ahead of construction. WCC stated the need for early scheduling of archaeological works well ahead of any planning construction scheme to avoid conflicts and delays impacting on the DCO schedule.	N	The DCO application includes an Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Document reference 7.6, DCO Volume 7) which sets out the approach to archaeological investigation and evaluation and a broad timetable for works required by the Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), including identification of which works are required pre-construction.
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PILs	TPP202	Responses requested that working hours be limited to Monday to Friday, not Saturday and Sunday and it was suggested that consultation documents included proposals for works to proceed and be extended beyond normal working hours which was opposed. Respondents also requested commitment from the Applicant that works to, and reinstatement of their landholdings would be programmed efficiently to be kept to a	N	The standard construction working hours proposed (07:00-19:00 Monday to Friday in summer, and 07:00-17:30 in winter, with Saturdays 07:00-17:00 year round) are consistent with national guidance and are commonly applied on comparable infrastructure projects. These hours balance delivery efficiency with community protection. Any work outside these core working hours would only be made in exceptional circumstances, subject to agreement with the relevant Local Planning Authority through a

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		minimum and that requested that fines for construction programme delay be made applicable. Another respondent expressed concern that the Applicant would be unable to deliver the Project in what was considered a short delivery programme.		Section 61 consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974. The Contractor will adopt additional noise and vibration mitigation measures as to be specified in a Noise and Vibration Management Plan (to be prepared by the Contractor post-consent). The Project would be constructed over approximately a five year period, however, a detailed construction programme has not been defined at this stage and will be developed by the Contractor once appointed. ES Chapter 3 Description of Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out the outline construction programme, which has informed the environmental assessments.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	TPP203	The respondents queried what the proposed timescales for the project construction are, as well as delivery. Specific comments included questions as to what the total proposed period for construction activities at Tangier View Farm would be and for how long the site be unusable to interested parties, as well as	N	The Project would be constructed over approximately a five year period, however, a detailed construction programme has not been defined at this stage and will be developed by the Contractor once appointed. ES Chapter 3 Description of Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out the outline construction programme, which has informed the environmental assessments. The construction programme will be phased and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		how long the construction would run and impact local residents. The respondents also requested information on the phasing of the Project.		will be determined by the Contractor once appointed. Further engagement with affected parties and landowners would be undertaken ahead of construction. Based on the indicative design and initial assessment, the pipeline construction will be delivered in sections. The maximum construction period of one of these sections will be circa six months with the potential of some enabling works prior to this.
Wider Community	TPP204	The respondent raised concerns about how the Project would impact them and their home for an unspecified amount of time.	N	Please see response to TPP203.
Wider Community	TPP205	The respondent stated that construction of a shaft just south of Portsdown Hill Road was expected to take place over a lengthy period and that this required management of the Project in a way to avoid traffic disruption.	N	The Project would be constructed over approximately a five year period however, a detailed construction programme has not been defined at this stage and will be developed by the Contractor once appointed. ES Chapter 3 Description of Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out the outline construction programme, which has informed the environmental assessments. Further engagement with affected parties and landowner would be undertaken ahead of construction.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Based on the indicative design and initial assessment the pipeline construction will be delivered in sections. The maximum construction period of one off these sections will be circa six months with the potential of some enabling works prior to this. The DCO application includes a Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) which sets out the mitigation measures to reduce impacts on the highway network. This plan has been developed in consultation with HCC.

Table G25-23 Summary of issues raised on the theme of the Development Consent Order (DCO) and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Royal Mail National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET), Portsmouth	DCOP2 01	The respondents stated that their work should not be adversely impacted by any statutorily authorised project and thus recommended the Applicant seeks all reasonable steps to protect assets and	N	The design of the Project has considered existing statutory undertaker's assets and has sought to avoid these where practicable. Further consultation and engagement has been undertaken with relevant statutory undertakers throughout the development of the Project, as set out in the Statement of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
City Council (PCC)		operational interests from any adverse impacts of the Project. The respondents also stated that where their projects are in close proximity to the Applicant's Project, that further discussion should be had with the relevant bodies.		Engagement (Document reference 5.9, DCO Volume 5). The Development Consent Order (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3) will include protective provisions to safeguard statutory undertaker's assets, and provide for further engagement during the detailed design and construction phase in the event these assets are impacted.
Royal Mail	DCOP2 02	Royal Mail wished to reserve its position to submit representations to the future DCO Examination if required. It noted that all correspondence should be directed to contacts already known to the Applicant.	N	The Applicant notes Royal Mail's intention to reserve its position for the Examination and will continue directing correspondence to the established contacts.
Havant Borough Council (HBC)	DCOP2 03	The Council stated that the preliminary nature of the work presented in the consultation and the commitment to undertake further studies was acknowledged, however it was stressed by respondents that the DCO process must ensure there remains no uncertainty as to the effects of the scheme before any consent is granted.	N	Following the Spring 2025 Consultation, further studies have been undertaken to inform the Environmental Statement (ES). The ES has been prepared in accordance with the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, and the EIA approach and methodology is set out in ES Chapter 5 EIA approach and methodology, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The ES robustly assesses and reports on likely significant effects associated with the Project. The methodology of the ES has been discussed with relevant stakeholders and undertaken in line with ES Appendix 5.2 EIA

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Scoping Opinion, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Winchester City Council (WCC)	DCOP2 04	WCC raised concerns regarding the detailed submission following the DCO consent. It was acknowledged that the DCO assesses the worst case scenario and that the more detailed matters would be secured through conditions. Concerns were noted regarding the level of detail that would be contained within post-consent submissions, and whether reliance on conditions would be sufficient to adequately address the sensitivity of certain areas.	N	The Applicant has worked closely with local planning authorities and statutory environmental bodies to ensure awareness and transparency of how the Project's detailed design as set out in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) and various management plans will be developed post consent as secured by DCO requirements (see the DCO (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3)). The Applicant has engaged with WCC on the design principles set out in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5), which will control the detailed design of the Project post approval of the DCO application. The Applicant has also discussed the Project's approach to design detail at the DCO application stage.
Environment Agency (EA)	DCOP2 05	The EA agreed with the 'next steps' outlined by the Applicant within the consultation material, including the continued monthly water quality monitoring by the Applicant to support the continued	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. Regular engagement has been maintained with the EA throughout the pre-application stage, including in relation to the development, assessment and reporting of water quality modelling.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		assessment of the water quality impacts of the recycled water.		
NGET	DCOP2 06	NGET requested that it continues to be consulted on the DCO process to ensure due consideration is being given to any impact on existing and future assets. NGET stated that where the promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights or interfere with or work within close proximity to the operator's apparatus or land, they will need to ensure appropriate protection and further discussion on the impacts to their apparatus and rights. This included the operator requiring an adequate form of Protective Provisions included within the order.	N	The design of the Project has considered NGET assets and has sought to avoid these where practicable. Further consultation and engagement has been undertaken with NGET throughout the development of the Project. This is set out in the Statement of Engagement (Document reference 5.9, DCO Volume 5). The DCO (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3) includes protective provisions for the benefit of NGET, and further engagement will be undertaken through the detailed design and construction phase.
PCC	DCOP2 07	It was noted that PCC's property team had spent time consulting with the Applicant on queries and reviewing the draft DCO documentation. The respondent anticipated that, as the DCO process continued, further property time would be needed to review and comment on the draft DCO proposals/documents as well as engaging with the Applicant's		The Applicant has noted this comment. The Applicant has continued to engage on land and property matters with PCC's relevant teams leading up to DCO submission and further engagement will be undertaken during the examination period as needed.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		representatives on a possible land agreement. It was added that the Council's Property team were also likely to need to engage specialist consultant representation in any land transaction or CPO discussions.		
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PILs	DCOP2 08	Respondents strongly objected to their land being used for proposed environmental mitigation, stating that it would reduce their usable land, as well as their income. It was stated that all proposed environmental mitigation land should be offsite or by private agreement on commercial terms. The respondents firmly recommended that their land should be removed entirely from the draft Order Limits.	N	The Applicant has considered comments from landowners on the environmental mitigation and enhancement areas (EMEAs) and refined these to ensure that the proposals are proportionate to the effects of the Project and environmental mitigation has only been included where required. ES Chapter 3 Description of Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) lists all EMEAs and identifies whether mitigation or enhancements are proposed in each area. The Project is seeking consent to deliver environmental enhancements, but these will only be implemented subject to securing agreements with landowners.
PILs	DCOP2 09	Respondents cited section 122 under the Planning Act 2008 which provides that a DCO can acquire land only if that land is	N	The Applicant has noted this comment and is aware of the statutory and policy requirements relating to the compulsory

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		required for the development to which the development consent relates or is required to facilitate or is incidental to that development. The Department for Community and Local Government Guidance relates to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land was also mentioned. Respondents noted that this confirmed in paragraph 11 that the Secretary of State will need to be satisfied that the land to be acquired is no more than is reasonably required for the purpose of the development, and that the land to be taken is no more than necessary for that purpose and that it is proportionate.		acquisition of land. These have been taken into account when developing the proposals.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DCOP2 10	The respondent supported the Project conditionally on the basis that the detailed assessments and steps were undertaken to prevent pollution or environmental damage during the construction phase and beyond, before the DCO is submitted.	N	The ES has been prepared in accordance with the EIA regulations, and the EIA approach and methodology is set out in ES Chapter 5 EIA approach and methodology, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The ES robustly assesses and reports on likely significant effects associated with the Project. Avoiding and reducing environmental impacts has been embedded in the scheme development process as evidenced in the Scheme Development

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) and the Design Approach Document (Document reference 5.12, DCO Volume 5). The Project will be implemented in line with the suite of management plans produced in order to avoid and reduce environmental impacts.
Wider Community	DCOP2 11	The respondents stated that they would be taking legal action if the effects of the Project would be detrimental to the local environment or the health of local residents. The respondents stated that they elected their Council to protect their wellbeing and envisaged a 'major pollution disaster' as a result of the Project.		The ES has been prepared in accordance with the EIA regulations, and the EIA approach and methodology is set out in ES Chapter 5 EIA approach and methodology, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The ES robustly assesses and reports on likely significant effects associated with the Project, including ES Chapter 12 Major Accidents and Disasters Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Chapter 15 Socioeconomic, tourism and health, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Avoiding and reducing impacts on the environment and people has been embedded in the scheme development process as evidenced in the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) and the Design Approach Document (Document reference 5.12, DCO Volume 5). The Project will be implemented in line with the suite of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				management plans produced in order to avoid and reduce impacts on people and the environment.

Table G25-24 Summary of issues raised on the theme of interface with the Applicant's existing infrastructure and assets and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Portsmouth City Council (PCC)	ISWI20 1	PCC noted that the consultation documents had included some changes to the draft Order Limits to the route in the north of Portsmouth's environs but noted that there had been no mention of the Long Sea Outfall to the east of Portsmouth. The Council requested clarification on what is meant by 'no works to the Long Sea Outfall' and queried why this had been included within the draft Order Limits.	N	The Eastney Long Sea Outfall (LSO) is included in the Order Limits to ensure that the Applicant can use this existing infrastructure as part of the operation of the Project. No works are proposed to the Eastney LSO, the Eastney Transfer Tunnel or the Eastney Pumping Station.
Wider Community	ISWI20 2	Respondents stated their objection to the incorporation of the Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) into this Project as they stated that the Budds Farm WTW was already overloaded and was failing to provide year-round	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. This Project will not add more strain on Budds Farm WTW. Instead, it will take a proportion of the highly treated wastewater from Budds Farm WTW (which is usually pumped out to sea) and process it into purified recycled water. The Project utilises Budds Farm WTW

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		wastewater treatment. A respondent stated that the Budds Farm WTW had two outlets, one towards Eastney LSO and one towards Langstone Harbour and that when these are overwhelmed, they are understood to need to be swapped over. On the basis that storage tanks at the Budds Farm WTW were stated to fill up within hours of rainfall and untreated overspill was being released into the Langstone Harbour, the respondent requested that any overspill was to be directed towards the Eastney LSO instead as part of the Project. In addition, respondents stated that Budds Farm WTW was unreliable and spilt into the sea before, meaning it needed improvement itself before being used on any other project.		as this is one of the Applicant's largest wastewater treatment works and therefore has the greatest capacity for supplying the treated wastewater required for a Water Recycling Plant (WRP) producing approximately 60 megalitres per day (Ml/d) of recycled water. The Project is not related to any release into Langstone Harbour and only proposes to use the Eastney LSO for release of reject water. The potential impacts of the release of this reject water from the Eastney LSO has been considered in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Chapter 19 Water Environment Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Upgrades to Budds Farm WTW are being progressed by the Applicant separately to the Project.
Wider Community	ISWI203	Respondents stated their concern surrounding the Eastney LSO and the associated Eastney Transfer Tunnel related to the proposed Water Recycling Project. The respondents argued whether the discharges at Eastney LSO and associated Eastney Transfer Tunnel would accept reject water from the proposed	N	No works are proposed to the Eastney LSO, Eastney Transfer Tunnel or the Eastney Pumping Station, and therefore there would be no works in the proximity to the Milton Piece allotments. The Project seeks to release reject water from the existing Eastney LSO which discharges into the Solent approximately 5km off the coast of Eastney.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		scheme. The respondents sought clarification if the outfall would affect the allotments at Milton Piece in Portsmouth and if so, noted that this would adversely affect allotment holders and raised their objection to the applicable aspect of the Project in the absence of further information about how impacts on the allotments would be mitigated.		ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity and Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) confirms that likely significant effects are not anticipated as a result of changes in water quality from the reject water released from Eastney LSO to the Solent. Therefore, there would be no direct or indirect impact to the allotments. As set out in the Other Consents and Licences Position Statement (Document reference 5.4, DCO Volume 5), the Applicant is seeking an environmental permit for reject water from the WRP to be discharged via the Eastney LSO.

Table G25-25 Summary of issues raised on the theme of the EIA approach and methodology and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC)	EIA201	EBC suggested that the Construction Environment Management Plan be updated to include additional mitigation measures in relation to proposed changes to the Project. EBC have stated that it	Y	Updates have been made to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1. DCO Volume 7), where relevant, to reflect changes to the Project presented during the Spring 2025

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		wishes, and is able, to review an updated Construction Environment Management Plan in due course.		Consultation. Additional assessment work allowed further details to be provided on the content of a number of detailed management plans to be prepared by the Contractor, for example, Noise and Vibration Management Plan, Site Waste Management Plan and Construction Drainage Plan. These updates have been shared and discussed through the EIA Working Groups (which EBC forms part of) across relevant environmental disciplines.
EA	EIA202	The EA noted that within the Water Quality Environmental Report, it is stated that Havant Thicket Reservoir will be designated by the EA as an artificial or heavily modified lake water body under Water Environment Regulations. The EA stated that this statement was incorrect and misleading. The EA's current position is that it has confirmed that it will classify Havant Thicket Reservoir and that its guidance is being reviewed. However, the EA advised that it was not in a position to state what this classification would be.	Y	The Applicant has noted this comment. In ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environmental Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), this statement has been amended to state that Havant Thicket Reservoir has not yet been designated as a water body by the EA.
EA	EIA203	The EA requested further dialogue during the process of investigating the treatment	Y	Modelling of water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies that

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		options for phosphorous prior to submitting the DCO application. It was also suggested that the current preliminary consideration of potential environmental effects on the water environment, freshwater biodiversity and marine biodiversity was all based on an assumption that there would be adequate treatment of the increased phosphorous within the recycled water. The EA has also requested clarification on the redirection of storm overflows proposal, as it is the EA's understanding that this proposal is no longer coming forward and it may impact the assessments for the DCO application and could result in permitting implications.		would receive compensation flows has been updated to account for additional phosphorus removal measures at the WRP. The results are presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir compensatory flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). A detailed assessment of water quality impacts is provided in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The updated modelling includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP and is underpinned by assumptions based on the measured performance of the WRP pilot plant at Budds Farm. There is additional information now available online regarding the performance of water recycling technology (Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance). The updated modelling demonstrates that the addition of a HRRM would avoid the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. Water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. The HRRM is primary mitigation in the design and operation of the WRP. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. The EA has been actively engaged with the updated modelling, through the EIA Working Group. The model methodology and results have been presented to the EA and other stakeholders during TWG sessions. The Applicant is committed to reducing spills and the regulators have set clear targets. As this is a combined system, high tide combined with storm events often result in discharges from the Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO). By removing seawater infiltration through combined sealing and storm water separation the frequency and volume of CSO spills can be reduced. Based on current understanding, this intervention is

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				expected to reduce infiltration by approximately 300 l/s.
Portsmouth City Council	EIA204	Portsmouth City Council (PCC) requested attention is drawn to the countryside manager's comments already made in regard to Break Pressure Tank/ Intermediate Pumping Station E, and anticipate that, in order to integrate restoration plans with the management of surrounding Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and habitats, there will be local officer involvement in the development of the design, mitigation and Construction Environment Management Plan and Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP).	N	Engagement has been undertaken with PCC on the development of the Project's design and on a wide range of DCO application documents, specifically through the EIA Working Groups, the Joint Officers Group and on a bilateral basis. Final species plant numbers, detailed specifications for plant material, planting, establishment maintenance and long-term management will also be developed at detailed design, post DCO consent. These will be set out in the LEMPs, to be produced by the Contractor, in accordance with the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) and subject to approval in accordance with the corresponding requirement in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3).
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	EIA205	The respondents stated that a robust Construction Environment Management Plan would be required, to include more	N	The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) is considered to be robust, accords with good practice and is secured

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		reasonable working hours as to avoid disruption. A further respondent added that it will be important to adhere to a robust Construction Environment Management Plan which is not a 'tick box' exercise.		through the DCO, placing legally enforceable requirements on the Contractor. The detailed CEMP(s) will be developed by the Contractor post-consent, as per standard practice for projects of national significance. The detailed CEMP(s) will be based on and secured to follow the principles and measures set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The detailed CEMP(s) must be approved by the relevant planning authority before the start of works. The standard construction working hours proposed (07:00-19:00 Monday to Friday in summer, and 07:00-17:30 in winter, with Saturdays 07:00-17:00 year round) are in line with national guidance, and are commonly applied on comparable infrastructure projects. These hours represent a balanced approach to enable efficient project delivery and community protection. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) includes measures to mitigate impacts from noise and vibration, such as restricting construction works from taking place after 13:00 on Saturdays, for activities in certain locations as identified in

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				section 15.9 of ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	EIA206	The respondents noted concerns that the Environmental Impact Assessment within the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report) was still at a high level scoping stage, with gaps in the assessment, and that the impact on protected and other rivers due to the construction of the proposed pipeline route and, in particular, the river crossings, had not been assessed, both in terms of the Environmental Impact Assessment regime and Habitats Regulations Assessment.	Y	The EqIA process for projects consented under the Planning Act, such as this Project, follow a process whereby the environmental information and assessment develops as the design evolves. The PEI Report (Appendix F.7 Preliminary Environmental Information Report Non-Technical Summary) was published alongside the Summer 2024 Consultation materials in May 2024, and provided the preliminary environmental information available, and also set out the potential likely significant effects based on the available information at that point in time. Following the conclusion of the Summer 2024 Consultation and Spring 2025 Consultation, further work has been undertaken on collecting baseline and survey data, modelling, and refining the design of the Project. This work has been used to inform the assessment of likely significant effects, presented in the ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), in line with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008 and the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017. This includes assessment of the effects

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				of the Project on rivers along the route of the pipeline, including at river crossings. This assessment is contained in ES Chapter 19 Water environment (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The DCO application is also accompanied by a Habitats Regulations Assessment - Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment and Marine Conservation Zone - Stage 1 Assessment (Document reference 5.2, DCO Volume 5) which provides detail on any potential impact pathways from the Project and any mitigation that will be implemented as a result to maintain the integrity of internationally designated sites.
Wider Community	EIA207	The respondent stated that the Water Quality Environmental Report reflects the acknowledged engagement, at considerable cost, of specialist consulting organisations assisting the Applicant in a wide range of matters.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Wider Community	EIA208	The respondent stated that in order to weigh up the environmental costs and benefits of the Project as a whole, an array of non-intrusive and intrusive surveys and assessments would need to be undertaken.	N	Surveys have been undertaken for a number of technical disciplines, to inform both the design of the Project and the assessment of environmental impacts as presented in the ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Volume II of the ES is the appendices

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				which includes the findings of the surveys which have been undertaken in accordance with industry guidance (where available). This includes, but is not limited to, the following surveys: ▪ Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity ▪ Marine biodiversity ▪ Ground investigations ▪ Unexploded ordnance ▪ Groundwater water features. Post consent and prior to construction starting, pre-construction surveys will also be undertaken by the Contractor for protected habitats and species to confirm and update the baseline survey findings, as detailed in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7).

Table G25-26 Summary of issues raised on the theme of air quality and odour and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
PIL	AQO201	The respondent noted concerns that the use of construction machinery and additional traffic along the proposed pipeline route, working on the pipeline and using the surrounding roads would cause dust, dirt, and emissions. The respondent also raised concerns over potential silica dust emissions and the impact this would have on human health, which has been flagged as a workplace health concern by HSE also. As the proposed pipeline route traverses the respondent's land in close proximity to the property, and working hours could be six out of seven days of the week, the respondent raised concern over exposure to dust and the impact this could have on health and wellbeing.	N	Construction dust risk has been assessed in ES Chapter 6 Air quality and odour, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). This has included consideration and assessment of potential impacts associated with dust arising from any demolition, earthworks, construction and trackout (the transport of dust and dirt from construction sites onto the public road network by construction vehicles) activities in relation to dust soiling, human health and ecological receptors. The construction dust and fine particulate matter assessment has been undertaken using a worst case scenario whereby the maximum amount of works are assumed to be undertaken up to the Order Limit boundary and in proximity to the greatest number of human and ecological receptors. Appropriate mitigation has been identified and is incorporated into the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The mitigation is designed such that any residual effect in relation to construction dust is not significant. In addition, construction phase vehicle trips were screened against relevant assessment thresholds within ES Chapter 6 Air quality and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				odour, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) In accordance with the Environmental Protection UK and Institute of Air Quality Management guidance the effect of Project-generated construction phase road traffic emissions at human receptors is not significant.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	AQO202	The respondents raised concerns over the already unpleasant smell from Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW). Respondents expressed disappointment in that they perceive that little is being done to resolve odours from the existing wastewater treatment plant.	N	Budds Farm WTW incorporates odour management systems to ensure odours from the WTW has no detrimental impact upon the quality of the local environment. As part of the baseline characterisation within ES Chapter 6 Air quality and odour, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), it was confirmed by HBC that no recent actionable odour-related complaints have been received. It is understood that 38 complaints were received directly by Budds Farm WTW between 2018-2023 and none in 2024-2025, highlighting the infrequency of odour complaints and associated issues. Operations at Budds Farm WTW would remain unchanged as part of the Project.
Wider Community	AQO203	The respondents queried whether the Project would impact on air quality within the local vicinity and bring about odour.	N	Budds Farm WTW incorporates odour management systems to ensure odours from the WTW has no detrimental impact upon the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		The respondent's suggested refinements are made to the design to help mitigate the smell from Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works.		quality of the local environment. As part of the baseline characterisation within ES Chapter 6 Air quality and odour, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), it was confirmed by HBC that no recent actionable odour-related complaints have been received. It is understood that 38 complaints were received directly by Budds Farm WTW between 2018-2023 and none in 2024-2025, highlighting the infrequency of odour complaints and associated issues. Operations at Budds Farm WTW would remain unchanged as part of the Project. The WRP would utilise and receive the treated wastewater from the existing treatment process at Budds Farm WTW. The treated wastewater entering the WRP would comprise highly treated wastewater and would have already been extensively cleaned and treated at Budds Farm WTW. Treated wastewater entering the WRP is not anticipated to be odorous and would resemble river water rather than wastewater. The recycled water produced by the WRP would meet strict water quality standards and would be odourless. The Project would not involve modifications to the odorous components of Budds Farm

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				WTW and utilises wastewater with minimal odour potential. It is not expected to contribute to any odour-related issues during its operation. On this basis, effects associated with potential odours arising from the operation of the Project are considered to be not significant.

Table G25-27 Summary of issues raised on the theme of archaeology and cultural heritage and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Historic England	ACH201	Historic England (HE) noted the consultation summary suggests that there may be some impact on the historic environment as a result of targeted vegetation removal at various points along the route and that further assessment would be required in order to understand this, an exercise HE would endorse. HE stated collaboration would continue to ensure impacts to the historic environment are minimised and that steps are taken to conserve and enhance heritage assets that	N	The Project has continued to engage with Historic England in respect of effects on the historic environment and proposed design and mitigation measures. Vegetation loss was identified as a potential issue for two design refinements (DR) (DR 20 – BPT-K and DR 24 – Pipeline Section L). The assessment parameters used in the Environmental Statement (ES) include this effect which is assessed as one of a number of factors contributing to a small number of short term and reversible non-significant adverse effects and restoration of vegetation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		could be affected by any element of the Project.		following construction will ensure that the impacts to the historic environment are minimised.
Historic England	ACH202	HE reiterated previous advice on approach to matters pertaining to the historic environment (including designated and non-designated archaeology), which would include assessment/evaluation, understanding significance, seeking to preserve and/or mitigate and the importance of considering setting and visual amenity. HE emphasised that the last point would be particularly pertinent in relation to any proposed environmental/ecological mitigation and enhancements.	N	The assessment of effects on the historic environment presented in ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) has been undertaken in accordance with the methodology and scope agreed with HE and other relevant consultees. Proposals for environmental mitigation and enhancement area (EMEA) have been consulted on with HE through the Historic Environment and Landscape EIA Working Group, in addition to having regard to statutory consultation responses.
Eastleigh Borough Council, Winchester City Council	ACH203	Respondents noted that the revised proposed pipeline route would bring the Project closer to the Marwell Manor Scheduled Monument, other Scheduled Monuments to the north, and listed buildings and that further investigation and assessment of the potential landscape and historic environmental impacts is proposed. Winchester City Council (WCC) stated that the impact on these heritage assets should	N	The route set out in the Spring 2025 consultation which took the Pipeline to the north of Low Hill Farm has subsequently been removed from the Project in favour of the southerly alternate alignment that is more effectively screened in views southwards in line with this consultation response. The assessment of the effects on the scheduled monument at Moated Site at Marwell Manor (NHLE 1012196) and the Grade II listed Low Hill Farmhouse (NHLE 1302822) are set out

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		be considered within the DCO application documents. EBC stated that the Council reserve the right to comment further on the heritage impacts of the proposal for when such additional information would become available.		at ES Appendix 7.7 Heritage assets setting assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The scheduled monuments to the north, which relate to the Park Pale at Marwell, would be screened from the Project and would not be affected.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider community	ACH204	Respondents asked about reassurances the Applicant can provide about a Grade II listed building, a resident's house, in a Conservation Area and therefore part of the valued local heritage.	N	A scoping appraisal (ES Appendix 7.6 Heritage assets settings scoping appraisal, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) carried out in accordance with HE GPA3 and agreed with the relevant consultees identified that no adverse effects would arise to this listed building.

Table G25-28 Summary of issues raised on the theme of terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Natural England (NE) and Langstone	TFB201	NE noted the impacts to protected species such as Bullhead and European eel which were present within the catchment which includes Hermitage Stream. Langstone	N	ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides a detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Harbour Board		Harbour Board were encouraged to see that additional measures had been proposed to enhance biodiversity value at the Water Recycling Plant Site. Langstone Harbour Board emphasised support for a more aspirational on-site Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) target exceeding the statutory 10% as it plays a vital role in the wider ecological functionality of Langstone Harbour; safeguarding its functions is imperative. Langstone Harbour Board stated the design refinements document takes account of the site's strategic importance to Solent Waders, under the Solent Wader and Brent Goose Strategy. However, it stated that the document did not refer to the fact that the Site is close to the boundaries of Langstone Harbour Site of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI), Chichester and Langstone Harbour's Special Protection Area (SPA), Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC), and Langstone Harbour Ramsar. Langstone Harbour Board stated that given the current information available, they are not confident construction, and operation would not be detrimental to the designated features of the protected sites.		freshwater biodiversity, including bullhead and European eel. A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects. Through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on ecological features from the Project are anticipated. Although not yet a requirement for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP)s, the Project has voluntarily committed to the delivery of at least 10% BNG. Engagement has been undertaken with NE to discuss opportunities for BNG and enhancements for the Project, including the creation of a biodiverse green/brown roof and sustainable drainage system at the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) site. A Biodiversity Gain Plan (Document reference 7.11, DCO Volume 7) details how the statutory BNG metric has been applied to the Project. Opportunities to incorporate environmental enhancements, including BNG have been explored. These opportunities are detailed within ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and the Biodiversity Gain Plan (Document reference 7.11, DCO Volume 7).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Where suitable opportunities are identified these will be delivered through a combination of on-site Environmental Mitigation and Enhancement Areas (EMEAs and off-site provision. The Spring 2025 Consultation Environmental Water Quality Report may not have explicitly stated that Langstone Harbour SSSI and Ramsar, Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA and Solent Maritime SAC are within the Zone of Influence (Zol). However, the findings in the updated report informed the detailed assessment of impacts on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, including the aforementioned sites, as detailed in ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects. Through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on ecological features from the Project anticipated. A Habitats Regulations Assessment - Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment and Marine Conservation Zone - Stage 1 Assessment (Document reference 5.2, DCO Volume 5) is

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				submitted with the DCO application and provides detail on any potential impact pathways from the Project and any mitigation that will be implemented. As part of this assessment, engagement has been undertaken with NE to ensure appropriate mitigation for impacts on Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy sites. This concluded that with the consideration of further design details and with the application of mitigation measures, there will be no impacts which undermine conservation objective or result in an adverse effect on the integrity of the habitat sites or Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ).
Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC)	TFB202	EBC supported the re-siting of the construction access from Bishopstoke Lane to Church Lane in principle but affirmed that support was subject to plans showing the impact on existing vegetation and matters of ecological interest.	N	ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides a detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, including impacts on vegetation and matters of ecological interest. A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects. Through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on ecological features from the Project are anticipated.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Portsmouth Water (PW)	TFB203	PW welcomed the proposed additional phosphorus treatment measures as part of the water recycling process within the DCO. PW added that as phosphorus is a limiting nutrient in freshwater systems, the additional treatment measures would support the development of a healthy ecosystem with a lower algal biomass and diverse community of plants, invertebrates and fish species.	N	The Applicant thanks PW for its feedback and confirms that phosphorus treatment measures are included within the water recycling process.
Havant Borough Council (HBC)	TFB204	HBC highlighted that the key consideration when assessing potential impacts of the proposal is the magnitude and significance of effects on the natural environment. This includes identifying which species or habitats may be affected, the nature of those effects, their location, and their duration. The Council also referred to paragraph 5.2.2 of the Environmental Water Quality Report and noted that the preliminary interpretation of initial model results did not provide an assessment of the likely magnitude and significance of any impacts at this stage. Therefore, the Council stated that this restricted the amount of detail	N	The assessment of likely significant effects on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity is undertaken in accordance with the Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) in the UK and Ireland. This guidance has been used when evaluating sites, habitats and species. Section 8.5 of ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) outlines the assessment methodology, including assigning magnitude of impact and the assessment of significance. Although the initial model results did not provide an assessment of the likely magnitude and significance of impacts. Water quality modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir and compensation flows has now been

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		available for consideration and thereby also restricted consultees to provide meaningful feedback. The Council noted the environmental effects as described in the Environmental Water Quality Report and stated that of greatest concern would be the potential eutrophication within Havant Thicket Reservoir. Following the addition of recycled water into Havant Thicket Reservoir, it was predicted that concentrations of Total Phosphorus, Biochemical Oxygen Demand and carbon compounds would increase, resulting in an increase in phytoplankton growth. The Council raised concerns that this could have profound effects on aquatic organisms, especially submerged aquatic vegetation, and aquatic invertebrates. The Council also added that it was expected that there would be a change in the status of the water body under the Water Framework Directive.		completed, and the results, including the assessment of likely magnitude and significance of any impacts, are presented and assessed in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the Water Recycling Plant site (WRP site) shows that nutrient and Dissolved Oxygen (DO) concentrations in Havant Thicket Reservoir following the input of recycled water are reflective of high-quality water. Based on the latest water quality modelling results, it is not anticipated that Havant Thicket Reservoir would become eutrophic or experience excessive phytoplankton growth. Operation of the Project is therefore, not predicated to result in a detrimental effect on the status of Havant Thicket Reservoir or receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. The results of water quality modelling is presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides a detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity including water quality change within Havant Thicket Reservoir. A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects, including phosphorus reduction measures at the WRP site. Based on water quality modelling data, through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on water quality, aquatic vegetation or invertebrates at Havant Thicket Reservoir from the Project are anticipated.
Portsmouth City Council (PCC)	TFB205	PCC stated that the coordination between PW and the Applicant on the required remediation for the proposed combined pipeline works was key. The Council noted that this included overall area management plans and to protect the integrity of local seed and wildlife habitats. The Council illustrated that imported plant life, even from similar habitats, could lead to an	N	The Applicant confirms that engagement with PW is ongoing and includes coordination on remediation and restoration. An Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) is submitted with the DCO application includes information on protection of biodiversity features, habitat creation or enhancement (including aftercare) and the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		imbalance in the current ecosystem as an example.		long-term management and monitoring to ensure the successful establishment of new habitats. A habitat reinstatement strategy forms part of the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) and provides information on seeding and planting specifications, including plant mixes. Principles to guide the detailed design include the consideration of soil reuse (including chalk arisings from local tunnelling activities) in areas of new chalk grassland planting and the use of grass seed harvested from local donor grassland sites.
Portsmouth Water (PW)	TFB206	PW restated earlier comments regarding the biodiversity value of parts of Farlington Wastewater Treatment Works (Farlington WTW) and its surroundings. PW noted that it had been careful to ensure that its own development proposals did not significantly impact the existing lowland calcareous grassland, neutral grassland, and ruderal vegetation present on the site and in the surrounding areas. As the Applicant's proposals developed, PW expressed the aim to ensure these habitats continued to be protected and that	N	A response to PW comments regarding the biodiversity value of part of Farlington Wastewater Treatment Works and its surrounds can be found with the Summer 2024 Consultation Issue Statements (Issue code TFB20). Portsmouth Water has shared its Farlington WTW UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) and National Vegetation Classification (NVC) survey results with the Applicant. These results have been included within the assessment in ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The pipeline

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		suitable mitigation measures were employed and requested commitments to reinstate affected Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) land to their previous condition after construction on PW land.		will be tunnelled under Farlington WTW. A small area of temporary loss of chalk grassland will occur in Field to West of Gilman Road SINC. This will be mitigated through a sensitive clearance approach, which may include, but is not limited to, turf stripping and storage, followed by reinstatement to its previous condition.
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PILs	TFB207	Respondents expressed firm objections to their land being used as environmental mitigation as part of the statutory BNG requirements.	N	The Applicant is seeking voluntary agreements with landowners to facilitate the delivery of BNG, which can be proposed on and/or off-site. Mitigation measures will need to be delivered in specific locations in order to achieve their required function, so this will be treated differently to BNG.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider community	TFB208	Respondents raised concerns about protected habitat areas and species and the need to avoid harm to these. A respondent raised further concerns about the timescales, regarding compliance with the section 20 agreement (s20 agreement) of the Project citing that	N	ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides a detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity. This includes considering protected habitats and species. A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects. These measures are detailed within the Design Principles

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		timing of the works would be critical given that some rivers hold migratory fish.		Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) will manage effects on local wildlife during construction. This includes the implementation of good practice measures, including complying with relevant protected species legislation, implementation of appropriate buffer zones and timing of works for the relevant ecological features. The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) submitted with the DCO application includes information on protection of biodiversity features, habitat creation or enhancement (including aftercare) and the long-term management and monitoring to ensure the successful establishment of new habitats. A habitat reinstatement strategy forms part of the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) and provides information on seeding and planting specifications, including plant mixes. Through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on ecological features from the Project are anticipated.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The Applicant, in line with its obligations under the s20 agreement with the Environment Agency (EA), continue to use all best endeavours to consent and deliver the Project at the earliest opportunity. If pre-construction surveys establish that fish could be within a watercourse where open cut trenching is proposed, works will proceed under a method statement for fish. The method statement will be agreed with the EA and delivered by the Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW). The method statement will include appropriate mitigation to ensure no adverse effects on the species potentially present; this will include fish rescue if required. The assessment in ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and Freshwater Biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) concludes that there will be no significant adverse effects on migratory fish or riparian habitat.
Wider community	TFB209	The respondent referred back to their 2024 consultation response specific to the PEI Report Chapter 8. The respondent raised concerns about the potential impacts from changes to the composition of water released from the	N	ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and Freshwater Biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides a detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity including designated sites and birds. A range of measures have

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Eastney Long Sea Outfall; as described in the PEI Report that, if unmitigated, would have significant impacts on statutory designated sites and birds during the operation stage of the Project.		been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects. Through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on ecological features from the Project are anticipated, including from the use of Eastney Long Sea Outfall. Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters from the Eastney Long Sea Outfall has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA's guidance, as set out in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6)

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				- ES Chapter 19 Water Environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) - ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environmental Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The Habitats Regulations Assessment - Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment and Marine Conservation Zone - Stage 1 Assessment (Document reference 5.2, DCO Volume 5) provides detail on any potential impact pathways from the Project and any mitigation that will be implemented as a result to maintain the integrity of internationally designated sites.
Wider community	TFB210	Respondents raised concerns about the introduction of recycled water to Havant Thicket Reservoir and the potential impacts	N	Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP site shows that nutrient and DO

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		on biodiversity and water quality. Others raised that there would be biodiversity loss due to Havant Thicket Reservoir no longer being spring water fed and instead topped up with recycled water. Concerns mainly pertained to the change in geochemistry, increase in salinity, temperature and number (and potential bioaccumulation) of contaminants of concern being discharged into Havant Thicket Reservoir as a result of adding recycled water to Havant Thicket Reservoir having detrimental effects on Havant Thicket Reservoir's biodiversity. Some comments suggested the proposed Project created a conflict between PW's suggested commitment to no loss of biodiversity and benefits associated with PW's proposals. Respondents expressed a preference for a previously proposed chalk spring-fed reservoir scenario, citing concerns about the currently proposed Project in relation to geochemicals, effluent, salinity, temperature and disinfection by-products.		concentrations in Havant Thicket Reservoir following the input of recycled water are reflective of high-quality water. Based on the latest water quality modelling results, it is not anticipated that Havant Thicket Reservoir would become eutrophic or experience excessive phytoplankton growth. Operation of the Project is therefore, not predicated to result in a detrimental effect (including from changes in salinity and temperature) on the status of Havant Thicket Reservoir or receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the EA's guidance for surface water pollution risk assessment which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAs), Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has been provided to the EA, which is currently considering how these chemicals should be assessed and submitted to the EA as part of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				the environmental permit application required for the Project. The results of water quality modelling are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and assessed in: ▪ ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) ▪ ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) ▪ ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides a detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity including water quality change within Havant Thicket Reservoir. A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects, including phosphorus

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				reduction measures at the WRP site. Based on water quality modelling data, through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on water quality or biodiversity at Havant Thicket Reservoir from the Project are anticipated. Regular engagement with PW has been undertaken to ensure mitigation measures are complementary. The Project is not expected to change the benefits associated with PW's delivery of Havant Thicket Reservoir. Although not yet a requirement for NSIPs, the Project has voluntarily committed to the delivery of at least 10% BNG. A Biodiversity Gain Plan (Document reference 7.11, DCO Volume 7) detailing how the statutory BNG metric has been applied to the Project is included. Opportunities to incorporate environmental enhancements, including BNG have been explored. These opportunities are detailed within ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and the Biodiversity Gain Plan (Document reference 7.11, DCO Volume 7). Suitable opportunities identified will be delivered through a combination of on-site EMEAs and off-site provision.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider community	TFB211	A respondent raised concerns that phosphorus in the purified recycled water could encourage algal growth in Havant Thicket Reservoir. Further respondents highlighted that the increased phosphorus treatment would also result in increased costs, energy and carbon use in order to mitigate the impacts to the biodiversity within the Havant Thicket Reservoir. It was also suggested that algal growth was widely known to affect the biodiversity in water bodies and produce an unpleasant smell.	N	Updated modelling that includes the use of a HRRM at the WRP site shows that nutrient and DO concentrations in Havant Thicket Reservoir following the input of recycled water are reflective of high-quality water. Based on the latest water quality modelling results, it is not anticipated that Havant Thicket Reservoir will become eutrophic or experience excessive phytoplankton growth. Operation of the Project is therefore, not predicated to result in a detrimental effect on the status of Havant Thicket Reservoir or receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. The results of water quality modelling presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and assessed in: ▪ ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) ▪ ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) ▪ ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Volume II (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) Based on water quality modelling data, through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on water quality at Havant Thicket Reservoir from the Project are anticipated. The addition of HRRM, for phosphorous removal, would result in a small increase in operational costs and carbon emissions for the WRP due to additional power consumption. However, this impact has been fully mitigated by power demand reductions for other components of the WRP due to design refinements, resulting in a small net reduction in power related operational costs and carbon emissions for the WRP, even with HRRM, compared to the gate 3a estimates. Both the capital cost and embodied carbon emissions for the HRRM solution have been assessed and found to be similar to those for the non-HRRM design. Carbon emissions from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Project are presented in ES Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Alternative

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				options for the Project were reviewed during the optioneering phase, and the option selected represents a lower carbon option than other alternatives such as desalination.
Wider community	TFB212	Respondents raised the potential impact the addition of recycled water could have on already established fauna and flora as well as the potential loss of biodiversity at Havant Thicket Reservoir.	N	Updated modelling that includes the use of a HRRM at the WRP site shows that nutrient and DO concentrations in Havant Thicket Reservoir following the input of recycled water are reflective of high-quality water. Based on the latest water quality modelling results, it is not anticipated that Havant Thicket Reservoir will become eutrophic or experience excessive phytoplankton growth. Operation of the Project is therefore, not predicated to result in a detrimental effect on the status of Havant Thicket Reservoir or receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. The results of water quality modelling presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and assessed in: ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6),

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				- ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) - ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) Based on water quality modelling data, through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on water quality at Havant Thicket Reservoir from the Project are anticipated.
Wider community	TFB213	Respondents raised concerns about the fact that mitigation measures would be decided and implemented after a period of operation of recycled water entering Havant Thicket Reservoir. Respondents were also concerned about the potential negative impacts on biodiversity at Havant Thicket Reservoir.	N	ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides a detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity including associated with water quality change within Havant Thicket Reservoir. Mitigation measures will not be decided and implemented after a period of operation, mitigation measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects. Through the implementation of pre-construction, construction and operational mitigation, no residual likely significant

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				adverse effects on ecological features from the Project are anticipated.
Wider community	TFB214	Respondents raised concerns about the Project's potential impact on wetland habitats and posed that these would be the most ecologically sensitive area of Havant Thicket Reservoir. It was suggested that there had been no assessment for this.	N	ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides a detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity including freshwater habitats in the Havant Thicket Reservoir. A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects, including phosphorus reduction measures at the WRP site. Based on water quality modelling data, through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on water quality or wetland habitats at Havant Thicket Reservoir from the Project are anticipated. The results of water quality modelling are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and assessed in: ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6)

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				- ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) - ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) The Invasive Non-Native Species INNS Biosecurity Plan (Document reference 7.10, DCO Volume 7) assesses the risk of INNS during construction and operation of the Project and concludes that the introduction of recycled water to Havant Thicket Reservoir provides no additional risk of INNS. Measures to prevent the introduction or spread of INNS in the reservoir during operation are set out in Portsmouth Water's INNS Biosecurity Plan for Havant Thicket Reservoir.
Wider community	TFB215	A respondent referred to the Applicant's Ofwat RAPID Gate 3 (Strategic regional water resource solutions: detailed feasibility and concept design) Report (July 2024) which stated that Havant Thicket Reservoir would be kept to near winter levels.	N	PW will manage the operation of Havant Thicket Reservoir and will determine water levels. The Project involves the input of recycled water, but it will not affect water levels because they will continue to be controlled on the basis of the impoundment licence with PW. The wetland area along the northern margin of Havant Thicket Reservoir will predominantly be fed by the existing

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Respondents raised concerns over how water levels at Havant Thicket Reservoir could negatively impact biodiversity and how topping up with recycled water could also prevent seasonal variation of water levels and therefore could impact biodiversity.		headwaters of Riders Lane Stream, not Havant Thicket Reservoir. Results of Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling exercise indicate that there will be limited movement of water from the main body of Havant Thicket Reservoir across the five control structures to the wetland. ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides a detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity including water quality change within Havant Thicket Reservoir. A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects, including phosphorus reduction measures at the WRP site. Based on water quality modelling data, through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on water quality at Havant Thicket Reservoir from the Project are anticipated. The results of water quality modelling presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and assessed in:

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				- ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) - ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) - ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider community	TFB216	A respondent acknowledged that extensive design refinements had been made following feedback. However, respondents raised concerns about potential costs falling to the customer to fund BNG and to fund the additional phosphorus treatment. It was also queried whether the further treatment would prevent algal blooms and another expressed disappointment suggesting that not all contaminants had been considered, such as forever chemicals, VOCs, pesticides, and pharmaceuticals.	N	The design of the Project has sought to reduce impacts on the environment, therefore reducing the amount of BNG that needs to be delivered by the Applicant. As with all the Applicant's costs, funding for new infrastructure will be averaged across water supply customers' bills and will be subject to approval by the water industry regulator, Ofwat. Providing net gains for biodiversity is a policy requirement in the National Policy Statement for Water Resources Infrastructure (NPSWRI). In addition, the provision of BNG responds to the general expectation that this is provided by major infrastructure projects subject to the DCO consenting process ahead of this shortly becoming a statutory requirement.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the EA's guidance for surface water pollution risk assessment, which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				performance produced by the University of Brighton (Mayor-Smith, 2024). The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024; Uhlhorn et al., 2025) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given that the pilot plant data does not represent the full

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				treatment process that will be in place at the WRP. The addition of the HRRM at the WRP would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. Modelling shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. For further details, refer to ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides a detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity including water quality change within Havant Thicket Reservoir. Based on water quality modelling data, through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on water quality at Havant Thicket Reservoir from the Project are anticipated.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The additional phosphorous treatment is necessary to achieve water quality requirements and the cost of this will need to be included within the overall cost of the Project. The competitive procurement for the delivery and operation of the Project will ensure costs are efficiently incurred.
Wider community	TFB217	Respondents raised concerns about the potential impacts on biodiversity, in particular construction impacts on Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy (SWBGS) sites in proximity to the WRP site. A further respondent referenced a “2011 Water Quality Report (Page 23)” and noted that the high calcium concentrations in the water was likely to increase the number and diversity of species that utilise calcium in their exoskeleton like molluscs, shrimps, which could increase the number of predators that feed on them, for example fish. It was also noted that it would be important to have areas of land close to Langstone	N	While the respondent refers to a ‘2011 Water Quality Report’ (page 23), the Applicant has not been able to identify a document of this description within the Project evidence base, and it was not produced as part of the current Project. The Applicant considers that any such report, if it relates to earlier iterations of Havant Thicket Reservoir investigations undertaken by third parties, it would pre-date the current Project design and assessment framework. Nevertheless, the Applicant has had regard to the matters raised by the respondent and has responded based on the information presented within the current Environmental Water Quality assessments supporting the Project. ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides a detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, including designated

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Harbour which could support habitats for feeding and roosting at high tide. It was also noted that the lighting at the WRP site would have adverse impacts on the nighttime ecology at the Broadmarsh Coastal Park, most notably on bats and their prey. Concerns were raised that the combination may drive birds away from the SPA and SSSIs and cause disturbances to local wildlife. One respondent also queried if there could be further negative impact on local biodiversity of a burst water main considering the source of the water.		sites, fish, bats (including those utilising the habitat around the WRP site) and birds. A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects. Primary mitigation includes designing the Project to avoid statutory designated sites and for operational lighting design to follow best practice to reduce illuminating ecologically sensitive habitats, to avoid disruption to retained vegetation and the species using these features for resting places, foraging or commuting routes. This is detailed within the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). Through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on ecological features from the Project are anticipated. A Habitats Regulations Assessment – Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment and Marine Conservation Zone – Stage 1 Assessment (Document reference 5.2, DCO Volume 5) has been produced and provides detail on any potential impact pathways from the Project and any mitigation that will be implemented as a result to maintain the integrity of internationally designated sites. As part of this assessment, engagement has

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				been undertaken with NE to ensure appropriate mitigation for impacts on SWBGS sites. The Applicant has noted the comment on calcium concentrations. The results of water quality modelling are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and assessed in: ▪ ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) ▪ ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) ▪ ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) Based on water quality modelling data, through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on water quality or aquatic biodiversity in Havant Thicket Reservoir or downstream

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				watercourses from the Project are anticipated. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) will manage effects on local wildlife during construction. This includes the implementation of good practice measures, including complying with relevant protected species legislation, implementation of appropriate buffer zones and timing of works for the relevant ecological features. The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) submitted with the DCO application and includes information on protection of biodiversity features, habitat creation or enhancement (including aftercare) and the long-term management and monitoring to ensure the successful establishment of new habitats. A habitat reinstatement strategy forms part of the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) and provides information on seeding and planting specifications, including plant mixes. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				DCO Volume 7) outlines how effects will be managed on local wildlife during operation including lighting design at the WRP site and the AGP sites to be in line with relevant standards and good practice. This includes avoiding the illumination of known bat foraging routes. A risk assessment has been undertaken and is presented in ES Chapter 14 Major accidents and disasters, Volume 1 (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and is set out in ES Appendix 14.1 Stage 2 risk assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The risk of pipeline leak during operation has been assessed and mitigation set out which reduces the risk to As Low As Reasonably Practicable (ALARP). Isolation valves will be installed on the Pipeline to reduce flooding in the event of a pipe leak. In addition, further mitigation measures for pipe leaks are secured in the Operational Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7). The Operational Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7) requires an Emergency Response Plan to

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				be produced at a future stage that will contain response procedures, including communication and coordination procedures with emergency services and measures for public safety, both in the immediate pipeline rupture vicinity and the overall system. Incident classification and escalation protocols in accordance with the Pipelines Safety Regulations 1996 will be produced and environmental containment measures, including coordination with environmental authorities, where reasonably practicable. Furthermore, the risk of INNS from the release of source water from an emergency washout release or pipeline leak will be through the preparation and implementation of an Emergency INNS Management Plan (EIMP) which will be developed by the Contractor post-consent as secured in the Invasive Non Native Species INNS Biosecurity Plan (Document reference 7.10, DCO Volume 7). The EIMP would set out the processes and procedure for releasing and managing water in an emergency, including procedures to assess and identify the current threat of INNS associated with the emergency event, for containment and eradication and a plan for regular monitoring and follow-up.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider community	TFB218	A respondent suggested that the Applicant work with an ecologist and create vast oyster nurseries to naturally cleanse the water.	N	ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides a detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity. A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects. Through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on ecological features from the Project are anticipated. Therefore, vast oyster nurseries are not considered necessary.
Wider community	TFB219	Respondents raised concerns over the potential impact the recycled water could have on protected and notable species and one respondent referred to the Environmental Water Quality Report stating that nitrate levels would be significantly lower in the purified water than the spring water in Havant Thicket Reservoir. One respondent noted potential impacts on the Langstone Harbour as a SSSI understood to be a known feeding ground for wildfowl. It was reiterated that care must be taken to avoid impacts on protected species in this area.	N	Updated modelling that includes the use of a HRRM at the WRP site shows that nutrient and DO concentrations in Havant Thicket Reservoir following the input of recycled water are reflective of high-quality water. Based on the latest water quality modelling results, it is not anticipated that Havant Thicket Reservoir would become eutrophic or experience excessive phytoplankton growth. Operation of the Project is therefore, not predicted to result in a detrimental effect on the status of Havant Thicket Reservoir or receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. The results of water quality modelling are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		It was stated that not enough information was available on potential environmental impacts for informed public comments to be made. A respondent stated that there were significant protected species within the vicinity of the Project and that great care would need to be taken to avoid any potential impacts.		Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and assessed in: - ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) - ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) - ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) Based on water quality modelling data, through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on water quality at Havant Thicket Reservoir from the Project are anticipated. A Habitats Regulations Assessment – Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment and Marine Conservation Zone – Stage 1 Assessment (Document reference 5.2, DCO Volume 5) has been produced and provides detail on any potential impact pathways from the Project and any mitigation that will be implemented as a result to maintain the integrity of internationally designated sites. As

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				part of this assessment, engagement has been undertaken with NE to ensure appropriate mitigation for impacts on SWBGS sites. The Applicant notes the comment on not enough information being available on potential environmental impacts. The documents provided during the Spring 2025 Consultation focused on updates to the water quality modelling and 25 Project design refinements. A detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity is included in the ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects. Through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on ecological features from the Project are anticipated.
Wider community	TFB220	A respondent stated that impact on hedgerows would need to be minimised to maintain habitat connectivity within the exposed area of the summit of Portsdown Hill. It was suggested that this could be done using alternative construction	N	ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides a detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity. Through the implementation of mitigation, no residual

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		techniques to avoid the removal of any hedges. A further respondent added that it would be important to maintain hedgerows which would provide wildlife corridors and expressed their concern about landscape impacts.		likely significant adverse effects on ecological features from the Project are anticipated. A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects. Primary mitigation measures include designing the Project to utilise, where practicable, existing gaps in vegetation, to reduce vegetation loss and reduce the creation of new (albeit temporary) gaps in linear vegetation features. These measures are detailed within the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) submitted with the DCO application. Tertiary mitigation includes the implementation of a reduced working width (RWW) of 20m, when crossing sensitive features, including vegetation of ecological importance for protected species or priority habitats. The locations of the RWW are detailed in the RWW and Trenchless Crossing and Tunnelling Schedules and Plans as outlined within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). All habitat which is temporarily lost will be replaced on a like for like or better basis as per the Outline Landscape and Ecology

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7). Impact on landscape character has been assessed in the ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), with further detail provided in ES Appendix 13.3 Landscape baseline and effects (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), including effects on landscape features (trees and hedgerows). Vegetation removed to facilitate construction of the Project would be fully reinstated as set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7).
Wider community	TFB221	Respondents noted concerns about the location of the water recycling plant and how this could impact designated sites including SPA, SAC, Ramsar designated sites, SSSI, and two SINCs at the western end of the tunnel. One respondent focused their concerns on impacts to birds and other species related to construction works near the harbour and the potential for compounded impacts to	N	ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides a detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, including designated sites. A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects. Through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on ecological features from the Project are anticipated.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		arise due to the timing of construction works of the Water Recycling Plant. Landscape views were raised as a concern in general and particularly from around Langstone Harbour and including Farlington Marshes Nature Reserve, Hayling Island coastal walks and Portsdown Hill.		A Habitats Regulations Assessment – Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment and Marine Conservation Zone – Stage 1 Assessment (Document reference 5.2, DCO Volume 5) has been produced and provides detail on any potential impact pathways from the Project and any mitigation that will be implemented as a result to maintain the integrity of internationally designated sites. As part of this assessment, engagement has been undertaken with NE to ensure appropriate mitigation for impacts on SWBGS sites. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) outlines how effects on local wildlife would be managed during construction. This includes the implementation of good practice measures, including complying with relevant protected species legislation, implementation of appropriate buffer zones and timing of works for the relevant ecological features. Regarding landscape views ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and supporting visual assessments demonstrate that in views from Langstone Harbour, the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				WRP will be largely screened or filtered by existing and proposed vegetation, both during the day and at night. Where glimpses of the WRP may be possible, these would be minimal, read in the context of existing industrial and urban features, and further reduced over time as mitigation planting matures. Through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects are anticipated. An assessment of landscape views is provided within a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6); with further details in ES Appendix 13.4 Visual baseline and assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6); and supporting photographs in ES Figure 13.23 Viewpoint photography, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6). Views from Farlington Marshes have been assessed as representative of people travelling along the Solent Way, with Viewpoints (VP)017 and VP133 located within Farlington Marshes.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Views from Hayling Island coastal walks have been assessed as representative of people travelling along the Hayling Billy Coastal Path (VP004). Views from Portsdown Hill have been assessed as such and represented by VP017. Further views from the Langstone Harbour include VP011 also from the Solent Way, and VP016 have been assessed as being representative of people using Broadmarsh Coastal Park. The location of viewpoints is shown in ES Figure 13.22 Representative viewpoints, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	TFB222	The respondent commented that tunnelling under the stream and proposed construction could have an impact on nearby wildlife through noise and vibration and stated that stringent Construction Environment Management Plan would therefore be required.	N	ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides a detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, including potential impacts from noise and vibration. A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects. Through the implementation of mitigation, no residual

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				likely significant adverse effects on ecological features from the Project are anticipated. Noise and vibration from trenchless construction under watercourses, including streams, is not expected to cause any significant effects on freshwater biodiversity receptors, including any detrimental effects of vibration from the construction on fish, fish eggs or larvae, or barriers to fish migration, as the levels of vibration and underwater noise are predicted to be extremely low. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) outlines how effects on local wildlife would be managed during construction, including from noise and vibration. This includes the implementation of good practice measures, including complying with relevant protected species legislation, implementation of appropriate buffer zones, acoustic fencing and timing of works for the relevant ecological features. Tertiary measures including good practice measures for noise and vibration reduction are secured within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) and will be included within

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				the Noise and Vibration Management Plan prepared post DCO consent.

Table G25-29 Summary of issues raised on the theme of marine biodiversity and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Natural England (NE)	MB201	NE noted that the Environmental Water Quality Report had reported survey methods which included Environmental DNA sampling and noted that this method for sampling marine species was still in its infancy and was therefore not considered a reliable source in isolation to map species. NE recommended sourcing alternative data if not done so already.	N	Environmental DNA (eDNA) sampling from marine water was used to record the existing fish and other species communities that are likely to be within the marine environment around the Eastney Long Sea Outfall (LSO). The analytical result of this eDNA sampling is used to complement existing surveys and desk study, and not to be used alone to map or record species. The complete current baseline information containing desk study and survey results are presented in section 9.7 of ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
NE	MB202	NE noted that it understood that the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust (HIWWT) had undertaken additional seagrass surveys within Langstone	N	ES Appendix 9.3 Intertidal seagrass survey, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) incorporates National Seagrass Layer (England) All Years – Intertidal

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Harbour. It was advised that this data should be requested and used to support conclusions if it has not already been done.		Seagrass All Years published on 20 August 2025 has been sent to the HIWWT to identify any data gap, along with the request for any additional seagrass data within Langstone Harbour that HIWWT hold. There has been no response from HIWWT, however, the assessment of no significant effects of the Project on seagrass habitat within Langstone Harbour is unlikely to be altered as the magnitude of impact would be negligible, as presented in ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
NE, Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	MB203	NE confirmed that based on the information provided within the Environmental Water Quality Report, it was broadly supportive of the conclusions regarding potential impacts to marine biodiversity at Eastney LSO. The MMO acknowledged that the Environmental Water Quality Report provided clear interpretation of the results and that the report indicated that the impacts of 'existing' and 'future' scenarios as a result of the Project showed that any likely change would be small.	N	Agreement with the approach of impact assessment, interpretation of the results of changes and the conclusions of no potential adverse impact on marine biodiversity at Eastney LSO anticipated are noted. The assessment approach and assessment of likely significant effects on marine biodiversity receptors are presented in sections 9.5 and 9.8 of the ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		The MMO stated that as such, impacts on biodiversity were not anticipated as a result of the Project and concluded the approach appeared reasonable.		
NE	MB204	NE said that it had not yet received the report on benthic surveys which were undertaken in 2024, although this information would be provided in the ES, further comments from NE would be provided at a later stage.	N	A summary of the benthic survey results undertaken in 2024 and had been provided in section 2.4 of the Environmental Water Quality Report shared at Spring 2025 Consultation. The reports on benthic surveys were shared with NE on 18 September 2025. NE responded on 30 October 2025 and stated that there were no comments on the benthic survey reports.
MMO	MB205	The MMO provided feedback on the proposed surface water Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) at the proposed WRP. The MMO commented that changes in salinity due to the SuDS outfall release compared to natural fluctuations in ambient salinity throughout the tidal cycle was predicted to be very low in the tidal reaches of the Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour (changes in salinity did not extend into the Solent), subsequently the effects on marine biodiversity receptors were also not anticipated by the MMO.	N	The Applicant is in agreement with the statement that there would be very low changes in salinity due to the SuDS outfall release and the conclusion of no anticipated effects on marine biodiversity receptors is noted. This assessment is presented in section 9.8 of ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Langstone Harbour Board (The Board)	MB206	The Board outlined the importance of Langstone Harbour as an internationally recognised ecological area of importance. The Board explained the many varieties of marine biodiversity present at Langstone Harbour, that the harbour functioned as critical habitat for migratory seabirds and overwintering waders and the harbour's designation as a Bass Nursery Area.	N	Ecological and fisheries importance of Langstone Harbour are acknowledged and included in the current baseline presented in section 9.7 of ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), whilst effects on Langstone Harbour are considered in the assessment presented in section 9.8 of ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). International designation of Langstone Harbour and the wetland birds there are also considered in ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider community	MB207	Respondents raised concerns over the potential impact of the water recycling process on marine habitats. A respondent raised questions, including what types of habitats exist and their distance to the release, and their sensitivity to the more concentrated contaminants or new contaminants potentially arising from the Project.	N	The marine habitats that exist around the Eastney LSO have been summarised from survey results undertaken in 2024 which was presented in section 2.4 of the Environmental Water Quality Report and shared at Spring 2025 Consultation. Broadscale habitats identified were mainly subtidal mud and subtidal mixed sediment in the vicinity of Eastney LSO and across the area. These habitats are mapped with respect to the location of release (i.e., Eastney LSO) as

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Another respondent suggested that risks to the marine habitat had not been adequately considered.		provided in ES Figure 9.6 Habitat mapping across the Eastney Long Sea Outfall survey area, Volume III (Document reference 6.3 , DCO Volume 6), and the details of risk to marine habitats have been provided in ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The assessment of chemical parameters within the WRP reject water release has been undertaken in line with EA's guidance for surface water pollution risk assessment and the output is presented in Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the Eastney LSO thus indicating rapid dilution at the Eastney LSO location. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality, therefore wide scale impacts on water quality are not predicted, and consequently no potential impacts on marine habitats (mentioned in the above paragraph)

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				are anticipated. This assessment has been presented in section 9.8 of the ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) by referring to the detailed water quality assessment results presented in the ES Chapter 19 Water environment Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
Wider community	MB208	Respondents raised concerns about the potential impacts to the marine environment from concentrated reject water from the water recycling plant via the Eastney LSO. Respondents referred to information provided in the Environmental Water Quality Report at section 6.2.9 which stated that no significant effects on marine biodiversity were anticipated, and a respondent described this as 'not sound'. A respondent added that there was no adequate assessment available to conclude this, given that the forecast small changes in concentrations it was unlikely that effects to marine statutory designated sites, marine habitats and species would be observed as a result of the effluent	N	The potential for chemical parameters to be within the WRP reject water has been considered through screening tests following EA's guidance for surface water pollution risk assessment, with three chemical parameters screened in for dispersion modelling. Modelling demonstrates insignificant water quality changes between existing and future scenarios. The distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the Eastney LSO thus indicating rapid dilution at the Eastney LSO location. Therefore, wide scale impacts on water quality are not predicted and consequently no significant effects on marine biodiversity receptors are anticipated. This assessment has been presented in section 9.8 of the ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) by referring to the detailed water

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		recycling reject water discharge via Eastney LSO.		quality assessment results presented in the ES Chapter 19 Water environment Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
Wider community	MB209	Bioaccumulation and sedimentation were raised as concerns whereby respondents noted that the risks had not been considered. Respondents also cited research undertaken by the University of Portsmouth which allegedly found that some contaminants can bioaccumulate in algae, such as Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) and “forever chemicals”. It was also noted that the University of Portsmouth had allegedly found that contaminants found in sewage could accumulate in algae which in turn could be eaten by marine creatures. It was outlined that with more concentrated reject water being discharged via the Eastney LSO, there could potentially be an increased risk of bioaccumulation of contaminants in marine plants and animals. A respondent requested that the risks and impacts of bioaccumulation had	N	Bioaccumulation has been considered in the assessment of likely significant effects in the ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Water quality modelling of Eastney LSO for currently consented parameters has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This demonstrates that the changes in concentrations between the current release and future release with the WRP in place are insignificant. Therefore, any effects associated with the pathways outlined in this issue concerning the Eastney LSO, if present, would be similar to those occurring now, i.e. are part of the baseline on which the Project is assessed against. The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA's guidance for surface water pollution risk assessment which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		to be considered in a robust and transparent way.		Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. Modelling using the EA's recommended tool CORMIX was then undertaken to look at distance to EQS which was calculated at 1-2m from the Eastney LSO indicating rapid dilution at the Eastney LSO location. Please note that the modelling was undertaken on a number of flow scenarios and potential contaminant concentrations associated with membrane efficiency. A scenario was assessed that considered complete removal of the parameter via the membrane (i.e. all discharged to the reject wastewater stream) to provide a sensitivity analysis regarding dilution at the Eastney LSO location. Full details are provided in Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Therefore, wide scale impacts on water quality are not predicted, and the scale of change in bioaccumulation is insignificant. Consequently, there are no significant effects anticipated on marine biodiversity receptors. For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has been provided to the EA for

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and against what thresholds. Following receipt of this advice, the assessment will be undertaken and submitted to the EA as part of the environmental permit application required for the Project. Sedimentation has also been considered in the assessment and subsequently it is not identified as an issue with tertiary mitigation measures applied and secured in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). This assessment has been presented in section 9.8 of the ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) by referring to the detailed water quality assessment results presented in the ES Chapter 19 Water environment (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
Wider community	MB210	A respondent raised concerns over the impacts on marine biodiversity at designated sites. It was suggested that the concentrated pollution should be subject to further processing before release. They also noted	N	Marine designations including three SACs, four SPAs, three Ramsar sites, eight SSSI, 5 Local Nature Reserves (LNR) and one MCZ are considered within section 9.7 of ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		that the Solent holds a number of Marine Protected Areas: Special Area of Conservation (SAC); four Special Protected Areas (SPA), three Ramsar sites and three Marine Conservation Zones (MCZ). The respondent stated that this should have been robustly considered already and before submitting the DCO application.		Recycled water from the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) site would be treated to a high standard using a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process (incorporating microfiltration/ultrafiltration (MF/UF), reverse osmosis (RO), an advanced oxidation process using ultraviolet (UV-AOP)/hydrogen peroxide, granular activated carbon adsorption and remineralisation). Within the WRP site, the treated wastewater would be pumped through two filtering processes. The first of these, MF/UF, is to remove remaining impurities that could block the membranes during RO. The RO process removes dissolved salts, impurities, bacteria and pharmaceuticals. The next stage within the water recycling process would be the advanced oxidation process involving the use of ultraviolet light and hydrogen peroxide to break down any remaining impurities. The water recycling process is presented in the ES Chapter 3 Description of Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The potential for chemical parameters to be within the WRP site's reject water has been considered through screening tests following EA's guidance for surface water pollution risk

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				assessment. Modelling demonstrates insignificant water quality changes between existing and future scenarios. The distance to the EQS for the chemical parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the Eastney LSO thus indicating rapid dilution at the Eastney LSO, therefore wide scale impacts on water quality are not predicted, consequently no significant effects on marine biodiversity receptors are anticipated. This assessment has been presented in section 9.8 of the ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) by referring to the detailed water quality assessment results presented in the ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
	MB211	Respondents raised concerns over the change in temperature of the reject water from the Eastney LSO and said that this change has been inadequately assessed. A respondent stated that there was no indication that changes in temperature of the effluent plume had been considered in the assessment.	N	Temperature has been considered in the assessment and it was presented in the ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) that there is no change to ambient water temperature for both the existing wastewater release from Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) and the future WRP site reject water. The distance between Budds Farm WTW and the Eastney LSO is

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				approximately 13km (much of which is under the seabed), therefore there is expected to be very little difference in release and ambient seawater temperatures by the time the flow moves from Budds Farm WTW to Eastney LSO. Modelling was undertaken for salinity and the currently consented water quality parameters (including Biological Oxygen Demand, Chemical Oxygen Demand, suspended solids, total nitrogen and total iron, in which temperature is not one of them) to determine the potential effect on the existing release associated with removal of wastewater for recycling and addition of the reject stream from the WRP site, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent regarding Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional information see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider community	MB212	A respondent claimed that the risk to the water downstream from the Broadmarsh wastewater plant had not been adequately assessed. In addition, it was noted that it was not clear how any leakage from the pipes below the tidal limit of the Hermitage stream was to be managed to stop harm to the harbour ecosystem.	N	The Applicant has implemented a Turnaround Plan (2023–2025) focused on improving operational performance, reducing pollution incidents, and enhancing customer service. Since 2020, pollution incidents have reduced by 38%, and leakage has reduced by 10% since 2023. The Applicant is committed to ongoing investment in its infrastructure and to maintaining high standards of monitoring and maintenance for both existing and new assets. Water quality is continuously monitored at all the Applicant sites including the Broadmarsh wastewater plant (Budds Farm WTW), with real-time data capture and automatic systems in place to shut down the wastewater plant if any issues are detected in order to minimise any adverse impact on the water downstream, i.e. the Langstone Harbour. This is supported by an ongoing programme of maintenance to ensure the Budds Farm WTW operates as it should without risk to the downstream water in Langstone Harbour. The same robust monitoring and control systems will apply to the proposed new water recycling plant and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				pipelines to manage to stop any adverse impact on the harbour ecosystem. Tertiary mitigation measures set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) would be implemented during construction of the pipelines below the tidal limit of the Hermitage Stream and these measures provide active intervention to remediate any spills in the unlikely occurrence of a direct spill so that leakage from the pipes into the marine environment would be minimised. The risk of pollution from leakage to the harbour ecosystem is considered to be limited. The potential impact on surface water in Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour are considered negligible. This assessment has been presented in section 9.8 of the ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
Wider community	MB213	The respondent noted that the Solent was a unique, complex and rich environment for which protection from the Applicant's activities was of equal importance to the protection of the chalk rivers and other sources which fed into it.		The Applicant's assessments contained within the ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) demonstrate that there

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				will be no significant impacts on the marine environment, including the Solent.

Table G25-30 Summary of issues raised on the theme of carbon and climate change and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Winchester City Council (WCC)	CCC201	WCC noted that the Council had declared a climate emergency in June 2019 and that the Council is committed to becoming a carbon neutral council by 2024 and was aiming for the wider district to become carbon neutral by 2030. The declaration was stated to be a common thread through all the Council's decisions and actions, including how WCC would consider and respond to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP). The Council stated that the Applicant was required to take this declaration into account throughout development of the scheme and would need to be able to demonstrate how the scheme being developed is consistent with the objectives of the made declaration. The Council stressed the importance of climate impact as an	N	The Applicant acknowledges WCC's climate emergency declaration and carbon neutrality goals. Climate impact has been a key consideration throughout the development of the Project. Emissions across all phases have been quantified and key emissions sources have been identified in the carbon assessment in ES Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Mitigation measures are detailed in the Outline Carbon Management Plan (Document reference 7.8, DCO Volume 7) and Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), submitted with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application. Emissions are not disaggregated by local planning authority area due in part to supply chain uncertainties, however the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		interrelated issue and stated their expectation that climate impact would be a key consideration throughout.		Project meets the National Policy Statement for Water Resources Infrastructure (NPSWRI) requirement for the Project emissions to be "as low as reasonably practicable".
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	CCC202	Respondents suggested that the amount of energy that would be utilised in the operation of the scheme, including by the daily phosphate removal process, the operation of the bubbler/aeration system in Havant Thicket Reservoir, along with the pumping of effluent for the water recycling process, would not be sustainable and would increase carbon emissions as well as costs in the long-term. A respondent suggested that in principle energy should be conserved and reused.	N	Water recycling is less energy-intensive and costly than alternatives that provide a comparable scale of water supply, such as desalination, and was determined as the best value solution as part of the Applicant's Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) and options appraisal processes. Project costs, carbon emissions, energy usage, environmental impacts and affordability have been key factors in the Applicant's assessment and consideration of alternative solutions. The different options considered are outlined in ES Chapter 4 Consideration of alternatives, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Furthermore, commitments made in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) submitted with the DCO application, will ensure that the design reduces energy use where practicable and complies with the National Policy Statement requirement to ensure

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions are as low as reasonably practicable. Carbon emissions from energy consumption during the operation of the Project have been quantified in ES Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Further mitigation measures are included in the Outline Carbon Management Plan (Document reference 7.8, DCO Volume 7), also submitted and secured as part of the DCO application. Regarding energy use, the majority of energy used by the Project is anticipated to be sourced from the National Grid, which is expected to decarbonise over time in line with Government policy. Additionally, the Applicant has assessed the feasibility of self-generating power for the Project, through a detailed examination of potential renewable energy options, as detailed in the Outline Carbon Management Plan (Document reference 7.8, DCO Volume 7). Please note, the bubbler system specifically will be owned and operated by Portsmouth Water, therefore is not part of the Applicant's assessment.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The Applicant is evaluating for optimal decarbonisation of energy. An updated energy strategy will be provided in the second iteration of the Carbon Management Plan, detailing the plan to supply power to the Project and its impact on operational phase carbon emissions. The second iteration of the Carbon Management Plan will be prepared in accordance with the DCO requirements and after the Direct Procurement for Customers (DPC) tender process, when the contract with the Contractor is signed.
Wider Community	CC203	Respondents stated that the Project would generate unacceptably high carbon emissions and greater environmental impacts compared with other alternatives such as using groundwater, river water, or nearer aquifers. Respondents added that the carbon emissions from treating and transferring recycled effluent along with the extensive mitigation required to prevent water quality deterioration would result in a higher environmental impact.	N	The Project was selected as the best value solution following an optioneering process that included consideration of lifecycle carbon emissions. Continued abstractions from groundwater and rivers are no longer sustainable at current rates and therefore a new source of water is required. Water recycling is less energy-intensive and costly than alternatives that provide a comparable scale of water supply, such as desalination, and was determined as the best value solution as part of the Applicant's WRMP and options appraisal processes. Project costs, carbon emissions, energy usage, environmental impacts and affordability have been key factors in the Applicant's

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				assessment and consideration of alternative solutions. The different options considered are outlined in ES Chapter 4 Consideration of alternatives, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Expected emissions from the operation of the Project are quantified in the carbon assessment in ES Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) as well as mitigation measures that will be adopted to reduce impacts to as low as reasonably practicable, in line with legal and policy requirements.
Wider Community	CCC204	The respondents stated the cost and carbon impact of the Project would already be high and would add to the possibility of flooding.	N	Emissions from all phases of the Project are considered in the carbon assessment in ES Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and also sets out the mitigation measures that will be adopted to reduce impacts to as low as reasonably practicable, in line with legal and policy requirements. Flood risk is primarily assessed in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), which includes relevant mitigation measures to prevent flooding. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) secures the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				requirement for the Contractor to produce a Construction Drainage Plan post-consent which will include plans to reduce flood risk due to construction activities. Site-specific SuDS Strategy/Drainage Reports for all the permanent Above Ground Plant (AGP), Water Recycling Plant (WRP) and pipelines are described in ES Appendix 19.1 Flood Risk Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This appendix includes climate change allowances and assessment of flood risk to and from the Project. In addition, the resilience of the Project to surface, fluvial and tidal flooding is presented in ES Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	CCC205	The respondents raised concerns over the carbon emissions and associated costs of the construction and operation of the Project. Concerns were raised that treatment would be necessary to address algal bloom and that this would incur additional unnecessary costs and carbon impact. Respondents referenced previous consultation responses submitted, suggesting there existed viable alternatives, with lower costs and risks,	N	Carbon emissions from the construction and operation of the Project are presented in ES Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Alternative options for designs and technologies were considered by the Applicant during the optioneering stage. The Project was selected through the Applicant's WRMP and options appraisal processes as the most sustainable and best value solution to address the forecast water supply deficit in

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		and should be considered further fully and robustly.		Hampshire. It has been extensively considered against a range of alternatives, including consideration of carbon emissions as part of the assessment, and is the only option available to deliver the scale of water resource required in the timescales needed. The different options considered are outlined in ES Chapter 4 Consideration of alternatives, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The Project design reflects a range of environmental, technical, and sustainability factors that have been considered. Commitments made in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5), submitted with the DCO application, will ensure that the design reduces energy use where practicable and complies with the National Policy Statement requirement to ensure GHG emissions are as low as are reasonably practicable. Additional carbon emissions mitigation measures are included in the Outline Carbon Management Plan (Document reference 7.8, DCO Volume 7) also submitted and secured as part of the DCO application. The addition of the High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) would avoid the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water.
Wider Community	CCC206	It was stated that early warnings about climate change were dismissed 40 years ago by the government and that the Project was a carbon intensive option.	N	The Project has been developed in response to future water resource challenges, including climate change. The Project was selected through the Applicant's WRMP and options appraisal processes as the most sustainable and best value solution to address the forecast water supply deficit in Hampshire. It has been extensively considered against a range of alternatives, including consideration of carbon emissions as part of the assessment, and is the only option available to deliver the scale of water resource required in the timescales needed. The different options considered are outlined in ES Chapter 4 Consideration of alternatives, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Carbon emissions across the lifecycle of the Project are provided in ES Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), with carbon emissions mitigations detailed in the Design Principles Document (Document

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5), Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) and Outline Carbon Management Plan (Document reference 7.8, DCO Volume 7).

Table G25-31 Summary of issues raised on the theme of land quality and ground conditions and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC)	LQGC201	EBC noted that the Design Refinements do not address the general comments made by the Council in response to the Summer 2024 Consultation with regard to the contaminated land risks. However, the respondent expected that any further ground investigation works would include details on the ground conditions for the proposed new pipeline route, new access via Church Lane and construction compounds.	N	Pre-consent project-specific ground investigations (conducted as Phase 0, 1, 2, 3A, 3B and 3C) have now been completed. The findings of each phase of ground investigation, including an interpretation of soil, soil-leachate and groundwater laboratory analysis, are reported within ES Appendix 11.2 Geotechnical and geo-environmental reports, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Section 11.7 (baseline conditions) of ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) has been updated and now incorporates the Project-specific ground

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				investigation data. The updated baseline section is considered to provide a refined baseline reflective of current ground conditions within the Order Limits, inclusive of the pipeline route, access routes and construction compound locations within EBC's authority. Characteristic Situation 3 conditions identified during ground gas monitoring were identified within the Water Recycling Plant site (WRP site), which is located within Havant Borough Council's (HBC) jurisdiction and is not considered applicable to land within EBC's authority.
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	LQGC202	The respondent noted that the working corridor will be 20m either side of the pipeline, the pipeline will bend around the edge of Wickham Golf Course, and that the pipeline crosses through the middle of their land. The respondent raised concern over the pipeline that appeared to cross the former landfill site to the north of Five Oaks Farm, which was suggested to have been in operation in the late 1980s. The respondent suggested the area had been	N	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out the proposed construction methodology for the Pipelines. This includes a description of the 40m working width which would be implemented when the open cut trench method of pipeline installation is used. The Order Limits at Wickham Park Golf Club have been designed to provide flexibility for the final location of the pipeline to be determined following further

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		built up by some 10-20 m above natural ground level and the respondent had no knowledge of the material utilised in the landfill. The respondent suggested the land had a high risk of contamination and has been advised previously not to break the soil. The respondent queried whether the Applicant had accounted for passing through landfill, the strategy for managing the interaction with landfill, and how any hazardous material would be managed and stored. The respondent raised concern over the landfill site near Sandy Lane at Waltham Chase that was stated to be dug through. The respondent suggested it was not known what would be in the landfill site but believed it was filled in the 1950/60's with various waste, including medical waste and other toxic waste. The respondent strongly advised that the Applicant avoid digging in this area at all, however stated that guaranteed legal assurances were needed that the Applicant would be responsible for any issues found and any contamination spread.		engagement with the golf club, so impacts on its operations can be reduced. Historical landfills located within the Order Limits, including Rossgarth Landfill (located to the north-west of Five Oaks Farm) and Ash House Farm Landfill (located near Sandy Lane), were targeted as part of the project-specific ground investigations. The findings of the project-specific ground investigation within these areas, including an interpretation of soil, soil-leachate and groundwater analysis are reported within ES Appendix 11.2 Geotechnical and geo-environmental reports, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Section 11.7 (baseline conditions) of ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) incorporates the project-specific ground investigation data which includes descriptions of the ground conditions encountered (inclusive of details of any landfill materials encountered). The assessment concludes that, with the implementation of mitigation measures, including, for example, the Outline Construction Environmental Management

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		The respondents noted the contaminated area was notably close to their homes and did not want to be put at risk from any contaminants released into the air or water courses.		Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) which sets out construction phase environmental controls inclusive of the procedures for working in areas of potential contamination (including historical landfills), there would be no significant effects to land quality and ground conditions receptors (inclusive of neighbouring site users and water courses). Details in relation to the off-site management of hazardous wastes are provided in ES Chapter 16 Resources and waste management, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) includes measures to ensure that hazardous waste generated by the Project is minimised and managed in accordance with relevant legislation. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) sets out measures to ensure that hazardous waste would be correctly tested, classified and kept separate from non-hazardous waste, and that opportunities to reduce and divert hazardous waste from landfill, through design measures, treatment, remediation and recovery, would

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				be identified in the Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) which would be produced by the Contractor post consent. The requirements for these measures to be documented in the SWMP are set out in RWM2, RWM5 and RWM8 of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7).
PIL	LQGC203	The respondent expressed concern that the pipeline would not pass through impermeable London clay but might instead disrupt the chalk bed and disturb the local aquifers. The respondent understood that the Applicant held data from boreholes, particularly those used for water abstraction further upstream in the area of the northern option, as well as from soundings - referred to as "sonic booms"-conducted near the southern option. This data had been used by the Applicant to determine the current proposed crossing point at the River Itchen. The respondent noted that the depth and, to some extent, the precise crossing point might change depending on the results of a detailed assessment that was scheduled to be performed at a later date. However, the	N	Pre-consent project-specific ground investigations within Sections L and M of the Pipelines, conducted as Phase 1, 2, 3A, 3B and 3C, have now been completed. The ground investigation reports for these sections of the Project form ES Appendix 11.2 Geotechnical and geo-environmental reports, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The site investigation data has confirmed that the River Itchen is underlain by the London Clay at the crossing location and not in direct continuity with the chalk Principal Aquifer. Section 11.7 (baseline conditions) of ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) incorporates the project-specific ground investigation data and so is considered to provide a baseline reflective of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		respondent outlined that the Applicant did not currently possess precise data regarding the geological strata of the land, especially the clay, beneath any part of the respondent's land.		the geological strata present within the Project. Section 11.8 (Assessment of likely significant effects) of ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of the potential impacts on aquifers (including chalk aquifers) as a result of the Project with respect to contamination. Mitigation measures protective of all aquifer units are secured within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) and discussed in both ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The assessment provided within ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) concluded that, with the implementation of mitigation measures, there would be no likely significant effects on aquifers as a result of the Project.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	LQGC2 04	Respondents strongly opposed the use of the Broadmarsh landfill site, citing significant environmental and safety concerns. They stated that construction could create new pathways for contaminated leachate to reach Langstone Harbour during both construction and operation. The site was described as an unlined historical landfill containing unknown materials, likely including mobile contaminants such as hydrocarbons and solvents. Disturbing the currently stable soil was considered a risk that could release pollutants into local streams, soil, and the sea. Concerns extended to the site's instability and evidence of subsidence near Harts Farm Way, as well as potential pollution of Bedhampton Springs, located less than a mile away. Respondents highlighted that deep piling, tunnel shafts, and pipelines through the landfill into the chalk aquifer could exacerbate risks, given the aquifer's hydraulic connection to the harbour and its sensitivity to tidal variations. Additional risks were associated with new surface	N	Pre-consent project specific and previous phases of ground investigations have been undertaken within the WRP site (also known as Broadmarsh landfill historically). The ground investigations involved the collection of geochemical samples, groundwater, surface water and ground gas monitoring both within the WRP site and surrounding areas (including Hermitage Stream). Soil, soil-leachate, groundwater and surface water samples were sent for laboratory analysis, the results of which are provided within ES Appendix 11.2 Geotechnical and geo-environmental reports, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), with an overview of the findings included within ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Surface water at the WRP site would be attenuated and treated through a sustainable drainage system (SuDS). This would include an outfall to release surface water into the tidal reach of Hermitage Stream. The SuDS will capture surface water and will not interact with the buried historical landfill. Detailed modelling of surface water runoff from the SuDS outfall is provided in ES Appendix

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		water drainage features, such as swales, detention basins, and carrier ditches, which could increase leachate dispersal. Respondents questioned the accuracy of the PEI Report which stated that Langstone Harbour was in 'good' condition for contaminants such as hydrocarbons and pesticides, despite existing issues with mercury and Polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDE)s. They argued that the potential effects of the Water Recycling Plant on landfill had not been adequately assessed, particularly regarding impacts on the Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Areas of Conservation (Special SAC), internationally protected species, and habitats. Further concerns included adverse effects on the coastal landscape and the urbanisation of the north coast. Additional objections focused on contaminated waste excavation, which could drain under gravity to the Hermitage Stream due to topography. Respondents warned of long-term risks from future maintenance or new works over the plant's 60–70-year lifespan, including health and		19.12 Water Recycling Plant site Sustainable Drainage System dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The change in salinity resulting from the SuDS outfall release, when compared with the natural fluctuations in ambient salinity levels throughout the tidal cycle, is predicted to be extremely small. Significant adverse effects on water quality are therefore not anticipated from releases from the WRP SuDS outfall. The SuDS outfall to Hermitage Stream would be designed in accordance with the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). Section 11.8 (Assessment of likely significant effects) of ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of the potential for preferential pathways to be created or modified (which would allow for the migration of contaminants, including soil leachates) as a result of construction and operation activities within the WRP site and the potential impacts this could have on surface waters and the ecological habitats they support (inclusive of Langstone Harbour). Section 11.8 ES

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		safety hazards. They also noted insufficient data on Langstone Harbour contamination and seasonal water quality changes, as well as risks of gas and leachate migration along tunnels and pipelines—even after decommissioning—if voids were left in place. Other issues raised included carbon impacts, cumulative effects on Langstone Harbour and Chichester, and the increased height of the Water Recycling Plant, which would require deeper piles. Respondents referred to PEIR statements that excavation shafts would likely encounter groundwater, necessitate control measures, and stress the need to consider risks from karstic features in the chalk.		Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) also assesses the potential impacts to Bedhampton Springs, and other controlled waters receptors as a result of the Project with regards to contamination. Additionally, potential impacts associated with the migration of ground gas as a result of construction activities within the WRP site are assessed within section 11.8 of ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Mitigation measures for the WRP site in relation to ground gas are outlined in ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and secured within the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). Mitigation measures associated with soil leachate from the historical landfill are secured within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) and discussed in both ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions Volume I (Document reference 6.1,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				DCO Volume 6) and ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The assessment provided within ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) concluded that, with the implementation of mitigation measures, there would be no likely significant effects to Langstone Harbour (including the tidal Hermitage Stream) and Solent designated sites from the migration of soil leachate from the historical landfill or to Bedhampton Springs as a result of the Project. The assessment also concluded that, with the implementation of mitigation measures, there would be no likely significant effect associated with the potential migration of ground gas from the historical landfill on land quality and ground conditions receptors. The WRP structure will rest upon piled foundations bearing upon competent natural strata. Deep shafts and tunnels will also be founded within competent natural strata. The detailed design of the WRP and associated shafts, tunnels and pipelines will be required to mitigate risks associated with differential settlement including provision of suitably

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				stable foundations and connections designed with additional tolerances to accommodate differential movement without the risk of leakage e.g., through flexible joints in pipework. An Outline Foundation Works Risk Assessment has been prepared and submitted with the DCO application (Document reference 7.4, DCO Volume 7). It is not intended to prescribe definitive foundation design but instead provide examples of foundation types that may be adopted. The Outline Foundation Works Risk Assessment (Document reference 7.4, DCO Volume 7) covers the Water Recycling Plant, AGP and trenchless crossings as well as tunnels and shafts. The commitment to undertake detailed Foundation Works Risk Assessments is secured within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The detailed Foundation Works Risk Assessments, to be developed by the contractor post-consent, will serve to manage potential risks and ensure appropriate mitigation measures are implemented to reduce the potential impacts on environmental receptors (including, for

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				example marine biodiversity and controlled water receptors) as a result of, for example, the creation or modification of preferential pathways. Detailed Foundation Works Risk Assessments will be developed in line with CL:AIRE's Piling and Penetrative Ground Improvement Methods on Land Affected by Contamination: Guidance on Pollution Prevention as secured within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). In addition to the measures outlined above, the potential hydrogeological impacts when working within the sensitive aquifer have been considered within ES Appendix 19.3 Hydrogeological Assessment (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) which has informed control measures outlined within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) and ES Appendix 19.9 Outline Water Monitoring Plan, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This includes a watching brief when working within the chalk, and the implementation of monitoring trigger levels and actions plans.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				With reference to the 'good' status of certain water quality elements in Langstone Harbour, these have been taken from the EA's Catchment Data Explorer. ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) (Table 19-45) states that: "Langstone Harbour is 'Heavily modified and at Moderate' potential. Langstone Oysterbeds is classified as artificial. Physico-chemical parameters (dissolved inorganic nitrogen, DO) are at good status and specific pollutants, and phytoplankton are at high status in Langstone Harbour." Chemical status for both water bodies is 'Fail' associated with mercury and PBDEs. A sector responsible has not been identified. These data are correct. In addition, the 2022 EA water body assessment for chemical status, which includes the pollutants mentioned, is 'does not require assessment'. This is the same for all water bodies in England due to a range of global pollutants. Good status is anticipated by the EA in around 2063 and is a reflection of natural system recovery time.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The effects on landscape character have been assessed and considered in the design of the Project, as summarised in the ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The Applicant acknowledges that the WRP would introduce new built form; however, this would be located adjacent to existing industrial development and would therefore not be out of keeping with the established context. The design incorporates a combination of embedded mitigation measures, including limiting building heights, using materials and colours suited to the local context (informed by a colour assessment), reinforcing existing boundary vegetation, and incorporating a green/brown roof to assist with landscape integration. This is presented in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). As set out in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), these measures would assist in integrating the WRP site within its landscape setting and enhancing the gateway to the area via the junction of Harts Farm Way with the A27. This would further reduce the size and scale and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				geographical extent over which impacts would be perceived to its immediate setting. The LVIA is presented in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), with further details in ES Appendix 13.4 Landscape baseline and effects, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessment concluded that, with the implementation of mitigation measures which includes measures set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7), there would be no long term significant effects on this landscape receptor. An assessment of the potential impacts on land quality and ground conditions receptors during the operation of the WRP is included within ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The assessment concluded that, with the implementation of mitigation measures which includes measures set out in the Operational Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7), there would be no significant effects on land quality and ground conditions receptors.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				With regards to the decommissioning of the Project, an assessment of the potential impacts associated with the migration of ground gas and soil-leachate along pipelines left in-situ on land quality and ground conditions receptors is included within ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The assessment concluded that, with the implementation of mitigation measures (assumed to be similar in nature to those implemented during construction), there would be no significant effects on land quality and ground conditions receptors. With regards to carbon impacts, the carbon assessment in ES Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) considers emissions from all phases of the Project and sets out the mitigation measures that will be adopted to reduce impacts to as low as reasonably practicable, in line with legal and policy requirements.
Wider Community	LQGC205	The respondent stated that the risk to Langstone Harbour through the building of the WRP on the Broadmarsh landfill had not been considered and more detailed	N	An assessment of the potential impacts associated with the Project, including from the construction of the WRP on the former Broadmarsh landfill site, on the Chichester

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		studies were needed. The respondent also stated the additional risk the developed site poses to water quality as a result of locating the new drainage system on top of or within the contained landfill site containing contaminants (leachate), had not been adequately assessed.		and Langstone Harbour SPA is provided within the ES. Each respective assessment sets out the relevant mitigation measures required to avoid, remove or reduce any impacts and effects: ▪ Section 4 of ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) ▪ Section 4 of ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) ▪ Section 4 of ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) ▪ Section 4 of ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) These chapters should also be read in conjunction with the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) which provides the full suite of proposed mitigation measures which would be employed by the Contractor once appointed during construction of the Project.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The assessments concluded that, following implementation of appropriate mitigation (including the design of a SuDS for the permanent development), there would not be any adverse impacts on the tidal Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour as a result of developing the WRP and its drainage system on the landfill site.
Wider Community	LQGC2 06	The respondent queried how it would be ensured that any chemicals or biochemicals in the excavated landfill sites would not cause contamination.	N	The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) provides the measures which would be employed by the Contractor once appointed during construction of the Project to prevent and reduce the likelihood of contamination occurring as a result of construction activities within the areas associated with historical landfills. This covers protections to contamination to the environment, human health and controlled waters receptors from the release of potential contaminants from landfill materials.
Wider Community	LQGC2 07	Respondents noted concern over the risk of contamination to Langstone Harbour, as a result of plans to build the WRP on former landfill site Broadmarsh, during construction and operation.	N	Pre-consent project specific and previous phases of ground investigations have been undertaken within the WRP site (also known as Broadmarsh landfill historically). The ground investigations involved the collection of geo-environmental samples, groundwater,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Respondents noted concern over the environmental risk of the construction on the landfill site specifically in relation to deep piling, tunnelling and burying of the pipes which the respondent suggested would likely result in new pathways for contamination to leach into the chalk aquifer. Respondents considered that adequate assessments to understand the risk of leachate during construction and maintenance had not been undertaken.		surface water and ground gas monitoring both within the WRP site and surrounding area. Soil, soil-leachate, groundwater and surface water samples were sent for laboratory analysis, the results of which are provided within ES Appendix 11.2 Geotechnical and geo-environmental reports, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) with an overview of the findings included within ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Section 11.8 (Assessment of likely significant effects) of ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of the potential for preferential pathways to be created or modified (which would allow for the migration of contaminants, including soil leachates) as a result of construction and operation activities within the WRP site and the potential impacts this could have on Langstone Harbour and chalk aquifers. Mitigation measures associated with the migration of soil leachate from the historical landfill are secured within the Outline Construction Environmental Management

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) and discussed in both ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I and ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). An Outline Foundation Works Risk Assessment (Document reference 7.4, DCO Volume 7) has been prepared and submitted with the DCO application. It is not intended to prescribe definitive foundation design but instead provide examples of foundation types that may be adopted. The Outline Foundation Works Risk Assessment (Document reference 7.4, DCO Volume 7) covers the WRP, AGP and trenchless crossings as well as tunnels and shafts. The commitment to undertake detailed Foundation Works Risk Assessments is secured within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The detailed Foundation Works Risk Assessments which would be produced by the contractor post-consent would serve to manage potential risks and ensure appropriate mitigation measures are implemented to reduce the potential impacts on Langstone Harbour and chalk aquifers as a result of, for example, the creation or

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				modification of preferential pathways. The detailed Foundation Works Risk Assessments would be developed in line with CL:AIRE's Piling and Penetrative Ground Improvement Methods on Land Affected by Contamination: Guidance on Pollution Prevention as secured within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The assessment provided within ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) for both the construction and operational phases of the WRP site concluded that, with the implementation of mitigation measures, there would be no likely significant effects to either Langstone Harbour or chalk aquifers from the migration of soil leachate.
Wider Community	LQGC2 08	Respondents queried where the sludge from the reverse osmosis process was going to go. It was stated that the sludge would contain high concentrations of contaminants that had been filtered out and that there was a growing issue with the normal sludge going to farmland where the contaminants would be absorbed by plants	N	The proposed treatment train in the reference design for DCO submission does not produce a solid stream and sludge management will not be required. Liquid process waste produced by the WRP would be transferred to Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) via the existing sewer network. The process waste would undergo the usual

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		and re-enter the food chain but in much higher concentrations.		wastewater treatment process at Budds Farm WTW.
Wider Community	LQGC209	The respondent stated that the risk to Langstone Harbour of building the WRP on the Broadmarsh dilute-and-disperse landfill had not been considered.	N	An assessment of the potential impacts associated with the Project, including from the construction of the WRP site of the former Broadmarsh landfill site, on the Chichester and Langstone Harbour SPA is provided within the ES. Each respective assessment sets out the relevant mitigation measures required to avoid, remove or reduce any impacts and effects: ▪ ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) ▪ ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) ▪ ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) ▪ ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). These chapters should also be read in conjunction with the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) which provides the full suite of proposed mitigation measures to be employed by the Contractor during construction of the Project. The assessments concluded that, following implementation of appropriate mitigation (including the design of a SuDS for the Project), there would not be any adverse impacts on the tidal Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour as a result of developing the WRP and its drainage system on the landfill site.

Table G25-32 Summary of issues raised on the theme of land use and agriculture and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
	LUA201	The Health and Safety Executive confirmed that based on the information in Vol I of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report; May 2024) version C01 and the contents of the Spring 2025 Consultation, it was unlikely that the Health and Safety Executive would advise against the development.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		The Health and Safety Executive advised that the advice is dependent on the location of areas where people may be present and added that this was based on the Executive's existing policy for providing land-use planning advice and the information which has been provided. It was noted that advice in response to a subsequent planning application may differ should the Health and Safety Executive 's policy or the scope of the development change by the time the DCO application is submitted.		
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	LUA202	The respondent described their land uses and landholding's circumstances. The respondent noted Five Oaks Farm comprises large hard standing yards for commercial storage, commercial office buildings in use and under construction, two domestic residences, barns for agricultural, commercial and equestrian use, as well as buildings associated with such use on approximately 35 acres of land.	N	The Applicant has engaged with the landowner of Five Oaks Farm to understand the land use of the holding. ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) does not report any significant effects specific to Five Oaks Farm. The Applicant continues to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and discuss their individual circumstances further.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Following the statutory consultations, the Applicant invited landowners who provided feedback to meet and discuss their comments further, to better understand possible impacts. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker for the status of negotiations of voluntary land agreements with affected landowners (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4).
PIL	LUA203	The respondents stated the proposed water main and associated infrastructure would impact on current land use and matters for discussion and agreement were set out within respective consultation responses. A respondent stated existing land uses to include grazing of goats, production of hay which in 2024 yielded 1400 small bales with a value of £8,400, use for livestock and pasture grazing and fodder production. Other respondents noted the field, known as Watsons, would be wholly affected as it was assumed this would be where the drilling rig for the underground tunnel would be positioned. This field was stated to have been sown to a new ley in Autumn	N	The Applicant continues to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and discuss their individual circumstances further. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker for the status of negotiations of voluntary land agreements with affected landowners (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4). Those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		2024 at great expense and investment and represented the primary and most productive field for fodder production on the farm to the landowner. The landowner stated that this was a 5-year ley which would be totally destroyed by works and would reduce the respondents fodder production and grazing capacity significantly and consequently endanger the ongoing viability of the livestock enterprise. The newly proposed route was described to also impact on the field known as Market Garden, which represented the farm's primary grazing pasture closest to the farm buildings. Although currently the proposed Draft Order Limits were identified to only impact the southeastern corner of this field, combined with the total loss of Watsons field was stated to render the usable grassland insufficient to sustain the respondents' current and proposed livestock numbers and would require some cattle to be sold and a reassessment of the whole enterprise.		amount of land necessary to deliver the Project within the Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant would only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the authorised development. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree practical solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted. With regards to maintaining the quality of topsoil, land would be restored to its existing condition following the installation of the pipeline in accordance with a detailed Soil Resource Management Plan (SRMP) that would be prepared by the Contractor once appointed as set in the Outline SRMP appended to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) and submitted

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		The respondent queried how the potentially hazardous material from the site would be stored and quality of topsoil maintained, noting years have been spent making improvements for equestrian and agricultural uses.		with the DCO application. The land would therefore be farmable following reinstatement. The Outline SRMP sets the criteria for the appropriate timing, weather conditions and soil moisture conditions for handling soils, including topsoil, and the appropriate plant to be used in order that the quality of topsoil and subsoil can be maintained and that the land can be fully reinstated. The Outline SRMP which is appended to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) also sets out the scope of works for the Agricultural Liaison Officer which includes preparing the Record of Condition of land prior to the commencement of the construction works (and intrusive surveys) and discussing and agreeing reinstatement measures following the completion of the construction works. Details in relation to the off-site management of hazardous wastes are provided in ES Chapter 16 Resources and waste management, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) includes measures to ensure that

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				hazardous waste generated by the Project could be minimised and managed in accordance with relevant legislation. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) sets out measures to ensure that hazardous waste would be correctly tested, classified and kept separate from non-hazardous waste, and that opportunities to reduce and divert hazardous waste from landfill, through design measures, treatment, remediation and recovery, would be identified in the Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP). The requirements for these measures to be documented in the SWMP are set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7).
PIL	LUA204	The respondents stated the Project would likely irreparably damage the soil structure and make the land unfarmable for a number of subsequent years, which was stated to be of concern to landowners. The respondents noted soil surveys are undertaken prior to the commencement of works and upon completion, whilst noting that the results should be shared with landowners.	N	Land would be restored to its existing condition following the installation of the pipeline in accordance with a detailed Soil Resource Management Plan (SRMP) that would be prepared by the Contractor as set out in the Outline SRMP appended to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) and submitted with the DCO application. The land would therefore be

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				farmable following reinstatement. The Outline SRMP sets the criteria for the appropriate timing, weather conditions and soil moisture conditions for handling soils, including topsoil, and the appropriate plant to be used in order that the quality of topsoil and subsoil can be maintained and that the land can be fully reinstated. The Outline SRMP (appended to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7)) also sets out the scope of works for the Agricultural Liaison Officer which includes preparing the Record of Condition of land prior to the commencement of the construction works (and intrusive surveys) and discussing and agreeing reinstatement measures with landowners following the completion of the construction works. The Applicant continues to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and discuss their individual circumstances further. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the status of negotiations of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				voluntary land agreements with affected landowners.
PIL	LUA205	The respondent raised concerns about the potential implications for future use of the site, particularly regarding future farming and potential aspirations to bring the site forward for residential development.	N	Land would be restored to its existing condition following the installation of the pipeline in accordance with a detailed SRMP that would be prepared by the Contractor as set out in the Outline SRMP appended to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) and submitted with the DCO application. There would therefore be no implications for the future farming of the land. The Applicant cannot mitigate impacts on proposed developments where no site proposals have been provided and there are only aspirations for future development. Where land is being promoted or affected parties are developing proposals, the Applicant would continue to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and discuss their individual circumstances further. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the status of negotiations of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				voluntary land agreements with affected landowners.
PIL	LUA206	The respondent stated that post completion of works, the land would be unusable for grazing for about 12 months while the grass was reseeded and reestablished.	N	Land would be restored to its existing condition following the installation of the pipeline in accordance with a detailed SRMP that would be prepared by the Contractor as set out in the Outline SRMP appended to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) and submitted with the DCO application. A Record of Condition would be prepared prior to intrusive surveys and construction works, and reinstatement measures would be discussed and agreed with the landowner following completion of the construction works. The land would be handed back to the landowner following reinstatement and it would be for the landowner to decide what and when to sow. Those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				amount of land necessary to deliver the Project within the Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant would only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the authorised development. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree practical solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted.
PIL	LUA207	The respondent stated their agricultural land was of high quality, a former market garden land and that the pipe installation must be sufficiently deep to facilitate any agricultural activity, e.g. ploughing, mole ploughing etc. and that the topsoil should be replaced to the depth as beforehand.	N	Land would be restored to its existing condition following the installation of the pipeline in accordance with a detailed SRMP that would be prepared by the Contractor as set out in the Outline SRMP appended to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) and submitted with the DCO application. The pipeline would be installed normally with a minimum of 0.9m coverage of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				soil above the crown of the pipeline which will allow all normal agricultural operations to continue following reinstatement of the land, as set out in ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
PIL	LUA208	The respondents stated that by the time the pipeline was ready to be laid, the development status of certain land was likely to be significantly enhanced (either via an allocation or potentially an outline consent) and as a consequence the value of this land, and the resultant easement consideration that the Applicant would need to pay would be significant and the further into the field the pipeline was routed (and the more land it sterilised around it) the greater the diminution in value of the land would be. The respondents requested the route to be realigned as close to the field boundaries as possible. It was also queried whether the easement width could be reduced to minimise impact on the land and its future use.	N	Those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum amount of land necessary to deliver the Project within the Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant would only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the authorised development. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree practical solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		One respondent also queried whether capping of the pipes would be done to allow some form of development above it. A further respondent raised concerns of potential impacts to on-going farming practices but also, due to the associated easements, that the Project would limit the extent to which the site could deliver residential development. The respondent expressed the feeling that their comments had been ignored and noted that the proposed pipeline followed a largely central route, through the middle of the Little Park Farm.		advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted. The Applicant cannot mitigate impacts on proposed developments where no site proposals have been provided and there are only aspirations for future development. Where land is being promoted or affected parties are developing proposals, the Applicant would continue to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and discuss their individual circumstances further. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the status of negotiations of voluntary land agreements with affected landowners. As set out in Section 3.6 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), a protective strip of land either side of the entire alignment would be required where the pipeline is installed using open-cut construction methods to ensure space and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				access to enable maintenance and repair; protect the integrity of the pipeline from external influences (e.g. loading) and protect third party assets from potential damage in the event of a burst. The protective strip would restrict the landowner or occupier from undertaking certain activities that would restrict access to or affect the integrity of the pipeline. These restrictions include erecting, constructing or placing any temporary or permanent building, wall or other structure. Land would be restored to its existing condition following the installation of the pipeline in accordance with a detailed SRMP that would be prepared by the Contractor as set out in the Outline SRMP appended to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) and submitted with the DCO application. The land would therefore be farmable following reinstatement. The Outline SRMP sets the criteria for the appropriate timing, weather conditions and soil moisture conditions for handling soils, including topsoil, and the appropriate plant to be used in order that the quality of topsoil and subsoil can be

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				maintained and that the land can be fully reinstated.
PIL	LUA209	A Respondent noted that the Little Park Farmland was currently in agricultural use and accessed via Titchfield Lane. Another respondent noted that the 'Top Field' part of their land was similarly affected by the original proposal but combined with changes resulting from the newly proposed route impacting other land the impact was considered more concerning overall. The respondent identified the revised route to result in increased impact on eastern parts of the Treefield Farm, which they highlighted critically included farm buildings and the primary access route into the farm that were now proposed to be included in the Project and on that basis raised their concern about the ongoing viability of the business and respondents' livelihood.	N	The Applicant continues to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and discuss their individual circumstances further. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker for the status of negotiations of voluntary land agreements with affected landowners (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4). Those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum amount of land necessary to deliver the Project within the Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant would only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				land actually required to deliver the authorised development. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree practical solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted.
PIL	LUA210	Respondents raised concerns that the Project would affect animals, including herds of goats on their respective land by crossing grazing land. A respondent noted that this would likely cause upheaval, stress, and anxiety to both the animals as well as themselves.	N	The Applicant continues to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and discuss their individual circumstances further. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker for the status of negotiations of voluntary land agreements with affected landowners (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4). The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), sets out how the Project would avoid, reduce and mitigate effects on the environment and surrounding area during construction, including accommodation such as crossing points,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				maintaining access or the provision of alternative accesses to mitigate field severance and reduce impacts on land uses such grazing land. Those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum amount of land necessary to deliver the Project within the Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant would only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the authorised development. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree practical solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted. As set out in the methodology in section 17.5 of the ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), this Chapter includes consideration of impacts on the community's mental health and wellbeing. With regards to the potential stress and anxiety caused to animals such as goats, this is not covered in the scope of the Environmental Statement (ES) as these follow defined regulations and focus on assessing likely significant effects on recognised receptors such as wildlife habitats they do not normally cover emotional impacts such as anxiety experienced by domestic animals.
PIL	LUA211	Respondents raised concerns stating that the proposed pipeline route would jeopardise the viability of their business farm operations and one respondent suggested that almost 50% of their operational farmland would become unusable during construction and	N	The Applicant continues to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and discuss their individual circumstances further. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the status of negotiations of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		reinstatement and that this may result in livestock reduction or disbandment. The beneficiaries of Upper Brambridge Farm stated their intention to expand the existing equestrian business and develop further farming and diversification activity on the farm. As a result, it was noted that at the point in time which construction of the Project was anticipated, there may be significantly more and different work happening which would need to be considered with regard to compensation for loss of income. The land south of Kiln Lane, Otterbourne was stated to be in use for hay production, which the respondent suggested would be halted for a minimum of two years in the event the pipeline ran through the site, which yielded £10,290 in 2024 with 343 large bales. The respondents noted the inability to effectively run the farm would result in insufficient income to be viable and may result in the need for a redundancy package.		voluntary land agreements with affected landowners. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), sets out how the Project would avoid, reduce and mitigate effects on the environment and surrounding area during construction, including accommodation such as crossing points, maintaining access or the provision of alternative accesses to mitigate field severance and reduce impacts on land uses such as equestrian holdings. Those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum amount of land necessary to deliver the Project within the Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant would only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		The respondent at Upper Brambridge Farm provided monetary values expected to arise from the impact of the Project and that were expected to be compensated if the Project was pursued as proposed.		land actually required to deliver the authorised development. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree practical solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	LUA212	The respondent requested a detailed breakdown of the land required for the pipeline and associated infrastructure to understand the extent of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land (BMV) that may be affected by the Project. The respondent suggested the breakdown should account for both temporary and permanent land take, and a breakdown of the respective Agricultural Land Classification Grade of the affected land. The respondent additionally queried the impact of ongoing surveys on agricultural activity of the land.	N	ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) assesses the impact of the Project on agricultural land and soils (section 12.8). This includes a detailed breakdown of the land required and the associated infrastructure. Overall, the area of agricultural land that would be removed temporarily from agricultural use during construction would extend to 240ha, although it is unlikely that this area would all be removed at the same time due to phasing of the construction works. This includes land within the Order Limits

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				required for the installation of the pipelines by open-cut trench construction, as well as the temporary construction compounds (other than those associated with the Above Ground Plant (AGP)). Approximately 114ha or 48% is BMV land in Grades 1, 2 and 3a, and 126ha (52%) is non-BMV land in Subgrade 3b and Grade 4. There would be a temporary, short-term, moderate adverse effect on Grade 1 and 2 BMV agricultural land and a temporary, short-term, minor adverse effect on Subgrade 3a BMV agricultural land. The effect on the non-BMV land is assessed as temporary, short-term, minor adverse to neutral. The area of agricultural land that would be removed permanently from agricultural use has been minimised and would be a minor magnitude of impact, involving a total of 2.68ha of agricultural land, of which 1.6ha is BMV land in Grades 2 and 3a. This is land required mostly for the AGP, although there would also be a number of isolation valves, air valves and washout valves (with ventilated chambers) along the route of the pipeline. There would be a minor to moderate adverse permanent effect on BMV land and neutral to minor adverse effect on non-BMV land.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Access for surveys on agricultural land was agreed with landowners via voluntary licences. Where access was not agreed voluntarily the Applicant used statutory notices under section 172 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016. The Applicant would continue to engage with affected parties to seek to agree access where required by voluntary agreement where possible and would aim to minimise disturbance to existing land uses wherever possible.
Wider Community	LUA213	The respondent referred to an earlier version of the proposal, which they understood to include measures to protect the surrounding woodland and wildlife, as well as maintaining access to and from Staunton Country Park. They expressed concern that these environmental commitments were not clearly secured and stated that a named officer should be appointed with clear responsibility and accountability for overseeing this key environmental aspect of the project.	N	At the time of the Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) Report, more than one option was being considered for the section of Pipeline between the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) site and Havant Thicket Reservoir. Staunton Country Park was within the study area for the land use and agriculture assessment at that time. A high-level assessment was carried out to address the comments received from stakeholders at the time, however following the approval in 2025 of Portsmouth Water's application for two new pipelines between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir, the Applicant's backup option for pipelines between the WRP site and Havant Thicket Reservoir was not

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				progressed any further. Therefore, no works are proposed between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir as part of the Project. The Applicant's DCO application will seek to authorise the use of Portsmouth Water's Pipelines to transfer recycled water between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir. Further information on the removal of the backup option is contained in section 5 of the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5).
Wider Community	LUA214	The respondent stated that an array of non-intrusive and intrusive surveys and assessments would need to be undertaken. These are to include ecology assessments undertaken by external biologists and ecologists, assessments on the long-term impact on soil health and agricultural productivity and improved water modelling with an associated report. The respondents also added that the timing and methodology of surveys should aim to minimise disruption to farming activities as much as possible.	N	Surveys have been undertaken, as detailed across the ES, Ground Investigation (GI) and FRA workstreams. These surveys have considered the long-term impact on soil health and agricultural productivity, as set out in ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Access for surveys on agricultural land was agreed with landowners via voluntary licences. Where access was not agreed voluntarily the Applicant used statutory notices under section 172 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016. The Applicant will continue to engage with affected parties to seek to agree access where required by

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				voluntary agreement where possible and will aim to minimise disturbance to existing land uses wherever possible. The approach taken to surveys of agricultural land used temporarily and permanently for the Project has been discussed and agreed with NE and presented in various Community EIA Working Group sessions. Detailed ALC surveys have been undertaken of areas required permanently for AGP whilst the areas subject to temporary, short-term disturbance for installing the pipelines have been classified using data and samples obtained from the GI. The importance of soil management is reflected in the Outline SRMP that is appended to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) submitted with the DCO application. Water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir and in water bodies downstream that will receive compensation flows has been modelled in detail. Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. This includes ecological status and biological quality elements. There would be no detrimental effects on biodiversity potential. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir. The Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. This shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. The impact of releases from Eastney LSO on Solent water quality has been modelled. The assessment of chemicals within the release released from the LSO has been undertaken in line with the EA's guidance for surface water pollution risk assessment. Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as Langstone Harbour or the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream.

Table G25-33 Summary of issues raised on the theme of landscape and visual and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Eastleigh Borough	LV201	EBC stated the Design Refinements did not alter the general comments made in response to the Summer 2024 Consultation. The Council considered that	N	The Applicant notes that this issue was raised before publication of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), which has since been completed. Vegetation loss is addressed with

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Council (EBC)		detailed plans for vegetation loss, replacement planting and landscape mitigation were required to enable a proper assessment of the long-term landscape impact within Eastleigh Borough.		the Equality Impact Assessment (Document reference 7.13, DCO Volume 7), and ES Appendix 8.2 Habitats, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The AIA identifies tree features proposed for removal. The assessment is provided in ES Appendix 13.5 Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). A detailed schedule of tree features likely to be removed under a worst case scenario is set out in Tables 3 and 4, with corresponding mapping in the report Appendices illustrating the locations of proposed full and partial removals. Further details regarding other vegetation (e.g. hedgerows and grasses) is provided in ES Appendix 8.2 Habitats, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The Applicant confirms that replacement planting has been considered. Where vegetation is removed to facilitate construction, it would be reinstated in line with the reinstatement strategy set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7). ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Volume 6), supported by ES Appendix 13.3 Landscape baseline and effects, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), provides an assessment of the long-term landscape impacts of the Project. Appendix 13.3 details the baseline and impacts on landscape features (trees and hedgerows) (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), broken down by landscape receptor (Local Landscape Character Area), drawing on the AIA and taking account of the committed measures in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7). While detailed plans for vegetation loss and replacement planting would be developed post-consent, the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) specifies that the Contractor would deliver each measure and commitment through detailed LEMPs prepared at the detailed design stage and submitted for approval to the local planning authority. In addition, the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) requires the Contractor to produce an updated AIA at that stage.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Design development, survey work and the assessment approach have been shared with EBC and other local planning authorities through the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) working groups and officer-level engagement, including bilateral meetings, as detailed within section 13.3 of Chapter 13 Landscape and visual (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET)	LV202	National Grid Electricity Transmission suggested that if a landscaping scheme is proposed, it requested that only slow and low growing species of trees and shrubs are planted beneath and adjacent to the existing overhead line to reduce the risk of growth to a height which could compromise statutory safety clearances.	N	The Applicant confirms that the reinstatement strategy is in line with NGET's request. The reinstatement strategy is set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) and has been informed by the ES Appendix 13.5 Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and hedgerow surveys. This includes consideration of planting beneath and adjacent to the existing overhead lines to reduce the risk of growth to a height which compromises statutory safety clearances.
Hampshire County Council (HCC)	LV203	The Council noted that regarding the environmental management plan, an overarching plan was required for submission to and approval by the County Council and the Staunton County Park	N	Following the approval in 2025 of Portsmouth Water's application for two new pipelines between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir, the Applicant's backup option for pipelines between the water

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		management team. The County Council explained further that the plan needed to include pre-commencement actions, operational period actions, as well as restoration and aftercare plans. It was intended to set out and address all aspects necessary to preserve, mitigate, and compensate for the works, ensuring there were no lasting effects on the site's status as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and a grade II* listed park and garden.		recycling plant (WRP) site and Havant Thicket Reservoir was not progressed any further. Therefore, no works are proposed between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir as part of the Project. The Applicant's DCO application would seek to authorise the use of Portsmouth Water's Pipelines to transfer recycled water between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir. Further information on the removal of the backup option is contained in section 5 of the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5). An Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) has been prepared, setting out the environmental mitigation and reinstatement measures for all areas where works are proposed.
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	LV204	The respondent stated that the proposal to remove a vast swathe of roadside hedge, assumed to be 58m had been included within the Draft Order Limits which was stated to drastically change the feel of the land.	N	The Applicant has had regard to these points and confirms that the design has sought to avoid impacts on vegetation and mature trees through alignment refinement, reduced working width (RWW) of 20m being implemented at sensitive locations and that

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		The respondent suggested the Applicant commit to removing as little hedgerow as possible, expressing a preference for less than 6m (3m for access + 3 m for pipe). The respondent also noted there was an ancient oak tree on the roadside (near Sciviers Lane) and requested commitment that this tree and its roots would be protected and not removed or damaged. The respondent stated two further oak trees were found on the northern side which should also be avoided at all costs.		there would be no loss or deterioration of ancient and veteran trees. While the Project seeks to minimise vegetation loss, it is anticipated that one high-quality (Category A) Oak tree and a section of hedgerow along Sciviers Lane would need to be removed to facilitate construction of the Project. In addition, two high -quality Oak trees and a moderate quality Willow to the east of Swallow Roost, would also need to be removed in a worst case scenario. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment (ES Appendix 13.5, Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) identifies tree constraints, root protection areas and the specific measures required to safeguard retained trees. Avoidance of these trees is not considered to be practicable, as the proposed location for the crossing of Sciviers is the only location that avoids directly impacting the curtilage of residential or commercial properties. To avoid these trees, construction works would be required in the curtilage of these residential or commercial properties, and other trees may be affected.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Reinstatement of hedgerows and other vegetation would be undertaken in accordance with the reinstatement strategy set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7), with replacement planting located as close as practicable to the point of loss. Impact on landscape character has been assessed in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment ES Chapter 13 Landscape and Visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), with further detail provided in ES Appendix 13.3 Landscape baseline and effects Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), including effects on landscape features. Sciviers Lane lies within Local Landscape Character Area (LLCA) 33: Durley and Durley Street. This assessment draws on the AIA and the committed mitigation in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7), and Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5), including the requirement to reinstate vegetation and maintain ecological and visual continuity along the lane. The assessment concludes

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				that temporary significant effects would arise on LLCA 33 during construction, diminishing to not significant in the long term once reinstatement planting has become established.
PIL	LV205	The respondent stated that their land was bordered by a linear group of mature common oak located along the northwestern boundary, which were considered of notable size providing an element of natural screening between the property and neighbours, as well as stated to enhance the setting of the site. The respondent also queried how it was proposed that mature oaks in proximity of Winchester Road were preserved and what plans were in place to ensure that these remained in place and roots remained undamaged. The respondent cited risks to livestock, property and buildings should damage to the referenced oak trees occur.	N	The Applicant confirms that the Project has been designed as far as reasonably practicable to avoid the loss of mature trees. Within this specific location the working width would be reduced from 40m to 20m to reduce loss of vegetation; however, and with reference to the AIA presented in ES Appendix 13.5 Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6); three oak trees have been identified for removal, comprising two of high quality, and one of moderate-quality. Loss of vegetation would be reinstated in accordance with the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) and the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). The respondent also raised concerns about safeguarding mature oaks near Winchester Road, noting potential risks if roots were

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				damaged. They also requested reinstatement of the Shirell Lane verge to prevent flooding. For the mature oaks 'in proximity to Winchester Road' (assuming this refers to the junction with St Ann's Lane) trenchless construction is proposed, thereby avoiding excavation within their root protection areas. Where vegetation, including that in verges must be removed, to facilitate construction, reinstatement would be undertaken in accordance with the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) and the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). Tree protection and root safeguarding measures are informed by the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and secured through the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The reinstatement and mitigation strategy is secured within the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7), and the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
PIL	LV206	The respondent stated the relevant verge/hedge at Shirell Lane was required to be re-instated to at least 150mm above the surface of the track to stop flooding.	N	The Applicant confirms that the vegetation removed to facilitate construction will be reinstated in line with the reinstatement strategy set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) which has been informed by the ES Appendix 13.5 Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO volume 6) and hedgerow surveys Detailed plans will be agreed at the detailed design stage post-consent, with the relevant local planning authority according to the location where such mitigation will be located, as part of the detailed LEMPs.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	LV207	The respondent stated that the take-off and landing area utilised by Aeromodellers, and their model aircrafts would need to be maintained to a high standard to continue to enable their unencumbered use, specified to constitute a closely cut grass rolled surface. The respondent queried if the Applicant would reinstate the take-off and landing area for modelled aircrafts to its current		The Applicant has had regard to the request to reinstate the take-off and landing area utilised by Aeromodellers to its existing condition and confirms that while the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) addresses the reinstatement of grassland following construction, setting out the general approach and objectives for habitat restoration across the Project, the specifics for individual fields that sit outside the identified EMEA, including requirements such

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		condition of a level and smooth close-cut grass rolled surface.		as a cut grass, rolled surface, will be determined at the detailed design stage, post-consent, and will be set out in the detailed LEMPs to be submitted for approval by the relevant local planning authority for the affected location.
Wider Community	LV208	The respondents stated the construction and operation of this scheme would directly or indirectly affect numerous ecologically valuable areas, including SSSI ancient woodlands, and veteran trees.	N	A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects to ecologically valuable areas, including SSSIs, ancient woodlands and veteran trees. Primary mitigation measures include avoiding all direct impacts to statutory designated sites (including SSSIs), a minimum of 15m horizontal and 4m vertical exclusion zone from any construction works to designated ancient woodland habitat, and no loss or deterioration of ancient and veteran trees as set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). Through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on ecological features are anticipated. ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides a detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, including SSSIs,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees. A detailed Arboricultural survey carried out between March 2023 and March 2025, informed the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, presented in ES Appendix 13.5 Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The survey identified the locations of veteran and ancient trees, and the Project design evolved in response to this as well as additional survey findings.
Wider Community	LV209	The mature tree line at Middle Park Way was specifically named to require minimised impacts from the proposed construction access and requiring avoidance of all mature trees. A respondent stated the impacts were poorly justified and represented long-term losses that could not be fully mitigated, particularly in the case of irreplaceable habitats. Another respondent stated that more detail needed to be provided on the area/ trees impacted and the proposed mitigation area noting that no plans had been provided in this respect.	N	The Applicant has had regard to these comments on the mature tree line at Middle Park Way and notes that the proposal for a pipeline connecting the WRP site and Havant Thicket Reservoir was removed from the Project following the approval of Portsmouth Water's pipelines between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir. Therefore, the Project is only seeking a change of use associated with Portsmouth Water's pipelines and the reservoir, and no longer proposes works, near Middle Park Way. Landscape considerations for the Project are assessed in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and Visual (Document reference 6.1, DCO volume 6), which provide details of impacts on

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				landscape features (trees and hedgerows) at construction stage, year 1 and year 15 of operation, ensuring long term mitigation, supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) which is included in ES Appendix 13.5 (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), and the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7). The AIA includes a tree survey and tree protection plan and accompanying schedules. ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides a detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity. A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects. Through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on ecological features are anticipated. Primary mitigation measures include a minimum of 15m horizontal and 4m vertical exclusion zone from any construction works to designated ancient woodland habitat and no loss or deterioration of ancient and veteran trees. As set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). No other irreplaceable habitats are present that could be impacted by the Project.
Wider Community	LV210	A respondent suggested tree planting was not practical to fully screen all of the proposed WRP at Broadmarsh (Design Refinement 2) citing the perceived elevated position on top of a landfill mound which was stated to already be more than 13m above sea level. The respondent stated that any screening planted would be slow to grow on the landfill due to site particulars and potential underground landfill gas may be absorbed by the roots. The respondent also stated the WRP in its current proposed position would be an eyesore to the local surroundings.	N	The Applicant acknowledges that the upper part of the structures within the WRP would be visible from certain areas within Broadmarsh Coastal Park, even after planting has been established. A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce visual effects. Through the implementation of mitigation, no long term likely significant adverse effects on views are anticipated. Aside from reinforcing existing planting, primary mitigation measures include the use of materials and a colour palette appropriate to the local context. A full visual assessment is provided in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), supported by ES Appendix 13.4 Visual baseline and effects, Volume II. Views experienced by people using Broadmarsh Coastal Park are represented by Viewpoint 016, with photography and photomontages from this location presented in Figure 13.23 Viewpoint photography, Volume III. The DCO application is also accompanied by an Outline Landscape and Ecology

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Management Plan which includes a reinstatement strategy. (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) Regarding interactions with landfill gas, the Applicant notes that tree and shrub planting is proposed around the site boundaries where mature vegetation is already successfully established. Detailed planting specification would be developed at the detailed design stage, informed by site specific ground conditions.
Wider Community	LV211	The respondent stated that the proposed WRP at Broadmarsh (Design Refinement 2) would be a higher building that would be lit at night thereby increasing visibility from across Langstone Harbour. The associated night-time lighting was considered to spread across the elevated WRP site and concerns were raised that this would add adverse visual impact from around the harbour after dark.	N	The LVIA in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and supporting visual assessments demonstrate that in views from Langstone Harbour, the WRP will be largely screened or filtered by existing and proposed vegetation, both during the day and at night. Where glimpses of the WRP may be possible, these would be minimal, read in the context of existing industrial and urban features, and further reduced over time as mitigation planting matures. Night-time lighting associated with the WRP would be filtered by vegetation and perceived within the context of existing urban lighting, resulting in no notable

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				increase in visual impact from around the harbour after dark. The impacts and effects on people's views and the landscape are assessed in ES Chapter 13: Landscape and Visual (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and supported by Appendix 13.3 Landscape baseline and effects (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), Appendix 13.4 Visual baseline and effects, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), and supporting photographs in ES Figure 13.23 Viewpoint photography, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6). Including night-time baseline and effects. Representative viewpoints from Langstone Harbour include VP004 from the Hayling Billy Coastal Path; VP011 and VP016 from the Solent Way to the south of the WRP, VP017 & VP133 from Farlington Marshes; VP129 & 132 also from the Solent Way near Eastern Rd, Portsmouth. The location of viewpoints is shown in ES Figure 13.22 Representative viewpoints, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				For context, the site previously had planning consent for a warehouse development, which would also have introduced built form within this part of the landscape. Although this does not form part of the LVIA baseline, the presence of a previously approved commercial structure indicates that development of this scale is not without precedent at this location. Outline planning permission was granted in June 2022 (reference number APP/21/00189) however the application has now expired and was not implemented.
Wider Community	LV212	The respondent queried how the Project would change the skyline when responding to Design Refinement 2 – The Water Recycling Plant. A further respondent raised concerns that the proposed Water Recycling Plant would have an adverse impact on the coastal landscape, therefore further urbanising the north coast of the nearby internationally important wetland (SPA, SAC, Ramsar, SSSI). The respondent also stated that views from Langstone Harbour would be impacted as well as views from Farlington	N	An assessment of potential skyline and wider landscape and visual effects arising from the Project, is provided within a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6); with further details in ES Appendix 13.4 Visual baseline and assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6); and supporting photographs in ES Figure 13.23 Viewpoint photography, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6). Across the assessed viewpoints, the LVIA concludes that the WRP would not introduce a prominent new skyline feature. Where

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Marshes Nature Reserve, Hayling Island coastal walks and Portsdown Hill.		visible, the upper parts of the structures would appear partially screened by existing vegetation or would be read in the context of existing built form including industrial buildings, lighting columns and power infrastructure (e.g., VPs 011, 016, 017). From Langstone Harbour (VP011) and Portsdown Hill (VP017), views of the WRP are distant and filtered, and the development would sit within the broader Brockhampton industrial landscape rather than altering the coastal skyline. From Farlington Marshes (VP017) and the Solent Way (VP016), the LVIA reports adverse effects, but these relate to glimpsed views of upper structures rather than any fundamental change to the skyline. Views from Hayling Island coastal paths (VP004) and from Broadmarsh Coastal Park (VP016) similarly indicate that only limited upper elements of the WRP would be perceptible, largely contained by the surrounding vegetated framework. Embedded design measures, including height limits, colour palette, and reinforced planting, assist in reducing visual contrast and skyline effects. The location of viewpoints is shown in ES Figure 13.22 Representative viewpoints,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6). For context, the site previously had planning consent for a warehouse development, which would also have introduced built form within this part of the landscape. Although this does not form part of the LVIA baseline, the presence of a previously approved commercial structure indicates that development of this scale is not without precedent at this location. Outline planning permission was granted in June 2022 (reference number APP/21/00189) however the application has now expired and was not implemented.
Wider Community	LV213	The respondent stated that trees planted would not be tall enough to screen the site for decades and that trees would not grow tall on landfill as the contaminants were suggested to inhibit their growth and that therefore trees would fail before reaching maturity. Respondents also raised further concern over the viability of planted trees for screening, as these would be slow to grow in the exposed coastal location and on a landfill site where the respondents suggested they are likely to die as they	N	The Applicant acknowledges that tree planting will not entirely screen the WRP, and has incorporated Project's general and site-specific design principles, within the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5), including limiting building heights, the use of materials, and a colour palette appropriate to the local context (informed by a colour assessment) to help the visible parts of the new structures blend with the surrounding landscape. Existing boundary vegetation will be reinforced through interplanting, and a green/brown roof will be

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		reach a substantial height due to the absorption of landfill gases carbon dioxide and methane from their roots underground, as opposed to oxygen. A further respondent stated that there could be no reliance on the trees growing high enough to mask the Water Recycling Plant from view as beyond a certain height, trees growing on landfill were likely to fail. The respondent suggested mitigation and BNG may have to be met off-site.		incorporated on the main process building to assist with screening and soften its appearance. The impacts and effects on people's views and the landscape are assessed in ES Chapter 13: Landscape and Visual (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), concludes that while the WRP would remain visible within the local context, its visual prominence would be reduced through embedded mitigation measures, ensuring the WRP is appropriately integrated, and that residual adverse visual effects are not significant in the long term. Regarding trees on landfill, the Applicant notes that tree and shrub planting is proposed around the site boundaries where mature vegetation is already successfully established. Detailed planting specification would be developed at the detailed design stage, informed by site specific ground conditions. Although not yet a requirement for NSIPs, the Project has voluntarily committed to the delivery of at least 10% BNG. A Biodiversity Gain Plan detailing how the statutory BNG metric has been applied to the Project is

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				included within 7.11 Biodiversity Gain Plan (Document reference 7.11, DCO Volume 7). Opportunities to incorporate environmental enhancements, including BNG have been explored. These opportunities are detailed within ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and the Biodiversity Gain Plan (Document reference 7.11, DCO Volume 7). They will be delivered through a combination of on-site EMEAs and off-site provision.
Wider Community	LV214	The respondents stated that 24-hour lighting would add to the visual impact on the harbour views and impact the birds and bats that existed nearby. The respondents stated that the essential lighting be low intensity at night to avoid the above-mentioned impacts.	N	Respondents raised concerns about 24-hour lighting at the WRP, citing potential visual impacts and effects on local wildlife. These matters have been assessed through the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and Biodiversity assessments within the ES. The LVIA concludes that night-time lighting associated with the WRP would be filtered by vegetation and perceived within the context of existing urban lighting, resulting in no notable increase in visual impact from around the harbour after dark.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Night time visual effects are addressed in ES Chapter 13: Landscape and Visual (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and supported by Appendix 13.3 Landscape baseline and effects (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), Appendix 13.4 Visual baseline and effects, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), and supporting photographs in ES Figure 13.23 Viewpoint photography, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6) including night-time baseline and effects. Representative Viewpoints from Langstone Harbour include VP004 from the Hayling Billy Coastal Path; VP011 and VP016 from the Solent Way to the south of the WRP, VP017 & VP133 from Farlington Marshes; VP129 & VP132 representative of long-distance view from the Solent Way near Eastern Road, Portsmouth. The location of viewpoints is shown in ES Figure 13.22 Representative viewpoints, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6). The biodiversity assessment concludes that, considering a range of measures that have been embedded into the Project design to

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				avoid or reduce environmental effects, no residual likely significant adverse effects on ecological features from the Project are anticipated. The full impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, including bats and birds is presented in ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The Operational Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7) will manage effects on local wildlife during operation including lighting design at the WRP site and the AGP sites to be in line with relevant standards and good practice. This includes avoiding the illumination of known bat foraging routes and habitats.
Wider Community	LV215	Respondents stated the pipeline should not impact mature or veteran trees and any impact on the footpath by the railway line at Bedhampton, should result in an alternative footpath route be provided.	N	In response to concerns regarding the Bedhampton rail-side footpath the Applicant confirms that the existing alignment of PROW 108/34/5, which runs adjacent to the railway line at Bedhampton, would not be impacted by the Project and could remain open throughout construction. As part of a separate scheme, Portsmouth Water are however proposing a permanent diversion to PROW

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				108/34/5. This new route would be impacted by construction activities, and as such, a temporary diversion is proposed. Therefore, in both scenarios with and without the Portsmouth Water permanent diversion, PRow 108/34/5 would be kept open, either along the existing alignment or via a temporary diversion. In regard to the impacts on mature and veteran trees in this area the Applicant confirms that implementation of the Project would not result in the loss or deterioration of any ancient or veteran trees. Impacts on landscape features have been informed by the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), which is included in ES Appendix 13.5 Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). While the Project seeks to minimise vegetation loss; in a worst case scenario up to 18 trees may be potentially removed along the PRow at Bedhampton Springs. These include six moderate-quality (Category B) trees and one low-quality group, to facilitate the construction of the Project. Further tree groups would be subject to partial removal.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Impact on landscape character has been assessed in the LVIA (ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual Volume I (Document reference 6.1 DCO Volume 6), with further detail provided in ES Appendix 13.3: Landscape baseline and effects (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), including effects on landscape features (trees and hedgerows). Details regarding the footpath by the railway line at Bedhampton (PRoW 108/34/5) can be found within Local Landscape Character Area (LLCA) 08: Bedhampton. Reinstatement measures are set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) and illustrated on the Indicative Environmental Masterplan appended to the Design Approach Document. The AIA specifies protection measures to existing trees secured through the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) The existing alignment of the PRoW (108/34/5) that routes adjacent to the railway line (108/34/5) would not be impacted by the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				scheme and could be kept open for the duration of the construction period.
Wider Community	LV216	The respondent noted the importance of minimising vegetation loss and retaining the existing embankment at Budds Farm.	N	The Applicant has had regard to these issues prioritising retention of existing vegetation and landform wherever reasonably practicable, at Budds Farm, noting that the Limits of Deviation (LoD) have been designed to avoid impacting the existing embankment and vegetation located to the south of the proposed structures. These measures are secured through the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). Respondent also raised concerns about the viability of planted trees for screening at the Water Recycling Plant (WRP), noting the exposed coastal location and underlying landfill conditions. The Applicant has incorporated broader Project general and site-specific Design Principles, including limiting building heights, the use of materials, and a colour palette appropriate to the local context (informed by a colour assessment) to help the visible parts of the new structures blend with the surrounding landscape. See the Design Principles

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). Regarding trees on landfill, the Applicant notes that tree and shrub planting is proposed around the site boundaries where mature vegetation is already successfully established. Detailed planting specification would be developed at the detailed design stage, informed by site specific ground conditions.
Wider Community	LV217	The respondent stated that trees and other vegetation around Budds Farm and Broadmarsh should be retained as far as possible to act as screening and support wildlife.	N	The Project has had regard to these comments, by designing the LoD of Budds Farm Pumping Station to avoid impacting the existing embankment and vegetation located to the south of the proposed structures, furthermore, maximum building heights will be limited, this together with a series of measures to protect local wildlife are set out in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) and the Outline LEMP (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7). Existing landscape features, wildlife corridors and vegetation within the Order Limits will be retained and protected to the extent that it is reasonably practicable to do so.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The potential effects on landscape character and visual amenity are assessed in the ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Budds Farm and Broadmarsh Coastal Park fall within Local Landscape Character Area (LLCA) 13: Farlington Marshes and Coastal Parks. The assessment concludes that within LLCA13, the Project results in no significant landscape or visual effects. The assessment draws on representative viewpoints VP011, VP015, and VP016, all of which show that existing and proposed vegetation would continue to screen or substantially filter views of the WRP. In the long term, established planting further integrates the development so that no perceptible change to the character or visual amenity of LLCA 13 is anticipated.
Wider Community	LV218	The respondent raised concerns about the visual impact of the Project, particularly the height of the proposed Water Recycling Plant at Broadmarsh. It was suggested that the building would be very tall at 13 to 14.5 metres and with the other tall tanks and silos in addition to night-time lighting, would represent an appearance of an industrial site to the north side of	N	The Project has had regard to these concerns through the embedded design measures secured in the Design Principles Document (Document Reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). Building heights are limited to a maximum of 14.5 m, materials and colour treatments are defined to reduce visual contrast, and a green/brown roof is incorporated on the main process building. Existing boundary vegetation is retained and reinforced where

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Langstone Harbour. It was also considered to be visible from across the Harbour and from Portsdown Hill.		practicable, reducing visibility of the structures in views from the south and south-west. The LVIA concludes that night-time lighting associated with the WRP would be filtered by vegetation and perceived within the context of existing urban lighting, resulting in no notable increase in visual impact from around the harbour after dark and that within LLCA 13: Farlington Marshes and Coastal Parks, the Project would not result in any significant landscape or visual effects. Representative viewpoints VP011, VP015, and VP016 show that existing vegetation and proposed planting substantially screen or filter views of the WRP, and that, in the long term, established planting further integrates the development. Full details are provided in ES Appendix 13.4 Visual baseline and assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6); and supporting photographs in ES Figure 13.23 Viewpoint photography, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6). Views from Broadmarsh have been assessed and represented by VP016.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Views from Portsdown Hill have been assessed and represented by VP017. Further views from the Langstone Harbour include VP004 along the Hayling Billy Coastal Path, VP011 from the Solent Way to the east of the WRP, VP017 & VP133 from Farlington Marshes. The location of viewpoints is shown in ES Figure 13.22 Representative viewpoints, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6). For context, the site previously had planning consent for a warehouse development, which would also have introduced built form within this part of the landscape. Although this does not form part of the LVIA baseline, the presence of a previously approved commercial structure indicates that development of this scale is not without precedent at this location. Outline planning permission was granted in June 2022 (reference number APP/21/00189) however the application has now expired and was not implemented.

Table G25-34 Summary of issues raised on the theme of major accidents and disasters and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	MAD201	The Health and Safety Executive noted that the Project falls within the consultation zones of several major accident hazard pipelines (MAHP) operated by Southern Gas Networks (SGN). The Health and Safety Executive advised the Applicant to contact SGN. The major accident hazard pipelines (operated by Southern Gas Networks) are: ▪ Lordswood / Purbrook (P006); HSE ref. number 8053, Transco ref.: 2312; ▪ Purbrook / Portsdown Hill (P041); HSE ref. number 8072, Transco ref.: 2331; ▪ Greatham Orifice Carrier / Portsdown Hill (P019); HSE ref. number 8059, Transco ref.: 2318; ▪ Portsdown Hill / Apuldram (P014); HSE ref. number 8054, Transco ref.: 2313; ▪ Portsdown Hill / Cap End (P095); HSE ref. number 8086, Transco ref.: 2345;	N	The Applicant notes the identification by HSE that the Project is located within the consultation zones of several major accident hazard pipelines operated by Southern Gas Networks. The Applicant confirms it has contacted Southern Gas Networks and is continuing active discussion. It has identified interests and interfaces between the Project and Southern Gas Network's assets. The Applicant is progressing ongoing engagement with relevant third party undertakers on protective provisions and managing the interface with its apparatus. Protective Provisions will be included in the DCO for the benefit of undertakers, such as Southern Gas Networks. Protective Provisions manage the interface between the Project and third party undertakers' apparatus, which when in place, will mitigate the risk of damage to the asset.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Bedhampton / Bedhampton Tee (P099); HSE ref. number 8087, Transco ref.: 2346.		
Health and Safety Executive	MAD202	Health and Safety Executive also noted the pipeline operator, Southern Gas Networks, may have legal interest in the development in the vicinity of the pipeline which may restrict developments within a certain proximity. Health and Safety Executive further noted that the standards to which the pipeline would be designed and operated may restrict major traffic routes within proximity of the pipeline, consequently requiring the need for Southern Gas Network to modify the pipeline or its operation if development proceeds. Health and Safety Executive stated there was a requirement to establish the necessary measures required to alter or upgrade the pipeline to appropriate standards. To address the above matters Health and Safety Executive recommended the Applicant to contact Southern Gas Network.	N	The Applicant confirms they have contacted Southern Gas Networks. They have identified interfaces between the Project and Southern Gas Network's assets and are currently engaged in managing the interface with its apparatus. Protective Provisions will be included in the DCO for the benefit of undertakers, such as Southern Gas Networks. Protective Provisions manage the interface between the Project and third party undertakers' apparatus, which when in place, will mitigate the risk of damage to the asset. The Applicant is progressing ongoing engagement with relevant third party undertakers on protective provisions and managing the interface with its apparatus. This is set out in section 14.4 of Chapter 14 Major accidents and disasters, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Health and Safety Executive	MAD203	The Health and Safety Executive referred to Chapter 3 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR; May 2024) as well as the additional information from the Spring 2025 Consultation and stated that depending on the specifics of the hydrogen peroxide to be used in the Water Recycling Plant, this may require hazardous substances consent. Health and Safety Executive advised that confirmation is sought as to whether or not any substance proposed falls into the categories in Schedule 1 (Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 as amended) and whether the quantities are sufficient to require consent.	N	It has been confirmed that Hazardous Substances Consent will not be required for the operation of the Project as the hazardous substances used during construction do not meet the volume thresholds requiring such consent. This is set out in section 14.4 of Chapter 14 Major accidents and disasters, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
Health and Safety Executive	MAD204	The Health and Safety Executive noted that Regulation 5(4) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 requires the assessment of significant effects to include, where relevant, the expected significant effects arising from the Project's vulnerability to major accidents. It was also highlighted that there is the need to consider risk assessments arising from the	N	The Applicant notes HSE's highlight that there is a need to consider risk assessments arising from the development's vulnerability to major accidents in line with Advice note 11. ES Appendix 14.1 Stage 2 risk assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) of the Major accidents and disasters chapter contains a risk assessment of the Project's vulnerability to major accidents and disasters.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		development's vulnerability to major accidents, in line with Advice note 11 on the Inspectorate website.		This is summarised in ES Chapter 14 Major accident and disasters, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The risk assessment concludes the Project would not lead to a major accident or disaster on the basis each risk is mitigated to 'as low as reasonably practicable' and thus no significant effects were identified. The Project has developed this risk assessment, along with the whole ES, in line with the 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on working with public bodies in the infrastructure planning process' (noting that it is no longer called 'Advice note 11').
Health and Safety Executive	MAD205	The Health and Safety Executive noted that the Explosives Inspectorate had no comment to make. It was noted that there are Health and Safety Executive licenced explosives sites in the vicinity of the Project, however, the Health and Safety Executive confirmed that the Project did not fall into any of the safeguarding zones.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment that there are HSE explosive licenced sites in the vicinity of the Project but that the site does not fall into any safeguarding zones. This did not require further consideration in the major accidents and disasters assessment as, as stated by the HSE, the Project does not fall into any safeguarding zones. This did not require further consideration in the major accidents and disasters assessment as, as stated by the HSE, the Project does not fall into any safeguarding zones.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	MAD206	The respondents raised concern over the risk of contamination of the public water supply and queried what the Applicant would do in the event of a failure of the scheme. It was queried who would be responsible for monitoring the Applicant's progress associated with the Project and that would ensure reliable information was made available to the public.	N	The Applicant has sought to provide assurances that appropriate measures and controls would be put in place to prevent possible malfunctions of the treatment process impacting on the environment or water supplies. The multi-stage water recycling process will feature numerous safeguards, including continuous monitoring, to ensure that significant deviations in expected water quality can be quickly spotted and rectified through partial or full system shutdowns. It will not be possible for treated wastewater to bypass this process and enter Havant Thicket Reservoir, let alone the public water supply. These safeguards will be implemented by the Contractor appointed to construct and operate the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) and will be a key specification for the plant to ensure water quality requirements will be met. Water sent into supply will need to continue to meet strict drinking water quality standards as required by the Drinking Water Inspectorate and relevant legislation. The Applicant has a duty under the Water Supply (Water Quality Regulations) to provide wholesome water that is safe and fit for human consumption and the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Drinking Water Inspectorate provide independent reassurance that public water supplies are safe and drinking water quality is acceptable for consumers.
Wider Community	MAD207	The respondent queried where a disaster recovery plan was made available.	N	The Operation Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7) includes details of an Emergency Response Plan which will be produced and will set out an overview of mitigation measures in the event of an incident. The Emergency Response Plan would be prepared by the Contractor and submitted for approval prior to commissioning and the commencement of the operational phase, in accordance with the corresponding requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO. The Contractor will implement the approved Emergency Response Plan throughout the operation and maintenance of the Project.
Wider Community	MAD208	Responses raised concerns in respect to the potential for accidents resulting in water and more generally environmental pollution. A respondent queried what would happen if the water recycling system broke down and the wider community became ill. A further respondent requested that interface with Havant Thicket Reservoir is	N	A risk assessment has been undertaken as part of the Major accidents and disasters assessment and is appended to ES Chapter 14 (ES Appendix 14.1, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)). Risks have been considered during both construction and operation of the Project and the mitigation required to prevent a risk event occurring are detailed and secured in the Outline

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		avoided altogether to avoid risk of contamination if something leaked from the water recycling plant accidentally. A respondent insisted that there should be risk assessments carried out for every contaminant present within the recycled effluent and their potential to impact on water quality and ecology. A further respondent raised concerns about what would happen to public health if the Project was to 'go wrong'.		Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) and Operational Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7). This includes risks associated with pollution and hazardous chemicals. Mitigation includes the production of a Pollution Management Plan which will satisfy The Applicant's existing plans and protocols to manage pollution for operational matters. Measures in the Plan will include response procedures, timescales and notification requirements. In the event of disruption to the water supply, bottled water will be supplied to rural and vulnerable customers as secured in the Applicant's standards and procedures and Security and Emergency Measures Direction (SEMD). The risk assessment concludes the Project would not lead to a major accident or disaster on the basis each risk is mitigated to 'as low as reasonably practicable'. The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the EA's guidance (Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit) which requires a number of screening tests to see which

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. PFAs, VOCs, pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has been provided to the EA, which is currently considering how these chemicals should be assessed and submitted to the EA as part of the environmental permit application required for the Project.

Table G25-35 Summary of issues raised on the theme of noise and vibration and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Winchester City Council (WCC)	NV201	WCC noted that the proposal would result in a refined layout for the Draft Order Limits. However, WCC noted that this has moved some compounds closer to sensitive receptors and therefore noise assessments will be required for each compound along the proposed pipeline	N	WCC are correct that 2025 Spring Consultation documents show some adjustments in the Draft Order Limits and compound locations which have occurred since the 2024 Summer Consultation. The assessment reported in ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes noise and vibration impacts from all aspects of the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		route as well as the Above Ground Plant (AGP) along the length of the route. It was suggested that these assessments should include proposed mitigation measures and hours of use.		project, including construction compounds and the AGP. The assessment considers the proposed hours of use, based on the criteria for different times of the day identified in British Standard 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 'Code of practice for noise and vibration control from open sites: Part 1 – Noise'. Engagement on noise and vibration has been undertaken with WCC through the Emissions and Transport Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Working Group, at which the proposed assessment methodology, mitigation measures and working hours for the Project were presented. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) identifies mitigation measures for construction noise impacts, which include Best Practicable Means and potential additional mitigation where required, such as temporary screening and working hours restrictions. With these mitigation measures in place, residual construction noise effects are not significant.
Wickham and Knowle	NV202	Wickham and Knowle Parish Council stated that the construction start time, as referenced in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan	N	The Parish Council's concerns regarding proposed 7am start times is noted. The standard construction working hours proposed (07:00-19:00 Monday to Friday in

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Parish Council		(Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), should not be 7am in residential areas, particularly on a Saturday. Wickham and Knowle Parish Council suggested that extended working hours can be applied for in extenuating circumstances, which could allow for Sunday working and extended Saturday hours.		summer, and 07:00-17:30 in winter, with Saturdays 07:00-17:00 year round) are commonly applied on comparable infrastructure projects. Additional restrictions on working hours would extend the time taken to complete the works near a property, thereby increasing the potential for the noise to disturb people. The potential noise impacts of the works have been assessed, considering typical sensitivity to noise at different times of the day in accordance with guidance. It is highly unlikely that noisy activities would be undertaken at 07:00, typically, the first 30-minutes to an hour of a shift would be taken up by meetings and tool box talks, which do not emit high noise levels. Further information on the assessment is provided in ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) contains a number of embedded mitigation measures to manage potential impacts on residents. The Contractor once appointed would adopt additional noise and vibration mitigation measures to be specified in a Noise and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Vibration Management Plan (to be prepared by the Contractor once appointed following consent being granted). Subject to detailed assessment to be presented in the Noise and Vibration Management Plan, measures are currently anticipated to include provision of acoustic screening between relevant receptors, and the introduction of additional working hours restrictions, for example restricting certain construction activities during Saturday afternoon. With these mitigation measures in place, the effects of construction noise and vibration are not considered to be significant. Any work outside these core working hours would only be made in exceptional circumstances, subject to agreement with the relevant Local Planning Authority through a Section 61 consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974.
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	NV203	The respondent noted that proposed work hours included late evenings during the summer period and Saturdays, which the respondent suggested would impact on the enjoyment and use of their garden and land. The respondent suggested there	N	The Applicant is continuing to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and discuss their individual circumstances further. The Applicant is engaging with and seeking to negotiate

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		would only be one day of the week, a Sunday, where family life would not be impacted by the work, temporary noise and vibration from the use of construction machinery and construction compounds along the route, as well as from construction traffic using surrounding roads. The respondent stated the land was an extension of their garden, and the property would be in close proximity to the route planned.		voluntary land agreements for the required rights with affected landowners and has undertaken a number of meetings to discuss issues raised by landowners and their representatives. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the current status of such negotiations. For most dwellings along the Project route, periods of disturbance will be very short whilst the pipeline is constructed outside their property. It is recognised that the duration of impact will be longer for dwellings near the Above Ground Plant or construction compounds. ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) assesses construction noise impacts in accordance with British Standard 5228-1:2008+A1:2014 'Code of practice for noise and vibration control from open sites: Part 1 – Noise'. The assessment accounts for the likely duration and timing of impacts as well as noise levels when determining effect significance. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) identifies mitigation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				measures for construction noise impacts, which include Best Practicable Means and potential additional mitigation where required, such as temporary screening and working hours restrictions. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) also commits to a range of measures for providing clear and responsive communication channels with residents living near the works. With these mitigation measures in place, residual construction noise effects are not significant, irrespective of the working hours.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	NV204	Respondents expressed concerns regarding the Project and its potential impact on residential properties. They live in a listed building, part of an old Victorian school, located on the corner of Kingscroft Lane and Bedhampton Road in Bedhampton, Havant. They noted that the pipelines and tunnel will run under nearby properties on the other side of Kingscroft Lane, backing onto Bidbury Mead Park, and then continue under the park.	N	The Project no longer involves a tunnel running underneath the properties identified in the issue raised, this option was removed from the Project following the 2025 Spring Consultation. For further information, see the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5). An assessment has been undertaken of the potential impacts of construction vibration from the Project, this considers the potential for people to be disturbed and for buildings to be damaged. The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with British

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		The respondent asked how older properties would be protected from ground movement caused by nearby tunnelling. They highlighted that Victorian footings are relatively shallow compared to modern buildings, making them more susceptible to structural damage from vibrations underground. They are concerned about movement and possible structural damage to their home. Additionally, the respondent stated that damage to people's homes caused by vibration may not be immediately visible and could manifest years later. They queried whether an allowance has been made to address latent damage that becomes apparent over time. This concern was echoed for any potential impacts on human health resulting from prolonged exposure to vibration or related activities.		Standard 5228-2:2008+A1:2014 'Code of practice for noise and vibration control from open sites: Part 2 – Vibration' and BS 7385-2:1993 'Evaluation and measurement for vibration in buildings - Part 2: Guide to damage levels from groundborne vibration'. The criteria taken from these standards factor in the vulnerability of older dwellings with relatively shallow footings and the potential for building damage to become apparent after the works are complete. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) identifies mitigation measures for construction vibration impacts, which include Best Practicable Means and potential additional mitigation where required. With these mitigation measures in place, residual construction vibration effects are not significant. Further information is provided in ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of effects on population health. Based on the residual effects identified in ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration (Document reference 6.1,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				DCO Volume 6), no potential adverse effects on population health were identified as a result of tunnelling noise and vibration.
Wider Community	NV205	Respondents suggested vehicles of large size so close to properties would cause a large amount of noise pollution and vibration due to driving on roads and metal tracks laid on the grass. The respondents noted building works have already had a negative impact on noise and traffic levels for local residents. In response to the Questionnaire related to Pipeline Section L one respondent expressed uncertainty in respect to what the improvements were near Sciviers Lane and noted that they had raised queries to previous consultations, particularly in respect to noise during construction, as well as during operation.	N	Construction noise and vibration impacts from the Project have been assessed at receptors most likely to be affected by works, including those near to Pipeline Section L and Sciviers Lane. Access to BPT-K is no longer proposed from Sciviers Lane. The proposed construction works are described in ES Chapter 3 Description of Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) this explains that, in general, initial construction works will involve topsoil strip; hence, vehicles are not anticipated to drive on metal tracks laid on grass. ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) describes this assessment and concludes that, with the mitigation measures in place (as described in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7)) residual construction noise and vibration effects are not considered to be significant. The assessment of operational noise from BPT-K is described in ES Chapter 15 Noise

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and concludes that, with mitigation measures as required, residual effects are not significant. In addition, construction phase vehicle trips were screened against relevant assessment thresholds within ES Chapter 6 Air quality and odour, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). In accordance with the Environmental Protection UK and Institute of Air Quality Management guidance, the effect of Project-generated construction phase road traffic emissions at human receptors is not significant.
Wider Community	NV206	The respondents raised concerns over the potential noise, vibration, visual impact and construction of the different elements of the associated infrastructure and expressed an interest in the minimisation of such impacts with respect to farming activities. Respondents requested further detail of how these impacts would be mitigated and sought to ensure that any underground pipelines would be buried at a minimum depth of 1.2m to ensure there was sufficient distance between the pipelines	N	The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) identifies a range of measures (known as Best Practicable Means (BPM)) that will be used to minimise construction noise effects. It also requires that a Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP) will be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval (prepared by the appointed Contractor) prior to commencement of construction works, this will detail any noise and vibration monitoring to be undertaken. No specific assessment of construction noise effects on farming

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		and farming operations to minimise any potential risk.		activities such as livestock has been undertaken as such effects will be minimised through the application of BPM and will be temporary. More detailed assessment of noise effects on animals is only considered necessary for particularly sensitive receptors such as sites of special scientific interest (SSSI) designated for waterbirds where large numbers of sensitive species could be affected during the construction period. Noise impacts on ecological receptors are considered in ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). With regards to a minimum depth of the pipeline, ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), states the pipeline would have a minimum depth of 0.9m below surface level within agricultural land and other undeveloped land, a minimum depth of 1.5m below road surfaces and a minimum depth of 2.5m below watercourse beds. The original soils will be reinstated over the pipelines in the correct order of subsoil followed by topsoil such that the farming operations will be able to take place above the pipelines following reinstatement.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Visual impacts of the Project are assessed in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The assessment is supported by ES Appendices 13.2 – 13.4, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) with detailed analysis broken down by landscape receptors (Local Landscape character Areas) and visual receptors, as well as maps (Figures) and photographs from representative viewpoints.
Wider Community	NV207	The respondent queried what the ongoing noise and disturbance of the running of the Above Ground Plant and hidden pipelines would be.	N	The proposed Above Ground Plant (AGP) will emit operational noise; however, the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) includes a commitment that sufficient measures will be included to avoid noise from causing adverse observed effects on health and quality of life, to accord with relevant planning policy. ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of the potential effects on nearby receptors. Control measures for these effects are identified in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) and include measures such as selection of quiet/low vibration plant and upgrades to enclosures or

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				buildings with high indoor noise levels. With these measures in place, effects are not expected to be significant. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) requires that the underground pipeline is designed and operated in accordance with industry good practice. This would ensure that pipeline walls are suitably rigid, and that fluid flow within the pipeline would be smooth enough to avoid vibration issues associated with turbulent flow. Smoothly flowing water at pressure does not generate sound; hence, the pipeline will not emit noise.
Wider Community	NV208	The respondent raised that they were concerned about the construction work for the additional pumping station which could release contaminants and cause disturbance to wildlife, for example noise.	N	Potential construction noise and vibration impacts from the Project have been assessed, this accounts for the construction of different elements of the Project likely to be undertaken simultaneously. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) identifies mitigation measures for construction noise and vibration impacts, which include Best Practicable Means and potential additional mitigation where required. ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6)

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				describes this assessment and concludes that, with the mitigation measures in place, residual construction noise and vibration effects are not considered to be significant. This is further supported by ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) which also concludes that noise and vibration effects on ecological receptors are not considered significant.

Table G25-36 Summary of issues raised on the theme of resources and waste management and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	RWM201	The respondent noted that greater understanding of how the Applicant's Project would impact the landowner's ability to abstract soft sand from their land was required and that concerns had already been raised to the Applicant without any received response.	Y	The Applicant has engaged with the landowner to further understand the status of their proposal for soft sand extraction. During the initial engagement session, potential mitigation options were also discussed. Following this engagement session, there has been a design refinement to the Order Limits in this location. This refinement involves the reduction in Order Limits by removing the land in the south-west of the landowner's site from within Order Limits. For further details on

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				the design refinement refer to Section 7 of the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5)] Discussions regarding the status of the landowner's proposal are still ongoing and the Applicant will continue to engage with the landowner to discuss their individual circumstances further. The Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) details the status of negotiations of voluntary land agreements for the required rights with affected landowners as correct at the time of submission.
PIL	RWM202	The respondent queried if they would be compensated for the trapped natural mineral if the pipeline was installed before it had been extracted, if the mineral department within Hampshire had been consulted and what the likely restrictions would be on the land, which may impact sand extraction within the easement corridor.	N	The Consultation Report summarises the consultation activities undertaken by the Applicant, which includes extensive engagement and consultation with affected parties to ensure landowners and others are informed of the proposals and how they might affect their interests. The Applicant has engaged with the respondent to further understand their extraction proposals, however to date, no development proposals or details of a planning application have been shared with the Applicant, and the Applicant continues to engage with the landowner on this matter. Those affected by compulsory

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum amount of land necessary to deliver the authorised development within the Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant will only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the authorised development. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree practical solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted. Ongoing engagement primarily through the EIA Working Groups has been held with

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Hampshire County Council informing them of the assessment and proposed mitigation across the Project. Regarding restrictions on the land, in areas where the pipelines are constructed using open-cut construction methods, a protective strip of land either side of the alignment would be required. For further details on reasoning for the protective strip see Section 3.6 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume I). The protective strip would restrict the landowner or occupier from undertaking certain activities that would restrict access to or affect the integrity of the pipeline. For further details on restrictions see Section 3.6 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume I). The restrictions will be determined by the depth and location of the pipeline maintenance. The protective strip requirements are being discussed individually with the relevant landowners and the status of the negotiations (as correct at the time of submission) are outlined in the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4).

Table G25-37 Summary of issues raised on the theme of socio-economic, tourism and health and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Wickham and Knowle Parish Council	SETH201	Wickham and Knowle Parish Council raised concerns about the potential impacts of the Project on the wider community's wellbeing and mental health. The Council also raised concerns about the lack of community payback or benefit they feel that the Applicant is giving back to the community.	N	Section 17.5 of ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health, Volume I, (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) describes the assessment methodology for the health assessment. This includes consideration of impacts to the community's health, mental health and wellbeing. The assessment specifically considers impacts health and wellbeing effects for residents in Wickham for residents resulting from impacts on neighbourhood amenity during construction. The assessment does not identify any significant health and wellbeing effects arising from impacts on neighbourhood amenity in Wickham and Knowle. In regard to opportunities for the Applicant to give back to the community, the Applicant has a dedicated community partnership manager to deliver a range of outreach programmes. The Applicant has set out in the Case for the Project (Document reference 5.6, DCO Volume 5), submitted with the DCO

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				application, a comprehensive package of benefits that the Project would deliver, including local benefits ranging from BNG, environmental enhancements, community and local skills and employment initiatives.
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	SETH202	Grayswood Carriage Driving Centre stated their objection to the Project as it would impact the main teaching area, and they would need to close the teaching element of their business.	Y	Grayswood Carriage Driving Centre operates from Low Hill Farm, which is situated on Portsmouth Road, Fishers Pond, Hampshire, SO50 7HF. Low Hill Farm is included as an equestrian/outdoor business receptor in ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) (Table 12-16) and is therefore covered by the overarching equestrian centres assessment. The Project is not expected to significantly impact the Grayswood Carriage Driving Centre. Design changes were undertaken following the Spring 2025 Consultation and the pipeline route and Order Limits were amended so that the pipeline installation would be constructed to avoid land taken from the teaching paddock. As a result, the assessment concludes a minor adverse effect which is not considered significant. Those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum amount of land necessary to deliver the Project within the Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant will only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the authorised development. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree practical solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted.
PIL	SETH203	Havant Rugby Club provided information regarding their pitch requirements and referred to the Havant Borough Council	N	As a result of the Applicant no longer pursuing a tunnelled pipeline option between the WRP and Havant Thicket Reservoir,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Playing Pitch Strategy 2024, which identified the need to increase the number of pitches in the borough. Havant Rugby Club noted that the lack of access to pitch 1, the position of the intermediate shaft from pitch 4, and the access needed across pitch 2 and 3 would be 'catastrophic' for the club.		Havant Rugby Club is no longer within the Order Limits and so would not be impacted by the Project.
PILs	SETH204	Respondents emphasised that failure to amend the Project could have significant adverse effects on community well-being and mental health. They expressed concerns about potential psychological distress stemming from the relocation of horses, emotional trauma associated with the disturbance of deceased animals, and increased anxiety regarding the safety of vulnerable individuals residing nearby. In addition, respondents noted the shortage of livery spaces for the horses that may have to be relocated during the construction works. They added that the additional cost of relocating the horses would be approximately £850 per horse per week, which was suggested to amount to £5,000 per week in addition to expenses.	N	The potential impacts and likely significant effects on equestrian centres are assessed in Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). There are no reported likely significant effects on these receptors for the construction, operation or decommissioning of the Project. ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) considers impacts on landowners. The concerns of the individual respondents have been recognised and those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum amount of land necessary to deliver the Project within the Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant will only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the authorised development. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree practical solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted.
PIL	SETH205	The respondent stated that they had concerns over who would be working on the land. The respondent also suggested if the contractor in charge would ensure that all workers would be Disclosure and Barring Service checked as they would be working in the community and would come	N	The health assessment component of ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) in section 17.8 considers the impact of the Project on community safety and social cohesion, including increased risks of crime and fear of crime associated with construction sites. In the context of the Project, community safety relates to potential

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		into close proximity with families and young children.		increased opportunities for crime and increased fear of crime. Construction workers would remain within the construction sites and would not be accessing private land. Hence, it is not expected there will be a statutory requirement for Disclosure and Barring Service checks on construction workers. Section 4.8 of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7)) requires the Contractor to sign up and adhere to the Considerate Constructors Scheme before commencement of the works which would actively manage its impact on neighbours and the public to support a positive experience by ensuring courteous and respectful language and appropriate behaviour in and around the construction activity.
PIL	SETH206	Respondents stated that the Project would disrupt their retirement plans. One respondent explained that they purchased their land to spend time with their horses during retirement, but the proposed pipeline would prevent them from using the land as intended. They also noted that	N	The potential impacts and likely significant effects on equestrian centres are assessed in Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). There are no reported likely significant effects on these receptors for the construction, operation or decommissioning of the Project.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		relocating the horses to a distant livery service was not a viable option.		As outlined in Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), construction effects are temporary and therefore are not expected to result in long term disruption to the use and enjoyment of land. Those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum amount of land necessary to deliver the Project within the Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant will only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the authorised development. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree practical solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	SETH207	The respondents queried if the disruption to the livelihood, transport, and homes of residents could be justified in the Project. Respondents also viewed potential disruption unfavourably and stated that the impacts would have adverse negative outcomes.	N	There are no significant impacts on residential property identified during construction, operation and decommissioning as described within ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), which considers impacts on residential properties, commercial properties and land, and community land and facilities. The assessment has considered the temporary nature of construction effects and mitigation measures to reduce disruption, resulting in a reduction in the magnitude of impacts. ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) considers changes in current traffic and transport and any resultant likely significant effects on receptors including community safety, along with effects on walking, cycling and horse riding (WCH) infrastructure, including Public Rights of Way (PRoW). No

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				residual likely significant effects have been identified with regards to traffic and transport. Section 17.8 of ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) considers impacts on neighbourhood amenity and related effects on health and wellbeing during construction. No significant effects have been identified except for neighbourhoods in Widley, who would experience temporary adverse effects with regards to visual amenity.
Wider Community	SETH208	One respondent noted that the Waltham Chase Aeromodellers encourage junior members to get into model aircraft construction and (STEM) more widely, and that the entire group benefits from the socialisation, skills and outdoor activity that the group presents, including many older members. Concerns were also noted that this would be impacted. A further respondent queried what the impacts on human health would be as a result of the Project.	N	Trenched, open-cut pipeline construction will take place in proximity to land used by the Aeromodellers club. Whilst there will be a temporary impact on local amenity, construction activities are not expected to prevent the club from carrying out its usual activities. The assessment in Section 17.8 ES of Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) has identified a neutral (not significant) effect on health and wellbeing for members of Waltham Chase Aeromodellers.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	SETH209	A respondent noted that the construction of the proposed pipeline would have an effect on the wellbeing of local communities.	N	The health assessment contained in section 17.8 of ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) considers the health and wellbeing effects on local communities associated with the impacts of the Project on access to healthcare, social care and other social infrastructure, access to green space and nature, recreation, neighbourhood amenity, accessibility and active travel, community safety, access to work and training, and social cohesion. Significant adverse (temporary) effects on wellbeing and quality of life have been identified as a result of impacts on neighbourhood amenity (construction noise and visual impacts) due to construction activities in Widley, and due to construction traffic affecting perceptions of safety for on pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists, specifically vulnerable groups such as older people, people with young children or people with disabilities. While the overall construction phase will last approximately 5 years, construction impacts in any given location will be considerably shorter. These significant effects on communities will occur while the construction works are ongoing. As local

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				amenity and traffic conditions will return to normal after construction, it is considered that the significant effects on wellbeing and quality of life would not continue to be felt.
Wider Community	SETH210	The respondent suggested that further safeguards should be put in place in relation to the Project.	N	Mitigation measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for likely significant adverse effects on communities have been included where possible and reported in section 17.4 of the ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	SETH211	The respondent noted that the Project got local support initially as it was approved to be clean water with provision for water sports and fishing.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. Havant Thicket Reservoir was consented on the basis of enabling additional water supplies to be provided to the Applicant's Hampshire supply area in times of drought. Havant Thicket Reservoir is not part of this Project.

Table G25-38 Summary of issues raised on the theme of traffic and transport and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
National Highways (NH)	TTR201	NH noted the current preferred location for the Water Recycling Plant and High Lift Pumping Station at land adjacent to the	N	The WRP is proposed to be located on land north of Harts Farm Way and south of the A27.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		A27 and Harts Farm Way. They requested further engagement to understand the potential risks this location may pose to the safe and efficient operation of the A27 and its users.		There has been ongoing engagement with National Highways regarding the transport impacts of the Project and NH have confirmed they are not concerned with both the construction and operational traffic impacts on the Strategic Road Network junctions, including the A27.
Royal Mail	TTR202	Royal Mail acknowledged that a Framework Traffic Management Strategy (FTMS), Construction Traffic Management Plan, and Environmental Management Plan were being prepared for the DCO application, but that these were not part of the March 2025 consultation. Royal Mail acknowledged that the Draft Construction Traffic Management Plan offered good level of detailed instruction on planned traffic management works, but understandably only included a high-level construction schedule.	N	A Traffic Management Strategy (Document reference 7.3, DCO Volume 7) and Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) have been submitted as part of the DCO application detailing where works in the public highway would be required and the associated traffic management. A detailed schedule of the construction works would be developed post-DCO consent and agreed as part of the detailed Traffic Management Strategy.
Royal Mail	TTR203	Royal Mail stated that sorting and delivery operations heavily relied on road communication and that services were sensitive to changes in the capacity of the highway network. Royal Mail raised concerns that disruption (such as traffic	N	The measures detailed in the Traffic Management Strategy (Document reference 7.3, DCO Volume 7) and Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) seek to minimise the impacts of the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		delays) or closure of any kind during day or night to the highway network may have direct consequences on Royal Mail's operations and the ability to meet the Universal Service Obligation and compliance with the regulatory regime for postal services, thereby presenting a risk to Royal Mail's business. This is of particular concern as on a daily basis, Royal Mail vehicles use all of the main roads that may be affected by the construction phase of the project.		construction activities on the local highway network. This includes night-time working at some locations, alongside calendar restrictions to avoid cumulative impacts of traffic management associated with other sections of the Project. In addition, there would be no road closures on any roads used for journeys made at a regional or national level, including all A roads and motorways.
Royal Mail Hampshire County Council	TTR204	Royal Mail stated that advanced knowledge of any traffic management affecting the public highway would allow the postal service to manage the impacts on their operation and asked for two months' notice to ensure access could be maintained or alternative arrangements could be put into place. Hampshire County Council (HCC) stated, as relevant Highway Authority, that any proposed temporary diversions and closures would be required to be submitted to and approved by the County Council prior to commencement of works.	N	The Traffic Management Strategy (Document reference 7.3, DCO Volume 7) outlines the scope of the communication strategy that would be developed as part of the detailed Traffic Management Strategy. This would include advanced notice of two weeks to stakeholders, including the Royal Mail, regarding planned works in the public highway that would require a temporary lane/road closure and could cause disruption. The potential of providing more advanced notice to the Royal Mail will be explored as part of the detailed Traffic Management Strategy. All closures and diversions are detailed in the FTMP. These would be approved in writing by

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				the relevant planning authority following consultation with the relevant local highway authority (LHA) and NH.
Portsmouth City Council	TTR205	PCC stated that, alongside the current consultation, the LHA has been holding regular meetings with the Applicant, Hampshire County Council Highways, and NH. Portsmouth City Council Highways advised that the proposed Project is unlikely to have a material impact on the safety or operation of the City Council's highway network. The Council noted that compound sites are proposed within the PCC area and considered that these would not generate significant traffic in the long term. PCC confirmed that it is continuing discussions on highway-related elements of the Project in order to mitigate any potential impacts during the construction phase.	N	The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) details the forecast changes traffic demand associated with construction activities, including construction worker movements. This has informed the traffic impact assessment included in the Transport Assessment (Appendix 18.1 of the ES Document reference 6.2 DCO Volume 6). This concludes there would be no significant long-term impacts on traffic in Portsmouth. There has been ongoing engagement with PCC regarding the construction compound accesses located within PCC area and this has been reflected in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PILs	TTR206	Buckland Development objected to the proposal as they stated no details had been included in the draft construction management plan related to construction traffic. They argued that this made it harder	N	The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) submitted as part of the DCO application details the construction traffic forecast to be generated by each construction

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		to consider the proposal at this stage. Respondents stated that Hoads Hill is the main route south from Wickham towards Fareham and the M27 as well as Upham Street through Upham. The respondents stated that they would trust that heavy traffic that would use the proposed construction area would be managed to minimise disruption. Another respondent was confused as to how the Applicant would access their land as the access track at Shirrel Lane was not considered suitable for heavy equipment.		compound and at each access on to the public highway. Several construction compounds are accessed directly from the A32 Hoad's Hill and the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) includes measures to manage these accesses and the HGV (Heavy Goods Vehicle) movements associated with the Project on the highway network. Access to the construction compound on the eastern side of Shirrel Heath High Street would be accessed from Blind Lane and a temporary haul road. No construction access is proposed from Shirrell Lane.
PIL	TTR207	The respondent stated that in previous representations, they had suggested that the unmade track on the western side of Little Park Farm was unsuitable for construction traffic. The respondent was pleased to note that the Applicant was considered to have accepted this and as a result reconsidered the access arrangements. The respondent stated that in their view, it appeared that a new purpose-built access from Titchfield Lane	Y	The Applicant had regard to this previous feedback and has revised the proposed access, meaning no construction traffic would use the unmade track on the western side of Little Park Farm. As detailed in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7), a temporary access is proposed to be taken directly from Titchfield Lane. This access has been located close to the junction with the A334 to reduce the length of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		on the northern boundary of Little Park Farm now formed part of proposals.		Titchfield Lane that would be impacted by construction vehicles.
PIL	TTR208	Grayswood Carriage Driving Centre were concerned that the notable level of vehicle movements could mean that there could be an increase in stones or debris left on the tracks which could damage the horses' feet.	N	The access routes to the construction compounds for HGVs are detailed in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) and predominately follow A and B classified roads. The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) also includes a requirement for wheel washing facilities to minimise the potential for any debris being deposited on the public highway. Construction traffic near Grayswood Carriage Driving Centre would take access directly from the B2177 Portsmouth Road and would not travel on any lanes/tracks.
PIL	TTR209	The respondent wanted to be assured that access from Castle Farm Lane to their residential dwellings nearby was retained, and that any work on the pipeline would be carried out with as little visual disturbance as possible, with a reasonable state of repair being upheld. The respondent noted that Castle Farm Lane was not suitable for heavy vehicle traffic.	N	As detailed in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7), access to nearby construction compounds would be accessed from either the A32 Hoads Hill or Chalk Lane, directly east of the roundabout with the A32. No HGVs associated with construction would be permitted to use Castle Farm Lane.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				A temporary road closure would be required on Chalk Lane and Castle Farm Lane to enable to the construction of the pipeline. The FTMS includes restrictions to prevent these road closures occurring at the same time. Therefore, access would always be available to Castle Farm Lane, either directly from the A32 or via Chalk Lane. The impact on views is assessed in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and Visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The closest representative viewpoint to Castle Farm Lane is VP125, located on Forest Lane. Construction activity would take place in the fields between the covered reservoir and Forest Lane, resulting in significant visual impacts during construction. These impacts would be temporary and reversible, with no change to views during the operational stage of the Project.
PIL	TTR210	A respondent was concerned that the proposed works would leave an open corridor to the main road which, in addition to machinery left on their land, could be dangerous for the landowner's dependents. The respondent noted that Winchester Road already had a problem with traffic, and they were concerned that if	N	The health assessment component of ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) in section 17.8 considers impacts on community safety, including effects on perceptions of road safety and how this may affect access and mental wellbeing. An assessment of accidents and safety is also

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		more construction traffic was to come through the area, fatalities could increase. The respondent stated that it was important to consider Upham School, as an increase of vehicles on the roads and the lack of adherence to the speed limits could cause concern regarding people's safety on the walk to school.		presented in the ES Chapter 18 Traffic and Transport, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and concludes there would be no significant effects associated with the forecast increase in construction traffic demand. The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) includes measures to reduce the impacts of construction traffic on Winchester Road, including restriction on HGV movements in the peak periods. The construction access routes for HGVs are also detailed in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) and do not permit HGVs on Upham Street past Upham School.
PIL	TTR211	The respondent was concerned about any changes relating to parking on West Street.	N	Double yellow lines would be required on West Street between Meyrick Road and Bedhampton Road to enable HGV access to Meyrick Road. This would be required for a temporary period (approximately 18 months), and the double yellow lines would be removed once access is no longer required, as detailed in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7). The same car

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				parking restrictions have been implemented to facilitate construction access to the housing development Land at Kingscroft Farm (APP/22/00669) and are also proposed to be implemented as part Portsmouth Water works at Bedhampton Springs (APP/24/00405). As such, there would be no change to the current car parking restrictions implemented by these other sites.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	TTR212	The Kemnal Academies Trust stated that they had two schools in the vicinity of the potential works (Petersfield Road area of Leigh Park/Havant) and asked for any work to be done at a time which would acknowledge school traffic. They suggested that the area around both schools was already congested at pick-up and drop-off times and adding roadworks would increase the problems.	N	The construction access routes for HGVs are identified in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7). There are no HGVs planned to route on Petersfield Road or near Leigh Park. Where construction traffic is planned to route near a school, HGV movements are restricted during the school's drop-off and collections periods.
Wider Community	TTR213	Front Lawn Primary Academy stated that the potential increase of traffic may impact students, staff and parents making their way to / from school and may affect student attendance and student and staff lateness.	N	The construction access routes for HGVs are identified in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7). There are no HGVs planned to route near Front Lawn Primary Academy. In addition, as set out in the Traffic Management Strategy (Document

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				reference 7.3, DCO Volume 7), there are no works in the public highway located near Front Lawn Primary Academy that would impact journeys to this school.
Wider Community	TTR214	Front Lawn Primary Academy stated that Broadmere Avenue and High Lawn Way already cause a number of issues due to a lack of safe crossings and a high volume of traffic. They suggested that doing the works during the holidays would mitigate accidents.	N	As detailed in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7), no construction traffic is planned to route on Broadmere Avenue or High Lawn Way.
Wider Community	TTR215	Respondents noted concerns around an increase in near misses due to increased traffic and vehicles using unsuitable roads.	Y	Access routes for HGVs to the construction compounds have been revised to avoid local roads and collision hotspots, where practicable. This includes a temporary access proposed directly from Winchester Road, removing the need for access via Sciviers Lane. To reduce the impacts of construction traffic on local roads, including near Wickham and Bedhampton Springs, the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) restricts any HGV movements in the peak hours.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	TTR216	The respondents stated that in their opinion, the new temporary construction access from an existing access point on the A27 slip road was needed to take the heaviest construction traffic and that there was not only a slip road but also a substantial hard shoulder which could enable HGVs to turn off of. However, they suggested that the bulk of the construction traffic would still go through Old Bedhampton which has narrow roads and tight bends and is an area of conservation.	N	NH have been consulted regarding a potential access from the A27 slip road as an option for to access construction compound B1-1. An alternative access for construction traffic to construction compound B1-1 via Brookside Road and Mill Lane has been discussed with HCC. As detailed in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7), HGVs accessing construction compound B1-1 via Mill Lane would need to be escorted to and from the construction compound and would take place after the PM peak period.
Wider Community	TTR217	The respondent queried what the daily vehicle movements would be during construction and what the maintenance once the Project had been completed would be like.	N	The daily construction vehicle movements are detailed in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) for each construction compound and access. An assessment of these traffic impacts on the local highway network can be found in the TA (Appendix 18.1 of the ES, Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The TA also outlines the forecast traffic movements associated with maintenance activities.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	TTR218	A respondent noted that Harts Farm Way was already busy and congested due to the industrial estates it served. The respondent stated that any additional traffic control or disruption caused by building a new Wastewater Treatment Works would cause significant problems locally. Another respondent stated that pipeline sections A, B and D were in their opinion unnecessary and would cause additional traffic chaos.	N	ES Appendix 18.1 Transport Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) outlines the construction traffic impacts of the Project on Harts Farm Way and at the junction with the A27. With the sustainable transport interventions secured through the Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan (appended to the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)) the forecast traffic impacts on delay would not be significant. Pipeline sections A-D comprise the transfers between: ▪ Budds Farm WTW and the WRP. ▪ WRP site and Bedhampton Springs. ▪ First section of the WRP site to Otterbourne WSW pipeline. These pipelines form key components of the Project. In this area, trenchless construction methods will be used to avoid construction works at surface level which would reduce impacts on communities, the road network and the environment.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	TTR219	The respondent questioned how much additional traffic they can expect along the roads within the vicinity of the proposed Water Recycling Plant.	N	The daily construction vehicle movements are detailed in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) for each construction compound, including the WRP. An assessment of these traffic impacts on the local highway network can be found in the ES Appendix 18.1 Transport Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With the sustainable transport interventions secured through the Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan (appended to the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)), the forecast traffic impacts on delay would not be significant.

Table G25-39 Summary of issues raised on the theme of water environment and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
South Downs National Park Authority, Havant Borough	WE201	South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) confirmed that the Environmental Water Quality Report was on water bodies outside of the National Park and therefore the SDNPA had no comment.	N	Regarding HBC's comment, modelling of water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies that would receive compensatory flows has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Council, and Portsmouth City Council		Havant Borough Council (HBC) stated the Project required the design to avoid negative impacts on water quality or biodiversity, which applied to Havant Thicket Reservoir itself as well as rivers and the marine environment downstream. The Council also stated it was mindful that the consultation relied on preliminary modelling of potential water quality effects and understand further detail was to follow through additional studies and the Environmental Statement (ES) which would accompany the Development Consent Order (DCO). Portsmouth City Council (PCC) confirmed that on the basis that proposed changes to water quality related to limited changes to the quality in water courses outside of the Council's administrative area, PCC offered no comments on the updated environmental water quality information.		19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). An assessment of water quality impacts is provided in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume I (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessments presented in ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I Document reference (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), conclude that the Project would not result in adverse likely significant effects on water quality or aquatic biodiversity in Havant Thicket Reservoir or downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour and The Solent).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Furthermore, the assessment presented in ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) demonstrates that the Project would not result in temporary or long-lasting effects (i.e., effects that are not permanent but could persist for the duration or beyond the current River Basin Planning Cycle) on the status of any lake, river, transitional, or coastal water bodies assessed at Stage 3 of the Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment (which includes biological water quality elements). Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) shows that water quality in the reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operational activities will allow water body status objectives to be achieved in the future. The Project is therefore considered compliant with the requirements of the Water Environment Regulations.
Natural England	WE202	Natural England (NE) welcomed the Applicant's commitment to include measures for reducing phosphorous as	N	Modelling of water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies that would receive compensatory flows has been

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		part of the water recycling treatment process and confirmed NE continued engagement with the Applicant. NE noted that water quality changes were anticipated to be greater in the Rider Lane Stream catchment and that any phosphorus removal would therefore have a positive impact on the Rider Lane Stream catchment. NE refrained from providing specific comments towards the Rider Lane Stream, noting that this fell outside of NE's remit and within the Environment Agency's (EA) scope. NE noted the nutrient assessment is ongoing and will continue to engage with this through the Technical Working Group meetings.		updated, and the results are presented in Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). An assessment of water quality impacts is provided in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). As described in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), the modelling undertaken subsequent to the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation with the HRRM in place at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in status of Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would therefore also have an effect on water quality within Riders Lane Stream, as compensatory flows from Havant Thicket Reservoir (receiving the recycled water) are released to this watercourse. The results of water quality modelling presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The updated modelling presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) includes the HRRM at the WRP shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour). Regarding the Nutrient Assessment, an assessment of the implications for the Project

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				on nutrient loads in the Solent and River Itchen nutrient neutrality catchments is provided in ES Appendix 19.7 Nutrient assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). A draft methodology for the Nutrient Assessment was issued to the Technical Working Group for comment in advance of the assessment. The findings of the Nutrient Assessment are presented to the Technical Working Group through to DCO submission. The Nutrient Assessment confirms that the Project will be compliant with the Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, with regard to NE nutrient neutrality guidance. The Nutrient Assessment concludes that, on the basis of nutrient management measures embedded within the Project, no additional mitigation would be required to achieve nutrient neutrality during the construction and operational phases.
NE and Langstone Harbour Board	WE203	NE noted that according to the Water Quality Report, nutrient load, in particular from agricultural sources, has decreased and eutrophication is no longer considered to be an issue within the harbour, however stated this counters NE condition assessment for SPA Chichester Harbour and Langstone Harbour as well as the	N	The information presented was based on a published EA report relating to Water Framework Directive water body classification assessments. Where additional information is available relating to condition assessments for designated sites (such as SACs), this is included and considered within the Habitats Regulations Assessment – Stage 2

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC). NE stated these sites have failed the water quality nutrients attribute due to continued signs of eutrophication in Langstone Harbour. Langstone Harbour Board also noted the counter evidence of NE's report to that submitted by the Applicant, stating this disconnect underscores the importance of addressing these issues.		Appropriate Assessment and Marine Conservation Zone – Stage 1 Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 5.2, DCO Volume 5).
NE	WE204	NE referenced the Environmental Water Quality Report Section 3.2.20, which noted the absence of alkalinity standards in the Water Framework Directive within transitional or coastal waterbodies and that the EA therefore does not routinely measure this in Langstone Harbour. NE queried if the data on alkalinity in transitional or water bodies had been collected by other bodies and suggested the University of Portsmouth held ample water quality data from Langstone Harbour and may thus be able to support the scheme.	N	Requests have been made to third parties to obtain any third-party alkalinity data for Langstone Harbour and connected transitional and coastal water bodies, but data has not been provided. However, assessments undertaken since the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation provided in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), demonstrate that alkalinity in Langstone Harbour would not

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				be subject to significant change once the Project becomes operational.
NE	WE205	NE referenced the Environmental Water Quality Report Sections 3.2.31 to 3.2.32 and requested clarification to understand the reasoning for the large increase in Dissolved Inorganic Carbon (DIC) in Langstone Harbour, as well as the potential impacts of this.	N	Additional assessment undertaken since the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation is now provided in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and predicts that DIC in Langstone Harbour would increase once Havant Thicket Reservoir becomes operational, but would not be subject to further change once the Project becomes operational. Furthermore, no changes in pH are predicted to occur in response to changes in DIC, which indicates that there would be no adverse impacts on water quality or aquatic ecology.
National Highways	WE206	National Highways (NH) advised that the impacts to Strategic Road Network assets such as landscape and drainage needed to be considered.	N	The Applicant confirms that landscape impacts have been assessed in full within the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), presented in ES Chapter 13

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). In line with standard LVIA methodology, people travelling on roads have been considered as receptors. The LVIA identifies that most of the landscape and visual impacts would arise during construction, due to temporary vegetation loss and presence of construction activity. Due to embedded mitigation measures, these effects would diminish at operational stage, with no long-term significant effects on road users. A Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) Strategy for all the permanent Above Ground Plant (AGP) is described in ES Appendix 19.1 Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The purpose of the SuDS strategy is to demonstrate how the Project will manage surface water runoff. The purpose of the FRA is to assess the vulnerability of the Project to flood risk and the impact of the Project on flood risk. Construction-stage drainage management measures are described in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). A Construction Drainage Plan will be

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				prepared by the Contractor, to manage the quality and quantity of construction stage drainage. The plan will be informed by surveys undertaken by a specialist drainage Contractor, to locate drains and create pre-construction drawings to ensure appropriate reinstatement. The plan will be agreed with the EA and the relevant Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) post-DCO consent during the detailed design stage. It will include measures to minimise water within the working area and ensure ongoing drainage of surrounding land. A suitable methodology for the reinstatement of drainage systems impacted by pipeline installation will be adopted, where appropriate. This would be prepared in agreement with the landowner, EA and LLFA, and informed by the pre-construction survey. In the event reinstating existing land drains is not feasible, an agreed post construction drainage scheme would be implemented. Operational drainage measures related to SuDS maintenance, washouts, emergency overflows are detailed in the Operational Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Winchester City Council	WE207	Winchester City Council (WCC) stated that as the areas covered within the Environmental Water Quality Report were not within or immediately adjacent to WCC authority area, comments were deferred to the relevant Local and County authorities as well as NE and the EA.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
WCC	WE208	WCC noted that the Project would result in a notable uplift in phosphorus within the Havant Thicket Reservoir via the Eastney Long Sea Outfall (LSO) and raised concerns given the requirement for nutrient neutrality and the potential harm to the surrounding sensitive areas. WCC stated that the Project's mitigation measures were expected to ensure a nutrient neutral outcome.	N	The Applicant would like to clarify that the Eastney LSO does not release into Havant Thicket Reservoir, the outfall releases reject water into the Solent. The assessment presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II and described in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) demonstrates that the Project would not result in an increase in phosphorus concentrations in Havant Thicket Reservoir or downstream water bodies that would receive compensation flows (Riders

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour and The Solent). An assessment of the impact of the Project on nutrient loads in the Solent and other nutrient-sensitive protected sites is presented in ES Appendix 19.7 Nutrient Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The nutrient assessment concludes that, on the basis of nutrient management measures embedded within the project, no additional mitigation would be required to achieve nutrient neutrality during the construction and operational phases of the Project.
EA	WE209	The EA stated that the issue of the future baseline of the Hermitage catchment had been raised with the project team on several occasions. The EA noted that although this matter was recognised within the Environmental Water Quality Report, the EA did not consider that the extent of the potential changes to the baseline had been fully accounted for. The EA considered that there existed a significant package of compensation measures associated with the Havant	N	Potential changes to the baseline, termed 'future baseline', of Riders Lane Stream and Hermitage Stream, including the planned enhancements agreed as part of the Regulation 19 measures and planning conditions to deliver geomorphological and habitat improvements in Hermitage Stream, Riders Lane Stream and Park Lane Stream (to be implemented by Portsmouth Water) is discussed in section 19.7 of ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Thicket Reservoir Project (classic), which includes extensive river restoration on the Hermitage Stream which would shift the baseline. The EA's position was that this had not been fully reflected within the report.		Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). As described in section 19.7, the future baseline of Hermitage Stream, against which the Project will be assessed, will be affected by Portsmouth Water's package of river channel improvement measures, which includes a range of geomorphological and habitat improvements in Hermitage Stream, and its tributaries Riders Lane Stream and Park Lane Stream. The combined length of these improvements would be approximately 5.48km. Detailed measures aimed at improving ecological resilience within the wider Hermitage Stream catchment (rather than replacing like-for-like habitat which will be lost under the Reservoir footprint) are currently being considered by Portsmouth Water, including: - Upper Hermitage Stream at The Queen's Inclosure: Localised tree pollarding/coppicing and installation of leaky woody barriers to improve habitat diversity and slow the flow. - Hermitage Stream from Bushy Lease to New Road: Removal of concrete bed and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				bank protection, and installation of in-channel berms to increase flow sinuosity. ▪ Headwaters of Riders Lane Stream: There is potential to construct a pond area so as to create additional water habitat. Further downstream, there is potential to design leaky woody barriers situated together to help slow the flow and create habitat diversity. ▪ Park Lane Stream at Waterloo Gold Club: Re-naturalise the channel through the removal of bank protection, increasing sinuosity, bank re-profiling and de-culverting. ▪ Park Lane Stream in Bell's Copse: Slow the flow by installing leaky woody barriers. These measures will be designed to deliver improvements to the geomorphology of the named watercourses and to the quality of habitats for fish, aquatic invertebrates and macrophyte communities. The baseline conditions of the watercourses are therefore expected to improve in the future. However, the measures are intended to address pressures associated with physical modifications and changes to the hydrological regime associated with construction of the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				reservoir. They are unlikely to address the water quality pressures that affect the water body, where point source pollution (as set out in 19.7, baseline conditions) is adversely affecting pH and phosphate concentrations. Under the conditions of its Impoundment License for Havant Thicket Reservoir, Portsmouth Water is also required to deliver fish passage easements at two large weir structures downstream of New Road. Although these easements are likely to deliver considerable benefits for fish passage, they are unlikely to result in significant improvements to the hydrology or geomorphology of the river channel if the structures remain in place.
EA	WE210	The EA noted that phosphorous and associated increased Biochemical Oxygen Demand had been highlighted as potential issues in the Riders Lane Stream and Hermitage Stream and that the Environmental Water Quality Report stated that Biochemical Oxygen Demand would be offset by increased oxygen concentrations, which the EA assumed to be achieved via the bubbler system proposed for the Havant Thicket Reservoir.	N	Modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) incorporates the change of inlet pipe location; the recycled water spring inlet location into Havant Thicket Reservoir has moved from the north basin (eastern borrow pit) to the south basin (western borrow pit) in closer proximity to the withdrawal infrastructure.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		The EA advised that further consideration would be required regarding the implementation and operation of this system, as well as the event of failure. It was noted that there was a high risk of eutrophication even if a bubbler was in place and advised that more consideration needed to be given as to how this will be managed and that the effectiveness of the bubbler still required demonstrating. The EA queried what other options/solutions were available to mitigate this impact and if consideration had been given to the impacts of potential failure both within the Havant Thicket Reservoir and on the downstream waterbodies. The EA broadly summarised that further information demonstrating the feasibility of the proposed option was required.		The model also includes: ▪ An updated bubble plume destratification system design, in particular the layout of the bubbler lines in the south basin. ▪ Improved characterisation of reservoir with the planned implementation of a HRRM that substantially decreases nutrient concentrations of this water source. Reservoir water quality simulations indicate that nighttime operation (1800 - 0600) of the bubbler system from April to August would be an effective means of preventing water column stratification, maintaining vertically homogenous physico-chemical conditions (e.g. DO concentration and temperature) and preventing the development of hypoxia or anoxia at depth. The addition to the bubbler system, primary mitigation of the HRRM at the WRP means that that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in: - ES Appendix 19.5: Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent Dispersion Modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) - ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
EA	WE211	The EA noted that the marine elements of the proposals (impacts on Langstone Harbour (via Hermitage Stream) and the Solent (via Eastney LSO)) were included in the Environmental Water Quality Report and that the report predicted no significant water quality effects.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
EA and Marine	WE212	The EA referred to the Environmental Water Quality Report confirming that seven chemicals were screened in for preliminary	N	Since the Water Quality Report was published, the Applicant has updated the screening assessment to reflect more recent

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Management Organisation		dispersion modelling following Environmental Quality Standard assessment of the release water from Eastney LSO. The EA stated that modelling indicated very small decreased concentrations between the existing and future release scenarios, however, it was noted that this modelling still needed updating to include the addition of baseline concentrations from ongoing marine water quality sampling, which the EA expected would be included and fully assessed within the ES. The EA confirmed further comment would be provided if required once the full results have been presented. The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) provided comments on the water quality modelling of water bodies downstream of the Havant Thicket Reservoir receiving compensatory flows. In this context the MMO noted that the Solent compensatory flows modelling showed that there were water quality changes as a result of the post WRP operation not		baseline information on marine water quality. The updated screening assessment screened in four chemicals and was based on a programme of sampling being undertaken at the Eastney LSO commencing in October 2024. The screening has been based on eight sampling rounds. Additional sampling is proposed to support the Environmental Permit application. The updated assessment still indicates the distance to the Environmental Quality Standard (EQS) as being 1-2 m thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Regarding the MMO aspects to this issue, it is noted that there are no specific issues raised and confirm that all comments are noted alongside confirming that all modelling reports are appended to ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) which include the source and format of data, field and scaling parameters. The assessment of chemicals within the release has been revised in line with EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance and the updated output is

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		extending into the Solent, and that no significant effects on marine biodiversity were anticipated. The MMO acknowledged that the assessment identified the surface water as being potentially at risk of failing respective Environmental Quality Standard, using seven parameters, to assess the risk of the release of the reject water from the Eastney LSO. The MMO acknowledged that the same seven parameters were used to compare the 'existing' scenario to the 'future' scenario of the reject water when the WRP added to the release from Budds Farm Water Treatment Works (WTW). The MMO stated that the modelled changes did not identify any significant adverse effects on water quality and the changes were not anticipated to affect the marine biodiversity as a result. It was also stated that the ES as part of the DCO should provide a report of the modelling to support statements suggesting there would be no significant		presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II. The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and account for baseline concentrations.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		change between existing and future scenarios, including the source and format of data, field and scaling parameters.		
EA	WE213	The EA referenced Sections 3.1.9 and 3.1.15 within the Environmental Water Quality Report and requested clarification as to the number of bubblers to be installed, noting the suggested number did not appear consistent throughout the Environmental Water Quality Report.	N	The detailed design of the bubbler system is yet to be complete and will be responsibility of Portsmouth Water, including the number of bubblers. The Spring 2025 Water Quality Modelling Report was informed by a previous iteration of the reservoir water quality modelling undertaken by the Applicant in July 2024. This assumed that there will be two lines of bubblers, one each in the deepest basins. The updated modelling presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) refined the design to include two lines each with a length of 360m at a height of 0.3m above the reservoir bed, with 180 openings at 2m intervals and a free air flow rate of 87.5 L/s. Reservoir water quality simulations indicate that nighttime operation (1800 - 0600) of the bubbler system from April to August would be an effective means of preventing water column stratification, maintaining vertically homogenous physico-chemical conditions

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				(e.g. DO concentration and temperature) and preventing the development of hypoxia or anoxia at depth.
EA	WE214	The EA referenced various sections within the Environmental Water Quality Report and suggested additional labelling of graphs to be undertaken throughout the Environmental Water Quality Report and concentrations be written on the relevant figures for ease of reading. The EA further suggested figures currently presented in graphical figures also be provided in tables for ease of reference and comparison for the reader.	N	The Spring 2025 water quality report is not being reissued. Updated modelling results and supporting data tables are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Updated figures are provided in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Specific concentrations have not been listed on the box and whisker plots because they made them difficult to read, particularly in cases where the median and percentile values are in a small range. However, summary data tables have been provided in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
MMO	WE215	The MMO noted that the extent of the water quality changes in the tidal reach of the Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour post Water Recycling Project operation compared to the 'classic' operation scenario showed it was unlikely to result in significant effects on marine biodiversity. The MMO added that when compared to measured baseline, the modelling predicted that water quality in Langstone Harbour would be subject to very small changes as a result of the compensatory flows, both in the "classic" and "post Water Recycling Project" operation scenarios, however they would be confined to the northern part of the harbour, adjacent to the mouth of Hermitage Stream. It was noted that for the tidal section of Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour, the modelled water quality changes of the seven Environmental Quality Standards comparing 'existing' and 'future' scenarios	N	The Applicant has noted these comments.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		were not predicted to extend into Langstone Harbour or the tidal part of the Hermitage Stream as the changes in the Environmental Quality Standards parameters in the Langstone Harbour and the Solent were anticipated to be small meaning significant effects to marine biodiversity were also not expected.		
MMO	WE216	The MMO acknowledged that the implementation of the SuDS outfall would reduce the salinity within Hermitage Stream due to the release of surface water flows rather than the receiving brackish water as it would be predominantly rainfall. The MMO noted the use of the MIKE21 hydraulic model to assess the potential changes as a result of the release of surface water into Hermitage Stream over spring and neap tides and that the SuDS discharge timeseries was derived from modelled outputs of a two-year return period storm event and a 16-hour storm duration was used as a conservative approach.	N	The Applicant has noted these comments.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		The MMO pointed towards results showing that the greatest change in salinity occurred in the main channel during the neap tide simulation (natural variations in salinity being low during this period due to the decreased tidal range). It was stated that spring tide simulation showed minimum salinity along the banks of the Hermitage Stream where the water was shallow. The MMO stated that however the overall change in salinity due to SuDS compared to natural fluctuations would be small.		
Fareham Borough Council	WE217	Fareham Borough Council (FBC) confirmed the Council had no comments on the Environmental Water Quality Report, however stated further examination of the potential impacts from increased phosphorous levels are to be discussed with the EA during the formal DCO application process. The Council were content that the appropriate measures required would be secured to address this.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. Phosphorus reduction measures HRRM have been incorporated into the design of the WRP.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Langstone Harbour Board	WE218	Langstone Harbour Board challenged the conclusion in the Environmental Water Quality Report that reject water from the WRP, discharged via the Eastney LSO, would not impact Langstone Harbour. Langstone Harbour Board suggested existing dispersion models demonstrated that discharges from the Eastney LSO reached both Langstone and Chichester Harbours, contradicting the Environmental Water Quality Report's conclusions. The Board raised concern about how reject water from the WRP might interact with the proposed Budd's Farm reconfiguration and stated no 'in-combination assessments' had been undertaken. Langstone Harbour Board added that although this reconfiguration project remained in early development, a detailed risk assessment would be imperative to evaluate potential impacts on Langstone Harbour and the wider Solent European Marine Sites.	N	The modelling undertaken for the currently consented parameters and salinity presents the differences in concentrations (not the plume extents) between the existing Budds Farm WTW discharge scenario and the operational Project scenario for discharge from Budds Farm WTW. The results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and show that the changes do not extend into Langstone Harbour or Chichester Harbour. The assessment of chemicals within the discharge has been undertaken in line with EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The distance to each EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall (located within the Solent) thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location and therefore effects would not extend into Langstone Harbour or Chichester Harbour. The Budds Farm WTW reconfiguration project, which would have involved switching of storm discharges between Langstone Harbour and the Eastney LSO is no longer being progressed at this time, and therefore it has not been assessed within the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA).
Langstone Harbour Board	WE219	Langstone Harbour Board commented that in light of the stated extensive existing research into the effects of pharmaceuticals on marine ecosystems in Langstone Harbour, that the Board was disappointed to see only seven parameters incorporated into the modelling of reject water to marine biodiversity. Langstone Harbour Board noted that reverse osmosis treatment at the WRP	N	The seven parameters were identified as part of the assessment which followed the EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance. This work has since been updated based on additional data and identified four parameters that required modelling. The modelling output is detailed in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The Applicant

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		was expected to mitigate contamination of pharmaceuticals, forever chemicals, Volatile Organic Compounds, and other persistent contaminants, however, suggested this assumption had to be substantiated with robust data and that the absence of publicly available data from the Budd's Farm water recycling pilot hindered the Board's ability to evaluate the effectiveness of the process in removing the aforementioned contaminants, which was considered pivotal to allaying Langstone Harbour Board's concerns.		has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflow) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given that the pilot plant data does not represent the full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				There is additional information now publicly available online regarding the performance of water recycling technology, refer to Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance.
Langstone Harbour Board	WE220	Langstone Harbour Board suggested the Environmental Water Quality Report did not consider the impact on water quality during the construction of the WRP at 'Site 72', which was described as a historic landfill adjacent to Langstone Harbour. Langstone Harbour Board referred to the Board's previous 2024 consultation responses, which noted the Eastern Solent Coastal Partnership's 2019 SCOPAC Coastal Landfills Study highlighting that £500,000 had already been spent refurbishing the site's coastal revetment over the past 25 years and that repairs to the deteriorating coastal defences at Broadmarsh were being undertaken by HBC to prevent considerable damage. However, it was stated that the concerns with the WRP being located on contaminated land remain.	N	The scope of the Water Quality Report was limited to an assessment of water quality effects associated to changes in the reject water from the Eastney LSO and releases of recycled water into Havant Thicket Reservoir, and downstream water bodies receiving compensatory flows. Construction impacts were not considered. However, potential impacts to the Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour associated with leachate releases during construction are presented in ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) along with embedded mitigation measures and concludes that with the implementation of mitigation measures, there would be no residual likely significant effects on land quality and ground conditions receptors as result of the migration of landfill leachates into Langstone Harbour, Chichester Harbour and chalk aquifers.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Langstone Harbour Board stated that the EA determine Langstone Harbour to be in 'good' condition for contaminants, however noted that this was not considered the case for mercury and its compounds, as well as Polybrominated Diphenyl Ethers. The Langstone Harbour Board raised the risks of leachate entering the harbour through pile driving and foundational infrastructure, citing the current chemical status of the harbour and reiterated that the Board stated that surface water modelling was needed at the WRP site to assess potential leachate concerns during construction. Langstone Harbour Board sought further clarification as it appeared to the Board that modelling conclusions relating to Biological Oxygen Demand and Dissolved Oxygen seemed inconsistent and to contradict what was considered a well-established inverse relationship between these parameters.		To mitigate the risk of release of contaminated water/leachate into water bodies, the Contractor will undertake a detailed Foundation Works Risk Assessment (FWRA) in line with CL:AIRE's Piling and Penetrative Ground Improvement Methods on Land Affected by Contamination: Guidance on Pollution Prevention, which will include a detailed Piling Risk Assessment. The detailed FWRA will be undertaken in consultation with the EA, relevant LPA and other relevant bodies (if applicable). The Outline Foundation Works Risk Assessment (Document reference 7.4, DCO Volume 7) includes outline versions of the Piling Risk Assessment. The chemical baseline of Langstone Harbour is presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.3 Water Environment Compliance Assessment (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). As described in those documents, and on the EA Catchment Data Explorer, all surface water bodies were classified as 'Fail' for chemical status in 2019 by the EA and 'Does not require assessment in 2022'. This is because the EA changed its methods and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				evidence base for chemical status, and the failures are due to four groups of global pollutants (uPBTs), including polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs) and mercury. Modelling shows the reservoir would be at High status and there would be no adverse impacts on water quality downstream. The EA baseline data for Langstone Harbour show that for both PBDE and mercury, the EA have delivered measures to address the reasons for failure and are awaiting recovery. For PBDE the objective date for 'Good' status is 2063, and 2040 for mercury, which reflects natural system recovery time. These dates are broadly the same for all surface water bodies in England for PBDE and mercury. The updated results demonstrate that DO concentrations would be higher than the current baseline once Havant Thicket Reservoir becomes operational and would not be subject to further change once water from the WRP is released into Havant Thicket Reservoir. Conversely, BOD would be subject to a small decrease, consistent with the increase in DO.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Langstone Harbour Board	WE221	Langstone Harbour Board queried if one assessment site, located at the junction of Binness Rithe and North Lake, could accurately reflect the effects on the entire harbour noting the site is further south than the proposed outfall from the WRP. Langstone Harbour Board considered that modelling of combined effects from the WRP discharges and alterations to freshwater inputs through compensatory flows to the Hermitage Stream at this site would be inadequate, as it was believed that these inputs may dilute the WRP discharges and compensatory flows.	N	The site specifically identified in the assessments was selected because it is also used as a water quality monitoring location by the EA, and there is therefore considerable baseline data available for this location against which modelled water quality results could be compared and applied to physico-chemical status under WFD Directions 2015 (Schedule 3, Part 1) with EQS or equivalent. Detailed modelling of surface water runoff from the SuDS outfall is provided in ES Appendix 19.12 Water Recycling Plant site Sustainable Drainage System dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The change in salinity due to the SuDS outfall release, when compared with the natural fluctuations in ambient salinity levels throughout the tidal cycle, is predicted to be extremely small. Significant adverse effects to water quality are therefore not anticipated from releases from the WRP SuDS outfall. Updated outputs from the modelling of water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies that would receive compensatory flows are presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). An updated assessment of water quality impacts is provided in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I, and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Very small changes are observed further upstream in the transitional reach of Hermitage Stream; these outputs are shown in full in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Although the degree of predicted change was calculated for the full domain of the hydraulic model, the absence of detailed baseline water quality data for this specific location meant that concentrations could not be calculated in the same way as those presented for the EA's monitoring site.
Langstone Harbour Board	WE222	Langstone Harbour Board considered that it was not appropriate for the Board to comment on the effects of the Project	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		solely with respect to Langstone Harbour, noting the harbour's relationship with the Hermitage Stream and Havant Thicket Reservoir.		
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PILs	WE223	Respondents raised concerns with respect to potential increased flood risks that could be associated with the Project, including seasonal risks and waterlogging during construction, as well as operation. Respondents sought clarification how the Project would intersect with other waterbodies. A respondent noted the existence of a subterranean river near Five Oaks Farm and queried how the Applicant would approach and manage the intersection of this waterbody with the Project. A respondent noted that their land had existing drainage systems in place under the surface and stated that the Applicant appropriately reinstated these before backfilling were to occur. The landowner provided a plan showing location of the respective drainage network.	N	A Flood Risk Assessment for the Project is presented in ES Appendix 19.1 Flood Risk Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The FRA concludes that during operation the Project will not result in any loss of floodplain storage capacity or reduce floodplain conveyance. The FRA also concludes that Project will not result in an increase in the volume or rate of surface water runoff during operation. ES Appendix 19.4 Watercourse crossing schedule, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), provides information on how the Project would intersect with other waterbodies. Good construction practices set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) which is secured by a requirement in the DCO will manage the effects of construction. A detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will be produced and submitted

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				for approval in accordance with the corresponding requirement in Schedule 2 to the DCO. This includes preparation of a Construction Drainage Plan to manage the quality and quantity of construction stage drainage. Measures required to be included in the Construction Drainage Plan are set out in the main body of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The issue of a subterranean river was addressed in the Summer 2024 Consultation Issue Statements. The respondent supplied a map of its approximate position. All sources of baseline data have been checked and there is nothing to suggest the existence of an underground river at this location. Any water that is encountered would be managed in line with the measures outlined in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) and relevant consents/permits, so as not to increase flood risk. All sources of flooding associated with the Project are assessed in ES Appendix 19.1 Flood Risk Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
PILs	WE224	Respondents raised concerns in relation to works with respect to their landholdings, which they had identified to be seasonally waterlogged and inaccessible to vehicles between October and April. Respondents noted that existing groundwater levels and surface water runoff would impact trenching during construction and whilst querying how the Applicant would manage disposal of groundwater and surface water run-off during construction works it was stated that no surface water or ground water was to be allowed onto or discharged on their property and for it to be contained and removed from the sites. A respondent cited specific locations within their landholdings identified as susceptible to waterlogging.	N	Good construction practices set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) which is secured by a requirement in the DCO will manage the effects of construction. A detailed CEMP will be produced and submitted for approval in accordance with the corresponding requirement in Schedule 2 to the DCO. This includes preparation of a Construction Drainage Plan to manage the quality and quantity of construction stage drainage. Measures required to be included in the Construction Drainage Plan are set out in the main body of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The plan will be informed by surveys to located drains and create pre-construction drawings to ensure appropriate reinstatement. The plan will be agreed with the EA and the relevant Lead Local Flood Authority post-DCO consent. It will include measures to minimise water within the working area and ensure ongoing drainage of surrounding land. A Water Monitoring Plan will be developed by the Contractor to ascertain the pre-construction baseline and verify predicted

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				impacts to the local surface water and groundwater regime from temporary and permanent construction effects during and post-construction. The Water Monitoring Plan will be produced and submitted for approval in accordance with the corresponding requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO and based upon the Outline Water Monitoring Plan which is included in ES Appendix 19.9 Outline Water Monitoring Plan, Volume II, (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The strategy includes long-term groundwater monitoring in key areas (from installation to post-construction) to ascertain seasonal variability in groundwater levels and monitor groundwater fluctuations pre, during and post construction.
PIL	WE225	The respondent queried if the Applicant had put a plan in place to deal with both surface water and ground water on their land and noted the natural water table is very high and all water would need to be pumped and transported off site.	N	Good construction practices set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) which is secured by a requirement in the DCO will manage the effects of construction. A detailed CEMP will be produced and submitted for approval in accordance with the corresponding requirement in Schedule 2 to the DCO. This includes preparation of a Construction Drainage Plan to manage the quality and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				quantity of construction stage drainage. Measures required to be included in the Construction Drainage Plan are set out in the main body of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The plan will be informed by surveys to locate drains and create pre-construction drawings to ensure appropriate reinstatement. The plan will be agreed with the EA and the relevant Lead Local Flood Authority post-DCO consent. It will include measures to minimise water within the working area and ensure ongoing drainage of surrounding land. A Water Monitoring Plan will be developed to ascertain the pre-construction baseline and verify predicted impacts to the local surface water and groundwater regime from temporary and permanent construction effects during and post-construction. The Water Monitoring Plan will be based upon the Outline Water Monitoring Plan which is included in ES Appendix 19.9 Outline Water Monitoring Plan, Volume II, (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The strategy includes long-term groundwater monitoring in key areas (from installation to post-construction) to ascertain seasonal variability

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				in groundwater levels and monitor groundwater fluctuations pre, during and post construction. Operational drainage at all AGP sites will be managed according to SuDS principles, as set out in the Sustainable Drainage Strategy (provided in ES Appendix 19.1 Flood Risk Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)).
PIL	WE226	The respondent stated that the land was extremely wet and would be inaccessible in the winter months. The respondent emphasised that construction trenches would fill up with water and that this had been reiterated at every consultation opportunity and referenced that borehole surveys got stuck accessing the land. The respondent stated no plan had been seen which proposed how to deal with the surface water on site and stated that the Applicant should guarantee that the trench water would not be pumped onto their retained land and that any flood water would be removed offsite with tankers.	N	A Water Monitoring Plan will be developed to ascertain the pre-construction baseline and verify predicted impacts to the local surface water and groundwater regime from temporary and permanent construction effects during and post-construction. The Water Monitoring Plan will be based upon ES Appendix 19.9 Outline Water Monitoring Plan, Volume II (Document reference 6.2 DCO Volume 6). The strategy includes long-term groundwater monitoring in key areas (from installation to post-construction) to ascertain seasonal variability in groundwater levels and monitor groundwater fluctuations pre, during and post construction. A Construction Drainage Plan will be developed to manage the quality and quantity of construction stage drainage. Measures

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				required to be included in the Construction Drainage Plan are set out in the main body of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The plan will be informed by surveys to locate drains and create pre-construction drawings to ensure appropriate reinstatement. The plan will be agreed with the EA and the relevant Lead Local Flood Authority post-DCO consent. It will include measures to minimise water within the working area and ensure ongoing drainage of surrounding land. Good construction practices set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) which is secured by a requirement in the DCO will manage the effects of construction. The mitigation measures outlined in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) will be carried forward and developed into a detailed CEMP(s), which will be produced by the Contractor prior to the commencement of construction of the Project.
PIL	WE227	The respondent stated the report on Environmental Water Quality Report	N	A detailed Nutrient Assessment for the Project is provided in ES Appendix 19.7

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		indicated that the project would introduce changes to the nutrient levels within the waterbodies that form a part of the Project, which was a concern to the respondent due to the suggested deterioration of the existing water quality in the Hermitage and Rider Streams and within the Havant Thicket Reservoir.		Nutrient Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The Nutrient Assessment concludes that the Project will be compliant with the Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, with regard to NE nutrient neutrality guidance. The Nutrient Assessment concludes that, on the basis of nutrient management measures embedded within the Project, no additional mitigation would be required to achieve nutrient neutrality during the construction and operational phases. The Project will not increase nutrient concentrations or lead to associated adverse impacts on water quality. Water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in significant adverse effects or a deterioration in the chemical or physico-chemical status of Havant Thicket Reservoir. The updated modelling includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in: - ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). - ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
PIL	WE228	The respondent noted that in January 2025, following invitation from the Applicant for the landowner to provide information of surface water drainage, localised information was provided on drainage channels over their land. The respondent raised concerns as to whether levels and drainage channels would be restored to a state that does not result in their landholdings to flood or become unduly wet following construction of the Project.	N	A Water Monitoring Plan will be developed to ascertain the pre-construction baseline and verify predicted impacts to the local surface water and groundwater regime from temporary and permanent construction effects during and post-construction. The Water Monitoring Plan will be based upon the Outline Water Monitoring Plan Water Monitoring Strategy which is included in ES Appendix 19.9 Outline Water Monitoring Plan, Volume II, (Document reference 6.2 DCO Volume 6). The strategy includes long-term groundwater monitoring in key areas (from installation to post-construction) to ascertain seasonal variability in groundwater levels and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				monitor groundwater fluctuations pre, during and post construction. A Construction Drainage Plan will also be prepared to manage the quality and quantity of construction stage drainage, incorporating the measures set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), informed by surveys to locate drains and produce preconstruction drawings, and agreed with the EA and relevant Lead Local Flood Authority post-DOC. Good construction practices and mitigation measures in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), secured through the DCO, will be developed into a detailed CEMP by the Contractor before construction begins.
PIL	WE229	The respondent raised concerns that the EA sets the water quality requirements of the purified recycled water which gave them little comfort on the EA's input, citing the current state of rivers, streams and coastal waters as reason.	N	The EA regulates water quality, sets environmental standards and is the regulatory authority responsible for permitting water releases to the environment. The Project must therefore comply with the water quality standards set by the EA.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	WE230	Respondents raised concern with respect to the Project's impact on the Riders Lane Stream and the Hermitage Stream. Respondents raised particular concern on the assessment of the chalk streams, noting that there was only one evaluation point in the Riders Lane Stream and one in the Hermitage Stream (New Road) as the latter would be at a point where dilution from other stream inputs would be greatest. A respondent suggested the data used to assess the baseline water quality of the existing streams was limited to that previously collected by Portsmouth Water (2008-2010 and 2018-2019) and queried why the Applicant did not continue water quality monitoring originally started by Portsmouth Water, as it was understood that since 2021 effluent recycling via Havant Thicket Reservoir may have constituted the Applicant's preferred option and that whilst the Environmental Water Quality Report refers to data collection on the streams to be on-going this did not	N	The Pipelines between Budds Farm WTW and the WRP site would pass below the tidal reach of Hermitage Stream, which is not a designated chalk stream at this location. Spatial data for all streams in England can be viewed and downloaded from Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra's) Chalk Rivers data viewer: Geoportal. Monthly water quality sampling has been undertaken on both the Riders Lane Stream and Hermitage stream, the results of which are summarised in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The locations of the samples were agreed with the EA through a survey specification. The compensatory flows modelling for the Project includes an assessment of effects within both watercourses. The modelling included additional topographic survey to ensure the watercourses are represented accurately in the model. The Applicant has continued to undertake water quality monitoring at locations in Riders Lane Stream and Hermitage Stream, including those that were previously sampled by Portsmouth Water. The results of this sampling are presented in ES Chapter 19

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		allay concerns due to the absence of recent long-term data collection. A respondent noted that for the 2011 and 2020 modelling undertaken to assess the impacts of the original spring fed reservoir on downstream water courses, a sample and modelling was undertaken at the confluence of the Riders Lane and Hermitage Streams, and it was queried why this was not being done for current or updated modelling. It was stated that the report underplayed the value of the Riders Lane Stream referencing a macroinvertebrate survey undertaken in 2024, which was time critical to the value of such surveys. The respondent stated it was not clear if earlier stream surveys commissioned by Portsmouth Water had been taken into consideration when assessing the quality of the habitat and potential impacts, such as the 2020 invertebrate surveys. A respondent considered that there was a lack of available data for a longer period was a concern that should have been		Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). In addition to this monitoring, long-term water quality records from the EA's monitoring points on river water bodies were used to characterise baseline water quality in the river network in the study area. These records typically commenced in 1999 and extend until 2025. Modelling undertaken since the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation that includes the HRRM at the WRP shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. The assessment presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), uses the EA's river water body catchments to define surface water receptors. Riders Lane Stream forms part of the larger Hermitage Stream receptor, which is considered to be of medium sensitivity. This results in an impact of minor significance, given that very minor changes in water quality were predicted. Although the assessment presents box and whisker plots to demonstrate changes in water quality at

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		addressed at this stage, to be able to assess more robustly the impact of the proposed effluent recycling scheme on downstream water bodies. It was stated that the impact of the input of recycled effluent into the Havant Thicket Reservoir required assessment against the expected improvement in downstream water quality which would result from the original spring fed reservoir scenario and reference was made to the approved Portsmouth Water Application's Section 106 Agreement (APP/20/00990). It was further noted the addition of the pumping station means that final effluent would be pumped under pressure from Budds Farm to the effluent recycling plant through a pipe passing below the tidal section of the Hermitage Stream and suggested that several chalk streams would become polluted as a result.		three specific locations (one each on Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour), the modelling on which it was based considers the entirety of the river system, including Riders Lane Stream from the release point from Havant Thicket Reservoir to the confluence with Hermitage Stream, the remaining Hermitage Stream catchment, Langstone Harbour and The Solent. The upper portions of Riders Lane Stream are considered a S41 habitat (under Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006) and the Riders Lane Stream located within the draft Order Limits has been considered as also a S41 habitat as a precautionary approach to assigning value, on the basis that the watercourse has the potential to support a species assemblage of the adjacent S41 habitat. Further details regarding aquatic invertebrates are provided separately in ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), which concludes no likely significant effects on aquatic invertebrates as a result of water quality changes in Riders Lane Stream and Hermitage Stream.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Chalk streams in the area will not receive compensation flows. Hermitage Stream is not a chalk stream. There is no pathway for effect on chalk streams from the pipeline below Hermitage Stream. The assessment presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), considers the package of geomorphological improvements in the Hermitage Stream catchment to be delivered by Portsmouth Water as part of the future baseline. The assessment also considers fish passage easements and minimum compensation flow requirements as part of the future baseline. For further information see: ▪ ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE231	The respondent stated that the reverse osmosis process resulted in pure water but also a concentrated slurry of all pollutants. The respondent stated that it was the Applicant's intent for this to be released into the Solent waters in an area that considered protected and in use for water sport.	N	The proposed treatment train in the reference design for DCO submission does not produce a solid stream and sludge management will not be required. Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters from the Eastney LSO has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) at the LSO with regard to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour.
Wider Community	WE232	Respondents acknowledged the consultation held and the modelling and the information provided by the	N	Following completion of water quality modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir and compensation flows, an assessment of likely

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Environmental Water Quality Report and stated that any assessment of impact on the Havant Thicket Reservoir, Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour and the Solent would need to include the construction phase risks, under the assumption that large open sites would be required around the crossing points and consequently to avoid sedimentation and pollution, both to the groundwater aquifer and the main rivers. Respondents queried what modelling had been undertaken that would demonstrably show that any proposed treatments/activities would reduce contaminants below estimated maximum K level the EA has calculated and stated that a commitment was required that water quality would be of the highest grade. A respondent referred to the Summer 2024 PEI Report Chapter 19 Appendices which described the necessary watercourse crossings and noted that their 2024 consultation responses identified that these crossings were described as 'trenchless' and that risks associated with this		significant effects during construction and operation is set out in ES Chapter 19 Water environment (Section 19.8), Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Primary and tertiary mitigation are described in Section 19.4; secondary mitigation, monitoring and enhancement measures are described in Section 19.9. The assessment and mitigation measures cover impacts on sediments and pollution to surface and groundwaters. Impacts on water bodies and associated protected areas are also assessed in ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Modelling undertaken since the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in the chemical or physico-chemical status of Havant Thicket Reservoir. This is presented

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		construction method would need to be described in the full ES and Habitats Regulations Assessment (Appropriate Assessment). A further respondent stated that they looked forward to reviewing the ES in full once it was available, as part of the application for a DCO. The respondent hoped that by that time, the modelling would be more thorough and that additional water quality parameters would have been tested.		in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (DCO reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. Details of the proposed foundation works for the Project are provided within the Outline Foundation Works Risk Assessment (Document reference 7.4, DCO Volume 7). This establishes the principles for a future Foundation Works Risk Assessments, to be prepared by the Contractor in line with the Outline Foundation Works Risk Assessment (Document reference 7.4, DCO Volume 7), to cover the WRP, AGP and Trenchless Crossings as well as Tunnels and Shafts. The Foundation Works Risk Assessments will serve to manage potential risks and ensure appropriate mitigation measures are implemented to reduce the potential impacts on the water environment. The DCO application is also accompanied by a Stage 2: Habitats Regulations Assessment

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				(Appropriate Assessment) which provides detail on any potential impact pathways from the Project and any mitigation that will be implemented to maintain the integrity of internationally designated sites.
Wider Community	WE233	Respondents raised concerns about the robustness of the modelling undertaken and considered that both the data sources used and the modelling approach itself were unclear. A respondent referred to Section 6 of the Environmental Water Quality Report and said it stated that the “preliminary modelling” ruled out water quality changes from releases to the Solent. It was stated that more of the contaminants of concern to those previously screened for needed to be accounted for in the updated screening referenced at Section 3.3.9 of the Environmental Water Quality Report. Specific concerns about the modelling were raised and queried what the modelled input volume of reject water compared to the effluent from the Broadmarsh Farm sewage works discharging from the Eastney Long Sea Outfall would be, as	N	The assessment and modelling has been undertaken in discussion with the EA and in line with relevant guidance such as EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit. All parameters and methodology used in the modelling assessment are detailed in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		well as if maximum contaminant concentrations were used within models, and what assumptions were applied, i.e. volume inputs and mix of final effluent and reject water expected in the Eastney LSO.		ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given that the pilot plant data does not represent the full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WE234	Respondents raised concern about the prospect of spill and leaks resulting in environmental pollution and detrimental impact on the environment at Havant Thicket, Broadmarsh and the Solent area. It was suggested that while pollution control measures, such as bunding of chemical storage tanks, could reduce risks, these could not eliminate them entirely in	N	Appropriate measures to control the risk of pollution resulting from construction operations will be developed and implemented to prevent adverse impacts to environmental receptors and water supplies based on the measures contained in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		examples where spills during tanker deliveries, pipe ruptures, vandalism and human error were occurring within the water industry. The respondents stated that the Environmental Water Quality Report therefore required consideration of the impact of a pollution incident occurring at the site in terms of water quality and ecological impacts to the Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour SAC, SPA, Ramsar designated area, and Site of Special Scientific Interest. Responses included considerations that not enough assessment of what could happen if there were spills or leaks from the chemicals or treated effluent storage and handling at the WRP had taken place.		The Contractor will prepare a Pollution Prevention Management Plan post-consent which will form part of, or be appended to, the detailed CEMP(s). It will provide information on how to handle and report environmental incidents, in accordance with relevant legislation, environmental good practice and ISO 14001, including proactive management practices to ensure that any pollution incident that may occur is controlled, reported to relevant parties and remediated. The plan will define the criteria for implementing the relevant measures. A detailed CEMP will be produced and submitted for approval in accordance with the corresponding requirement in Schedule 2 to the DCO. An Operational Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7) has been provided with the DCO application. The measures contained in the Operational Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7) are secured by the corresponding requirement in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3). The Operational Environmental Management Plan will provide information on how to handle

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				and report environmental incidents, in accordance with relevant legislation, environmental good practice and ISO 14001, including proactive management practices to ensure that any pollution incident that may occur is controlled, reported to relevant parties and remediated The WRP and pipeline infrastructure is designed to prevent contamination in the event of an emergency (e.g. process failure). The Sustainable Drainage Systems Strategy, which forms part of ES Appendix 19.1 Flood Risk Assessment, Volume I (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), sets out details of the good practice pollution prevention and control measures that will be incorporated into the design of the WRP site, which will ensure that any accidental chemical spillages are contained. ES Chapter 14, Major accidents and disasters (Document Reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) presents the assessment of the expected significant effects on the environment deriving from vulnerability of the Project to risks of major accidents and disasters. This includes considering the risk events of pollution from chemicals and major pipe leaks and concludes that the risks are not significant as

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				they are reduced to 'as low as reasonably practicable'. There will be a dual mains supply from independent sub-stations with back-up power generators to ensure continuity of power supply. This will reduce the risk of system failures.
Wider Community	WE235	The respondents raised concerns about a lack of detail and uncertainty about how the risk of pollution was dealt with by the Applicant. It was stated that no assessment of the impact on Havant Thicket Reservoir wetland and Havant Thicket Reservoir shallows had been carried out, where the impact on biodiversity was likely to be greatest, and modelling only considered the open water body. Respondents questioned the Applicant's ability to operate and maintain the WRP and the Project without incident. It was noted that risks associated with the WRP did not exist in a spring-fed 'classic' scenario. It was also queried if the risks of pollution, including that from the sewers e.g. chemicals from manufacturing, had been assessed sufficiently and suggested	N	Good practice pollution prevention and control measures will be incorporated into the design of the WRP site, which will ensure that any accidental chemical spillages are contained. Further details are set out in the SuDS Drainage Strategy within ES Appendix 19.1 Flood Risk Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The Contractor once appointed would develop and implement appropriate measures to control the risk of pollution resulting from construction operations. The contractor will prepare a Pollution Prevention Management Plan in accordance with the Operational Environmental Management Plan, which will provide information on how to handle and report environmental incidents, in accordance with relevant legislation, environmental good practice and ISO 14001, including proactive management practices to ensure that any

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		there was no plan to control this ahead of recycling effluent.		pollution incident that may occur is controlled, reported to relevant parties and remediated. The plan will define the criteria for implementing the relevant measures. The Applicant developed a sampling programme to include metals and other contaminants from in the Budds Farm WTW catchment. Sampling was expanded to include the pilot plant, and the results show that these substances were greatly reduced as the water passed through the system – from when it entered Budds Farm to when it left the full advanced treatment process. An Operational Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7) has been provided with the DCO application. The measures contained in the Operational Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7) are secured by the corresponding requirement in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3). Reservoir modelling simulated water quality in two different areas of Havant Thicket Reservoir: the relatively deep south basin and larger and shallower north basin. The model used a 'levee' function to represent retention

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				structures between the four wetland compartments and the open water. In this way the wetlands were included in the modelling. Potential impacts from pollution have been assessed in section 19.8 of ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE236	The respondent raised concern over the Project's proposal for 'reject water', which was suspected to likely also include the membrane deposits arising from regular servicing to be discharged together with a suggested 400% concentration of the existing final effluent pollutants without further treatment directly into the Solent via the Eastney LSO. The respondent noted additional chemicals would be added, however, suggested this does not achieve a positive environmental impact which is what is surely required. The respondent stated it is also not consistent with the Applicant's handling otherwise of operational process wastewater 'sludge' generated from Budds	N	The proposed treatment train in the reference design for DCO submission does not produce a solid stream and sludge management will not be required. The reject stream will be produced via a liquid backwash system and will be pumped back to the head of the works at Budds Farm WTW. Model outputs show that the differences in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). For further details see:

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Farm WTW nor from its Otterbourne water purification plant. The respondent queried that if 'reject water' was to be piped back to Budds Farm to be added to the Eastney LSO then why can it not be further processed (again) at the WTW and such waste be consolidated with Budd's Farm's usual wastewater sludge handling protocol and why costs were being prioritised over environment benefit which they assumed to be the reasoning. The respondent stated the plan outline stated that storm water from Budds Farm currently released into Langstone Harbour would potentially change to discharge through Eastney LSO together with the 'reject water' from the recycling plant and that treated wastewater which is currently released via Eastney LSO would instead be released into Langstone Harbour, however the reasoning behind this was not entirely explained. The respondent suggested that if storm containment was not substantially improved then such storm water may also include 'spills of wholly untreated wastewater' comprising a usual		- ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). - ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). - ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). - ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		40-60% average wastewater proportion and this then would have serious implications for Langstone Harbour. The respondent stated the effluent was not 'highly diluted and up to 95%' as stated on the web site, and that it can only reach 95% in exceptional circumstances.		
Wider Community	WE237	The respondent objected to the reconfiguration proposals for the Budds Farm WTW which would provide connection between the Eastney LSO/Solent and therefore also the proposed Project as they suggested that reject water would be discharged into the existing Eastney LSO into the Solent. The respondent noted the reconfiguration works at Budds Farm, as described on page 9 of the Environmental Water Quality Report, emphasising that potential interactions had not been considered within the report. Respondents stated that the Applicant and the EA needed to ensure that the reconfiguration of pipelines and discharges would prevent reject water ever reaching Langstone Harbour.		At the time of this Consultation the Budds Farm reconfiguration project was identified as potentially coming forward during the timescales of the Project's application, and therefore would have been required to be assessed, in terms of its interface with the Project and cumulative effects. As the reconfiguration project is no longer being progressed at this time, it has not been assessed within the EqIA.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Section 3.3.5 of the Environmental Water Quality Report was noted and that this described the Project's proposed new connection downstream of the existing release at the Budds Farm Water Treatment Works was noted. The respondent further specified that the new release point into the Eastney LSO should be located downstream of any reconfiguration pipework for the discharge diversion to Langstone Harbour.		
Wider Community	WE238	The respondents confirmed their satisfaction and encouragement of the new information provided by independent consultants and noted approval of the extensive report and modelling that has been undertaken thus far.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Wider Community	WE239	The respondent noted that the modelling and predictions on water quality for Riders Lane Stream and Hermitage Stream show they would not be adversely affected and in turn they would not have an impact on Langstone Harbour.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Wider Community	WE240	Respondents raised concerns that the impact of changes in salinity and	N	The distance between Budds Farm WTW and the LSO is approximately 13km, much of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		temperature had not been adequately considered. It was added that the salinity of the wastewater is orders of magnitude less than natural seawater and that temperature would be little or no different from the current waste discharge. Concerns were also raised over increased salinity into Langstone Harbour or further out into the Solent and the effects in the Solent are very likely to be mitigated by dilution in a large tidal reach body of water. It was suggested that this could also be mitigated with an outlet that disperses the outflow along a length of pipe and not just a single source outlet.		which is under the seabed. There is therefore expected to be very little difference in release and ambient seawater temperatures by the time the flow moves from the WTWs to the outfall. Drawings of the LSO (dated 15 January 1990) indicate nine ports at the LSO, with a single port per raiser, along a diffuser line separated each by 12m. There are no proposals to install additional diffusers. Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters and salinity from the existing diffuser arrangement at the Eastney LSO has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Modelled outputs for salinity show that the differences in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant. Changes to the existing release when the WRP is in place in relation to salinity would therefore not affect Langstone Harbour. For further details see:

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				- ES Appendix 19.5: Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent Dispersion Modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). - ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE241	The respondent noted claims from a local interest group that the recycled and reject water would contain pharmaceuticals, forever chemicals, pesticides and volatile organic compounds seem overblown as these chemicals are already there in the incoming sewage. The respondent stated that they would be concentrated by the purification process in order to extract the pure fresh water to send on to Havant Thicket Reservoir however, the final two of the four advanced treatment stages would destroy and/or modify and remove some of these chemicals, so that the net result would be an overall decrease in load, even if there may be a small increase in concentration. Dispersion would quickly take care of this, and the respondent	N	The Applicant thanks the respondent for its supportive feedback. Note that additional information is now available online: Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		therefore urged that information to counter this and myriad other false/misguided claims be made available to the public.		some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given that the pilot plant data does not represent the full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WE242	The respondents stated most of the contaminants of concern have not been considered, including contaminants found in the output water from the effluent recycling trial plant which operated at Budds Farm Sewage Works for a short period in 2023, such as pharmaceuticals, forever chemicals, pesticides and volatile organic compounds, which is an issue with all sources of potable water, wherever wastewater is disposed of into waterways. The respondents stated pharmaceuticals include 15 substances including caffeine, trimethoprim, theobromine, loperamide, venlafaxine (anti-depressant). The respondents noted these substances were not considered in the current water quality report, even though they could have a	N	The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		detrimental effect on Havant Thicket Reservoir's ecosystem and downstream watercourses. Respondents also highlighted differences between the Peel Common and Budds Farm catchment areas, expressing concern that the testing approach used at Budds Farm WTW lacked sufficient duration and scope to provide reliable evidence. The respondent stated that inconsistencies between the two trial sites were identified through information obtained via a Freedom of Information request indicated that several microbiological and physical parameters were not assessed at Budds Farm in the same way as at Peel Common. These omissions were said to include indicators such as Enterococci, Giardia, Cryptosporidium, legionella, norovirus (including F+ coliphage), as well as microplastics, temperature, and salinity. Respondents also stated that some substances with higher occurrence in the final recycled water at Budds Farm appeared to fall outside the trial's testing		Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		parameters, citing concerns about untested metals, specific trace organics such as toluene sulfonic acid, and additional volatile organic compounds.		harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given that the pilot plant data does not represent the full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WE243	The respondents suggested given the confined nature of Havant Thicket Reservoir water body the impact of pollution incidents must be assessed, especially as there was no previous risk of this nature to the spring fed reservoir. The respondents noted the risk arising from the sewer catchment was assessed in the initial consideration of the project. The respondents stated as a general point that the Solent is a complex water body, already heavily polluted by agricultural and urban run-off, sewage discharges and maritime shipping activity. The water body flushes gradually and slowly from west to east at an overall rate of less than a knot, with pollutants	N	The updated modelling, undertaken since the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation, includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP. This demonstrates that the addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. Water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in significant adverse effects or a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		remaining present in the water body at varying states of decay and deposition over many tidal cycles.		compensatory flows released downstream. The results of this process are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). These results demonstrate that the release of water from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir would not result in significant adverse effects or deterioration in chemical or biological status in the water bodies downstream of Havant Thicket Reservoir that would receive compensation flows (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour and the Solent). For further details see: ▪ ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters and salinity at the Eastney LSO has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The model output represented changes over a period of 30 days. Dilution to EQS for the chemicals screened in for assessment (see EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for environmental permit guidance and ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) was demonstrated by the near field modelling to be reached within 1-2m of the LSO location indicating efficient dilution. Further modelling to look at longer-term simulations over the far field (such as within the harbours) has therefore not been deemed necessary. Note that baseline water quality data collected from the Solent in the vicinity of the LSO was used to undertake this assessment.
Wider Community	WE244	The respondent stated the water industry had recently been campaigning through Water UK for PFAS chemicals, including Perfluorooctane sulfonic acid and Perfluorooctanoic acid, to be banned as they are so difficult to remove during	N	The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		treatment. The respondent raised concern that there was a very low rate of sampling for pesticides and not all pesticides, including DEET, Chlormequat and 2(4-dichlorphenoxy) butanoic acid, found in the final Budds Farm effluent were tested in the output water from the recycling trial plant and stated that a robust evaluation was therefore difficult to undertake.		pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given that the pilot plant data does not represent the full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WE245	The respondent stated that negative commentary around the proposals, such as inadequate recognition of the downstream benefits of the original reservoir, ignore the considerable benefits of the Project to the ecology of the Itchen and Test rivers. The	N	The approach to developing the Project has been underpinned by the Applicant's overarching Project Vision which emphasises its fundamental role and purpose: <i>"We're transforming the way we source, treat and supply water across Hampshire. Creating</i>

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		respondent noted the impact of seasonal variation in downstream flow was not adequately considered but this would be the case with or without recycling. The respondent suggested no assessment of the potential impact on the stream to the south-east of Havant Thicket Reservoir was undertaken and countered it stating Havant Thicket Reservoir is already impacting it.		<i>a new, resilient and sustainable water supply will protect and enhance the county's rare and sensitive chalk streams, while maintaining supplies for our communities and the local economy".</i> Downstream (compensatory) flows from Havant Thicket Reservoir have been modelled. The results of water quality modelling are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This modelling, undertaken since the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation, includes the HRRM at the WRP and shows that operation of the Project would not result in significant adverse effects on water quality or biology in water bodies downstream of Havant Thicket Reservoir (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour and The Solent). During operation, compensation flows from Havant Thicket Reservoir will be directed into Riders Lane Stream, under the terms of an Environmental Permit secured by Portsmouth Water from the EA. There would be no

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				discharges into other watercourses such as Durrants Stream or Park Lane Stream.
Wider Community	WE246	The respondent outlined how the Applicant assessed environmental effects and used a variety of criteria for these assessments. The respondent stated the inconsistency in the method of reporting water quality should be considered and explained. The respondents queried whether or not the water quality assessment had been carried out independently of the Applicant, suggesting further independent re-assessment is needed if not. Whilst the respondents suggested some of the baseline data and modelled outputs appear to be suspect when compared to previous independent modelling reports, it was noted the reports were independently commissioned by the Applicant.	N	Modelling of water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies that would receive compensatory flows has been undertaken by independent consultants. The modelling approach for Havant Thicket Reservoir and compensation flows modelling represents a further development of the initial high-level modelling undertaken by Portsmouth Water to support the planning application for Havant Thicket Reservoir. The outputs of the modelling are presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). An assessment of water quality impacts is provided in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	WE247	The respondent stated there would be a reduced nitrate benefit to Langstone Harbour if effluent recycling goes ahead, with the benefit confirmed by water quality modelling for the spring fed reservoir in 2011 and 2020, which has not been considered. Nitrates are generally considered as a negative issue in the Solent, hence NE nutrient neutrality scheme to taken nitrates out of freshwater entering the Solent.	N	Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. The results of this modelling are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Modelling shows that with primary phosphorus reduction control measures in place at the WRP, operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream (including Langstone Harbour). Because nitrates are considered a negative issue in the Solent by NE a nutrient neutrality assessment has been undertaken for the Project and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.7 Nutrient Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The nutrient assessment concludes that, on the basis of nutrient management measures embedded within the project, no additional mitigation would be required to achieve nutrient neutrality during the construction and operational phases of the Project.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	WE248	The respondents stated the risk of contamination from the reject water discharge reaching Langstone Harbour from the Solent has been dismissed and the period of time over which modelling was carried out may not have been sufficient. The respondent noted previous modelling of the long sea outfall discharge showed multiple tidal cycles carried the plume a long distance from Southampton Water along the coast to Bracklesham Bay with some entering the harbours. The respondents accepted this effluent would be mixed with the effluent from Budds Farm resulting in little difference in planned discharge to the current discharge. Whilst the respondents stated the in combination impacts of effluent on the harbours have not been thoroughly considered, it was noted that the high ratio of seawater to effluent makes this unnecessary. The respondent stated that risks to the harbour from future effluent recycling pipeline construction, maintenance or bursts are not considered but accepted the	N	Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters and salinity (i.e. calculated change between the existing release and the release combined with the WRP reject water) at the Eastney LSO has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The model output represented changes over a period of 30 days. Note that this modelling output does not reflect plume extents. The report concludes that the changes are insignificant and therefore there would be no change to the existing effect the LSO has on the Solent and any adjoining water bodies such as Southampton Water for example. Dilution to EQS for the chemicals screened in for assessment and ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) was demonstrated by the near field modelling to be reached within 1-2m of the long sea outfall location indicating efficient dilution. Further modelling to look at longer-term simulations over the far field (such as within the harbours) has therefore

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		extent of this was not yet known. The respondents however queried what other effects would result on the Langstone Harbour from the release of effluent. The respondents stated that even if a water quality risk is outside of the scope of the existing report it is still a risk to the water environment and it should at least be acknowledged.		not been deemed necessary and effects outside the immediate vicinity of the LSO location in the Solent are not predicted. Regarding pipeline construction for this project, there would be no effects on Langstone Harbour as construction works are not required directly within the water body. The exception would be the construction of the SuDS outfall from the WRP located in the tidal section of the Hermitage Stream but this activity would be small scale in nature and good construction practices set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) which is secured by a requirement in the DCO will manage the effects of construction. With respect to operational effects, in addition to those discussed above from the LSO, runoff from the WRP site would be captured in a SuDS system and model simulations show that the maximum difference in minimum salinity due to the SuDS outfall is typically very low (<0.1PSU), with greater differences confined to small areas of the tidal Hermitage Stream. See ES Appendix 19.12 Water Recycling Plant site Sustainable Drainage System dispersion modelling,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE249	The respondents submitted examples of a simulated plume from the existing Eastney LSO dispersing over a 72-hour period, over multiple tidal cycles. The respondents noted that there would be additional new contaminants of concern in the reject water from the effluent recycling plant including treatment chemicals, cleaning chemicals and treatment by-products which have been considered.	N	The distance to EQS for the parameters screened via the process detailed in EA guidance has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Full details are provided in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm Water Treatment Works (WTW) (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that would be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour;

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output would be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that would be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WE250	Respondents stated that many recalcitrant ecotoxins had not been considered in the assessment of the effluent to be released. It was noted that such compounds cannot be broken down through sewage treatment processes and may therefore bioaccumulate in the aquatic environment. Concerns were also raised that wastewater sludge and reject water, including membrane deposits from routine servicing, are likely to contain bioactive recalcitrant compounds. Respondents also questioned whether the discharge of reject water, with additional chemical inputs and concentrations	N	The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the EA guidance Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit, which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		reportedly three to four times higher than existing levels, would deliver a positive environmental outcome, noting an apparent contradiction with the Environmental Water Quality Report. Respondents further queried why reject water returned to Budds Farm via the Eastney LSO could not be reprocessed and consolidated within existing sludge treatment protocols. It was also questioned why cost appeared to have been prioritised over environmental benefit.		The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that would be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by the University of Brighton. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output would be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that would be in place at the WRP. The proposed treatment train in the reference design for DCO submission does not produce a solid stream and sludge management will not be required. Blending the reject stream from the WRP with a sludge stream would reduce the efficiency of the treatment process at Budds Farm sludge treatment centre and is therefore not proposed.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	WE251	The respondents queried how the concentrated discharge further out to sea will be prevented from coming back to shore with tidal movements. The respondents suggested that an example from a longer-term simulation of the Eastney LSO showed that after three full tidal cycles, content was entering Chichester Harbour on the flood tide and dependent on the time of day, tidal direction and state (neap or spring), the output could thus also enter into Langstone and Portsmouth Harbours. The respondents queried if both neap and spring tides were considered in the modelling and provided image extracts from modelling outputs of the existing LSO to show the plume extent over a broad area when considered over multiple tidal cycles. The respondents suggested independent scientists had found the tidal modelling carried out for another project in Beach Bouy likely to be inaccurate and inadequate.	N	Dilution to EQS for the chemicals screened in for assessment (using EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for environmental permit guidance) was demonstrated by the near field modelling to be reached within 1-2m of the LSO location indicating efficient dilution. Further modelling to look at longer-term simulations over the far field (such as within the harbours) has therefore not been deemed necessary. Modelling simulations of discharges for the currently consented parameters from Eastney LSO were set to a duration of one month; to cover several tidal cycles, including neap and spring tides, (to assess potential accumulation of the discharged pollutants) and various wind conditions were included in sensitivity tests to evaluate how plumes were changed by the wind.
Wider Community	WE252	Respondent stated the report dismissed the likelihood that the plume of reject water	N	Modelling of the LSO shows differences in concentrations from the current (baseline)

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		from the Eastney Long Sea Outfall could reach Langstone Harbour, however publicly available modelling simulating the movement of dispersion plume showed this extends into Portsmouth Harbour, Langstone Harbour and Chichester Harbour at specific states and stages of the tidal cycle.		situation; the respondent is referencing the baseline extent, not the changes in concentrations at the LSO – which do not reach the harbours. Dilution to EQS for the chemicals screened in for assessment using EA guidance was demonstrated by the near field modelling to be reached within 1-2m of the LSO location indicating efficient dilution. Further modelling to look at longer-term simulations over the far field (such as within the harbours) has therefore not been deemed necessary.
Wider Community	WE253	The respondent stated that during the time the overall flushing cycle, it is highly likely that the discharges from multiple Long Sea Outfalls and Combined Sewer Overflows will blend and combine as there are more than 300 Combined Sewer Overflows which discharge to the Solent, most of them lying to the west of Langstone and Chichester harbour entrances, 10-15% of them contributing around 80% of the unacceptable discharge hours recorded in the EA data. The respondents noted some of the worst offending Combined Sewer Overflows observed in the EA data by SPS	N	ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), assesses the cumulative effects of the Project with other developments. This assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's 2024 Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment. Releases from Eastney LSO have been modelled and assessed in detail. With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. This means that because the EQS is met within a

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		analysts, discharge into Chichester Harbour and it is important to recognise that the two harbours are linked and considered to be a single water body by the EA. The respondents queried how the cumulative effects on the Solent from day-on-day discharge of a more concentrated reject water would be assessed.		spatially restricted area of 1-2 m of the LSO, adverse effects from cumulative impacts with any other releases will not occur. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as Langstone Harbour or the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream. See the following appendix reports for more detail: ▪ ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6 ▪ ES Appendix 19.8 Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project Eastney Long Sea Outfall - CORMIX Modelling for Chemicals Screened in via the Surface Water Risk Assessment Process, Volume II, (Document Reference 6.2, Volume 6.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	WE254	The respondent stated studies by Portsmouth University have already shown that some contaminants can bioaccumulate in algae, such as forever chemicals and therefore with more concentrated reject water being discharged via the Long Sea Outfalls there would be an increased risk of bioaccumulation of contaminants in marine plants and fauna such as bivalves. The respondent suggested the risks and impacts of bioaccumulation have not been considered in a robust and transparent way.	N	Bioaccumulation has been considered in the assessment of likely significant effects in ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Water quality modelling of Eastney LSO for currently consented parameters has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This demonstrated that the changes in concentrations between the current release and future release with the WRP in place are insignificant. Therefore, any effects associated with the pathways outlined in this issue concerning the Eastney LSO, if present, would be similar to those occurring now, i.e. are part of the baseline on which the Project is assessed against. With respect to chemical contaminants, the assessment followed the requirements of the EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance, which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. Modelling using the EA's

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				recommended tool CORMIX was then undertaken to look at distance to EQS which was calculated at 1-2m from the LSO indicating rapid dilution at the LSO location. Note that the modelling was undertaken on a number of flow scenarios and potential contaminant concentrations associated with membrane efficiency. A scenario was assessed that considered complete removal of the parameter via the membrane (i.e. all discharged to the reject wastewater stream) to provide a sensitivity analysis regarding dilution at the LSO location. Full details are provided in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Therefore, wide scale impacts on water quality are not predicted, and the scale of change in bioaccumulation is insignificant. Consequently, there are no significant effects anticipated on marine biodiversity receptors. For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has been provided to the EA for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and against what thresholds. Following receipt of this advice, the assessment will be undertaken and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				submitted to the EA as part of the environmental permit application required for the Project. This assessment has been presented in section 9.8 of ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) by referring to the detailed water quality assessment results presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE255	The respondent raised concern over the perceived lack of proposal for the installation of an additional diffuser to the Long Sea Outfalls to improve dispersal of contaminants from effluent. The respondent stated that dispersal maps should be provided for a 72-hour period to allow scrutiny and noted that the time period over which the modelled outputs were generated remains unclear. The respondent noted previous modelling showed that the Long Sea Outfalls effluent can disperse across a wide area of the Solent in 72 hours (figures were provided) through various tidal cycles but that the modelling results indicated on pages 38 to	N	Drawings of the LSO (dated 15th January 1990) indicate nine ports at the LSO, with a single port per raiser, along a diffuser line separated each by 12m. There are no proposals to install additional diffusers. Water quality modelling using the existing diffuser layout on permitted parameters and salinity was undertaken, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The model output reflected changes between the existing and future release with the reject water combined over 30 days to capture a full range of tides (neap and spring). Changes were modelled because the existing release is accounted for in the EqlA baseline (i.e. any water sampling

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		44 of the Water Quality Report suggest it was only carried out over a short time period thus not illustrating the full extent of the plume. The respondent further noted that maps illustrating the modelled extend of the dispersion for the existing effluent was not provided in the report. The respondent suggested modelled dispersal plumes should have been provided for each parameter as opposed to only the changes, which should include dispersal plume of the existing Long Sea Outfall discharge, future discharge to include the more concentrated reject water and then also the change. These should all reflect both spring and neap tides over numerous tidal cycles. The respondent further noted modelling has been undertaken for dispersal of Perfluoro octane sulfonic acid and its salts from the long sea outfall, but queried if this was a small enough compound that much of it likely passed through the Reverse Osmosis membranes and therefore be more likely to discharge into the Havant Thicket Reservoir, noting that this was		collected by the EA to inform classification status would include the effects of the existing release). The approach and findings of the water quality modelling have been discussed with the EA as part of the engagement and consultation process, as described in section 19.3 of ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Regarding chemical parameters a screening exercise as defined in EA guidance Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit has been updated since the issue of the consultation document. Where parameters were screened in (i.e. because they are at risk of failing to meet the appropriate EQS), these were modelled using an EA recognised modelling tool - CORMIX. Further information on the approach and results of this modelling is provided in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling indicated that dilution to EQS for the parameters screened in was 1-2m thus

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		found in the output water from the effluent recycling trial plant. If so, other larger forever chemical compounds should also have been selected for modelling as their concentration in the reject water may be higher.		indicating rapid dilution close to the LSO outfall.
Wider Community	WE256	The respondents stated it was not acceptable to only screen contaminants for which there is an Environmental Quality Standard threshold as others may also pose a risk to the marine environment and stated most contaminants of concern have not been considered as they should have. The respondents noted that the reject water from the effluent recycling plant would be 3-4 times more concentrated with contaminants than existing discharge from Budds Farm with new contaminants too, but suggested Section 3.3.17 of the Water Quality Report claims none of the modelled parameters will increase significantly, meaning the conclusion is not credible. The respondents queried if the new contaminants from the reject water from the effluent recycling plant, including treatment chemicals, have been	N	The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		considered in the screening. The respondent further stated it was not clear how all contaminants of concern were screened from selecting just seven parameters to model, as listed in Section 3.3.3 of the Water Quality Report and suggested this was inadequate. The respondents noted their scepticism of the modelling results that states only a small decrease in the concentration of contaminants are predicted as set out in Section 6.2.8 of the Water Quality Report. The respondent stated that with a point source of discharge and the increased concentration of contaminants in the reject water, there would be increased concentration of contaminants in the water around the LSO, however stated that this is not acknowledged in the report. The respondents suggested a list of contaminants identified be made publicly available for scrutiny.		(2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given that the pilot plant data does not represent the full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP. The list of chemicals screened is provided in the annex to ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and is in line with EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance.
Wider Community	WE257	Respondent queried at what point past discharge the assessments have been made and how the impact of reject water from the normal operation of the effluent recycling process over a short and long timeframe has been assessed for the Solent. The respondent stated that the data used must demonstrate that it is a worst case scenario for all the contaminants of concern, which the respondent stated has not been done.	N	Detailed modelling of the LSO release in the Solent has been undertaken. The assessment of chemicals within the release released from the LSO has been undertaken in line with EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance. The model output reflected changes between the existing and future release with the reject water combined over 30 days. Model outputs for the currently consented parameters indicate that the differences in chemical concentrations are negligible when comparing the existing Budds Farm WTW

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				release with the future release from Budds Farm. With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as Langstone Harbour or the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream. Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in: ▪ ES Appendix 19.5: Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent Dispersion Modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. Several flow scenarios were considered alongside two different calculations for membrane efficacy, one that reflected removal rates from a literature review and one that assumed 100% of contaminants were removed and discharged to the reject stream. The 100% membrane efficiency scenario enabled an assessment of the worst case scenario for the screening tests and then release concentrations for modelling. Further information is provided in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE258	The respondent stated section 3.3.1 of the Water Quality Report refers to the future	N	The Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation shows that the two scenarios considered were the existing

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		scenario as being during peak operation of the WRP and queried if this was when the plant was operating to produce 60 megalitres per day (Ml/d) and generating 20Ml/d of reject water and why the volume of reject water assumed for modelling was not provided. The respondent further queried how the volumes have been determined in Section 3.3.8 for the referenced drought scenario and if these were reasonable worst case scenarios. This section also indicated that only drought was modelled for, and the respondent thus suggested the assumption made that the flows through the WRP would be lower with less effect at other times of year should have been tested when undertaking modelling for a more typical non-drought scenario.		(baseline) situation of discharges from the LSO, and maximum peak output of 60 Ml/d which is the worst case scenario. The volume of reject water was generated by the Applicant's process team and is set out in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall (LSO) Cormix Modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE259	The respondent queried what the cumulative effects would be for the day-on-day and year-on-year discharge of effluent going into the Solent from Eastney LSO.	N	Modelling relating to chemicals was undertaken using an EA approved model CORMIX. The results of which are presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Dilution at the Eastney LSO is such that the chemical modelling indicated rapid dilution to EQS, within 1-2m of the release location. As a result, cumulative effects are not predicted.
Wider Community	WE260	The respondents suggested no consideration had been given to the impact of bioaccumulation or sedimentation and that research from Portsmouth University had shown contaminants found in sewage could accumulate in algae which are then eaten by other species that settled on the seabed when they die. Whilst the respondents stated there was a lack of information on the inputs and assumptions used for modelling the impact on the Solent, it was acknowledged that this may not have been possible at the level the report was in. The respondents queried how the amount of mixing of final effluent and reject water in the LSO had been	N	Water quality modelling of Eastney LSO for currently consented parameters has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This demonstrated that the changes in concentrations between the current release and future release with the WRP in place are insignificant. Therefore, any effects associated with the pathways outlined in this issue, if present, would be similar to those occurring now, i.e. are part of the baseline on which the Project is assessed against. With respect to chemical contaminants, the assessment followed the requirements of the EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for environmental

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		determined and if particle size was taken into consideration when assessing the risks and determining which contaminants were most likely to be present in the reject water.		permit guidance. This requires screening of parameters against Environmental Quality Standards using a number of tests. The parameters failing one or more of these tests were then screened in and carried forward to modelling in line with this guidance. Further information is available in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE261	The respondents stated there was a lack of detail to assess the surface water modelled outputs, including how modelling was undertaken and for what time period. Page 46 shows the extend of the plume from the modelled output for a neap and spring tide, but no time period was provided. The respondents queried how the extent of the plume would change from the surface water discharge if modelling was run over a longer period of time. The respondents noted that section 3.4.3 highlighted that impermeable areas of the site would increase, and new collection systems will concentrate surface water flows to a single collection point release	N	Runoff from the WRP site would be captured in a SuDS system, which would release via an outfall to the tidal reach of Hermitage Stream. The modelled outfall location is just upstream of Harts Farm Way Road, and it is shown on Figure 3-14 of the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation. SuDS outfall modelling is also detailed in ES Appendix 19.12 Water Recycling Plant site Sustainable Drainage System dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document Reference 6.2, Volume 6). To assess the potential changes associated with the release of surface water into the Hermitage Stream, modelling using a calibrated MIKE21 hydraulic model has been undertaken. The model simulated seven days of both the spring and neap tidal cycle,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		but stated no detail on the existing surface water discharge point was provided making it difficult to assess the impact and needs to be acknowledged. The respondents raised concern about the impact of shaft, tunnel and pipeline construction on the groundwater in Bedhampton which is near a spring used to supply water to people.		following the SuDS release in the first day of the simulation. The SuDS release time series was derived from modelled outputs of a two-year return period storm event. The 960-minute (16 hour) storm duration was adopted as a conservative approach, based on the highest volume of discharged water across the event. Model simulations show that the maximum difference in minimum salinity due to the SuDS outfall is typically very low (<0.1PSU), with greater differences confined to small areas of the tidal Hermitage Stream. Interaction of the Project with the underlying Principal Aquifer and Bedhampton and Havant Springs has been taken into consideration in ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.3 Hydrogeological Impact Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I, Document Reference 6.1, Volume 6The Land Quality chapter and ES Appendix 19.3 Hydrogeological Impact Assessment, Volume II, (Document Reference 6.2, Volume 6) have informed the embedded design measures (avoidance of subterranean works within the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Source Protection Zone 1) and good practice measures (as outlined in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7)) to be implemented to mitigate potential quantitative and qualitative impacts on the underlying aquifer and springs. Portsmouth Water as the operator of Bedhampton and Havant springs have been consulted through the DCO process. Any abstractions (greater than 20m ³ /d) required to construct the shafts and tunnels would be subject to an EA abstraction licence.
Wider Community	WE262	The respondents stated claims relating to the dissolved oxygen increased when biochemical oxygen demand increased needs to be substantiated and suggested it was counterintuitive that this would be the case. The respondents stated they did not support the scheme due to the suggested lack of consideration of all environmental risks and stated it required an expensive plant that would utilise a damaging level of chemicals and energy.	N	Updated outputs from the modelling of water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies that would receive compensatory flows are presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). An updated assessment of water quality impacts is provided in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The updated results demonstrate that DO concentrations would be higher than the current baseline once Havant Thicket Reservoir becomes operational and would not be subject to further change once water from the WRP is released into Havant Thicket Reservoir. Conversely, BOD would be subject to a small decrease, consistent with the increase in DO.
Wider Community	WE263	The respondents stated that even if the risk to water quality is outside of the scope of the existing water quality report, it is still a risk to the water environment and therefore should be acknowledged. The respondents stated the water quality is already impacted by the amount of sewage pumped into it and reject the idea of worsening the water quality even if the report suggests it is only a little bit as it would still be a negative impact. The respondents queried what the consequences of not meeting standards (intended and unintended) would be of the	N	Water quality modelling was undertaken by independent consultants using industry-standard software and modelling approaches. Water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir was simulated using the AEM-3D model, and water quality in compensatory flows from the reservoir and in releases from the WRP SuDS was simulated using MIKE software. The results of the water quality modelling shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definitions of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		water treatment process at the maximum levels that may be needed.		deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. The results of this process are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Modelling shows that with primary phosphorus reduction control measures in place at the WRP, operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in: ▪ ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters from the Eastney LSO has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) at the LSO with regard to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as Langstone Harbour or the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream. The EA will issue a permit to release into the environment and the consequences of not meeting the permit will be considered in the same as every other treatment works permit is, currently. This process has not been concluded yet and information will be provided in due course.
Wider Community	WE264	A respondent stated it was unclear if both neap and spring tides had been considered in the modelling and queried what the	N	Modelling simulations of discharges from Eastney LSO were set to a duration of one month, to cover several tidal cycles (to assess potential accumulation of the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		output from the different modelling was. The respondent noted that Section 3.3.7 indicated both tides had been modelled but noted only one set of maps were provided. Dispersal maps for 72-hour periods were provided by the respondent as an example of what they considered should be provided.		discharged pollutants) and various wind conditions were included in sensitivity tests to identify the worst wind conditions. This modelling assessed changes to currently consented parameters. Further information is provided in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) at the LSO with regard to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as Langstone Harbour or the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream. Modelling of the SuDS outfall simulated seven days of both the spring and neap tidal cycle, following the SuDS release in the first day of the simulation.
Wider Community	WE265	The respondent stated the water quality assessment was disappointing due to a lack of detail on inputs, assumptions and scenarios modelled suggesting the public	N	The Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation presented an initial assessment of the potential changes to water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		could have no confidence in the report conclusions. The respondent noted that the Applicant indicated in a recent briefing that reasonable worst case scenarios were modelled however stated the assessment for Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies is based on median values instead.		Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour and The Solent, based on a series of assumptions set out in more detail in technical modelling reports that were issued alongside the PEI Report. The modelling has now been updated, and all modelling inputs, assumptions and scenarios are detailed in the following reports: ▪ ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.10 Degradation Modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ES Appendix 19.12 Water Recycling Plant site Sustainable Drainage System dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation shows several “box and whisker” plots (Figures 3-2 to 3-4). These charts show how each water-quality measurement is spread out. The vertical lines (“whiskers”) show the full range of the data, except for any extreme values. The coloured boxes show the middle half of the results, and the horizontal line inside each box marks the median value. The report uses the median instead of the average (mean) because it is less affected by unusual results. This helps make sure that a few extreme readings do not distort the picture of normal water-quality conditions. Modelling undertaken since the Environmental Water Quality Report includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP; this is described in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This shows that the addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. Water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in significant adverse effects on water quality or a deterioration in the chemical or physico-chemical status of Havant Thicket Reservoir. The results of water quality modelling presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) demonstrate that operation of the Project would not result in significant adverse effects on water quality or a deterioration in the chemical or physico-chemical status in water bodies downstream of Havant Thicket Reservoir, including Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour and The Solent.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The analysis presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) uses 'box and whisker' plots to show the statistical characteristics of each water quality parameter. The vertical 'whiskers' (black lines) show the full range of data, excluding outliers. The solid-coloured boxes for each scenario denote the upper and lower quartiles of each dataset, and the horizontal black lines show the statistical 'median' value. The median value has been selected, as opposed to mean, to avoid outliers in baseline data skewing the representation of water quality conditions. The analysis presented in the ES chapter is informed by the overall changes in data population and is not solely based on the comparison of median values. Additional analysis presented in ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) compares the predicted data populations to the status classification thresholds for each physico-chemical parameter using the statistical measures defined in the WFD Directions 2015.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				With respect to the LSO assessment, screening for chemical parameters was based on two scenarios for membrane removal efficiency, the worst case being that all chemicals are removed during the reverse osmosis process and therefore are discharged into the reject water waste stream.
Wider Community	WE266	The respondent queried what the sensitivity of the data was to model the inputs and outputs.	N	A range of scenarios were examined to check the sensitivity of Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality model, as presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This included a scenario to determine the sensitivity of water quality predictions to estimates of the stabilisation effect during the initial four years following reservoir completion. Other scenarios considered the sensitivity of predicted water quality to operational variations in recycled water and springs inflows and withdrawals and evaluated the response time to return to baseline conditions. A targeted sensitivity analysis was undertaken to evaluate the degree to which the results of the dispersion modelling

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				presented in Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II, were affected by changes to key parameters used in the hydrodynamic model: - Input concentrations. modelling analysis assessed changes in TN, BOD, and TP concentrations and their effect on dispersion. Simulated phosphorus reduction measures reduced TN and BOD by 50% and TP by 90%. - Bed Roughness. Main model used Manning's $n = 0.02$; sensitivity test run with $n = 0.03$. Higher value represents increased coarse sediment presence observed in the receiving water body. - Prevailing Winds. Initial runs assumed no wind; additional runs tested wind influence on dispersion. South-westerly winds (prevailing): 7.0 m/s; northerly winds (worst case): 4.95 m/s. With respect to the LSO assessment, screening for chemical parameters was based on two scenarios for membrane removal efficiency, the worst case being that all chemicals are removed during the reverse osmosis process and therefore are

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				discharged into the reject water waste stream.
Wider Community	WE267	The respondent raised concern over the low number of samples and short time period over which the Budds Farm Trial operated given the complex catchment and noting 16% of the sewage came from industrial or commercial uses, there would have been variation in the presence of certain contaminants across the year impacting the reliance of this data. The respondent also noted the Applicant had indicated the water quality of the water arriving at the recycling plant needed to be relatively consistent for the treatment to be most effective but that the data from the Budds Farm Trial was very variable. The respondent suggested this was expected as the effectiveness of the Budds farm treatment process was dependent on a number of factors including storm events.	N	It is accepted that the trial period at Budds Farm was relatively short, but the Applicant is confident it was robust. The Applicant leveraged data collected from the comparable Peel Common catchment to inform the efficacy of the proposed WRP design at Budds Farm WTW. Both Peel Common and Budds Farm WTW have a similar characteristic, by way of the domestic, trade and infiltration and cess import contribution. To reduce the risk of variability in water quality and quantity, a sizeable buffer tank has been included in the design to ensure the water quality at the front end of the WRP is consistent for treatment. During storm event, i.e., non-drought events, a small side-stream flow will be treated through the WRP.
Wider Community	WE268	The respondent suggested there was insufficient information provided on the operating scenarios modelled to assess the validity and adequacy of the modelling, as it was not clear how many model runs	N	Reservoir modelling simulated a range of scenarios. Scenario 2H-J covered operational variations with a very high withdrawal period with concomitant sizeable decreases in water levels during drought conditions. The model

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		were used to achieve the range of results in the Water Quality Report. The respondent queried what the modelled results in Havant Thicket Reservoir were for, if this was a point in the deep bowl of Havant Thicket Reservoir and also how far from Havant Thicket Reservoir the inlet discharge pipe would be. The respondent stated the Atkins 2020 report confirmed water quality risks increased during drawdown and refilling events and therefore queried what drawdown scenarios were modelled. The respondent also noted the volume of reject water in the modelling was not stated.		simulated an approximate five-year period from June 2037 to February 2042 with variations in operational recycled and springs inflows and very high withdrawals and concomitant reservoir drawdown during drought. Results show that very large increases in the 'drought' operational discharges into and from Havant Thicket Reservoir were not forecasted to dramatically change Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality. A minimum retention time of ~50 days was forecast for the scenario over the period with the most sizeable reservoir drawdown of the surface, the only scenario with water extracted from the middle draw-off. This was the most extreme drought scenario considered in terms of drawdown of the surface level, which indicates a minimal risk of short-circuiting with the current reservoir morphology, inlet location and withdrawal operational rules. Full details of the modelling work undertaken is provided in the following appendix documents: ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). A number of flow scenarios were considered for the Eastney LSO modelling. Details are provided in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)
Wider Community	WE269	The respondent raised concern that the maximum values for each parameter to assess impacts, as suggested in Section 3.2.7 of the Water Quality Report, were not used but instead median values were used for Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream removing the peaks from the assessment. The respondent queried why the 90th or 95th percentile was not used, suggesting the median value would not take into account the seasonal variations and excludes contamination peaks.	N	The analysis presented in the Water Quality Report and updated in ES Chapter 19 Water environment; Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) uses 'box and whisker' plots to show the statistical characteristics of each water quality parameter. Although median values of each water quality parameter have been quoted for simplicity, the box and whisker plots also clearly show the upper and lower quartiles and range of each data population. The vertical 'whiskers' (black lines) show the full range of data, excluding outliers. The solid-coloured boxes for each scenario denote the upper and lower

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				quartiles of each dataset, and the horizontal black lines show the statistical 'median' value. The median value has been selected, as opposed to mean, to avoid outliers in baseline data skewing the representation of water quality conditions. The analysis presented in the ES chapter is informed by the overall changes in data population and is not solely based on the comparison of median values.
Wider Community	WE270	The respondents stated the use of median concentrations in the comparison of modelled outputs to the baseline values as set out in Section 3.2 of the Water Quality Report was not adequately justified and queried what impact this would have in comparison to the other criteria that could be used. The respondents further stated the time utilised in the modelling was too short to produce reliable results. The respondents stated insufficient information was provided on the assumptions and scenarios used to assess the validity of the modelling and its outputs and queried where the end of the pipe discharge is	N	The analysis presented in the Water Quality Report and updated in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) uses 'box and whisker' plots to show the statistical characteristics of each water quality parameter. The vertical 'whiskers' (black lines) show the full range of data, excluding outliers. The solid-coloured boxes for each scenario denote the upper and lower quartiles of each dataset, and the horizontal black lines show the statistical 'median' value. Median value has been selected, as opposed to mean, to avoid outliers in baseline data skewing the representation of water quality conditions. The analysis presented in the ES chapter is informed by the overall changes in data

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		planned or if multiple points would be provided and with diffusers or without.		population and is not solely based on the comparison of median values. The inlet pipe is being designed by Portsmouth Water and is currently proposed as a single point release. A Bubbler system is to be utilised for diffusion. All modelling inputs, assumptions and scenarios are set out in the following reports: ▪ ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.10 Degradation Modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE271	The respondent raised concern that the baseline data in the 2011 and 2020 reports was different to that in the 2025 report, with fewer contaminants considered. The respondent further raised concern over the use of median values that had the ability to smooth over peaks where the greatest impact would occur, as well as the relatively short period of time and number of samples used in the Water Quality Report.	N	Baseline water quality data presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), was determined with reference to several existing datasets, including the EA's long-term monitoring data and data from Portsmouth Water. The Applicant has continued to undertake water quality monitoring at locations in Riders Lane Stream and Hermitage Stream. The results of this sampling are presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). This includes additional rounds of monthly water quality sampling in the Riders Lane Stream and Hermitage Stream (12 months in total) and additional rounds of seawater sampling which have informed the H1 Screening Assessment and associated Eastney LSO modelling. The baseline is based on the most recent up-to-date information rather than five to 14 year old data. The assessment of water quality impacts provided in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) considered the relevant water quality parameters that are used by the EA to determine the status of a water body under the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017. The analysis presented in the Water Quality Report and updated in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) uses 'box and whisker' plots to show the statistical characteristics of each water quality parameter. The vertical 'whiskers' (black lines) show the full range of data, excluding outliers. The solid-coloured boxes for each scenario denote the upper and lower quartiles of each dataset, and the horizontal black lines show the statistical 'median' value. Median value has been selected, as opposed to mean, to avoid outliers in baseline data skewing the representation of water quality conditions. The analysis presented in the ES chapter is informed by the overall changes in data population and is not solely based on the comparison of median values.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Additional analysis presented in ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) compares the predicted data populations to the status classification thresholds for each physico-chemical parameter using the statistical measures defined in the WFD Directions 2015.
Wider Community	WE272	The respondent stated no reference was made to the industrial and commercial wastewater, which makes up 16% of the sewage received at Budd Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) and includes waste from both hospitals and Ministry of Defence sites.	N	The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that would be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				CECs remaining in the WRP output would be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that would be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WE273	The respondent stated there would be a risk to the water quality from the chemicals being stored at Broadmarsh.	N	In the context of the historical landfill at Broadmarsh, the design of piled foundations and deep structures has been informed by the Outline Foundation Works Risk Assessment (Document reference 7.4, DCO Volume 7) that has been prepared and submitted with the DCO application. As set out in the Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), the Contractor, once appointed would undertake detailed Foundation Works Risk Assessments (FWRA) in line with CL:AIRE's Piling and Penetrative Ground Improvement Methods on Land Affected by Contamination: Guidance on Pollution Prevention, which would include detailed Piling Risk Assessments. A detailed CEMP would be produced and submitted for approval in accordance with the corresponding requirement in Schedule 2 to the DCO.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				A Drilling Fluid Management Plan (DFMP) would be developed by the Contractor, once appointed, to document how risks of any fluid breakouts would be reduced, and in the event of an outbreak from drilling or tunnelling works during construction how any breakout would be managed and mitigated, to reduce environmental impacts.
Wider Community	WE274	The respondent requested the authorship of the Water Quality Report be made clear.	N	Modelling of water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir was undertaken by GHD (independent consultants). Modelling of downstream compensations flows, SuDS outfall flows and discharges from the Eastney LSO was undertaken by Haskoning (independent consultants).
Wider Community	WE275	The respondent queries what volume of compensation discharge has been assumed in the assessment and whether this discharge varies throughout the year to reflect seasonal variations in rainfall and river flows. The respondent further seeks clarification on whether the assumed compensation discharge regime, including any seasonal variation, has been agreed with the Environment Agency (EA). In the respondent's view, seasonal variations in downstream flows have not been	N	Portsmouth Water is responsible for compensation flows to downstream watercourses from Havant Thicket Reservoir, in accordance with its planning permission. The Project does not affect the level of compensatory flows from Havant Thicket Reservoir. Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. This was used to inform starting concentrations of each modelled parameter in

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		adequately considered within the assessment.		the compensation flow modelling. Maximum values for determinands used in the modelling compensatory flows are also provided in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The dispersion modelling presented in Appendix 19.6 considered two flow scenarios to simulate low and high flows (Q95 and Qmean, respectively). Summer and winter temperatures were also considered to represent seasonality. Engagement remains ongoing with the EA, particularly regarding discharges to the water environment, which will require permits under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016. For further details see: - ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). - ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE276	The respondents stated the current proposal would allow the Applicant to inflict further damage, now on Langstone Harbour through the release of discharge with more concentrated contaminants from Havant Thicket Reservoir and suggested it would affect the drinking water of local residents. The respondents further stated forever chemicals and pollutants were not considered in the contamination assessment.	N	The proposed WRP would not only remove contaminants of concern but also pathogens and nutrients from the source water from Budds Farm WTW. A drinking water safety plan was created by Portsmouth Water (PW) and the Applicant and no risks to source water supply were identified. Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. The envelope is presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Modelling undertaken since the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation includes the High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP and is presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir compensatory flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This shows that operation of the Project would not result in significant adverse effects on water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir or in downstream

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				water bodies such as Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour and The Solent. The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release from Eastney Long Sea Outfall (LSO) followed the EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for environmental permit guidance, which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. The results of this modelling are shown in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall (LSO) Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall (LSO) Solent dispersion modelling – Chemicals, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has, has been provided to the EA for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and against what thresholds. Following receipt of this

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				advice, the assessment would be undertaken and submitted to the EA as part of the environmental permit application required for the Project. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP. As described in ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), the Project would improve source water supply. Reverse osmosis is a tried-and-tested method of water treatment and has been used to great success in other parts of the world for many years. In the event that some treated wastewater is not filtered out, making it through the membrane process, there are further steps in the rigorous cleaning process. Following reverse osmosis, the water goes through an advanced oxidising stage which is widely used in other water treatment processes to eliminate any unwanted left over material. Minerals that get removed during the earlier stages of treatment, such as calcium and magnesium) are added back in and, as in traditional treatment methods, some chlorine may be added to the water to ensure it meets strict water quality standards. In addition, there is strict legislation and guidance in place for the quality of drinking water, which must be met. For instance, the Applicant has a duty under the Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				2016 to provide safe drinking water. In addition, the Drinking Water Inspectorate (DWI) provide independent reassurance that public water supplies in England and Wales are safe and drinking water quality is acceptable to consumers.
Wider Community	WE277	The respondents queried if pharmaceuticals, hormones, narcotics and other contaminants such as herbicides, insecticides and fertiliser chemicals (nitrates and phosphates) could not be removed by reverse osmosis instead of being released. The respondents stated untreated sewage must not be discharged into the sea or landfill and suggested organic matter residue could be incinerated with the carbon dioxide emitted being fairly insignificant. The respondents stated the water quality assessment fails to adequately address the potential risks associated with the discharge of recycled effluent into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream watercourses, lacking the necessary detail to evaluate the reliability of the modelling process and downplaying key contaminants that could pose	N	The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the Environment Agency's (EA) EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for environmental permit guidance, which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has, has been provided to the EA for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and against what thresholds. Following receipt of this advice, the assessment would be undertaken and submitted to the EA as part of the environmental permit application required for the Project.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		significant environmental and public health risks, such as pharmaceuticals and per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances , commonly known as “forever chemicals” which undermines the summary of the Environmental Water Quality Report that stated the reject water pumped into the Solent is ‘unlikely’ to affect water quality or the biodiversity of the Solent. The respondents further queried how the complex set of contaminants of concern have been reduced to a selection of just seven parameters to model for the study listed in Section 3.3.3. of the Environmental Water Quality Report. For example, the effluent recycling trial plant data shows that levels of some pharmaceuticals in the final effluent from the Water Treatment Works (WTW) are already present at significant levels, including venlafaxine (anti-depressant) and Ethinylestradiol (contraceptive pill), which can have ecological impacts (e.g. feminised fish). The respondent stated the concentrations of such contaminants of concern would be even more concentrated in the reject water discharged into the		The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Solent during the operation of the Water Recycling Plant (WRP). The respondent also stated not all pharmaceuticals are removed by effluent recycling plants such as the venlafaxine (anti-depressant) found in the Budds Farm WTW trial plant output and the impact of this on Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream must be considered further.		decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The modelling presented in the Spring 2025 Environmental Water Quality Report considered a range of water quality parameters for which environmental quality standards have been established under the Water Framework Directive (Standards and Classification) Directions (England and Wales) 2015. The report was intended to provide a summary of water quality effects for non-technical stakeholders. Full details on the assumptions that underpin the updated modelling that underpins the assessments presented in: ▪ ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) are presented in: ▪ ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) ▪ ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) ▪ ES Appendix 19.8 Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project Eastney Long Sea Outfall - CORMIX

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Modelling for Chemicals Screened in via the Surface Water Risk Assessment Process, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) - ES Appendix 19.10 Degradation modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) - ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) - ES Appendix 19.12 Water Recycling Plant site Sustainable Drainage System dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) Updated reservoir modelling presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP and shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in significant adverse effects or a deterioration in the chemical or

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				physico-chemical status of Havant Thicket Reservoir. The water quality of compensation flows to downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour) has also been modelled (ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)). This modelling also includes the HRRM at the WRP and shows that operation of the Project would not result in significant adverse effects or a deterioration in the chemical or physico-chemical status of downstream water bodies.
Wider Community	WE278	The respondents stated the risk of pollution incidents have not adequately been considered and that the discharge would be into a confined water body where any pollution could not be removed. The respondents argued that given the Applicant's track record it was not acceptable to assume that there is no pollution risk as this was not the case.	N	The quality of recycled water released from the WRP and entering Havant Thicket Reservoir would be routinely monitored and regulated by the EA through an Environmental Permit to reduce the risk of pollution incidents. The Applicant is working with Portsmouth Water to establish the use of online measurable surrogate compounds that would be used for daily operation of the WRP. The multi-barrier treatment process will be equipped with online monitors to ensure the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				efficacy of various treatment processes. However, in the same way that drinking water supply works are controlled the WRP will also have a set of online monitors to control the transfer of flow into Havant Thicket Reservoir. The EA is expecting regular sampling of the recycled water and test for compounds with an EQS and it is understood that not all of these can be measured online. A water monitoring plan will be produced post-consent and ES Appendix 19.9 Outline Water Monitoring Plan, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) is submitted with the DCO application. This will include general quantity (flows/levels) and quality monitoring requirements, together with specific monitoring requirements at particular component of the Project, geographic locations, and/or receptors susceptible to specific or increased risks. The monitoring plan will outline trigger levels and action plans during construction (to be agreed with stakeholders) to mitigate any observed impacts. In addition, engagement with the EA remains ongoing, particularly regarding discharges to the water environment, which will be secured through the appropriate licence and permitting regimes under the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016. Water quality modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir, (ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) and compensation flows (ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) has been completed, and the results are assessed in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The Water quality modelling includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP and shows that the addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. Water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in significant adverse effects or a deterioration in the chemical or physico-chemical status of Havant Thicket Reservoir. The water quality of compensation flows to downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour) has also been modelled (ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This modelling also includes the HRRM at the WRP and shows that operation of the Project would not result in significant adverse effects or a deterioration in the chemical or physico-chemical status of downstream water bodies. For chemicals which do not have Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has, has been provided to the EA for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and against what thresholds. Following receipt of this advice, the assessment would be undertaken and submitted to the EA as part of the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				environmental permit application required for the Project. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP. Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in: ▪ ES Appendix 19.5: Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent Dispersion Modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling - Chemicals, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE279	The respondents stated that the water quality impacts and associated risks to Langstone Harbour have not been sufficiently evaluated in the current assessment and that conclusions drawn	N	Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		regarding the potential effects of effluent recycling on water quality and biodiversity are not adequately substantiated and fail to provide a comprehensive analysis of the long-term environmental implications. The respondents stated the proposed effluent recycling scheme also fails to account for the reduction in nitrate concentrations that would result in Langstone Harbour, thereby undermining a previously established benefit. This benefit was substantiated through water quality modelling conducted for the spring-fed reservoir in both 2011 and 2020, which demonstrated the positive impact of Havant Thicket Reservoir in maintaining beneficial nitrate levels. The respondents stated that given the ecological sensitivity of connected areas like Langstone Harbour and the Solent-both of which are internationally protected for their biodiversity-this project poses unacceptable environmental risks. The respondents raised concern over the Applicant's Solent model that suggested contaminants in reject water discharged via the Long Sea Outfall (LSO) would not reach Langstone Harbour however		Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Given the scale of the predicted changes, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and the changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream or Langstone Harbour. Furthermore, water quality modelling of the compensatory flows released from Havant Thicket Reservoir has indicated that the Project would not adversely impact water quality or nutrient levels in Langstone Harbour. Since the Spring 2025 Consultation further analysis of nutrient impacts has been undertaken as part of a Nutrient Assessment. The Nutrient Assessment (ES Appendix 19.7 Nutrient Assessment, Volume II, (Document Reference 6.2, Volume 6)) confirms that the Project would be compliant with the Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, with regard to NE nutrient neutrality guidance. The Nutrient Assessment concludes that, on the basis of nutrient management measures embedded within the Project, no additional mitigation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		suggested independent experts have previously shown that the Solent model used by the Applicant is not robust. The respondent further stated that the conclusions drawn that the environmental water quality in the downstream watercourses and Langstone Harbour, which was predicted to be largely unaffected by the addition of recycled effluent to Havant Thicket Reservoir, is not credible.		would be required to achieve nutrient neutrality during the construction and operational phases. The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling - Chemicals Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling demonstrated that the distance to Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream to Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour). This shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in: - ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). - ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE280	A respondent stated that even if certain water quality risks are considered to fall outside the direct scope of the current report, these risks remain pertinent and potentially harmful to the water environment and they need to be acknowledged, as failure to do so may result in unforeseen negative consequences. The respondent suggested a more comprehensive and precautionary approach is necessary to safeguard the long-term health of Langstone Harbour and its associated ecosystems.	N	Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. The results of this process are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Updated modelling that includes the High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant Given the scale of the predicted changes, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream or Langstone Harbour. For chemicals which do not have Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has, has been provided to the Environment Agency (EA) for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and against what thresholds. Following receipt of this advice, the assessment will be undertaken and submitted to the EA as part of the environmental permit application required for the Project. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WE281	The respondent stated the Environmental Water Quality Report concluded that there would be no likely significant effects on the Solent due to the effluent recycling plant's operations however suggested the	N	The consultation material is supported by more detailed modelling reports that form appendices to the Environment Statement (ES). A brief summary is provided below and references to the detailed text are given.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		available information is inadequate to substantiate this conclusion. The respondent stated the reject water from the plant would contain a multitude of contaminants, some of which could pose potential risks to the Solent's marine environment, necessitating more detailed and comprehensive marine dispersion modelling. The respondent suggested additional work was required to evaluate the risks associated with various operating scenarios and to ensure a better understanding of potential environmental impacts.		Modelling simulations of discharges from Eastney LSO for currently consented parameters were set to a duration of one month, to cover several tidal cycles (to assess potential accumulation of the discharged pollutants) and various wind conditions were included in sensitivity tests to identify the worst wind conditions. Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Modelling for the chemical parameters was undertaken using an EA approved modelling tool CORMIX. The modelling demonstrated that the distance to Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as Langstone Harbour or the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream. For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has, has been provided to the EA for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and against what thresholds. Following receipt of this advice, the assessment would be undertaken and submitted to the EA as part of the environmental permit application required for the Project. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				(Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP. Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in: ▪ ES Appendix 19.5: Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent Dispersion Modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE282	The respondents queried the time over which the discharge was modelled and suggest it may not have been long enough	N	Modelling simulations of discharges from Eastney LSO for currently consented parameters were set to a duration of one month, to cover several tidal cycles (to

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		to assess the extent of the effects of discharging more concentrated reject water into the Solent. The respondents raised concern over design refinements 1, 2, 3 as they would have the most impact on highly sensitive environments including Langstone Harbour and the chalk aquifer, noting that despite claims Langstone Harbour no longer has a problem with eutrophication, green algal mats covering the harbour mud remains a common occurrence. The respondents noted the plan outline states that storm water from Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) currently released into Langstone Harbour is potentially proposed instead to be changed to discharge through Eastney Long Sea Outfalls (LSO) together with the reject water from the recycling plant and that treated wastewater currently released via Eastney LSO would instead be released into Langstone Harbour. The respondent stated that if storm containment is not substantially improved then such storm water may also include spills of wholly untreated wastewater comprising a usual 40-60% average		assess potential accumulation of the discharged pollutants) and various wind conditions were included in sensitivity tests to identify the worst wind conditions. Modelling for the chemical parameters was undertaken using an EA approved modelling tool CORMIX. The modelling demonstrated that the distance to Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Model outputs show that the differences and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Given the scale of the predicted changes, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as Langstone Harbour or the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		wastewater proportion that would potentially have serious implications for Langstone Harbour. The respondents stated concentration of contaminants rejected by the recycling process will exit the outfall pipes causing of pollution of Langstone Harbour over and above those experienced increasingly in recent years which would increase the hazard of swimming at high tide in Emsworth.		Furthermore, water quality modelling of the compensatory flows released from Havant Thicket Reservoir has indicated that the Project would not adversely impact water quality in Langstone Harbour. Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. This shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in: ▪ ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). At the time of the Spring 2025 Consultation the Budds Farm reconfiguration project was identified as potentially coming forward during the timescales of the Project's application, and therefore would have been required to be

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				assessed, in terms of its interface with the Project and cumulative effects. As the reconfiguration project is no longer being progressed at this time, it has not been assessed within the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA).
Wider Community	WE283	The respondents noted that Section 4.5 of the 2020 Atkins Water Quality Report noted that constructing the new reservoir is projected to reduce nitrogen levels in Langstone Harbour by an average of 6.7%, aiding the preservation of the Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Special Protection Area (SPA) site but this could reach up to 40% during and after drought periods, depending on the volume of spring water pumped into Havant Thicket Reservoir. It is crucial to protect this benefit and avoid compromising it by introducing effluent recycling as a reservoir top-up method and the respondents therefore stated this is thoroughly evaluated and documented. The respondents stated the benefit of reduced nitrate flow into the harbour would be greatest when Bedhampton spring	N	The mass balance modelling undertaken by Portsmouth Water was based on initial assumptions on the water quality within Havant Thicket Reservoir. The updated modelling presented in the ES and its appendices uses a more detailed model and is informed by updated assumptions on water quality in the groundwater sources and recycled water. This shows a small decrease in ammonia and nitrate concentrations in Havant Thicket Reservoir once water from the WRP is released. Ammonia concentrations in both Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour are not affected by the release of water from the WRP, while nitrate concentrations show a small decrease. Updated water quality modelling outputs are presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		water is used to fill Havant Thicket Reservoir post construction and after a drought drawdown event. If the effluent recycling plant is used as planned to add more water to Havant Thicket Reservoir in a drought, then at the end of any drought event Havant Thicket Reservoir water level is likely to be higher than it would have been without effluent recycling with less spring water containing elevated nitrate needed to top up Havant Thicket Reservoir after a drought and the nitrate benefit to the harbour from directing spring water to Havant Thicket Reservoir would be reduced.		Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). An assessment of water quality impacts is provided in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE284	Respondent queried if the effluent recycling plant separately proposed at Sandown (Isle of Wight) could, in some events, discharge treatment by-products directly via the Eastern Yar or indirectly via the Ryde outfalls to the Solent.	N	This issue is not related to the Project and is related to another of the Applicant's projects, the proposed Isle of Wight Water Recycling Project.
Wider Community	WE285	The respondents noted eddies can significantly influence the behaviour and distribution of discharge plumes in water systems, trapping and transporting the	N	Modelling simulations of discharges from Eastney LSO for currently consented parameters were set to a duration of one month, to cover several tidal cycles (to assess potential accumulation of the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		plume's contents, over varying distances and dependent on the eddy's size and strength, it may either disperse the plume, diluting its concentration, or concentrate its contents in specific areas, potentially intensifying localised impacts. Eddies also affect the residence time of plume materials in the water, which can influence how contaminants interact with the environment with longer residence times may lead to greater accumulation of pollutants, while shorter times might reduce their impact. The respondents queried where the sludge from the treatment plan would be discharged and what the impact/effects of this would be. The respondents further queried if treatment chemicals, byproducts and cleaning chemicals that will be in the reject water were considered in the assessment, how far away from the outfall would the discharge changes be considered not significant and at what point in the Solent are conclusions being drawn for.		discharged pollutants) and various wind conditions were included in sensitivity tests to identify the worst wind conditions. Modelling for the chemical parameters was undertaken using an EA approved modelling tool CORMIX. Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters from the Eastney LSO has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) at the LSO with regard to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as Langstone Harbour or the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given that the pilot plant data does not represent the full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP. The proposed treatment train in the reference design for DCO submission does not produce a solid stream and sludge management will not be required.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	WE286	The respondents noted saline intrusion during dewatering of shafts at the Water Recycling Plant site is flagged as an issue on page 112 of Chapter 19 of the Water Quality Report.	N	Due to the proximity of the sea, there is a risk of saline intrusion as a result of the dewatering works during construction of the shafts in the WRP site and Budds Farm WTW area, and this will be a factor in the groundwater control design which will be secured through the appropriate licence and permitting regimes as set out in the Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7).
Wider Community	WE287	The respondents queried where the pipeline washouts will be, whether they could discharge into Langstone Harbour or the Hermitage Stream and how often they will operate. The respondents stated that washouts are built into pipelines and used during maintenance activities, or when there is a need to flush out a build-up of sediment and that in these pipelines the silt will be contaminated and poses a significant risk to the harbour if it escapes or is discharged to the environment with testing and operation of washouts proposed yearly (PEI Report Chapter 9, Section 9.8.20). The respondent noted sediment build up in the pipes between Budds Farm and the WRP is highly likely to	N	During normal operation the washout valves would be inspected and tested to check the valves are operational. All source water resulting from the testing of washout valves would be collected directly by a tanker, with no source water discharged to the environment (land or watercourse). This could require the installation of temporary pumping and flexible pipework to connect the tanker to the washout valve. Testing of a washout valve would result in the release of up to approximately 4.5m ³ of source water from the Pipelines, requiring only one tanker. Testing of washouts would be required approximately once every six months.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		be an issue due to the nature of the contaminated liquids they will carry. The respondents suggested a plan for how to carry out washouts of the pipes in a way that does not risk contaminating the Harbour.		
Wider Community	WE288	The respondents raised concern that no work was planned to the LSO so there is no proposal for installation of additional diffusers to improve dispersal of the contaminants. The respondent further noted with a point source of discharge and a significant increase in contaminants in the reject water, there would be an increase in the concentration of contaminants in the water around the outfall which was not acknowledged anywhere in the report.	N	Drawings of the LSO (dated 15 January 1990) indicate nine ports at the LSO, with a single port per raiser, along a diffuser line separated each by 12m. There are no proposals to install additional diffusers. Water quality modelling using the existing diffuser layout on permitted parameters was undertaken, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Significant changes in concentrations of these parameters between the existing and future scenario with the WRP operating were not predicted. The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I, and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Given the scale of the predicted changes, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour.
Wider Community	WE289	The respondents noted the treatment process will remove some of the salt from Budds Farm effluent and that will be concentrated in the reject water, making the output from the Long Sea Outfall higher in salinity than the existing effluent discharge. The respondents stated the impact could be significant but there is no plume map provided for salinity in the report. The respondents noted page 37 of	N	Water quality modelling of Eastney LSO has been completed (including plume maps showing the difference between the existing release and the release combined with the reject water), and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This included consideration of salinity changes.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		the water quality report indicated that salinity was considered however queried where the results of the modelling and the plume map were.		Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant. It should be noted that the salt concentration in reject water from the WRP is not comparable to a brine solution produced from a de-salination process Given the scale of the predicted changes, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as Langstone Harbour or the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream.
Wider Community	WE290	The concerns revolved around discrepancies between the current water quality report and previous independent models for Portsmouth Water's spring-fed reservoir. The respondents noted that the latest forecast suggested a decrease in contaminant concentrations, which conflicted with earlier models accepted by the EA and experts. Respondents stated that some of the data and model outputs in the current study appeared questionable, especially when compared to the detailed	N	Water quality modelling is robust and was carried out by independent consultants appointed by the Applicant and Portsmouth water. The experts that advised on the original reservoir proposal for Portsmouth Water have also been involved in validating the water quality modelling methodology and outputs. The mass balance modelling undertaken by Portsmouth Water was based on initial assumptions on the water quality within Havant Thicket Reservoir. Updated modelling

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		models from 2011 and 2020, which had been conducted by experienced independent consultants and peer-reviewed by the EA. The respondent highlighted that the 2011 model considered seasonal variations in calcium, raising questions about whether similar seasonal analyses had been applied in the latest modelling. Additionally, there was uncertainty about whether the previous reports, which covered a broader range of parameters, had been adequately referenced or incorporated into the current study. Furthermore, the respondents pointed out that the lack of reassurance regarding the peer review process for the latest modelling raised concerns about its reliability, particularly given the community's mistrust of the Applicant's involvement. Respondents argued that was unclear if the current model had used previous water quality data and parameters to validate or compare findings, especially concerning the impact of introducing recycled effluent into Havant Thicket Reservoir. Overall, the respondents expressed that the limited parameters and		(ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, Volume 6) uses a more detailed model and is informed by updated assumptions on water quality in the groundwater sources and recycled water. This shows an increase in nitrate and a decrease in ammonia concentrations once Havant Thicket Reservoir becomes operational, and no further change in water quality once water from the WRP is released. Modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) incorporates the change of inlet pipe location; the recycled water spring inlet location into Havant Thicket Reservoir has moved from the north basin (eastern borrow pit) to the south basin (western borrow pit) in closer proximity to the withdrawal infrastructure. The model also includes: ▪ An updated bubble plume destratification system design, in particular the layout of the bubbler lines in the south basin. ▪ Improved characterisation of reservoir with the planned implementation of a High

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		questionable outputs in the new modelling raised significant doubts about its accuracy and whether it provided a reliable basis for assessing water quality impacts, especially in light of past comprehensive and peer-reviewed studies.		Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) that substantially decreases nutrient concentrations of this water source. The modelling presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) also includes the use of a HRRM at the WRP. This modelling informed the assessment presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), which demonstrates that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir.
Wider Community	WE291	The respondents expressed concerns about the independence and transparency of the assessment report. They questioned who prepared it and whether they were fully independent from the Applicant. They pointed out that in their view, key issues	N	Water quality modelling is robust and was carried out by independent consultants appointed by the Applicant and Portsmouth Water. The experts that advised on the original reservoir proposal for Portsmouth Water have also been involved in validating

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		were inadequately addressed, with missing data, assumptions, and unclear methodologies. The respondents were sceptical about the conclusion that storing recycled effluent posed no environmental risk, especially given the Applicant's history and potential pollution risks. They noted that the water quality modelling lacked details about who conducted it, their expertise, and independence. Additionally, they highlighted missing information about referenced reports and criticised the presentation of results. The respondents believed the report failed to properly assess or acknowledge potential environmental impacts, particularly regarding risks to Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies like the Solent.		the water quality modelling methodology and outputs. The Environmental Water Quality Report supporting the Spring 2025 Consultation was an interim report presenting a summary of emerging findings, with further information on underlying assumptions, data and methodologies provided within ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II, (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Together with the PEI report, which was consulted on, the consultation materials were detailed and adequate. Modelling undertaken since the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP and shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. The assessment of chemicals within the release from the LSO has been undertaken in line with EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance. Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) at the LSO with regard to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				as Langstone Harbour or the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream. Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in ES Appendix 19.5: Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent Dispersion Modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE292	The respondents noted that the water quality assessment report acknowledged that discharging recycled effluent into Havant Thicket Reservoir could cause algal blooms and reduce biodiversity. However, they found it very concerning and disappointing that the report was largely dismissive of the scheme's risks and failed to address many relevant contaminants. They pointed out that the EA's testing parameters were limited and did not include numerous substances of concern, such as pharmaceuticals and forever chemicals. They also highlighted that not all parameters used in the study, like Biochemical oxygen demand, were tested, and differences in analysis methods could hinder comparisons. The	N	Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in the reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in chemistry or physico-chemistry status of the reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within the reservoir and prevent the reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the EA's guidance, which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		respondents argued that the modelling underestimated the long-term impacts on sediment quality, water chemistry, and thousands of species, including humans, emphasizing that large city wastewater treatment works introduce around 50,000 chemicals, which the new process could not fully eliminate. They cited recent studies on pharmaceuticals and pesticides at Langstone to support their concerns.		Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has, has been provided to the EA for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and against what thresholds. Following receipt of this advice, the assessment will be undertaken and submitted to the EA as part of the environmental permit application required for the Project. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm Water Treatment Works (WTW) (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that would be

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by the University of Brighton. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				(Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output would be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that would be in place at the WRP. Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in: - ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) - ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE293	The respondent argued that there was inadequate consideration of the risk of treatment chemicals and disinfection by-	N	The assessment of chemicals within the Eastney LSO release has been undertaken in line with EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		products being discharged into Havant Thicket Reservoir and Solent. They argued that new chemicals would be introduced that are not present in Havant Thicket Reservoir environment, stream catchment and marine environment.		environmental permit guidance and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This modelling uses baseline data from the marine environment to undertake the assessment and the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in was calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has been provided to the EA for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and against what thresholds. Following receipt of this advice, the assessment will be undertaken and submitted to the EA as part of the environmental permit application required for the Project. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm Water Treatment Works (WTW) (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that would be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output would be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that would be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WE294	Respondents' questions were raised about flow requirements and discharge obligations for the Lavant Stream after reservoir construction, as well as what water would be discharged into it. They also criticised the reliance on median values in the modelling, which they	N	There would be no discharges into the Lavant catchment or water body associated with the Project. Water quality modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies undertaken since the Spring 2025 consultation exercise is presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		believed was insufficient for capturing seasonal variations and assessing the true impact of effluent recycling on water quality downstream. Also, the respondents pointed out inconsistencies in the modelling results, particularly regarding Biological Oxygen Demand and Oxygen, Oxygen, where predictions of increasing Biological Oxygen Demand were contradicted by predicted increases in Dissolved Oxygen, raising doubts about the accuracy of the conclusions. They emphasised that pollution levels in local waters were at their worst, with the Applicant's history of discharges contributing to this deterioration and argued that the environmental impacts of the scheme had not been fully explored. They called for greater reassurances that the unused water from the recycling plant would not harm the local streams or the Solent environment, stressing that the potential impacts on the stream southeast of Havant Thicket Reservoir had not been properly assessed.		water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). An updated assessment of water quality impacts is provided in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The updated results demonstrate that DO concentrations would be higher than the current baseline once Havant Thicket Reservoir becomes operational and would not be subject to further change once water from the WRP is released into Havant Thicket Reservoir. Conversely, BOD would be subject to a small decrease, consistent with the increase in DO. Median values are quoted in the assessment because this allows a comparison between data sets, and the box and whisker plots show the full range of water quality predicted in each receptor. It is also important to note

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				that the compensation flows modelling presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) was informed by the maximum (i.e. worst case) predictions of water quality discharged from Havant Thicket Reservoir in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Modelling undertaken since the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP and shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water.
Wider Community	WE295	The respondent argued that in their view, it was not credible for the Water Quality Report to conclude that there are no potential environmental effects from storing recycled effluent in Havant Thicket Reservoir, other than likely the change in trophic state to eutrophic due to phosphorous, as they argued that there would be other effects from the discharge of recycled effluent into Havant Thicket Reservoir. The respondent's view was that simply adding phosphate treatment would not address these concerns, and that Portsmouth Water must ensure that the Applicant applies a more stringent 'no deterioration' discharge condition for total phosphorous and orthophosphate.	N	Modelling undertaken since the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation includes the use of a HRRM at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality at Havant Thicket Reservoir. Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. The results of this process are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Updated modelling includes the HRRM at the WRP shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream.
Wider Community	WE296	The respondents highlighted that the impacts of sedimentation and the remobilisation of contaminants needed to	N	With regard to phosphates and contaminants, modelling completed since the Spring 2025 Consultation includes the use of a High

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		be thoroughly assessed. They referred to the 2020 Atkins Water Quality Report, which pointed out that phosphates could accumulate in sediments and potentially be released, increasing Havant Thicket Reservoir's trophic state. They stressed the importance of considering the re-suspension of phosphates and other pollutants, especially in shallow areas and wetlands. Additionally, they emphasised that bioaccumulation of substances such as forever chemicals detected in the final effluent must be properly evaluated, noting ongoing marine fauna studies by Portsmouth University. The respondents also observed that certain contaminants found in the effluent recycling trial plant's final output, including disinfection by-products like bromodichloromethane, bromoform, chloroform, and chlorate, had not been sufficiently considered in the water quality report. They raised concerns about chemicals generated during treatment and pointed out the high variability in input parameters such as pH,		Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) to remove phosphorus at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. This means there would not be issues with bioaccumulation or eutrophication. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. The HRRM means there will not be any bioaccumulation of phosphates or sedimentation of phosphates. The Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. The results of this process are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Updated modelling that includes the HRRM at the WRP shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		total dissolved solids, turbidity, and nutrients. They questioned what work had been carried out to assess the impact of fluctuating effluent qualities, whether worst case scenarios had been used in modelling, and how seasonal or drought conditions might influence these parameters, underlining the need for comprehensive evaluation across different scenarios.		The applicant has designed a buffer tank at the start of the process, to even out quality changes as well as provide enough quantity of flow to ensure a steady treatment process Reservoir modelling (ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) simulated a range of scenarios. Scenario 2H-J covered operational variations with a very high withdrawal period with concomitant sizeable decreases in water levels during drought conditions. The model simulated an approximate five-year period from June 2037 to February 2042 with variations in operational recycled and springs inflows and very high withdrawals and concomitant reservoir drawdown during drought. Results show that very large increases in the 'drought' operational discharges into and from Havant Thicket Reservoir were not forecast to dramatically change Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality. A minimum retention time of ~50 days was forecast for the scenario over the period with the most sizeable reservoir drawdown of the surface, the only scenario with water extracted from the middle draw-off. This was the most

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				extreme drought scenario considered in terms of drawdown of the surface level, which indicates a minimal risk of short-circuiting with the current reservoir morphology, inlet location and withdrawal operational rules. Scenarios 2E-G (ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) simulated operational variations cover a three year period (June 2037–May 2040) and assessed variations in the contributions of recycled water discharges, spring inflows, and reservoir withdrawals, followed by an additional year of baseline hydrology (Scenario 1B) to evaluate recovery to typical conditions. Scenarios included: ▪ 2E: High yield (~50 MI/d withdrawal). ▪ 2F: Moderate yield (~30 MI/d), maximising spring inputs and minimising recycled water. ▪ 2G: Moderate yield (~30 MI/d), minimising spring inputs and maximising recycled water. Modelling examined the sensitivity of water quality to operational changes and the time required to return to baseline conditions.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				With respect to the marine environment and LSO release, the assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) followed the EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. Modelling using the EA's recommended tool CORMIX was then undertaken to look at distance to EQS which was calculated at 1-2m from the release outfall. Note that the modelling was undertaken on a number of flow scenarios and potential contaminant concentrations associated with membrane efficiency. A scenario was assessed that considered complete removal of the parameter via the membrane (i.e. all discharged to the reject wastewater stream) to provide a sensitivity analysis regarding dilution at the outfall location. Full details are provided in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has, has been provided to the EA for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and against what thresholds. Following receipt of this advice, the assessment will be undertaken and submitted to the EA as part of the environmental permit application required for the Project. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that would be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output would be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that would be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WE297	The respondents noted that the baseline data for some parameters appeared suspect when compared to previous water quality reports from 2011 and 2020, which had been peer-reviewed by the EA. For instance, they pointed out that the baseline figures for nitrate and orthophosphate in the Riders Lane Streams were higher in the 2025 data, making subsequent changes seem less significant. They also observed that the baseline Dissolved Oxygen levels had decreased in the Riders Lane and Hermitage Streams, which could make the reported improvements appear more favourable than they truly were. The respondents emphasised that, since the	N	The baseline water quality presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), was determined with reference to several existing datasets, including the EA's long-term monitoring data and data from Portsmouth Water. The Applicant has continued to undertake water quality monitoring at locations in Riders Lane Stream and Hermitage Stream. The results of this sampling are presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The mass balance modelling undertaken by Portsmouth Water was based on initial assumptions on the water quality within Havant Thicket Reservoir. The updated

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		2025 the Applicant's report largely used the same sampling data to establish the baseline, an explanation for any differences from earlier data should have been provided. Moreover, they highlighted that the increase in concentrations of all parameters modelled for Havant Thicket Reservoir and Riders Lane Stream, as shown in Table 4.2, was not discussed in the report—despite being a significant finding—and warned that other unmodelled contaminants could also increase and persist longer in the environment.		modelling presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and its appendices (within Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) uses a more detailed model and is informed by updated assumptions on water quality in the groundwater sources and recycled water. This shows an increase in nitrate and a decrease in ammonia concentrations once Havant Thicket Reservoir becomes operational, and no further change in water quality once water from the WRP is released.
Wider Community	WE298	The respondent stated no assessment on the impact of effluent recycling on the water quality in the wetland was undertaken and queried why this was not modelled. The respondent stated the wetland is a relatively shallow body of water with a greater vulnerability to algal blooms to be considered in the modelling, especially in relation to any change in trophic state, and for parameters which have the potential to adversely impact ecological functions (e.g. Biochemical oxygen demand, dissolved oxygen calcium). There	N	A range of scenarios were considered and assessed against the baseline scenario. The model also simulated water quality in two different basins of Havant Thicket Reservoir – the shallower north basin and the deeper south basin. The four scenarios modelled against the baseline scenario took account of: ▪ Stabilisation effects ▪ Variations in the release of recycled water and spring water inputs and withdrawals from Havant Thicket Reservoir ▪ Operational variations with a very high withdrawal period with concomitant

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		are weirs in the wetland retaining structure close to the proposed position of Havant Thicket Reservoir inlet where recycled effluent will be discharged and the respondent stated with a South Westerly prevailing wind it is inevitable that recycled effluent will disperse into the wetland. The respondent stated section 5.2.14 of the Water Quality Report confirms the potential impact of the bubbler system on water column mixing and phytoplankton growth in marginal areas of Havant Thicket Reservoir was not yet known as modelling was focused on open water areas. The respondent stated this must be considered due it its sensitive ecology.		sizeable decreases in water levels during drought conditions Extended classic phase (i.e. forecast long-term reservoir and withdrawals water quality in the absence of recycled water inputs). Because of its modest size (~1.5 km fetch), the horizontal WQ variability in Havant Thicket Reservoir's main body is forecast to be very low. As described in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), the wetlands were incorporated into the model. The model used a 'levee' function to represent retention structures between the four wetland compartments and the open water. Spillway widths between compartments and from wetlands to Havant Thicket Reservoir were set to one grid cell (20 m), close to the design width of 28 m. However, with the coarse grid (50 m), openings are about twice as wide, likely overestimating horizontal flow. Opening elevations were set to 38.8 m OD between compartments and 38.7 m OD between

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				wetlands and Havant Thicket Reservoir, consistent with the design. Updated modelling that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir.
Wider Community	WE299	Respondent argued that the impact of new contaminants introduced by the effluent recycling such as pesticides, forever chemicals, salinity and metals would be the greatest when the stream flow was at its lowest which was not assessed in the Water Quality Report.	N	Modelling of water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies that would receive compensatory flows has been updated since the Water Quality Report was issued in spring 2025. The updated results are presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling demonstrates that the addition of the High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) would ensure that the operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				in water quality in downstream water bodies that would receive compensatory flows from Havant Thicket Reservoir (i.e., Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour). The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release, presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), followed the EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has, has been provided to the EA for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and against what thresholds. Following receipt of this advice, the assessment will be undertaken and submitted to the EA as part of the environmental permit application required for the Project.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that would be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by the University of Brighton. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output would be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that would be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WE2100	The respondent queried what the range of results for each parameter shown in the figures of the Water Quality Report represent and whether these results were from a range of modelled runs or the range	N	Updated water quality modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies are presented in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume (Document reference 6.2,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		for a number of modelled points within Havant Thicket Reservoir.		DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). An assessment of water quality impacts is provided in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The Environmental Water Quality Report, please refer to Appendix G.2 (Environmental Water Quality Report) shows several “box and whisker” charts (Figures 3-2 to 3-4). These charts show how each water-quality measurement is spread out. The vertical lines (“whiskers”) show the full range of the data. The coloured boxes show the middle half of the results, and the horizontal line inside each box marks the median value. For this report, the median is used instead of the average (mean) because it is less affected by unusual results. This helps make sure that a few extreme readings don't distort the picture of normal water-quality conditions. The vertical lines (whiskers) show the full range of water quality predictions for each receptor.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				It is important to note that the compensation flows modelling presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) was informed by the maximum (i.e. worst case) predictions of water quality discharged from Havant Thicket Reservoir in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE210 1	Respondent stated the impact of change in temperature of the Long Sea Outfall discharge was not adequately considered. The respondent stated the treatment process would change the temperature of the reject water which could have significant impact on algal or other biological growth as well as encourage chemical reactions.	N	The distance between Budds Farm WTW and the LSO is approximately 13km, much of which is under the seabed. There is therefore expected to be very little difference in release and ambient seawater temperatures by the time the flow moves from the WTW to the outfall.
Wider Community	WE210 2	Respondent queried what sedimentation of contamination currently takes place from the effluent discharge plume, what additional sedimentation can be expected during both normal operation and when effluent is more concentrated during	N	Water quality modelling of Eastney LSO for currently permitted parameters has been completed (including plume maps showing the difference in concentrations between the existing release and the release combined with the reject water), and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		drought, whether contaminants of concern accumulating in algae pose a risk when they die and settle on the seabed, if there is a risk of coagulation within the Long Sea Outfall or plume that might cause particles to clump together adding to the sediment load and how the sediment risk has been assessed as there is no reference to this specifically in the Water Quality Report. The respondent additionally stated no consideration has been given to the risk or impact of sedimentation which result from the higher concentrated reject water being discharged which in a drought would be diverted to Havant Thicket Reservoir via the treatment plan from Budds Farm leaving very little water to dilute the reject water from the effluent recycling plant.		Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The consideration of changes to suspended solid concentrations was included as part of this assessment. The reject stream is a liquid stream and no additional chemicals to generate coagulation, will be added prior discharging into the Solent. Moreover, the reject stream will be blended with the residual flows from Budds Farm as a combined liquid stream into the Solent Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) at the LSO with regard to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Therefore, no change is predicted between the sedimentation processes occurring now or in the future when the WRP is in place.
Wider Community	WE2103	Respondent stated storing these liquids on site presents an added risk to the surface water drainage system that is not currently present and not adequately considered in	N	The WRP SuDS system is designed to deal with runoff (rainfall and surface water drainage from slopes) from the increased impermeable area of the WRP. The proposed

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		the report, it is dismissed by indicating that pollution control measures will be adequate to control the risk (page 72 of the Water Quality Report).		WRP surface water SuDS would include a range of control measures such as filter strips, swales and a detention basin, to provide sufficient mitigation for reducing any pollutants entering the surface waters. Potential changes to salinity have been considered through the use of dispersion modelling, as described in ES Appendix 19.12 Water Recycling Plant site Sustainable Drainage System dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The change in salinity due to the SuDS outfall release, when compared with the natural fluctuations in ambient salinity levels throughout the tidal cycle, is predicted to be extremely small. Significant adverse effects to water quality are therefore not anticipated from releases from the WRP SuDS outfall.
Wider Community	WE2104	The respondents stated there was no mention of a phosphate stripper at Appledown Water Treatment Plant. The respondents queried why there was any phosphorous being released, even if within guidelines.	N	Appledown Treatment Plant is not part of the Project. Modelling undertaken since the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP to remove phosphorus and shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. For further information see: - ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) - ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE2105	The respondent suggested that despite controls in place to prevent levels of increased pollution in Langstone Harbour, there is no guarantee these would be effective at stopping the replication of the pollution over the years.	N	Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream, including Langstone Harbour. Updated modelling that includes the HRRM at the WRP shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream of Havant Thicket Reservoir (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Modelling has also been undertaken to examine the impact of runoff from the WRP SuDS to the tidal reach of Hermitage Stream that connects to Langstone Harbour. The proposed WRP surface water SuDS would include a range of control measures such as filter strips, swales and a detention basin, to provide sufficient mitigation for reducing any pollutants entering the surface waters. The change in salinity due to the SuDS outfall release, when compared with the natural fluctuations in ambient salinity levels throughout the tidal cycle, is predicted to be extremely small. Significant adverse effects to water quality are therefore not anticipated from releases from the WRP SuDS outfall. In the Solent, water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters from the Eastney Long Sea Outfall has been completed. The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance. Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) at the LSO with regard to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant. With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. This means that releases from the LSO will not affect Langstone Harbour. See the following appendix reports for more detail: ▪ ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6 ▪ ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.8 Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project Eastney Long Sea Outfall - CORMIX Modelling for Chemicals Screened in via the Surface Water Risk Assessment Process, Volume II, (Document Reference 6.2, Volume 6.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				- ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document Reference 6.2, Volume 6). - ES Appendix 19.12 Water Recycling Plant site Sustainable Drainage System dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document Reference 6.2, Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE2106	Respondents suggested thousands of contaminants would be released in the final effluent from Budds Farm but that the Water Quality Report only considered a small portion of these. The respondents queried how phosphorous would be reduced as no clear plan was evident.	N	Modelling undertaken since the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir, including total phosphorus, would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters from the Eastney LSO has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA (2016, updated

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) at the LSO with regard to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream or Langstone Harbour.
Wider Community	WE2107	A respondent noted the advanced wastewater treatment process removes the majority of impurities in the water and was therefore surprised by the modelled results of higher levels of phosphates when these can readily be removed by adjusting the four advanced treatment processes. The respondent stated the concentration of wastewater was not as high as one would get from a desalination plant and the wastewater flow can also be dispersed over the length of the outfall pipe spreading the volume and increasing dispersion area.	N	The recycled water would be subject to High Rejection Rate Membranes (HRRM) treatment prior to release into Havant Thicket Reservoir. Updated modelling (ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) that includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. Model outputs (ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) show that the differences (and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant. With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as Langstone Harbour or the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream.
Wider Community	WE2108	The respondents argued most of the contaminants of concern, including pharmaceuticals and forever chemicals, had not been considered. Only seven are stated within the Water Quality Report which pose a risk to the environment and that additional contaminants would arise in the reject water from the WRP that was not adequately considered in terms of risk to the marine environment. The respondents also stated the removal of the phosphates	N	The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the EA's guidance which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. The distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		would not address the other effects for the discharge from the recycled effluent.		For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has been provided to the EA for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and against what thresholds. Following receipt of this advice, the assessment will be undertaken and submitted to the EA as part of the environmental permit application required for the Project. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WE2109	The respondent argued that there was no consideration of the effects of the new chemicals such as disinfectants and the by-products that would be introduced by the recycling process.	N	The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has been provided to the EA for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and against what thresholds. Following receipt of this advice, the assessment will be undertaken and submitted to the EA as part of the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				environmental permit application required for the Project. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WE2110	A respondent stated there was not enough focus on the recycled effluent water was going into a unique environment and the same attention that was being given to chalk streams was not being given to a chalk stream fed reservoir. Another respondent objected to the Applicant increasing bills for a system which was 'dangerous' to customers.	N	Water quality in the groundwater bodies that supply the reservoir have also been assessed. A full assessment of impacts to the water environment are assessed in detail in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE2111	Respondents were concerned about the flood risks of the Project especially in relation to Budds Farm, the WRP, Pipeline Sections A and B and the Havant Thicket Reservoir. A further respondent stated that a WRP was primarily used in countries where there was significant drought. Other respondents were concerned about the safety of their property and also damage or destruction of trees and shrubs they maintain.	N	A Flood Risk Assessment for the Project is presented in ES Appendix 19.1 Flood Risk Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The FRA includes allowances for climate change. A detailed CEMP will be produced and submitted for approval in accordance with the corresponding requirement in Schedule 2 to the DCO. This includes preparation of a Construction Drainage Plan to manage the quality and quantity of construction stage drainage. Measures required to be included in the Construction Drainage Plan are set out in the main body of the Outline Construction

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The FRA concludes that during operation the Project will not result in any loss of floodplain storage capacity or reduce floodplain conveyance. The FRA also concludes that Project will not result in an increase in the volume or rate of surface water runoff during operation. Vegetation removed to facilitate construction will be reinstated in line with the reinstatement strategy set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7) which is informed by the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and hedgerow surveys.
Wider Community	WE2112	The respondent stated that it was surprising that only a limited range of contaminants were assessed, including some found in output water from the 2023 trial recycling plant at Budds Farm, which included pharmaceuticals, forever chemicals, pesticides and volatile organic compounds. The respondent argued that there was not enough consideration of whether the water	N	The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the EA's guidance which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		treatment chemicals and disinfection by-products would linger in the water and would have an impact on water chemistry. The respondent thought that the impact on the environment of the potential contaminants should have been assessed in more detail.		chemicals has been provided to the EA for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and against what thresholds. Following receipt of this advice, the assessment will be undertaken and submitted to the EA as part of the environmental permit application required for the Project. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WE2113	The respondent asked for more research on the impact of salinity and temperature changes in relation to Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream.	N	A range of water quality variables for Havant Thicket Reservoir were modelled, including temperature. In the model, water temperature data of sewage effluent was provided by the Applicant, and Portsmouth Water provided spring water temperature data. The model also simulates salinity. Modelling undertaken since the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. The temperature of compensatory flows from Havant Thicket Reservoir was explicitly modelled (ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) as it mixed with the ambient receiving water, to show the change in temperature of water throughout Riders Lane Stream and the wider receiving water bodies due to release of water with and without the input of the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir. Temperature data were derived from the Havant Reservoir Modelling study completed by Portsmouth Water, where both average winter and summer values were used for this dispersion modelling study to understand the seasonal variations in the impact on surrounding water quality. Salinity was included in Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality the withdrawal water quality envelope for selected determinands and defined as the range of the maximum

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				and minimum simulated values across all scenarios in this investigation. Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters from the Eastney LSO has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) at the LSO with regard to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant. Note that with respect to temperature, the distance between Budds Farm WTW and the LSO is approximately 13km, much of which is under the seabed. There is therefore expected to be very little difference in release and ambient seawater temperatures by the time the flow moves from the WTW to the outfall.
Wider Community	WE2114	The respondent questioned what had been researched in relation to temperature change and salinity. The respondent stated that Portsmouth University research had	N	A range of water quality variables for Havant Thicket Reservoir were modelled, including temperature. In the model, water temperature data of sewage effluent was provided by the Applicant, and Portsmouth Water provided spring water temperature data. The model

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		discovered that contaminants found in sewage could accumulate in algae.		also simulates salinity. Salinity was included in Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality the withdrawal water quality envelope for selected determinants and defined as the range of the maximum and minimum simulated values across all scenarios in this investigation. The temperature of compensatory flows from Havant Thicket Reservoir was explicitly modelled (ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) as it mixed with the ambient receiving water, to show the change in temperature of water throughout Riders Lane Stream and the wider receiving water bodies due to release of water with and without the input of the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir. Temperature data were derived from the Havant Reservoir Modelling study completed by Portsmouth Water, where both average winter and summer values were used for this dispersion modelling study to understand the seasonal variations in the impact on surrounding water quality. Modelling undertaken since the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation includes the use of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the WFD Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. The addition of the HRRM would avoid the accumulation of phosphorus within Havant Thicket Reservoir and prevent Havant Thicket Reservoir switching to a eutrophic state (and the risk of algal blooms) with the addition of recycled water. As stated in ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) there is a degree of predictive confidence in regards to the forecasted total phytoplankton biomass as three generic groups (i.e. green algae, blue-green algae, diatoms) have been configured into the modelling framework with productivity characteristics that span typical seasonal variations in water temperatures and water quality in temperate lakes and reservoir temperatures and water quality in temperate lakes and reservoirs.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm Water Treatment Works (WTW) (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that would be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output would be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that would be in place at the WRP.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Bioaccumulation has been considered in the assessment of likely significant effects in the ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Water quality modelling of Eastney LSO for currently consented parameters has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This demonstrates that the changes in concentrations between the current release and future release with the WRP in place are insignificant. Therefore, any effects associated with the pathways outlined in this issue concerning the Eastney LSO, if present, would be similar to those occurring now, i.e. are part of the baseline on which the Project is assessed against. The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA's guidance for surface water pollution risk assessment which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. Modelling using the EA's recommended tool CORMIX was then

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				undertaken to look at distance to EQS which was calculated at 1-2m from the Eastney LSO indicating rapid dilution at the Eastney LSO location. Please note that the modelling was undertaken on a number of flow scenarios and potential contaminant concentrations associated with membrane efficiency. A scenario was assessed that considered complete removal of the parameter via the membrane (i.e. all discharged to the reject wastewater stream) to provide a sensitivity analysis regarding dilution at the Eastney LSO location. Full details are provided in Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE2115	The respondent argued that more research was needed about the effect of salinity and temperature changes in Havant Thicket Reservoir, streams, harbours and sea.	N	A range of water quality variables for Havant Thicket Reservoir were modelled, including temperature. In the model, water temperature data of sewage effluent was provided by the Applicant, and Portsmouth Water provided spring water temperature data. The model also simulates salinity. Water quality modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir has been completed, and the results are presented and assessed in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6),

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Modelling undertaken since the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir. The temperature of compensatory flows from Havant Thicket Reservoir was explicitly modelled (ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) as it mixed with the ambient receiving water, to show the change in temperature of water throughout Riders Lane Stream and the wider receiving water bodies due to release of water with and without the input of the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir. Temperature data were derived from the Havant Reservoir Modelling study completed by Portsmouth Water, where

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				both average winter and summer values were used for this dispersion modelling study to understand the seasonal variations in the impact on surrounding water quality. Salinity was included in Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality the withdrawal water quality envelope for selected determinants and defined as the range of the maximum and minimum simulated values across all scenarios in this investigation.
Wider Community	WE2116	The respondent noted that the suggestion from the Applicant seemed to be that the water quality in any of the water bodies impacted could be allowed to deteriorate as a result of the effluent recycling plant discharges, as long as they can meet a threshold level for a small number of parameters. The respondent stated that it was not acceptable to only consider parameters with a water quality standard threshold, as many other contaminants could pose a risk to flora and fauna.	N	Water quality modelling has been undertaken to understand the impact of blending recycled and spring water on water quality and aquatic ecology in Havant Thicket Reservoir, as well as potential water quality effects on downstream water bodies receiving flows from Havant Thicket Reservoir (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour), and the Solent (releases or reject water from the water recycling process from Eastney LSO. Outputs from the detailed water quality modelling and assessment of effects is fully reported in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), submitted with the DCO application.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Water quality modelling of Havant Thicket Reservoir has been completed, and the results are presented and assessed in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, ES, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Modelling undertaken since the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP and shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. The results of water quality modelling are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Updated modelling that includes the HRRM at the WRP shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters from the Eastney LSO has been completed, and the results are presented in Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA's guidance the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling – Chemicals, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Model outputs show that the differences in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operation Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as Langstone Harbour or the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that would be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 214% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output would be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given that the pilot plant data does not represent the full treatment process that would be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WE2117	The respondent questioned that given there were no existing water recycling plants in the UK, was the Applicant making assumptions about the lack of impact to the Hermitage, Langstone Harbour and the Solent. The respondent stated that the outflow at Budds Farm WTW routinely discharged untreated sewerage into Langstone Harbour.	N	Impacts downstream of Havant Thicket Reservoir on Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour have been modelled and assessed in detail. Impacts of releases from the SuDS outfall at the WRP and from the LSO in the Solent have also been modelled in detail. The reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream, including

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Langstone Harbour. Updated modelling that includes the HRRM at the WRP shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream of Havant Thicket Reservoir (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour). Modelling has also been undertaken to examine the impact of runoff from the WRP SuDS to the tidal reach of Hermitage Stream that connects to Langstone Harbour. The proposed WRP surface water SuDS would include a range of control measures such as filter strips, swales and a detention basin, to provide sufficient mitigation for reducing any pollutants entering the surface waters. The change in salinity due to the SuDS outfall release, when compared with the natural fluctuations in ambient salinity levels throughout the tidal cycle, is predicted to be extremely small. Significant adverse effects to water quality are therefore not anticipated from releases from the WRP SuDS outfall. In the Solent, water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters from the Eastney Long Sea Outfall has been

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				completed. The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit guidance. Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) at the LSO with regard to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant. With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. This means that releases from the LSO will not affect Langstone Harbour. See the following appendix reports for more detail: - ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) - ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				- ES Appendix 19.8 Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project Eastney Long Sea Outfall - CORMIX Modelling for Chemicals Screened in via the Surface Water Risk Assessment Process, Volume II, (Document Reference 6.2, Volume 6). - ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document Reference 6.2, Volume 6)
Wider Community	WE2118	The respondent noted concerns about the water quality modelling presented for the Solent.	N	Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters from the Eastney Long Sea Outfall (LSO) has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling - Chemicals, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations assessment,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as Langstone Harbour or the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	WE2119	The respondent asked if the Applicant was using information obtained from Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) effluent recycling trial plant to inform the studies on the impact to the Solent, and if they are not, then why not.	N	Information is available online regarding the performance of the water recycling technology The Applicant generated a mass balance calculation investigating the efficacy of removal, through the full advanced treatment process, for compounds with an Environmental Quality Standards (EQS). The mass balance calculation included removal rates from the pilot study and available literature values for compounds that have an EQS but not tested via the pilot. EQS were published in 2022 and the pilot trial ended around that timeframe. The output from a H1 screening assessment of the reject stream blended with Budds Farm flow to be discharged into the Solent was used as basis for the modelling work conducted in the Solent. For more details of the Solent Modelling see: - ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6 - ES Appendix 19.8 Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project Eastney Long Sea Outfall - CORMIX Modelling for Chemicals Screened in via

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				the Surface Water Risk Assessment Process, Volume II, (Document Reference 6.2, Volume 6.
Wider Community	WE2120	A respondent questioned that if the Applicant are using the effluent recycling plant manufacturers data on the concentration of contaminants in the reject water, was its data from a comparable sewer catchment with much industrial and hospital waste? Another respondent argued that there was no clear evidence to support the claim that contaminants would not increase close to the outfall and noted that there was no plan to improve the dispersal of reject water at the outfall.	N	The full-scale design was based on a combination of pilot trial data and literature values for removal rates for various contaminants listed in the EA Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) compounds list. Therefore, there is no direct relationship between the sewer catchment composition and the Applicant's risk assessment based, using the EA's EQS data. Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters from the Eastney LSO has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA's guidance and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling - Chemicals, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				6.1, DCO Volume 6), and Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream, or Langstone Harbour.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	WE212 1	A respondent requested clarification as to why the reject was in the Water Quality Report was 3 or 4 times more concentrated than the existing Long Sea Outfall (LSO) discharge. The respondent added that that many contaminants would be in higher concentration in the reject water than anticipated. Another respondent stated that they thought the Applicant would be spending a lot of money to justify further pollution and substandard water treatment. The respondent stated that the Applicant dismissed the risk of contaminants from reject water discharge reaching Langstone Harbour via the Solent. However, they noted that the modelling period may have been too short to fully assess this risk. Past studies of the existing discharge showed that tidal cycles could carry pollutants over large distances, from Southampton Water to Bracklesham Bay, with some pollutants entering the harbours. Overall, the respondent stated that the Applicant had downplayed concerns about pollution	N	It is acknowledged that Reverse Osmosis (RO) processes produce a reject stream that contains a greater concentration of the contaminants separated out from the process. However, given these compounds were present in the original source water, the overall load (concentration x flow) discharging into the Solent remains relatively unchanged. Modelling simulations of discharges from Eastney LSO for currently consented parameters were set to a duration of one month, to cover several tidal cycles (to assess potential accumulation of the discharged pollutants) and various wind conditions were included in sensitivity tests to identify the worst wind conditions. Modelling for the chemical parameters was undertaken using an EA approved modelling tool CORMIX. Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters from the Eastney Long Sea Outfall has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA's

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		reaching Langstone Harbour, despite evidence indicating that discharged plumes could travel significant distances due to tidal movements. Respondents considered that reject water from the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) was three to four times more contaminated than the Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Work (WTW)'s effluent, yet the report, at section 3.3.17, claimed there was no significant parameter increase, which respondents expressed doubt toward.		guidance and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling - Chemicals, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream or, Langstone Harbour.
Wider Community	WE212 2	A respondent stated that the forecasted decrease in the predicted concentration of all 7 contaminants which had been considered in the modelling was highly suspect and could not be believed because the reject water would be several times more concentrated than the existing Long Sea Outfall (LSO) discharge. A further respondent stated that they thought there was inadequate information as to why there would be no significant effects – new contaminants of concern in the reject water from recycling including treatment and cleaning chemicals must be considered.	N	The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA guidance Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit. This work has been updated since the Spring Consultation document was issued due to additional data becoming available. The distance to the Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) for the parameters assessed has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. The consultation material provided an interim report of emerging findings. Detailed reports are provided in the following appendix documents: ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) ES Appendix 19.8 Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project Eastney Long Sea Outfall - CORMIX Modelling for Chemicals Screened in via the Surface Water Risk Assessment Process, Volume II, (Document Reference 6.2, Volume 6). The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by the University of Brighton. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given that the pilot plant data does not represent the full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WE212 3	The respondent stated there was no information provided on what would happen to the sludge from the effluent recycling plant and where this would be discharged. The respondent queried if the effluent sludge would be discharged into the Solent, and how and when the impacts of this would be assessed. The respondent noted that more sludge would be generated as a result of the proposed additional phosphate treatment.	N	The proposed treatment train in the reference design for DCO submission does not produce a solid stream and sludge management would not be required.
Wider Community	WE212 4	The respondent stated that the information surrounding the water environment in relation to Intermediate Pumping Station E had not been sufficient to make comments, but it was acknowledged that potential	N	Impacts to the water environment and from all components of the Project are assessed in detail in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		environmental impacts must be recognised and minimised.		assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE212 5	A respondent stated that in their opinion, the Water Quality Report dismissed the potential risks to water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir, Langstone Harbour and The Solent without adequately considering all associated risks. The respondent argued that this oversight led to an incomplete and unconvincing analysis which undermined the credibility of the project's environmental assessments including the impact of effluent recycling on water quality, and biodiversity risks. Another respondent noted that Portsmouth Water previously committed to there being no detrimental effect on the benefits of the original spring fed reservoir, yet any deterioration in water quality would represent a detrimental impact from the effluent recycling process, which is likely in turn to have adverse impacts on Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream ecology. A respondent referred to the 2011 and 2022 Water Quality Reports which confirmed the loss of nitrate benefit to	N	While the respondent refers to a '2011 and 2022 Water Quality Report', the Applicant has not been able to identify a document of this description within the Project evidence base, and it was not produced as part of the current Project. The Applicant considers that any such report, if it relates to earlier iterations of Havant Thicket Reservoir investigations undertaken by third parties, it would pre-date the current Project design and assessment framework. Nevertheless, the Applicant has had regard to the matters raised by the respondent and has responded based on the information presented within the current Environmental Water Quality assessments supporting the Project. The Environmental Water Quality Report provided was interim document of emerging findings. Potential impacts on water quality have been modelled in detail in the ES appendix documents and assessed in the detail in the ES. A summary is provided below and full references given. Modelling undertaken since the Environmental Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Langstone Harbour and the benefit from the classic reservoir operation. The respondent argued that in their view, the Solent Model was suspect as it suggested that contaminants in reject water discharged via the Long Sea Outfall (LSO) would not reach Langstone Harbour.		includes the use of a High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) Directions. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration in water quality Havant Thicket Reservoir. Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. The results of this process are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Updated modelling that includes the HRRM at the WRP shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters from the Eastney LSO has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA's guidance and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling - Chemicals, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with regards to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour or The Solent.
Wider Community	WE2126	The respondents raised concerns surrounding the possibility of damage to Langstone harbour if a burst of the pipeline occurred over Broadmarsh. The respondents stated that this risk had not been considered in the Water Quality Environmental Report. A respondent quoted the Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) Report Chapter 9 (Section 9.8.12) which highlighted the risk of a blow-out occurring during the drilling or micro-tunnelling process below the Hermitage Stream. The respondent acknowledged that this could lead to pollutants and/or sediments	N	In the context of the historical landfill at Broadmarsh, the design of piled foundations and deep structures has been informed by the Outline Foundations Works Risk Assessments (Document reference 7.4, DCO Volume 7) undertaken in accordance with relevant EA published guidance. These have been prepared and submitted with the DCO and would be developed further by the Contractor, once appointed, and subject to further consultation with relevant stakeholders (e.g. the EA, NE, Lead Local Flood Authority and Portsmouth Water) post-DCO consent. In addition, mitigation measures in the Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7)

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		travelling downstream into Langstone Harbour. The respondent was concerned that if the drilling equipment was broken off under the stream, it could require direct excavation for their retrieval which would likely generate further risk of pollution and/or sediment runoff.		would be carried forward and developed into a detailed CEMP(s), which would be produced by the Contractor, once appointed, prior to the commencement of construction of the Project. The Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) includes measures to deal with potential pollution, including from drilling works: A Drilling Fluid Management Plan (DFMP) would be developed by the Contractor, once appointed, to document how risks of any fluid breakouts would be reduced, and in the event of an outbreak from drilling or tunnelling works during construction how any breakout would be managed and mitigated, to reduce environmental impacts. During operation of the Project solation valves would on the pipeline to prevent flooding. Further mitigation for the risk of flooding and pipe rupture during the operation of the Project is secured in the Operational Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7). It contains information on the formation of incident

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				classification and escalation protocols in accordance with the Pipelines Safety Regulations 1996, containment measures where reasonably practicable and coordination with the emergency services.
Wider Community	WE2127	The respondent suggested that there appeared to be important areas that the report did not address in relation to Langstone Harbour, including the reduced nitrate benefit to Langstone Harbour if the effluent recycling was to take place.	N	Regarding nutrients, an assessment of the implications for the Project on nutrient loads in the Solent and River Itchen nutrient neutrality catchments is provided in ES Appendix 19.7 Nutrient assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). A draft methodology for the Nutrient Assessment was issued to the Technical Working Group (TWG) for comment in advance of the assessment. The findings of the Nutrient Assessment are presented to the TWG through to DCO submission. The Nutrient Assessment confirms that the Project would be compliant with the Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, with regard to Natural England's (NE) nutrient neutrality guidance. The Nutrient Assessment concludes that, on the basis of nutrient management measures embedded within the Project, no additional mitigation would be required to achieve nutrient neutrality during the construction and operational phases.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The mass balance modelling undertaken by Portsmouth Water was based on initial assumptions on the water quality within Havant Thicket Reservoir. The updated modelling presented in the Environment Statement (ES) and its appendices uses a more detailed model and is informed by updated assumptions on water quality in the groundwater sources and recycled water. This shows an increase in nitrate and a decrease in ammonia concentrations in Langstone Harbour once Havant Thicket Reservoir becomes operational, and no further change in water quality once water from the WRP is released. For further details see: ▪ ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ▪ ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment,

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Consultation Report Appendix G – Statutory Spring 2025 Consultation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE2128	Respondents stated that they had no further comments relating to the updated water quality information when asked on the Spring 2025 feedback form.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Wider Community	WE2129	The respondent stated that discharge of reject water from Eastney Long Sea Outfall (LSO) can reach Langstone Harbour. The respondent stated that the Water Quality Report dismissed the risk of the plume of reject water from the Eastney LSO reaching Langstone Harbour but the period over which the modelling of the plume was undertaken was not clear.	N	Modelling simulations of discharges from Eastney LSO for currently consented parameters were set to a duration of one month, to cover several tidal cycles (to assess potential accumulation of the discharged pollutants) and various wind conditions were included in sensitivity tests to identify the worst wind conditions. Modelling for the chemical parameters was undertaken using an EA approved modelling tool CORMIX. Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters from the Eastney LSO has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA's (2016, updated 2026) guidance Surface water pollution risk

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				assessment for environmental permit and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling - Chemicals, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) at the LSO with regard to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream or Langstone Harbour.
Wider Community	WE2130	A respondent stated that the Water Quality Environmental Report dismissed the risk of the plume of reject water from the Eastney LSO reaching Langstone Harbour. However, the period over which the modelling of the plume which had been undertaken was not clear.	N	Modelling simulations of discharges from Eastney LSO for currently consented parameters were set to a duration of one month, to cover several tidal cycles (to assess potential accumulation of the discharged pollutants) and various wind conditions were included in sensitivity tests to identify the worst wind conditions. Modelling for the chemical parameters was undertaken using an EA approved modelling tool CORMIX. Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters from the Eastney Long Sea Outfall has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessment of chemicals within the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				release has been undertaken in line with EA's guidance and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling - Chemicals, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Model outputs show that the differences at the LSO with regard to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as Langstone Harbour or the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream.
Wider Community	WE213 1	The respondent stated that previous modelling of the dispersion plume from the Eastney Long Sea Outfall (LSO) had shown that the plume did extend as far as both Langstone Harbour and Chichester Harbour. The respondent added two images of plume dispersal support their point. The respondent also noted that the Environment Agency (EA) considered Langstone and Chichester Harbour to be one body of water.	N	Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters from the Eastney LSO has been completed, and the results are presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with EA's guidance and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling - Chemicals, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and Es Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Model outputs show that the differences at the LSO with regard to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour or Chichester Harbour.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	WE213 2	The respondent noted that the assessment point for impacts in Langstone Harbour, as shown in Figure 3-1 (page 24), is located well south of where the mixed compensation flow from Havant Thicket Reservoir would discharge into the northern part of the harbour. This location is at a point where multiple channels converge at low tide, resulting in more diluted water that may not accurately represent conditions further north, where the discharge could have a more significant impact. The respondent suggested that the Applicant might justify the choice of this assessment point because baseline data are available there for comparison. However, the respondent also indicated that the assessment point could have been positioned further north. The respondent critiques the Environment Agency's (EA) approach, pointing out deficiencies in the spatial extent, frequency of sampling, and parameters tested, which collectively mean that the data set is insufficient to establish a robust baseline for assessing potential changes.	N	The site in Langstone Harbour was specifically selected for assessment because it is also used as a water quality monitoring location by the EA, and there is therefore considerable baseline data available for this location against which model results could be compared. This site is the most northerly (and the closest to the tidal Hermitage Stream) of the monitoring locations used by the EA to classify the status of the Langstone Harbour water body under the Water Environment Regulations (WER) and provides a long-term record of water quality going back to 2000. Although the degree of predicted change was calculated for the full domain of the hydraulic model, the absence of detailed baseline water quality data meant that concentrations could not be calculated in the same way as those presented for the EA's monitoring sites. For further details see: - ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). - ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE2133	Respondents queried the data sets and modelling used to assess potential impacts on Langstone Harbour. A respondent stated that the assessment point for Langstone Harbour could have been further north with a further having stated that deficiencies in the spatial extent, frequency of sampling and parameters tested by the Environment Agency (EA) meant that there was not an adequate data set to provide a robust baseline against which any potential changes could be assessed. A respondent outlined that only monthly data has been collected by the EA, and they have not collected data in the months of March, April, October and November and added that monthly data would not	N	The site in Langstone Harbour was specifically selected for assessment because it is also used as a water quality monitoring location by the EA, and there is therefore considerable baseline data available for this location against which model results could be compared. This site is the most northerly (and the closest to the tidal Hermitage Stream) of the monitoring locations used by the EA to classify the status of the Langstone Harbour water body under the Water Environment Regulations (WER) and provides a long-term record of water quality going back to 2000. The EA minoring data is used to determine the status of the water body and therefore robust for assessing potential changes in water quality. Although the degree of predicted change was calculated for the full domain of the hydraulic model, the absence of detailed baseline water quality data meant that concentrations could

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		provide an adequate assessment through time. The respondents also queried the reasoning for selecting water recycling at Budds Farm as the preferred option in 2020/21, and why did the Applicant not start collecting a robust baseline data set for Langstone Harbour and the Solent.		not be calculated in the same way as those presented for the EA's monitoring site. Water quality data can display considerable variability, depending upon parameters such as river flows, precipitation patterns and activities within the catchment. Monthly sampling is therefore adopted as a best-practice approach to remove short-term variability whilst allowing longer-term trends to be easily compared. Budds Farm WTW was selected as the source water for Water Recycling due to the availability (or quantity) of high quality treated effluent being wasted through release into the Solent. This treated effluent is not required to support environmental flows in the sea. The change in environmental legislation in February 2022 prompted the need to sample for an updated list of compounds with an Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) value. Sampling of the Solent commenced to ensure appropriate baseline data was used for the environmental risk assessment (H1 screening). Further details of modelling work undertaken can be found in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling – Chemicals, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	WE2134	Respondents raised concerns over the potential impact on Langstone Harbour from the reject water from the water recycling plant. The respondent stated that the reject water from Eastney Long Sea Outfall could reach Langstone and Chichester Harbour, as modelling had shown the plume could stay in the area for days. The respondent added that the cumulative effects of the reject water had not been considered, and it was not clear how the Applicant would prevent the reject water dispersing into the harbour when the storm water tanks were full.	N	Water quality modelling of Eastney LSO has been completed (including plume maps), and the results are presented in Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling – Chemicals, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) Modelling simulations of discharges from Eastney LSO were set to a duration of one month, to cover several tidal cycles (to assess potential accumulation of the discharged pollutants) and various wind conditions were included in sensitivity tests to identify the worst wind conditions. Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. This means that cumulative effects are unlikely. Given the scale of the predicted changes, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as Langstone Harbour, Chichester Harbour or the tidally influenced Hermitage Stream. The WRP reject stream is not influenced by the status of the storm tanks as it's downstream of the Final Effluent release point and will use the LSO.
Wider Community	WE2135	Respondents raised concerns that any leaks in the proposed pipeline between Budds Farm and the water recycling plant could spill over the landfill and would risk the harbour being contaminated.	N	In the context of the historical landfill at Broadmarsh, the design of piled foundations and deep structures has been informed by the Outline Foundations Works Risk Assessments (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) that has been prepared and submitted with the DCO application. As set

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		It was also perceived that the plant discharged far too much pollution into Langstone Harbour, and investment would be needed to protect the marine environment rather than being used as a source of water supply to the Havant Thicket Reservoir. A respondent added that expenditure on the water recycling plant should be devoted to improving its capacity to avoid a discharge of sewage into Langstone Harbour, thus reducing the environmental impact.		out in the Outline Foundation Works Risk Assessment (Document reference 7.4, DCO Volume 7), the Contractor, once appointed would undertake detailed Foundation Works Risk Assessments (FWRA) in line with CL:AIRE's Piling and Penetrative Ground Improvement Methods on Land Affected by Contamination: Guidance on Pollution Prevention. In addition, mitigation measures in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) would be carried forward and developed into a detailed CEMP, which would be produced by the Contractor, once appointed, prior to the commencement of construction of the Project. The CEMP includes measures to deal with potential pollution, including from drilling works: A Drilling Fluid Management Plan (DFMP) would be developed by the Contractor, once appointed, to document how risks of any fluid breakouts would be reduced, and in the event of an outbreak from drilling or tunnelling works during construction how any breakout

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				would be managed and mitigated, to reduce environmental impacts. For operational purposes the Operational Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7) includes for the Contractor, once appointed, to prepare an Emergency Response Plan for the operation of the Project to include measures relating to pipe rupture. This will include: ▪ Incident classification and escalation protocols will be prepared in accordance with the Pipelines Safety Regulations 1996. ▪ communication and coordination procedures with emergency services and measures to prioritise public safety both in the immediate pipeline rupture vicinity and the overall system. ▪ environmental containment measures. It will set out communication and coordination procedures with the Environment Agency on implementation of containment measures and strategies, where reasonably practicable, including to prevent the spread of Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				indicate the procedure for controlling release events, including timely notification and communication with relevant emergency services, regulators and local authorities, in accordance with agreed incident response and escalation protocols. Formal incident reporting will be undertaken following initial response and stabilisation of the event. Water quality modelling of the changes in currently consented parameters from the Eastney LSO has been completed, and the results are presented in Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The assessment of chemicals within the release has been undertaken in line with and the output is presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling – Chemicals, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The modelling results were used to support the assessments presented in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant. With respect to chemicals, the distance to the Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. Given the scale of the predicted changes for the currently consented parameters and distance to EQS for the chemical parameters screened in, the addition of the reject water to the existing release would not result in any changes to water quality and changes would not extend into connected water bodies such as Langstone Harbour.
Wider Community	WE213 6	The respondent stated that the location of the WRP being on the Broadmarsh Landfill was considered a risk as it could result in major disturbance of the landfill and the	N	In the context of the historical landfill at Broadmarsh, details of the proposed foundation works for the WRP are provided within the Outline Foundation Works Risk Assessment (Document reference 7.4, DCO Volume 7) which covers the WRP, AGP and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		possibility of contaminants leaching into the harbour. The respondent stated that these, nor the pollution risk had been adequately assessed. The respondent also raised concern regarding the risk of contaminants running into the Solent and reaching Langstone Harbour, and the cumulative impact that would occur in Langstone and Chichester Harbour. The respondent noted that if the scheme were to be accepted, the reverse osmosis plant should certainly not be sited on what was considered a derelict, toxic industrial waste dump as the site was stated to be too close to existing water channels and Langstone harbour. The respondent suggested piling to the depths required would cause extensive risk of disastrous pollution and that the bi- product of the process would be unacceptable.		trenchless crossings as well as tunnels and shafts. The Outline Foundation Works Risk Assessment (Document reference 7.4, DCO Volume 7) would serve to manage potential risks and ensure appropriate mitigation measures are implemented to reduce the potential impacts on Langstone Harbour, the Solent and Chichester Harbour as result of the migration of contaminants. Detailed Foundation Works Risk Assessments would be developed by the Contractor, once appointed post-consent in line with CL:AIRE's Piling and Penetrative Ground Improvement Methods on Land Affected by Contamination: Guidance on Pollution Prevention. In addition, mitigation measures in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) would be carried forward and developed into a detailed CEMP, which would be produced by the Contractor, once appointed prior to the commencement of construction of the Project. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) includes measures to deal

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				with potential pollution, including from drilling works: A Drilling Fluid Management Plan (DFMP) would be developed by the Contractor, once appointed, to document how risks of any fluid breakouts would be reduced, and in the event of an outbreak from drilling or tunnelling works during construction how any breakout would be managed and mitigated, to reduce environmental impacts. In addition to the above, a range of tertiary mitigation measures would be adopted to manage the effects on controlled water receptors during the operation of the Project, as set out in the Operational Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7). This includes the development of task specific risk assessments and method statements by those conducting any required maintenance works during the operational phase, as well as the development of an Emergency Response Plan (or similar) to mitigation potential impacts from an uncontrolled release of hazardous materials which may impact upon controlled water receptors.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Havant Thicket Reservoir model includes a predicted water quality envelope for compensatory flows released downstream. The results of this process are presented in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream.
Wider Community	WE2137	The respondent stated that Section 3.3.9 of the Water Quality Environmental Report confirmed that the screening was due to be updated and that that could change the parameters screened into the assessment, confirming that what risk had been presented in the report would likely be inadequate to assess the risk.	N	The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). The screening assessment has been updated since the Environmental Water Quality Report for the Spring 2025 Consultation as a result of additional baseline data in the Solent being available. For chemicals which do not have EQS (e.g. pharmaceuticals), monitoring data for these chemicals has, has been provided to the EA for consideration regarding how these chemicals should be assessed and against what thresholds. Following receipt of this advice, the assessment will be undertaken

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				and submitted to the EA as part of the environmental permit application required for the Project. The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that will be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output will be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				full treatment process that will be in place at the WRP.
Wider Community	WE2138	The respondents stated that the screening process information had not been provided and must be published in the public domain to allow public scrutiny. The respondents also suggested a robust risk assessment of the sewer catchment to Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works must be published to show that all contaminants of concern in the output water and concentrated reject water stream had been considered. This would also include radioactive contaminants. It was also stated that there had been inadequate consideration of risk of treatment chemicals and disinfection by-products being discharged into Havant Thicket Reservoir and the Solent. It was added that new chemicals would be introduced to the immediate water environment including Havant Thicket Reservoir, stream catchments and marine environment.	N	The assessment process for the consideration of chemicals in the release followed the EA (2016, updated 2026) Surface water pollution risk assessment for environmental permit guidance, which requires a number of screening tests to see which chemicals are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS). Where this was the case, the parameter was carried forward for modelling in line with this guidance. The Applicant conducted a catchment study for Budds Farm WTW using crude influent and final effluent from the facility. The sampling exercise included testing for contaminants of emerging concern as well as a host of compounds based on the sewer catchment (trade, domestic, cess). This data has been submitted to the EA and the Applicant would be given an appropriate discharge permit. The output of these tests is provided in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling – Chemicals, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of monitoring of a wide range of Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the final treated effluent from Budds Farm WTW (i.e., a representation of influent water quality to the WRP) and water treated in its pilot treatment plant at Budds Farm WTW. The pilot plant included a Full Advanced Treatment (FAT) process, comprising integrated membranes followed by an ultraviolet and advanced oxidation process, but did not include the granular activated carbon (GAC) and remineralisation processes that would be present within the WRP. Because some contaminants would also be removed by the GAC process, the results from the pilot plant therefore represent an underestimate of the performance of the full WRP and are therefore considered to be the worst case. Further information can be found in an independent review of the recycling pilot plant performance produced by Mayor-Smith (2024) Reflections on Water Recycling Pilot Plant Performance. The results of the investigation into pilot plant performance indicate that the FAT process resulted in a considerable increase in water quality, with the concentration of CECs decreasing after passing through the pilot plant. Over 60% of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				the CECs measured in the WRP influent decreased to below the limits of detection in the recycled water that had passed through the WRP, with the largest reductions identified for a range of pharmaceuticals, personal care products and pesticides. This suggests that releases from the WRP into Havant Thicket Reservoir and downstream water bodies (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour) are unlikely to contain the full suite of CECs measured by the Applicant or independently recorded in Langstone Harbour (Ford and Ginley, 2024. Insights into PFAS contaminants before and after sewage discharges into a marine protected harbour; Uhlhorn et al., 2025, Chemical profiling of surface water and biota in protected marine harbours impacted by combined sewer overflows) and that any CECs remaining in the WRP output would be present in extremely low concentrations. Significant adverse effects on water quality and biota from CECs are considered unlikely, particularly given the full treatment process that would be in place at the WRP.

Table G25-40 Summary of issues raised on the theme of cumulative effects and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Wickham and Knowle Parish Council	CE201	Wickham and Knowle Parish Council noted that two access points into the construction area are within Wickham, which site traffic would be using. The access point near Titchfield Lane and use of Titchfield Lane is of particular concern. There are three energy projects currently going through the planning process, all requiring Titchfield Lane for construction access and all bringing multiple daily HGV movements. The junction and rural roads are not equipped to accommodate heavy construction traffic from multiple projects.	N	ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out the parameters for which other existing development and/or approved development are included in the Cumulative Effects Assessment. For energy projects, this includes DCOs, planning applications above the thresholds for an EqlA and planning applications identified by the local planning authority. No energy projects near Wickham were identified through this process and included on the long and short list. The proposed temporary construction access for the Project that is taken from Titchfield Lane has been located near the junction with the A334 Winchester Road to limit the distance HGVs need to travel along Titchfield Lane. The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) also includes measures to reduce the impacts of construction traffic impacts on the transport network, including restricting HGV movements in the peak periods. This Plan will be developed into a

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				detailed plan for approval post-consent under the DCO requirements, which must then be complied with. Whilst there is potential that the construction activities for the energy projects and this Project could overlap, the cumulative impacts of the construction traffic demand would be sufficiently low as to not result in any likely significant effects.
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	CE202	The respondent noted that a 6,000-home new community, the Welborne development, to the north of Fareham is currently under development, benefitting from an outline planning permission (ref: P/17/026 6/OA). The respondent added that a number of Reserved Matters applications had been approved pursuant to RMA, including the first housing applications which were approved in May 2024. It was also noted that development had commenced on site, with initial homes expected to be occupied in early 2025.	N	ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes the consideration of the Welborne development in the CEA which concludes there is no likely significant cumulative effect. The Project has been designed to reduce interfaces with Welborne Garden Village, and the Applicant will engage with the developer and landowner of Welborne Garden Village to coordinate construction works.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	CE203	The respondents raised concern over the in-combination effects on the Solent of the	N	Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		day-on-day discharge from multiple long sea outfalls, including three planned water recycling plants which includes Havant, Littlehampton, and Sandown. The respondent stated these combined effects had not been considered. The respondent also noted that this could apply to all long sea outfalls for existing practices and that water recycling would not materially add to this. Respondents also questioned the cumulative environmental impact on the Solent from discharging concentrated reject water from the Water Recycling Plant during construction and operation.		scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. This means that the release plume from the Long Sea Outfall (LSO) is unlikely to interact with other outfall release plumes in the Solent for the parameters screened in. Further information is provided in Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume I (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). During construction there would not be any changes in discharges from the LSO. As stated above, during operation EQS are met with 1-2 m of the outfall, meaning cumulative

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				effects are extremely unlikely as releases from the LSO are rapidly diluted.
Wider Community	CE204	The respondents stated that the cumulative and in-combination effects in Havant Thicket Reservoir, streams, Havant Thicket Reservoir, Langstone Harbour, and Solent had not adequately been considered. Respondents specified that the effects of daily discharge of concentrated reject water into the Solent and its long-term impacts on the health of the marine environment had not been assessed. Respondents stated that some chemicals found in the sewage do not degrade, or take a long time to, which requires further assessment.	N	Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The changes do not extend into Langstone Harbour. Assessment of effects of release of reject water on marine biodiversity in Langstone Harbour and the Solent has been presented in the ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) by referring to the detailed water quality assessment results presented in the ES Chapter 19 Water environment (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. This means that the release

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				plume from the LSO is unlikely to interact with other outfall release plumes in the Solent for the parameters screened in and would not extend into Langstone Harbour. Further details are provided in Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	CE205	The respondent stated it is essential to evaluate whether there are combined or cumulative impacts involving long sea outfalls from other sewage works, including those at Peel Common and Appley Park Ryde and Sandown.	N	Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. This means that the release plume from the LSO is unlikely to interact with other outfall release plumes in the Solent for the parameters screened in. Further information is presented in Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6EA) and Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	CE206	The respondents outlined that the area around West Street/ Meyrick Road/Bedhampton level crossing is already very congested at peak times. Respondents also queried the in-combination traffic effects with the multiple housing developments planned around Bedhampton. The respondents also noted that the creation of a temporary access road from the A27 slip road would be the preferred solution for construction traffic.	N	The existing congestion around the level crossing on West Street is understood. As detailed in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7), HGV movements are not permitted in peak periods and would arrive to/from Meyrick Road from the south, avoiding the level crossing. The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) also notes the need for the Contractor to engage with the Contractors of nearby sites so the cumulative impacts of construction traffic are appropriately managed. Detailed CTMP(s) will need to be agreed with the relevant stakeholders post-DCO consent. ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of the construction traffic impacts of the Project on those links in Havant where material impacts are forecast. This assessment considers the cumulative

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				impact of the various housing developments consented in Havant. The Applicant is also engaging with NH around the use of the A27 slip road to access construction compound B1-1 and the DCO includes optionality for this potential access.
Wider Community	CE207	The respondents stated that in-combination effects from additional discharges must be thoroughly assessed.	N	The Applicant has assumed that by 'in-combination effects from additional discharges' the respondent was referring to potential in-combination effects arising from multiple discharges related to the Project, and other consented effluent discharges via Eastney Long Sea Outfall. Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. This means that the release

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				plume from the LSO is unlikely to interact with other outfall release plumes in the Solent for the parameters screened in. Further information is presented in Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6EA) and Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	CE208	The respondents suggested cumulative and in-combination impacts had not been adequately considered for Langstone Harbour and Chichester Harbour. The respondents stated evaluating the cumulative impact of reject water and residual contaminants, including persistent chemicals like ammonia in Langstone and Chichester Harbour, is essential to understand their combined environmental effects. The respondents suggested daily discharge of contaminants will impact on the environment, especially in-combination with other proposed effluent recycling discharge. The respondents suggested	N	Updated modelling that includes the High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the WRP shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. The assessment of chemicals within the release (which included unionised ammonia) has been undertaken in line with EA's guidance, as set out in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). This required processing release and environmental data through a series of screening tests to look at whether the contaminants are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS) in the release. Unionised ammonia was

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		previous modelling showed that over several tides, the plumes can stretch a long way off the coast with parts entering into the Harbours, which the respondents note has not been assessed.		screened out at this stage so did not require modelling. Only the parameters failing one or more of these screening tests were carried forward for modelling as presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). For the chemical screened in, the distance to the EQS was calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. This means that the release plume from the LSO is unlikely to interact with other outfall release plumes in the Solent (and Langstone and Chichester Harbours) for the parameters screened in. With respect to currently consented parameters (including salinity) model outputs in the Solent show that the differences are insignificant regarding Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario. Further information is presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	CE209	The respondents queried the in-combination effects of day-on-day	N	Updated modelling that includes the High Rejection Rate Membrane (HRRM) at the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		discharge of more concentrated reject water discharge from three new effluent recycling plants, specifically on the Solent. The respondents stated evaluating the cumulative effects of reject water and residual contaminants, including chemicals such as ammonia, is essential to understand the combined impact on the environment.		WRP shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream. The assessment of chemicals within the release (which included unionised ammonia) has been undertaken in line with EA's guidance, as set out in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). This required processing release and environmental data through a series of screening tests to look at whether the contaminants are at risk of failing its Environmental Quality Standard (EQS) in the release. Unionised ammonia was screened out at this stage so did not require modelling. Only the parameters failing one or more of these screening tests were carried forward for modelling as presented in ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). For the chemical screened in, the distance to the EQS was calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. This means that the release plume from the LSO is unlikely to interact with other outfall release plumes in the Solent

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				(and the harbours) for the parameters screened in. With respect to currently consented parameters (including salinity) model outputs in the Solent show that the differences are insignificant regarding the Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario. Further information is presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	CE210	The respondents stated consideration needs to be given to potential cumulative effects from outfalls of other sewerage works, including Peel Common, Sandown and Littlehampton. The respondents queried if it was possible that the effluent recycling plant separately proposed at Sandown could, in some events, discharge treatment by-products directly via the Eastern Yar or indirectly via the Ryde outfalls to the Solent. The respondents suggested previous modelling showed that plumes from each of the effluent discharges form slugs that	N	Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location. This means that the release plume from the LSO is unlikely to interact with

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		move up and down the Solent with the tide. The respondents noted reject water would be 3-4 times more concentrated, with new treatment chemicals, than existing discharges which needs to be considered.		other outfall release plumes in the Solent for the parameters screened in. Further information is presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). It is true that RO processes produce a reject stream that contains a greater concentration of the contaminants separated out from the process. However, given these compounds were present in the original source water, the overall load (concentration x flow) discharging into the Solent remains relatively unchanged. The chemicals used for the cleaning operation of the membranes will be returned to Budds Farm WTW where they will be degraded in the biological treatment process.
Wider Community	CE211	The respondents stated cumulative effects on the Solent must be considered in a robust and transparent manner, which the respondents suggested is currently not the case. Especially considering the water	N	Updated modelling that includes the HRRM at the WRP shows that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in water quality or biological status in receiving watercourses and water bodies downstream.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		recycling plant would be operational 365 days a year. The respondents stated that the cumulative and in-combination effects in Havant Thicket Reservoir, stream, Langstone Harbour and Solent had not adequately been considered. Respondents specified that the effects of daily discharge of concentrated reject water into the Solent and its long-term impacts on the health of the marine environment had not been assessed.		Model outputs show that the differences (and salinity) in the Solent with respect to Budds Farm WTW release between the existing scenario and the operational Project scenario are insignificant, for additional detail see ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With respect to chemicals, the distance to the EQS for the parameters screened in has been calculated as being 1-2 m from the outfall thus indicating rapid dilution at the outfall location within the Solent. This means that the release plume from the LSO is unlikely to interact with other outfall release plumes in the Solent (or the harbours) for the parameters screened in. Further information is presented in ES Appendix 19.5 Eastney Long Sea Outfall Solent dispersion modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.8 Eastney Long Sea Outfall CORMIX modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, Volume 6). Assessment of effects of release of reject water on marine biodiversity in Langstone Harbour and the Solent has been presented in the ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) by referring to the detailed water quality assessment results presented in the ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	CE212	The respondent stated in-combination effects with impacts that result from climate change must also be considered in the marine environment, including water temperature, carbon dioxide, oxygen and algal growth.	N	In ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) climate change has been considered within the future baseline section discussing carbon dioxide and ocean acidification, rising water temperature, oxygen reduction, algal growth, precipitation and sea level changes, with cross-references made to ES Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change Volume I (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). For assessment of effects, as potential impacts on marine biodiversity are considered negligible, there would not be any significant in-combination effects on the marine biodiversity receptors. This assessment has been presented in section 9.8 of the ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) by referring to the detailed water quality assessment results presented in the ES Chapter 19 Water environment (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).

Table G25-41 Summary of issues raised on the theme of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Winchester City Council	PRoW2 01	Winchester City Council (WCC) suggested that in terms of public benefits, the Council expressed an interest if some of the temporary haul roads that would cross over existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) could be partially retained as cycle paths that would interconnect with the existing PRoW. The Council noted that the PRoW plan had not been included, however, improvements to the PRoW network to include cycle paths would be considered a key benefit of the scheme.	N	The potential for delivering new pedestrian and cycle routes as part of this Project along the temporary haul road has been reviewed. There are, however, significant barriers to delivering these routes, primarily around land ownership, and therefore these potential routes were not considered viable. The Framework Rights of Way Management Plan (RoWMP), appended to the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7), details all the PRoW associated with the Project and how they will be managed during the construction period. Potential enhancements to the PRoW network are detailed in the Case for the Project (Document reference 5.6, DCO Volume 5).
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	PRoW2 02	The respondent opposed any footpath diversions for the pumping station which would be identified to affect farming or interfere in any current activity on Southwick Estate Land.	N	As detailed in the Framework RoWMP, appended to the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7), no temporary diversions are proposed on land adjacent to

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				the pumping station that would impact activities on Southwick Estate Land.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	PRoW2 03	The respondents stated that the public footpaths from Old Bedhampton to the footbridge over the A27 and to Meyrick Road would have to be kept open during construction.	N	As detailed in the Framework RoWMP, appended to the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7), a temporary closure is required on the Public Rights of Way (PRoW) between the A27 footbridge and Harts Farm Way for a maximum of four weeks to enable the construction of the SuDS outfall pipeline from the proposed Water Recycling Plant. Local residents would be informed of this footpath closure in advance so they can plan accordingly.
Wider Community	PRoW2 04	The respondent raised concerns about the effect the deforestation and construction work would have on the footpath from Titchfield Lane to Winchester Road, access beside Park Place pastoral centre. The respondent noted they were a resident of Titchfield Lane and that the footpath is used regularly to reach the village of Wickham. The respondent suggested there was no alternative path to the village and Titchfield Lane itself was considered very unsafe for people on foot.	N	As detailed in the Framework RoWMP, appended to the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7), PRoW Wickham 1 would be kept open. A temporary diversion would be required whilst the pipeline is being constructed, but this would be under 200m in length. Please could respondent identify with map area/trees concerned for response.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	PRoW2 05	The respondent stated that there was a well-used footpath around the site which the respondent's family often used. They therefore were opposed to the proposed pumping station in the short term due to the disruption that was considered to almost certainly be caused to the footpath, local area and local wildlife. The respondent also stated their opposition in the long term where the new building was considered to impact the views. The respondent stated that due to the associated operation of a pumping station this was likely to be noisy as well which would disturb the current peacefulness of the area.	N	PRoW Havant 30 is located directly east of the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) and High Lift Pumping Station. As detailed in the Framework RoWMP, appended to the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7), a temporary closure (under 4 weeks) would be required, but would otherwise be kept open throughout the construction period. Regarding landscape and visual, and assuming the comment relates to PRoW Havant 30 (Hampshire 108/30/1) located to the east of the WRP, the footpath is located within landscape receptor LLCA 13: Farlington Marshes and coastal parks, and the closest representative viewpoint is VP014 located on the footpath as it crosses the elevated pedestrian crossing over the A27. It is acknowledged that there would be awareness of construction activity during the construction stage, however this will be screened by the substantial vegetation that borders the footpath to the west, and the rest of the vegetation surrounding the WRP site. No existing vegetation is proposed to be removed. During operation, the existing and proposed new vegetation would partially screen the new built form. Mitigation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				measures, such as limiting building heights, using materials and a colour palette appropriate to the local context, and reinforcing boundary planting, form part of the design, as outlined in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, Volume 5) to help integrate the development into the surrounding landscape. The existing noise climate at the section of the identified PRoW which runs along the eastern boundary of the WRP site is likely to be dominated by the sound of traffic on the A27. Further south along the PRoW, as it skirts the boundary of Broadmarsh Coastal Park, existing noise levels will be lower; however, operational noise from the WRP would also reduce. An assessment of operational noise impacts on Broadmarsh Coastal Park (which is closer to the WRP site) is presented in ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and effects are considered not significant. Mitigation measures will be incorporated to reduce operational noise emissions, such as using quieter pumps and enclosures of noisy equipment. Most of the trees and scrub around the outside of the WRP site will be retained,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				particularly those on the northern and eastern edges of the site where they will maintain the buffer between the site and both the A27 and the footpath, continuing to provide habitat for local wildlife. In addition, the main building on the WRP will have a brown roof, replicating the habitat currently on the open areas of the site and providing habitat for invertebrates in particular. A further area of this habitat will be created at the eastern end of the WRP site on completion of construction. Invertebrates are a key food source for bats and birds.
Wider Community	PRoW2 06	The respondent stated that if the scheme were to have an impact on the footpath by the railway line at Bedhampton, an alternative footpath route would have to be found.	N	As detailed in the Framework RoWMP, appended to the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7), a temporary diversion is proposed for PRoW Havant 34. Options have also been identified depending on whether the permanent diversion being delivered by Portsmouth Water has come forward. This will enable the footpath to be kept open (with a temporary diversion) throughout the construction period.

Table G25-42 Summary of issues raised on the theme of legislation, policy and permits and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Health and Safety Executive	LLP201	The Health and Safety Executive questioned if a hazardous substance consent would be needed in reference to storage or use of any of the Categories of Substances or Named Hazardous Substances set out in Schedule 1 of The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 as amended, if those hazardous substances will be present on, over or under the land at or above the controlled quantities. The Health and Safety Executive note that there existed an "addition rule" in Part 4 of Schedule 1 for below-threshold substances. The Health and Safety Executive requested that if hazard substances planning consent was required, that the relevant Hazardous Substance Authority (usually the Local Planning Authority) be consulted on the application.	N	The Other Consents and Licences Positions Statement (Document reference 5.4, DCO Volume 5) sets out the approach to other consents that are sought alongside the DCO. The Applicant can confirm that no Hazardous Substance Consent is required for the Project.
National Grid Electricity	LLP202	NGET stated that electricity infrastructure related to National Grid's Overhead Lines must be considered as they are protected by a deed of easement/wayleave	N	The design of the Project has considered existing statutory undertaker's assets, including NGET, and has sought to avoid these where practicable. Further consultation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Transmission PLC (NGET)		agreement which provides full right of access to maintain, repair and inspect their assets.		and engagement has been undertaken with relevant statutory undertakers throughout the development of the Project, as set out in the Statement of Engagement (Document reference 5.9, DCO Volume 5. The DCO (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3) will include protective provisions for the benefit of statutory undertakers, including NGET, and provide for further engagement during the detailed design and construction phase in the event these assets are impacted.
Portsmouth Water	LLP203	Portsmouth Water noted that Havant Thicket Reservoir will be designated as an artificial or heavily modified 'lake' water body in the future as its size would be greater than 40 hectares. Portsmouth Water highlighted the importance of the Project to adhere to the requirements of The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) Regulations (England and Wales) 2017 ('WER') and the water quality and ecological standards therein. PW specifically noted the requirement that the Project would not cause water quality deterioration away from the 'good' water quality that the Havant Thicket Reservoir is	N	The Applicant notes that the status of Havant Thicket Reservoir has not yet been designated. As set out in section 10 of the Statement of Engagement (Document reference 5.9, DCO Volume 5), the Project has been developed in consultation with Portsmouth Water and engagement is ongoing. Water quality modelling of the Havant Thicket Reservoir is presented and assessed in the ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Modelling shows that with the implementation of additional phosphorus removal at the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		predicted to attain (as required by WER Regulation 13(2)a); or would introduce an impediment for Havant Thicket Reservoir to attain 'good' status in future (as required by WER Regulation 13(2)b and 13(2)c). In addition, Portsmouth Water noted that the Applicant sought to apply for a new environmental permit for the release of reject water from the proposed Water Recycling Plant (WRP) into the Solent via the Eastney Long Sea Outfall (LSO). Portsmouth Water requested that Water Environment Regulations water quality standards required to attain good status as set out in the Water Framework Directive Directions 2015 would be a material consideration in determining the environmental permit. Portsmouth Water stated that it would continue to engage with the Applicant on such an application to manage the interface with Portsmouth Water's Havant Thicket Reservoir Project.		WRP, operation of the Project would not change the predicted ecological status of the reservoir under the Water Environment Regulations, nor would it impact on biodiversity within the reservoir. As set out in the Other Consents and Licences Position Statement (Document reference 5.4, DCO Volume 5), the Applicant is seeking an environmental permit for recycled water from the WRP to be discharged into Havant Thicket Reservoir and for reject water from the WRP to be discharged via the Eastney LSO.
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	LLP204	The respondent stated that they identified impacts to arise from the relationship between the construction periods of the Applicant's Project and essential enabling	N	The Applicant is continuing to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction and operation of the Project and discuss their individual circumstances

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		infrastructure for Welborne secured under planning permission granted by Fareham Borough Council (FBC) and Winchester City Council (WCC) and mitigation planting approved as part of this development.		further. As set out in the Consultation Report, the Applicant has undertaken informal and statutory consultation with landowners impacted by the Project, including the landowner and developer of Welborne Garden Village. The Applicant is engaging with and seeking to negotiate voluntary land agreements for the required rights with affected landowners and has undertaken a number of meetings to discuss issues raised by landowners and their representatives. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the current status of such negotiations. Coordination with FBC and Welborne Garden Village, and relevant stakeholders is ongoing to ensure that construction sequencing, access arrangements, and environmental protection measures are aligned to minimise disruption and safeguard approved mitigation planting.
PIL	LLP205	The respondent noted in respect of the identified relationship between the construction periods of the Project and essential enabling infrastructure for Welborne that the location of Intermediate Pumping Station F and the construction	N	Coordination with FBC, Welborne Garden Village, and relevant stakeholders is ongoing to ensure that construction sequencing, access arrangements, and environmental

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		compound would be in close proximity to the eastern undergrounding station included as part of essential enabling infrastructure proposed as part of approved planning applications P/23/1004/FP (FBC) and, 23/01722/FUL (WCC). The respondent stated that this would create potential conflict between the two schemes during the construction phases of each development.		protection measures are aligned to minimise disruption.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	LLP206	The respondents state as far as they understood, that at the time of writing, a formal DCO had not been submitted and there was no evidence of any permit or licence applications relevant to the Project having been made. The respondent stated that as a result of this, it was difficult for them to comment on the general, high-level description of the Project.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Applicant's consultations have provided a clear description of the Project, alongside plans and illustrations, to aid consultee's understanding of the proposals. The application documents, including the draft DCO (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3) and ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provide a detailed description of the Project. Further, the Other Consents and Licences Positions Statement (Document reference 5.4, DCO Volume 5) sets out the approach to other consents that are sought alongside the DCO.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	LLP207	The respondent believed that it was important that the full details of permitting by the EA were dealt with now rather than later as it was considered that these should be aligned with the modelling.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. As set out in the Other Consents and Licences Position Statement (Document reference 5.4, DCO Volume 5), the Applicant is seeking an environmental permit for recycled water from the WRP to be discharged into Havant Thicket Reservoir and for reject water from the WRP to be discharged via the Eastney LSO. The discharge permit process is running in parallel to the DCO process and the Applicant is in formal pre-application discussions and working closely with the EA in this respect, noting that modelling and assessment work for the DCO will also inform the permitting process.

Table G25-43 Summary of issues raised on the theme of the Applicant's wider operations and Project interfaces and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	WSWO 201	The respondents stated that the Applicant has a very poor reputation (notably within the vicinity of Langstone Harbour), especially in regard to water pollution, fines	N	The Applicant recognises concerns about reputation, particularly in relation to water pollution, fines, and asset maintenance. The Applicant has implemented a Turnaround Plan (2023–2025) focused on improving operational performance, reducing pollution

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		and cost increases which have not been justified. Respondents added that the Applicant has a bad track record with maintenance and monitoring of existing assets which has made public trust in them low. Respondents added that due to the reputation of the Applicant they had limited or no faith in the Applicant being able to manage the proposals effectively. Respondents also stated that there was limited trust in the Applicant's ability to avoid and manage impacts and called for more certainty over outcomes rather than waiting until it was too late.		incidents, and enhancing customer service. Since 2020, pollution incidents have reduced by 38%, and leakage has reduced by almost 20% by 2024/25. The Applicant is committed to ongoing investment in its infrastructure and to maintaining high standards of monitoring and maintenance for both existing and new assets. The Project would be subject to robust monitoring, control systems and maintenance regimes. The full advanced treatment process at the WRP would have multiple safeguards to ensure regulatory water quality standards are achieved. Water going into supply will also continue to meet current strict regulatory standards for drinking water quality. The Project would also be subject to regulated discharge consents from the EA. The obligations on the Applicant to comply with EA regulations, and the drinking water safety plan, would inform a monitoring regime that will be designed to minimise environmental risk and protect public health.
Wider Community	WSWO 202	Respondents stated that they had very low/no amount of trust in the Applicant based on historical behaviour including reported non-compliance with	N	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding trust, historical performance and ensuring a clean and safe water supply. Please refer to the response to WSWO201

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		environmental regulations and that because of this the public cannot trust the Applicant to monitor and maintain a new project to the necessary level. The respondents sought clarification on how the Applicant will ensure that clean safe water will be constantly available as this had not been the case in previous years. Respondents raised concerns regarding negative views of local MP's and how this is increasing the public's lack of trust towards the Applicant. Finally, respondents raised issues surrounding vague language used in the consultation materials which led to an increase in public concern regarding the possibility of further pollution in the waterways.		above which provides assurances around company performance, maintenance and monitoring, and meeting regulatory standards on water quality. Regarding the consultation materials, documents are prepared to support engagement at a formative stage of project development, in line with best practice such as the Gunning Principles and Planning Inspectorate pre-application Advice. With regard to the water quality assessment, the consultation materials clearly outlined the modelling and assessment work undertaken at that stage to inform the consultation. The Environmental Water Quality Report confirmed that appropriate levels of treatment would be applied to ensure regulatory water quality standards would be achieved to avoid impacting on reservoir water quality and biodiversity, including downstream watercourses. It was explained that the EA would set the water quality requirements for purified recycled water entering Havant Thicket Reservoir through the Environmental Permit and that these requirements would then inform the final treatment measures, ensuring the Project meets regulatory standards. ES Chapter 19 Water

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) confirms that updated modelling has demonstrated that necessary water quality standards can be achieved through the water recycling process.
Wider Community	WSWO 203	The respondents raised concerns regarding the Applicant's historic handling of wastewater, with respondents having stated that they believe the Applicant to be pumping sewage into rivers and seas and maintaining a low level of water quality. The respondents stated that the Applicant must improve current handlings of wastewater before the public is able to trust with new projects. The further respondent stated that the underfunding and lack of investment in infrastructure has caused immense damage to the harbour and the water quality in the Solent over many years.	N	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding trust and historical performance. Please refer to the response to WSWO202. Alongside the Applicant's significant investment in its wastewater infrastructure, the Applicant is also investing heavily in providing new water sources, such as this Project, in order to continue to meet its duty to supply water in the face of climate change, population growth and reductions in how much water can be abstracted from the environment.
Wider Community	WSWO 204	The respondents stated that they understood that originally the new reservoir was to enable Portsmouth Water to store more of the water from the Butser aquifers, however respondents have expressed	N	The scale of the water supply shortfall in Hampshire requires regional collaboration between water companies. This collaboration enables water companies to share resources and collectively respond to long-term challenges, such as climate

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		disappointment regarding Portsmouth Water's collaboration with the Applicant. The respondents stated that they then understood the amended Project allowed Portsmouth Water to provide the Applicant with 40 megalitres per day (MI/d). This water was understood to be taken from Bedhampton Springs.		change, population growth, and environmental protection. Havant Thicket Reservoir was consented as a spring-fed reservoir, with water from Bedhampton Springs, and is being delivered to enable Portsmouth Water to share water with the Applicant in times of drought (approximately 21 MI/d) as planned for in WRMP19, hence why it is being funded over the long-term by the Applicant. Given the growing challenge of water scarcity in Hampshire, and the wider South East region, the current proposal is to augment the storage capability of Havant Thicket Reservoir through the addition of purified recycled water – this would enable an additional 90MI/d of water to be sent to the Applicant's supply area (not 40MI/d as stated) to support essential daily supplies and provide resilience during drought conditions.
Wider Community	WSWO 205	The respondent raised concerns about reported misinformation from local interest groups which is perceived to not being countered in the press and media. The respondent urged the Applicant to hold a media event to give its side of the story. The respondent offered their time to advocate for the Project and to help underline the role it would play in	N	The Applicant thanks the respondent for their interest in advocating for the Project. The Applicant remains focused on ensuring that the public has access to clear and factual information about the Project, the need for it and its environmental benefits, including the role it will play in protecting the rare and sensitive chalk streams of the River Test and River Itchen.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		protecting the chalk stream ecology at such an event.		
Wider Community	WSWO 206	The respondent stated that Portsmouth Water had a good local reputation and there were no concerns about the quality of their water supply at present. The respondent stated that in contrast the Applicant didn't have the confidence of customers and there were widespread doubts about its competence to build the Project, especially as the technology has not been 'proven' safe in the UK. The respondent noted that to date neither the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) nor the water companies have provided reassurance to consumers that the Project would supply a reliable source of water.	N	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding trust and historical performance. Please refer to the response to WSWO202. Water recycling is a well-established and internationally proven technology that has been successfully implemented in countries such as the United States, Australia, and Singapore for over 40 years. The development of the Project has included input from specialists who have worked on or collaborated with others on these well-established international schemes, ensuring that best practice has been embedded throughout the design and development of the Project. In the UK, the Drinking Water Inspectorate (DWI) has confirmed that water recycling can be delivered safely, outlining the robust regulatory requirements that water companies must demonstrate before recycled water can be put into supply. The EA has also confirmed that water recycling offers a feasible alternative supply option, supported by stringent regulations, improved technology, and more reliable monitoring and control systems.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	WSWO 207	A respondent suggested that the Applicant needs to be restoring public confidence through transparency and compliance. A further respondent also sought clarification regarding the Applicant's desire to regain public trust and suggested that engaging with a highly respected monitoring entity would have helped regain this trust.	N	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding trust and historical performance. Please refer to the response to WSWO201.
Wider Community	WSWO 208	The respondents stated there was a concern over the water quality of any overspill into Langstone Harbour. In addition, respondents stated that there should have been a deeper educational programme about the value of fresh water.	N	The Project itself would not enable any overspill into Langstone Harbour, however water from Havant Thicket Reservoir would reach Langstone Harbour through compensations flows via downstream watercourses. Extensive water quality modelling has demonstrated that the recycled water can achieve regulatory water quality standards without any detriment to Havant Thicket Reservoir, downstream watercourses or Langstone Harbour. Further details of the modelling undertaken can be found in ES Appendix 19.6 Havant Thicket Reservoir Compensatory Flows water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 19.11 Havant Thicket Reservoir water quality modelling, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				In response to the comment for a deeper educational programme, the Applicant is actively engaging with its customers and stakeholders on the challenge of water scarcity and why water recycling is a key part of the solution. The need for the Project has been communicated throughout the Applicant's consultations and further information about water scarcity is available on the Applicant's Water for Life Hampshire webpages in this respect.
Wider Community	WSWO 209	The respondent noted the disparity between the high energy cost of this Project against the Applicant's wider Net Zero Plan.	N	The Applicant has corporate emissions reduction targets, including an interim goal to reduce Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 35% from the 2022-2023 baseline by 2035, and a long-term target of achieving Net Zero by 2050, as outlined in the Applicant's Net Zero Plan – Our Net Zero Goal. The Applicant, as part of the Project design development, is committed to reducing operational carbon to as low as reasonably practicable, having regard to the UK's Net Zero by 2050 target, which aligns with the Applicant's Net Zero Target, as detailed in the Outline Carbon Management Plan (Document reference 7.8, DCO Volume 7). This plan sets out specific mitigation measures for both construction and operation, including energy

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				efficiency measures, assessment of renewable energy opportunities, and optimisation of energy procurement routes to support decarbonisation. The plan also outlines how carbon emissions will be monitored and reported during construction and operation to ensure emissions are low as reasonably practicable. These measures ensure that the Project supports the Applicant's Net Zero Plan. The Applicant has assessed carbon emissions across all phases of the Project in the carbon assessment presented in ES Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Section 10.4 of ES Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) outlines the adopted design principles that aim to reduce energy use where practicable and comply with the National Policy Statement requirement to ensure greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are as low as reasonably practicable. The Applicant recognises that the Project would consume energy; however, it is being delivered in a manner that aligns with the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Applicant's wider carbon reduction commitments and regulatory expectations.

Table G25-44 Summary of issues raised on the theme of landowner engagement and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Wickham and Knowle Parish Council	LEN201	The Parish Council encouraged the Applicant to consider the communities which could be impacted and offer compensation to more impacted parties than just the landowners.	N	The Applicant continues to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and discuss individual circumstances further. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) sets out how the Project will avoid, reduce and mitigate effects on the environment and surrounding area during construction. Those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				amount of land necessary to deliver the Project within the draft Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant would only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the Project. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted.
Portsmouth City Council (PCC)	LEN202	PCC queried if it was envisaged that the management of an area of land would be added to the conservation works of the PCC countryside service or would this be the Applicant's responsibility, and if so, for how long. The Council added that the land was farmed by Widley Farm, and the potential	N	The Applicant has engaged with PCC regarding the voluntary land agreements required and has discussed the individual requirements for land management. The Applicant has also discussed the land farmed by Widley Farm with PCC to understand the possible impacts further and details regarding the status of negotiations are included within the Pre-application Land and Rights

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		loss would adversely affect the financial stability of the farm. PCC stated that there had been no information provided for the rights which the Applicant would be seeking over PCC freehold or leasehold property. Therefore, the Council had been unable to comment on this aspect of the Project. The PCC Property Team noted that they had been instructed to review and respond to a significant volume of land referencing requests made by the Applicant's appointed land agent. The Council confirmed that land referencing questionnaires had been researched, completed and returned in order to confirm details of the Council's land interests (freehold / leasehold) and that of third-party interests on PCC's land.		Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4). ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) outlines the analysis undertaken to assess the potential impacts on farming activities and businesses. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) sets out further details regarding mitigation measures which will be implemented during construction to reduce impacts on interested parties, and the Applicant continues to engage with landowners and occupiers along the pipeline to understand the impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and discuss individual circumstances further. Those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum amount of land necessary to deliver the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Project within the draft Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant would only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the Project. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree practical solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted. The Applicant has submitted a Book of Reference (Document reference 4.3, DCO Volume 4) which details the land and/or rights of those persons within the draft Order Limits and Land Plans (Document reference 2.2, DCO Volume 2) show (in accordance with the details in the Book of Reference) the land where the Applicant intends to seek compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
PCC	LEN203	PCC raised concerns regarding the volume of work undertaken in relation to the draft Development Consent Order and the Council sought clarification on whether the Council's property costs and consultant costs in connection with the draft DCO would be secured via the Planning Performance Agreement.	N	The Applicant has engaged with PCC regarding the Planning Performance Agreement, property costs and voluntary agreements required over PCC land. Further details regarding the status of negotiations are included within the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4).
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PILs	LEN204	The respondents stated that that they had not received formal responses to their Summer 2024 Consultation representation. The respondents objected to their land being used as part of the Project as it would have a significant impact on their businesses, livestock, and family life. Respondents stated a desire to have further meetings with the Applicant to try and resolve some of the issues already brought to the attention of the Applicant.	N	The Applicant is continuing to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and discuss their individual circumstances further. Following the Summer 2024 Consultation, the Applicant wrote to landowners in December 2024 to provide the opportunity to meet and discuss their comments further, to better understand possible impacts. As part of the Spring 2025 Consultation, the Applicant also contacted landowners and/or their representatives who were impacted by design refinements to ensure they were aware of the consultation timescales, where information would be available on the website and offered meetings to discuss the design refinements. The Applicant then provided written responses to landowners who provided feedback to the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Summer 2024 and Spring 2025 Consultations via letters which were sent to landowners and their representatives in December 2025 and January 2026. As set out in the Consultation Report, the Applicant has undertaken non-statutory and statutory consultation with landowners impacted by the Project. The Applicant is engaging with and seeking to negotiate voluntary land agreements for the required rights with affected landowners and has undertaken a number of meetings to discuss issues raised by landowners and their representatives. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the current status of such negotiations. Those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum amount of land necessary to deliver the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Project within the draft Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant would only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the Project. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted.
PILs	LEN205	Concerns relating to security were raised if hedges are removed as proposed. One respondent raised concerns over possible trespass and rural crime while another expressed concerns about removing hedge screening between paddocks separating mares and stallions.	N	The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) sets out that the contractor would undertake a site specific risk assessment of security and trespass and implement appropriate control measures, including ensuring that contractors secure barrier fencing, lighting (appropriate to setting) and a gate person (where practicable) to reduce safety risks and perceptions of safety risks around construction sites for the public. Where

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				hedges are removed, screening is required or access needs to be managed, temporary fencing would be implemented as appropriate at the extent of construction working areas.
PIL	LEN206	A respondent stated the proposed pipeline would cross an agricultural field between 'Dellfield' and 'Bramble Cottage', within close proximity of a respondent's house. It was stated to cross Castle Farm Lane, which gives vehicle access to properties. The respondent also identified a proposed construction area close to the end of Castle Farm Lane, joining Hoads Hill.	N	Since the Spring 2025 Consultation, the Applicant provided responses to landowners who raised feedback via letters which were sent to landowners and their representatives in December 2025 and January 2026. Section 12.8 of ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document Reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) identifies several areas in which access to residential properties could be temporarily affected by road or lane closures during construction of the Project. Access to residential properties would be maintained at all times, and where road closures are proposed in proximity to each other a sequential approach would be adopted to reduce impacts on journey times and reduce disruption for road users. Additional information is provided in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) submitted with the DCO application. Impacts to residents on all affected roads are deemed to be minor or negligible adverse.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Section 12.8 of ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document Reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) also assesses in-combination effects on amenity for residential receptors, taking into account the findings of other relevant environmental assessments, including air quality, noise, landscape and visual, and traffic and transport. There are no in-combination effects on amenity identified for residential properties during construction, operation or decommissioning of the Project. Regardless of this, the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) includes the following commitments: The Contractor's community relations personnel shall notify affected communities and other relevant stakeholders prior to the commencement of potentially disruptive construction activities, to enable those affected to plan ahead and to reduce uncertainty particularly to align with actions set out in the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) Action Plan (Document reference 7.13, DCO Volume 7) that forms part of the EqIA submitted with the DCO application. Communication will include information about

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				the nature and timing of the works and how any adverse effects will be managed. The Access and Public Rights of Way plan (Document reference 2.4, DCO Volume 2) show the temporary construction accesses and the permanent accesses proposed as part of the Project. The Applicant will continue to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of construction of the Project and access requirements will be developed further at the detailed design stage.
PILs	LEN207	The respondents requested further engagement with the Applicant to further work with landowners so that the potential impact on the land is minimised. One respondent requested definitive details and scaled drawings of an Above Ground Plant Site, to discuss options to minimise disturbance on the land with the Applicant. The respondents requested for a nominated named contact from the Applicant's technical or engineering team to act as the primary liaison to ensure open and consistent communication.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment and continues to engage with landowners to discuss their individual circumstances further, including providing drawings to those landowners who have Above Ground Plant (AGP) sites on their land. The Consultation Report summarises the consultation activities undertaken by the Applicant with consultees including landowners. Following the statutory consultations, the Applicant invited landowners who provided feedback to meet and discuss their comments further, to better understand possible impacts. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		A further respondent added for context that it is proposed to have a drill pit and a section of Pipeline installed through an open cut method on their land, taking around 1/3 of their holding. The respondent added that they use the land for private enjoyment by keeping horses, geese, and other poultry on the land. The respondent added that they tend to vegetables and grow food for personal consumption.		Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the current status of negotiations of voluntary land agreements with affected landowners. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) sets out how the Applicant intends to avoid, reduce and mitigate effects on the environment and surrounding area during construction and the appended Outline Soil Resource Management Plan (SRMP) confirms that an Agricultural Liaison Officer would be appointed by the Contractor. Once appointed they would act as the primary contact for ongoing engagement with landowners, their agents and occupiers of the land about practical agricultural matters. Those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum amount of land necessary to deliver the Project within the Order Limits whilst ensuring

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant would only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the Project. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree practical solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted.
PILs	LEN208	Respondents raised their concerns on the Project's expected impact on the landowners' private and business-related equestrian land uses. A respondent noted that their business relied on renting out 25 stables at the farm, which includes access to on-site grazing and use of other facilities all year round, so access to stabling alone would be insufficient to operate the business. It was noted that enough grazing areas accessible to be grazed and rotated would	N	The Applicant continues to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and discuss their individual circumstances further. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), sets out how the Applicant would avoid, reduce and mitigate effects on the environment and surrounding area during construction, including accommodation works such as crossing points, maintaining access or the provision of alternative accesses to

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		be needed and that this was why the overall field area was currently divided into smaller fields. It was indicated that their other landholdings were unlikely to replicate the equestrian operation requirements, and the respondent estimated field rent and stabling loss for 1 year at £53,000. Another respondent requested that the Applicant relocate stables to prevent severing from other landholdings.		mitigate field severance and reduce impacts on land uses such as equestrian holdings. Following the statutory consultations, the Applicant invited landowners who provided feedback to meet and discuss their comments further, to better understand possible impacts. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the status of negotiations of voluntary land agreements with affected landowners. Those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum amount of land necessary to deliver the Project within the Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant would only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land required to deliver the Project.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted.
PILs	LEN209	The respondents queried how they would be compensated monetarily and reimbursed for the disturbance that the Project could cause to their land and livelihood. Respondents also asked what insurance cover would be applied to their property and what funds were available to pay for their representation. Respondents also sought clarification regarding compensation for business losses and diversified holdings losses. One respondent set out their annual losses as a result of cessation of trading for 1 year and asked how this would be compensated.	N	Following the statutory consultation stages, the Applicant invited landowners who raised feedback to meet and discuss their comments further, to better understand possible impacts. Letters were sent to landowners and their representatives in December 2025 and January 2026 to provide further responses to feedback raised during the consultations, including information regarding compensation provisions. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the status of negotiations of voluntary land agreements with affected landowners. Those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum amount of land necessary to deliver the Project within the Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant would only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the Project. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree practical solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted.
PILs	LEN210	The respondents laid out information regarding how the Project would impact their business and the compensation requirements as a result, as well as how the Applicant would take into account any delays to the delivery of the Project. The	Y	The Applicant continues to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and discuss individual circumstances further.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		respondent also sought justification for the scale of the proposed working area required for construction. One respondent expressed disappointment at the proposed change to the routing and lack of justification on this.		Following the statutory consultation stages, the Applicant invited landowners who provided feedback to meet and discuss their comments further, to better understand possible impacts. Letters were sent to landowners and their representatives in December 2025 and January 2026 to provide further responses to feedback raised during the consultations, including information regarding compensation provisions and the scale of the working area. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the status of negotiations of voluntary land agreements with affected landowners. Those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum amount of land necessary to deliver the Project within the Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				design has been confirmed. The Applicant would only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the authorised development. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted. The Applicant has carefully evaluated site and route options against a range of planning and environmental criteria, including potential impacts on land use. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) and ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out the process the Applicant has taken to refine the pipeline route whilst ES Chapter 4 Consideration of alternatives, Volume I (Document reference

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				6.1, DCO Volume 6) details the other options considered. Following the Spring 2025 Consultation, further design refinements were made in this location to take into account landowner feedback, so that the pipeline would be installed using trenchless construction under the residential garden and paddocks. The landowner was consulted on this change as part of Autumn 2025 Targeted Consultation.
PILs	LEN211	The respondents asked for reassurance that their sand would not be removed from their property, and any excess would be stockpiled for landowner use. A respondent also requested an independent assessment of the soil structure, fertility, drainage and topography before the works started to provide them with an accurate record to hold the Applicant accountable at the end of the Project.		The importance of soil management and reinstatement is reflected in the Outline Soil Resource Management Plan (SRMP) that is appended to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The Contractor will prepare and adhere to the detailed SRMP(s) in accordance with the Outline SRMP. The Outline SRMP sets out the overall approach to managing soil resources affected by the Project and describes the measures and principles required to reduce potentially harmful impacts on soils, including: ▪ Relevant policy and guidance, especially the Department for Environmental Management Plan (Defra) Construction

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites and the Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils. ▪ Description of soils on site. ▪ Characterisation of soils according to resilience to structural damage. ▪ Soil handling methods – timing of soil stripping and stockpiling according to soil type and moisture conditions; management of stockpiles; reinstatement of soils. ▪ Monitoring procedures during and following construction. ▪ Pre and post construction soil surveys will be carried out by competent soil specialists.
PILs	LEN212	A respondent noted that the Department for Community and Local Government Guidance, related to the procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land, confirms in paragraph 11 that: “The Secretary of State will need to be satisfied that the land to be acquired is no more than is reasonably required for the purposes of the development” [sic]	N	The Applicant notes the comments raised and confirms that it has carefully evaluated site and route options against a range of planning and environmental criteria, including potential impacts on land use. The Applicant would only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the Project. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) and the ES Chapter 3

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		"And that the land to be taken is no more than is reasonably necessary for that purpose, and that is proportionate". A further respondent resubmitted their objections to their property being requisitioned.		Description of Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out the process the Applicant has taken to refine the pipeline route, whilst ES Chapter 4 Consideration of alternatives, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) details the other options considered. The Applicant is seeking to acquire relevant freehold interests, new rights and temporary use of land by voluntary agreement in accordance with the PA 2008: Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land. The current status of negotiations is summarised in the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4). Negotiations will continue with landowners, however it is necessary for the Applicant to seek compulsory acquisition powers to secure such land, rights and interests to ensure the Project can be constructed and operated. The Statement of Reasons (Document reference 4.1, DCO Volume 4) provides further details regarding the justification for seeking the powers required.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
PILs	LEN213	One respondent recommended that the Project was kept as north as possible through their water meadow as this is reportedly the 'dryer' area. They stated that it would be difficult to work in the bottom of the water meadow in the winter months as it is reportedly waterlogged from November to March. Another respondent stated that their soils are very sandy being running sand and that if the Applicant digs straight down their hill (11% fall) that any rain would wash all the sand to the bottom of the hill. Another respondent stated that all soil extracted must be stored separately based on the soil type/strata layer; with the respondent asking for a full soil assessment to be undertaken by an independent expert before the work commences, with the results shared with the landowner.	N	The Applicant notes the comments raised and confirms that it has carefully evaluated site and route options against a range of planning and environmental criteria, including potential impacts on land use. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) and ES Chapter 3 Description of Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out the process the Applicant has taken to refine the pipeline route, whilst ES Chapter 4 Consideration of alternatives, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) details the other options considered. The Applicant continues to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and discuss their individual circumstances further. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the status of negotiations of voluntary land agreements with affected landowners. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), sets out how the Project will

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				avoid, reduce and mitigate effects on the environment and surrounding area during construction. The importance of soil management and reinstatement in different ground conditions is reflected in the Outline Soil Resource Management Plan (SRMP) that is appended to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The Contractor once appointed would prepare and adhere to the detailed SRMP(s) in accordance with the Outline SRMP. The Outline SRMP (appended to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) sets out the overall approach to managing soil resources affected by the Project and describes the measures and principles required to reduce potentially harmful impacts on soils, including: ▪ Relevant policy and guidance, especially the Defra Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites and the Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils. ▪ Description of soils on site.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				- Characterisation of soils according to resilience to structural damage. - Soil handling methods – timing of soil stripping and stockpiling according to soil type and moisture conditions; management of stockpiles; reinstatement of soils. - Monitoring procedures during and following construction. Once construction has been completed, the land (and soils) will be returned to its pre-existing agricultural land use as far as reasonably practicable. As detailed in the Outline SRMP (appended to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7)), reinstatement would occur as soon as reasonably practicable, the soils replaced in order i.e subsoil first then topsoil and liaison with the landowners would be undertaken to agree timings and management of the reinstatement.
PIL	LEN214	The respondent stated that their land is waterlogged for long periods of the year, making pipe laying challenging and questioned how the Applicant would stop the trench filling with water. They asked for		The Applicant notes the comments regarding waterlogged land, and confirms that the ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides an assessment of the likely

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		assurances that this would not cause flooding on their land.		significant effects on the water environment, including land drainage. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) details the mitigation measures which will be implemented during construction, including land and groundwater drainage management. A detailed CEMP (or CEMPs) would be produced by the Contractor once appointed and would set out plans and method statements substantially in accordance with the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) for certain construction activities. As detailed in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), a Construction Drainage Plan would be prepared by the Contractor once appointed to manage drainage and will include measures to minimise water within the working area and ensure ongoing drainage of surrounding land.
PILs	LEN215	The respondent stated that the Applicant does not have a good reputation, it 'knowingly' polluted the waterways. As a result, the respondent has asked how they can trust that the Applicant will properly reinstate their land.		The Applicant acknowledges that trust is a key issue for many stakeholders. The Applicant has implemented a Turnaround Plan (2023–2025) focused on improving operational performance, reducing pollution incidents, and enhancing customer service.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		A further respondent added that the loss of land would impact on the amount of forage that the owner had available to feed his livestock. It was also noted that the fields through which the proposed Pipeline is to be routed has working land drainage systems under the surface and therefore any severed drains will need to be carefully reinstated before backfilling. The respondent attached a plan to support their feedback.		Since 2020, pollution incidents have reduced by 38%, and leakage has reduced by almost 20% for financial the year 2024-25. These improvements demonstrate the Applicant's efforts to rebuild public confidence. The Applicant continues to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and discuss their individual circumstances further. Following the statutory consultations, the Applicant invited landowners who provided feedback to meet and discuss their comments further, to better understand possible impacts. Letters were sent to landowners and their representatives in December 2025 and January 2026 to provide further responses to feedback raised during the consultations. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the status of negotiations of voluntary land agreements with affected landowners. Further information on landscape reinstatement is provided in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				(Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7), which sets out the reinstatement strategy. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), sets out how the Project will avoid, reduce and mitigate effects on the environment and surrounding area during construction, including accommodation such as crossing points, maintaining access or the provision of alternative accesses to mitigate field severance and reduce impacts on land uses such as equestrian holdings. Those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum amount of land necessary to deliver the Project within the Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant would only exercise the compulsory

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the Project. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree practical solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted. The Applicant notes the comments regarding waterlogged land, and confirms that the ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides an assessment of the likely significant effects on the water environment, including land drainage. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) details the mitigation measures which will be implemented during construction, including land and groundwater drainage management. A detailed CEMP (or CEMPs) would be produced by the Contractor once appointed and would set out plans and method statements substantially in accordance with

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) for certain construction activities. As detailed in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), a Construction Drainage Plan will be prepared by the Contractor to manage drainage, and will include measures to minimise water within the working area and ensure ongoing drainage of surrounding land.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider community	LEN216	The respondent reported staff supposedly clambering through communal grounds on the private road, causing damage to vegetation, and not having given permission for access on their land.	N	Access for surveys was agreed with landowners via voluntary licences. Where access was not agreed voluntarily the Applicant used statutory notices under section 172 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016. The Applicant continues to engage with affected parties to seek to agree access where required by voluntary agreement where possible and will aim to minimise disturbance wherever possible.
Wider community	LEN217	Respondents stated their concern around timely and transparent communication between the Applicant and affected landowners during construction of the	N	Following the statutory consultation stages, the Applicant invited landowners who raised feedback to meet and discuss their comments further, to better understand possible impacts.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		associated infrastructure and requested impacts to be reduced as much as possible. There was also a request for communication to be improved.		Letters were sent to landowners and their representatives in December 2025 and January 2026 to provide further responses to feedback raised during the consultations, including information regarding construction impacts. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the status of negotiations of voluntary land agreements with affected landowners. The Applicant continues to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and discuss their individual circumstances further. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) includes the following commitments: ▪ The Contractor's community relations personnel shall notify affected communities and other relevant stakeholders prior to the commencement of potentially disruptive construction activities, to enable those affected to plan ahead and to reduce uncertainty particularly to align with actions set out in the Equality Impact Assessment (Document reference 7.13, DCO Volume

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				7) that forms part of the Equality Impact Assessment submitted with the DCO application. - Communication would include information about the nature and timing of the works and how any adverse effects will be managed. - an Agricultural Liaison Officer would also be appointed to act as liaison between landowner's and the contractor during construction.
Wider Community	LEN218	The respondent outlined the disruption that the Project would cause to the Waltham Chase Aeromodellers. The respondent asked if the Applicant would provide an alternative site for them to operate from until the site is reinstated, and if they would provide financial compensation, to enable the refund of members' fees, as a result of the loss of the use of the flying site.	N	The Applicant has engaged with the Waltham Chase Aeromodellers and held a meeting to understand the impacts on their operations. The Applicant will continue to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and discuss their individual circumstances further. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) sets out how the Project will avoid, reduce and mitigate effects on the environment and surrounding area during construction. Those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum amount of land necessary to deliver the Project within the Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant would only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the authorised development. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree practical solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted.
Wider Community	LEN219	A respondent raised the concern that a fissure could develop as a result of sections A and B of the proposed pipeline	N	The Applicant continues to engage with affected parties to understand the impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		traversing underneath the lake which would act like a plug, and the water would drain out. They added that given much of the value of their house lies in the lake as a feature and that if a fissure did arise, that it would be an issue for them. A further respondent raised similar concerns about the impact the Project would have on property prices in the area.		of the Project and discuss their individual circumstances further. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) sets out how the Project will avoid, reduce and mitigate effects on the environment and surrounding area during construction. Those affected by compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the DCO may be entitled to compensation in line with the Compensation Code and relevant statutory provisions. The Applicant has confirmed sufficient resources to meet these obligations as set out in the Funding Statement (Document reference 4.2, DCO Volume 4). The Applicant has included the minimum amount of land necessary to deliver the Project within the Order Limits whilst ensuring suitable flexibility is retained until the detailed design has been confirmed. The Applicant would only exercise the compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers over land actually required to deliver the Project. The Applicant aims to work collaboratively with landowners to address concerns and agree practical solutions wherever practicable. Affected landowners are also entitled to seek independent professional

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				advice and reimbursement of associated costs may be provided as part of the negotiation of voluntary agreements or in accordance with established law and practice if the DCO is granted.

Table G25-45 Summary of issues raised on the theme of wider water industry challenges and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	WWIC2 01	The respondent expressed enjoyment of leisure uses at sea in general, however, noted an inability to continue due to concerns over the Applicant's sewage treatments.	N	The Applicant acknowledges concerns related to reducing storm overflow releases into the environment. The Applicant has completed an ambitious plan to address its operational performance. The Applicant's Turnaround Plan rapidly improved performance between 2023 and 2025, with a renewed focus on ensuring a reliable water supply, enhancing customer service, becoming an industry leader in health and safety and protecting and improving the health of rivers and seas. Furthermore, the Applicant recognises that continued investment is required in both wastewater and water supply infrastructure to

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				address these challenges and ensure the network's long-term resilience. The Applicant remains committed to delivering upgrades and enhancements across both wastewater and water supply systems to meet current and future needs. This Project relates to maintaining water supplies for customers and not sewage treatment.
Wider Community	WWIC202	Respondents commented on the relationship between Government and the water industry. A respondent referenced news outlets suggesting the Secretary of State had made positive comments on the Project and raised their concern that this could prejudice the regulatory application process. It was also suggested that further collaboration between the government and the water industry take place to more effectively monitor water consumption.	N	The Project is subject to a rigorous and independent consenting process. An independently appointed Examining Authority (ExA) is responsible for examining applications for DCOs under the PA 2008 regime. Following examination, the ExA provides a recommendation to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, who makes the final decision on whether to grant consent. When deciding whether to grant consent, the Secretary of State must have regard to, amongst other things, the relevant National Policy Statement, ensuring that decisions are made in accordance with legal and policy frameworks. Regarding collaboration between the government and the water industry on water consumption, the EA has identified that by 2050, almost 5 billion extra litres of water will

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				be required every day to maintain public water supplies in England, with more than half of that need in the South East. The Applicant recognises this and contributes to regional planning through Water Resources South East (WRSE), a sector-wide partnership that brings together water companies, regulators and stakeholders in the South East to develop integrated strategies for managing water demand and supply.
Wider Community	WWIC2 03	The respondent suggested alternative scenarios for water consumption and waste disposal had not been stressed enough. The respondent noted their relationship to academia in Portsmouth and Examination Boards. It was suggested the Project constituted an opportunity to involve educators in conveying an understanding of the impact of people on their local environment and how to cope in a sustainable fashion.	N	Investing in demand reduction and water efficiency measures are all key to addressing the water supply shortfall in Hampshire but these can only be part of the overall solution, which also requires a large new water resource to maintain supplies into the future. The Applicant recognises the importance of education and awareness in promoting water-saving behaviours with customers. It also offers water efficiency and wastewater management incentives to developers to promote more sustainable practices in new development. These include encouraging the installation of 'water capture' technologies such as greywater recycling, rainwater harvesting and attenuation.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	WWIC204	The respondent raised concerns about company practices in principle, and noted this included water companies, to historically accept the payment of fines as opposed to following appropriate requirements.	N	The Applicant is aware of concerns regarding historical practices within the water industry, including the perception that fines have been accepted in place of compliance. The Applicant has implemented a Turnaround Plan (2023–2025) focused on improving operational performance, reducing pollution incidents and enhancing customer service. Since 2020, the Applicant has reduced pollution incidents by 38 per cent, and it reduced leakage by almost 20% last year. These improvements reflect the Applicant's commitment to meeting regulatory requirements and rebuilding public confidence. Furthermore, the Applicant is committed to transparently reporting environmental performance. The Applicant's website provides real-time alerts and reporting on pollution incidents, flow and spill data, wastewater treatment works compliance, regional bathing water results, emissions and river levels. The Applicant remains subject to oversight by independent regulators, including the EA, the Drinking Water Inspectorate and Ofwat. These bodies have the legal authority to enforce compliance and ensure that water

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				companies operate in accordance with environmental standards.
Wider Community	WWIC205	Respondents expressed discontent with water companies in general, on the basis public perception and relations, as well as concern about instances where water companies held monopolies.	N	Regarding public perception of water companies, please refer to the response to WWIC204. Regarding the Applicant operating as a monopoly – water and sewerage companies in England operate as regional entities, with dedicated infrastructure in each company's area. To ensure value for consumers and the environment and to protect against monopolistic practices, the sector is subject to economic regulation. In England, Ofwat is the financial regulator responsible for setting price limits and performance targets through a five-yearly price review process. These targets include reducing leakage, lowering personal water consumption and improving environmental outcomes. The Applicant's operations are subject to this regulatory framework, which balances the need to keep bills affordable with the requirement to finance infrastructure and meet environmental responsibilities.
Wider Community	WWIC206	The respondent stated that the entire exercise should not be entrusted to a privatised entity and suggested that this	N	While the Applicant is responsible for progressing the Project, it is subject to ongoing independent scrutiny and regulatory

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		was an important initiative that should be progressed by the central government and independently of the Applicant.		oversight, ensuring that public interest, environmental protection, and long-term resilience are considered in its development. Key to this is the Regulators' Alliance for Progressing Infrastructure Development (RAPID), a partnership between Ofwat, the EA, and the Drinking Water Inspectorate. RAPID was established to enable the development of new water resources that are safe, sustainable, and provide value for customers. The Project is subject to the RAPID gated process, which consists of four independent checkpoints. At each gate, the Project's progress, viability, and compliance with environmental and regulatory requirements are rigorously considered by the regulators. In addition, the Project will be subject to a consenting process whereby the Applicant's DCO application will be considered by an independently appointed Examining Authority, and a decision made by the relevant Secretary of State on whether to grant consent.

Table G25-46 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 1 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Natural England (NE)	DR1201	NE noted that Design Refinement 1 may have implications for the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). NE recommended that the shadow HRA should be updated to include an assessment of potential impacts from noise or disturbance to the qualifying features of the nearby designated sites due to this design change.	N	A Habitats Regulations Assessment - Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment and Marine Conservation Zone - Stage 1 Assessment (Document reference 5.2, DCO Volume 5) is submitted with the DCO application and provides detail on any potential impact pathways from the Project and any mitigation that will be implemented as a result to maintain the integrity of internationally designated sites. These assessments reflect this design change. As part of this assessment, engagement has been undertaken with NE to ensure appropriate mitigation for impacts on Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy sites.
National Highways (NH), Hampshire County Council (HCC)	DR1202	NH advised that the addition of a pumping station at Budds Farm would need to be considered in any wider cumulative impact assessments supporting proposals. HCC noted that with the addition of the pumping station, proposals for the Project would be in proximity to Solent Way running along footpath Havant 45. The Council continued on to state that the footpath was within the waterworks site	N	Effects arising from the construction and operation of the Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) pumping station have been considered in the Environmental Statement (ES), including ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Visual impacts on people travelling along the Solent Way, have been addressed in ES

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		and therefore it was assumed visual impact would be the only effect. The County Council advised consideration to be given to this matter, relative to the surrounding of the Public Rights of Way (PRoW).		Chapter 13 Landscape and visual (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), supported by ES Appendix 13.4 Visual baseline and effects, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Due to a series of embedded mitigation measures, including limiting heights of Budds Farm WTW pumping station, and retention of the embankment and vegetation to the south, the new structures would not be visible from footpath Havant 45.
Winchester City Council (WCC)	DR1203	WCC noted that Budds Farm WTW was located outside of the Winchester Local Authority area and therefore comments were deferred to the relevant authorities.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR1204	The respondents raised concerns, noting that the addition of another pumping station further increased the energy requirement and carbon cost of what was already considered an energy intensive scheme. Whilst responses expressed acknowledgement that the proposed location for the pumping station close to existing buildings would reduce the risk of buildings standing out, the proposed siting	N	A carbon assessment has been undertaken to determine the effects of the Project on climate, reported in ES Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The outline Carbon Management Plan (Document reference 7.8, DCO Volume 7) sets out the measures that will be followed to drive down carbon during construction and operation of the Project.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		was suggested to be located on land that was likely to be contaminated, thereby increasing the risk to Langstone Harbour. It was noted that both construction and operation of the Budds Farm WTW would increase risks to Langstone Harbour. Respondents further stated that construction of the pumping station and associated proposed pipelines posed a risk of mobilising silt and even leachate which could be discharged into the stream or harbour.		Section 11.8 of ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of the potential for preferential pathways to be created or modified (which would allow for the migration of contaminants) as a result of construction and operation activities at Budds Farm WTW and the potential impacts this could have on surface waters and the ecological habitats they support (inclusive of Langstone Harbour). Construction of the Budds Farm WTW pumping station would be undertaken in line with the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) which sets out mitigation measures associated with soil leachate to ensure potential pollution is minimised. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) also includes measures relating to the management of stockpiled materials during the construction phase including, for example, covering contaminated soil stockpiles and implementing control measures to prevent windblown dust, the ingress of rainwater and containment of surface water run-off.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				The assessment provided within ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) concluded that, with the implementation of mitigation measures, there would be no likely significant effects to Langstone Harbour from the migration of soil leachate from the Budds Farm WTW site.
Wider Community	DR1205	The respondent stated concerns regarding the proposed Design Refinement as tunnelling below the tidal section of Hermitage Stream could cause noise, vibration and mobilisation of sediment in an area of the harbour, which was considered important for birds, as well as the possible impact on other species including fish within the Special Area of Conservation/Site of Special Scientific Interest. In addition, the respondent stated their understanding that the Applicant proposed to increase the height of the main Water Recycling Plant (WRP) building by 1.5m to terminate 14.5m above the landfill, which the respondent stated would increase the landscape impacts beyond existing. The respondent did not consider that tree	N	An assessment of effects resulting from the construction of the pipeline between Budds Farm WTW and the WRP is included in the ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out that no significant adverse effects on the Hermitage Stream are expected from direct disturbance or from contaminants (e.g. fine sediment) as a result of constructing the Pipelines between Budds Farm WTW and the WRP site. ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out that potential residual effects on marine biodiversity (e.g. fish and designated sites) are not anticipated to be significant as a result of the Project's construction. Construction of the Project will be managed by an Outline Construction Environmental Management

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		screening would be practical and that the structure would be visible from all around Langstone Harbour, Portsdown Hill and Old Bedhampton.		Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, which sets out the measures that will be implemented to avoid and reduce environmental impacts. ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of the landscape and visual impacts of the WRP site. As per Design Principle WRP_13, the green/brown roof at the WRP main process building will help reduce impacts on key views from the south. Further, Design Principles WRP_8 and WRP_9 set out measures that will be adopted to integrate the WRP site within the landscape and ensure the detailed design of buildings (including finishes) and fencing has regard to local context. Please refer to the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5).
Wider Community	DR1206	A respondent stated that it was their understanding that the design change proposed an additional pumping station to transfer treated final effluent from the Budds Farm sewage works to the higher ground on which the WRP was located at the Broadmarsh Coastal Site.	N	An assessment of effects resulting from the construction of the Pipelines between Budds Farm WTW and the WRP is included in the ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The operational maintenance approach for the Project is set out in the Operational Environmental Management Plan (Document

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		The respondent stated that the addition of a pumping station meant that final effluent would be pumped under pressure from Budds Farm to the effluent recycling plant. They raised concerns that any burst or leak would pose a significant risk to Langstone Harbour, something which was not considered in the Environmental Water Quality Report assessment. The respondent further stated that there would also be significant risk of site contamination which could end up in the harbour. Another respondent stated that due to the pumping station location, they would need to be satisfied that the infrastructure would not be detrimental to the features of the neighbouring protected sites, which were named as the Langstone Harbour Site of Special Scientific Interest, Solent Maritime Special Conservation Area, Chichester and Langstone Harbour RAMSAR site, Chichester and Harbour Special Protected Area, and Solent Waders and Brent Geese Strategy site.		reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7). ES Chapter 14 Major accidents and disasters (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out the mitigation measures for the risk of pipe rupture and associated flooding which are secured in the Operational Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7). An Operational Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7) has been prepared to cover the operational lifetime of the Project and has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The implications of a pipeline burst are not considered in the water quality modelling as this is considered to be an operationally exceptional event that would not be expected to occur during the operation of the Project. Effects arising from the construction and operation of the Budds Farm WTW pumping station have been considered in the ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and the Habitats Regulations Assessment - Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment and Marine Conservation Zone - Stage 1 Assessment (Document reference 5.2, DCO Volume 5). Construction of the Project would be undertaken in line with the Outline

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) which sets out mitigation measures to ensure potential pollution is minimised. With the implementation of mitigation measures, there would be no likely significant effects to Langstone Harbour from the migration of soil leachate from the Budds Farm WTW site.
Wider Community	DR1207	Respondents raised that the construction site and the additional two construction compounds would be very close to the harbour, which could result in potential impacts from construction work on the harbour, birds, and other species using this part of the harbour to feed, drink and roost. It was noted that the construction would be taking place at the same time as construction of the nearby WRP and could result in cumulative and combined impacts on birds, therefore driving them away from this part of the harbour SPA.	N	An assessment of effects resulting from the construction of the Pipelines between Budds Farm WTW and the WRP and the Budds Farm WTW pumping station is included in the ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and Habitats Regulations Assessment - Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment and Marine Conservation Zone - Stage 1 Assessment (Document reference 5.2, DCO Volume 5). ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Chapter 20 Cumulative effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) are particularly relevant. Construction of the Project will be managed by an Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), which sets out the measures that will be implemented to avoid and reduce

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				impacts on biodiversity. No adverse effects on the integrity of the SPA are anticipated. Potential construction noise and vibration impacts from the Project have been assessed, this accounts for the construction of different elements of the Project likely to be undertaken simultaneously. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) identifies mitigation measures for construction noise and vibration impacts, which include Best Practicable Means and potential additional mitigation where required. ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) describes this assessment and concludes that, with the mitigation measures in place, residual construction noise and vibration effects are not considered to be significant. Disturbance of birds using the Special Protection Area (SPA) will be minimised through a number of measures set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) including those set out above, the use of visual and acoustic screening barriers and the presence during construction work of an Ecological Clerk of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Works who will have the authority to stop work if disturbance levels exceed thresholds agreed with NE, particularly at high tide during the non-breeding season. Design Principles BFWTW_4 and BFWTW_5 set out commitments for the detailed design to adhere to in order to avoid and reduce impacts on birds including Solent Waders and Brent Geese. This includes avoiding placing temporary and permanent barriers to movement and minimising disturbance to species from lighting. Please refer to the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5).
Wider Community	DR1208	Respondents further noted that the proposed Budds Farm WTW would be visible from the Solent Way long distance footpath and emphasised the importance of retaining existing bund and vegetation and the introduction of native landscape screening.	N	The existing bund and vegetation on the southwestern boundary of Budds Farm WTW will be retained following the development of the Budds Farm WTW pumping station. This is secured by the work area for the pumping station as shown on the Works plans (Document reference 2.3, DCO Volume 2), which avoids the existing bund and associated vegetation.

Table G25-47 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 2 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
National Highways (NH)	DR2201	NH stated that the increased roof height from 13m to 14m to accommodate a green roof would unlikely impact the A27, and therefore NH offered no objection to this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Winchester City Council WCC, Hampshire County Council HCC	DR2202	WCC stated that Design Refinement 2 is proposed to be located outside of the Winchester Local Authority Area and therefore deferred comments to the relevant authorities. HCC stated that they had no comment.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Langstone Harbour Board	DR2203	Langstone Harbour Board stated that whilst measures such as the green roof were promising, additional specifics on planned environmental mitigation were necessary for meaningful evaluation.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) sets out the EMEA measures that will be implemented at the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) site, with WRP_13 focusing on the green/brown roof. Design Principles WRP_11 and WRP_12 ensure that existing vegetation along the site boundaries will be reinforced through interplanting and/or by widening the existing extent of the vegetation, helping to screen the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				site, enhance ecological corridors and/or protect mature tree stock. Design Principle WRP_16 ensures that the detailed design has regard to delivering open mosaic habitat.
Langstone Harbour Board	DR2204	Langstone Harbour Board stated that given the strategic importance of the site to Solent Waders, further refinements were urged to retain the functionality. Refinements to the design were quoted to inevitably result in the building becoming more prominent in the landscape, and it was stated that the WRP would require nighttime lighting. The Langstone Harbour Board stated that there appeared to be no assessment of the increased lighting at the site, and further across Broadmarsh Coastal Park and into Langstone Harbour. The respondent stated that the effects on terrestrial and marine economy with specific reference to SPA species that utilise breeding islands in Langstone Harbour would be required.	N	The Environmental Statement (ES) (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of the landscape and visual impacts of the WRP site, including this design refinement. As per Design Principle WRP_13, the green/brown roof at the WRP main process building will help reduce impacts on key views from the south. Further, Design Principles WRP_9 and WRP_10 set out measures that will be adopted to integrate the WRP site within the landscape and ensure the detailed design of buildings (including finishes) and fencing has regard to local context. ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) considers the impacts of lighting at the WRP site, and Design Principle GDP_8 sets out measures to ensure the lighting design will avoid and reduce impacts.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Please refer to the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). An HRA undertaken for the Project considered the impact on Solent Waders and Brent Geese which are qualifying features of the ecological sites in Langstone Harbour and concluded no adverse effect on the integrity of the ecological sites in Langstone Harbour – please see the Habitats Regulations Assessment - Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment and Marine Conservation Zone - Stage 1 Assessment (Document reference 5.2, DCO Volume 5) for more details.
Wider Community	DR2205	The respondent stated that they thought the heat produced might supplement the energy from solar panels previously proposed to cover the WRP. The respondent stated that there would be no need for a green roof in an area which would largely be uninhabited by humans.	N	The Outline Carbon Management Plan (Document reference 7.8, DCO Volume 7) sets out the Project's renewable energy strategy and briefly considers the feasibility of renewable energy options. As per Design Principle WRP_13, a green/brown roof is proposed at the WRP site to mitigate environmental effects and provide environmental enhancements. Please refer to the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	DR2206	The respondent raised objection that increasing the height of the building would make the issue worse and would ultimately increase the risk for leachate entering the groundwater and potentially into Langstone Harbour. The respondents sought clarification regarding the scalability of the design and what the plan for control, monitoring and management during construction and operation of the WRP would be.	N	ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of the landscape and visual impacts of the WRP site, including the height proposed in the design refinement. As per Design Principle WRP_13, the green/brown roof at the WRP main process building will help reduce impacts on key views from the south. Further, Design Principles WRP_9 and WRP_10 set out measures that will be adopted to integrate the WRP site within the landscape and ensure the detailed design of buildings (including finishes) and fencing has regard to local context. The Project's detailed design as set out in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) and various management plans will take place post consent as secured by DCO requirements (see the DCO (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3)). Construction of the WRP site would be undertaken in line with the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) which sets out mitigation measures to ensure environmental impacts including potential pollution is minimised. The

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				operational maintenance approach for the Project is set out in the Operational Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7). An HRA undertaken for the Project which considered the impact on ecological sites in Langstone Harbour concluded no adverse effect on the integrity of the ecological sites in Langstone Harbour as a result of water quality changes – please see the Habitats Regulations Assessment - Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment and Marine Conservation Zone - Stage 1 Assessment (Document reference 5.2, DCO Volume 5) for more details.
Wider Community	DR2207	The respondents stated their confusion regarding how the roof of the WRP could serve as an environmental mitigation area, and what would this mitigate against. Respondents also stated that they had not seen any information regarding the size or impact on the environment regarding this design refinement.	N	A green/brown roof is proposed at the WRP site (at the main process building) to provide for open mosaic habitat mitigation, enhance biodiversity and reduce impacts on key views from the south; please see Design Principle WRP_13 in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). The extent of the green/brown roof would be determined at the detailed design stage and would cover as large an area as reasonably practicable (as per Design Principle WRP_13).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Information on the potential impacts of the WRP were provided in the Applicant's Summer 2024 Consultation and Spring 2025 Consultation for Design Refinement 2. The ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of the environmental effects of the WRP site, with ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) reporting on the landscape and visual impacts of the WRP site.
Wider Community	DR2208	The respondent stated that the proposed green roof was described as an on-site habitat enhancement, yet the respondent believed that there was already grassland at the site being lost. The respondent raised their concern that it was not realistic to expect a green roof to flourish in the exposed, windy, raised, coastal location. The respondent suggested that solar panels would be a better option for the design of the WRP.	N	As per Design Principle WRP_13, a green/brown roof is proposed at the WRP site (at the main process building) to provide for both environmental mitigation and enhancements. Specifically, it would provide for open mosaic habitat mitigation, enhance biodiversity and reduce impacts on key views from the south. Please refer to the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) sets out the specification for the green/brown roof to support the development of the new habitat.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Solar panels on the WRP roof have not been proposed given the likely visual impact of these on important viewpoints. In response to feedback, the design approach has been to integrate the building as far as practicable into its landscape setting, which the green/brown roof will help to achieve. The Outline Carbon Management Plan (Document reference 7.8, DCO Volume 7) sets out the Project's renewable energy strategy and the feasibility of renewable energy options.
Wider Community	DR2209	The respondent suggested that a one-meter height addition could be accommodated by sinking the building a further one metre lower. The respondent queried if the walls would be screened in the same way as the roof.	N	As per Design Principle WRP_13, the green/brown roof at the WRP main process building will help reduce impacts on key views from the south. Further, Design Principles WRP_8 and WRP_9 set out measures that will be adopted to integrate the WRP site within the landscape and ensure the detailed design of buildings (including finishes) and fencing has regard to local context. Sinking the building 1m lower would require further excavation of landfill waste on the site and is not considered necessary given the purpose of the green/brown roof in mitigating the potential visual impact of the building.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Please refer to the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5).
Wider Community	DR2210	The respondent stated clarification regarding the size of the WRP.	N	Design Principles WRP_3 to WRP_7 set out the controls for building and structure footprints and heights. Please refer to the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5).

Table G25-48 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 3 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
National Highways (NH)	DR3201	NH understood that the proposal would allow for a new temporary construction access from an existing access point on the A27 slip road, which would support access to construction compound B1-1 located west of Mill Lane. NH understood that the access would be added as some of the abnormal and heavy construction vehicles would not have been able to pass over the Mill Lane railway bridge. It also understood that this access	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		would only be used by a low number of construction vehicles.		
NH	DR3202	NH stated that it would not support DR3 due to potential impacts to safety of the existing users of the A27 slip, which when combined with the design requirement, would not be in accordance with the Design Manual for Road and Bridges. NH referred to the Department for Transport Circular 1/22 (Strategic Road Network and the delivery of sustainable development) paragraphs 18 to 25, in particular paragraph 20 <i>"The presumption against new connections includes temporary access points for construction vehicles."</i> NH did not support a departure from this policy based on the available information. NH also stated that it would be essential that alternative proposals were considered and they recommended that the site promoter engaged with NH and Hampshire County Council (HCC) to develop an alternative strategy.	N	The Applicant is continuing to engage with NH and HCC on this matter. The existing gated vehicle access onto the A27 slip road is understood to be occasionally used for Telecom Mast maintenance and operation vehicle access. The Applicant is of the view that providing limited use by construction traffic purposes of low numbers of large vehicles only and with the appropriate and suitable notification and traffic management arrangements, would be beneficial and outweigh the potential impacts from using the local highway network. The smaller and more numerous vehicles would use the local highway network.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Portsmouth Water	DR3203	Portsmouth Water noted that the Applicant proposes a series of design refinements in the area, partly to ensure that Portsmouth Water's proposed pipelines between Bedhampton and Havant Thicket Reservoir were included in the proposed draft Order Limits. Portsmouth Water noted that the proposed use by the Applicant of Bedhampton and Havant Thicket Reservoir could be authorised by the Development Consent Order (DCO). This included correction of the draft Order Limits in the vicinity of Havant Rugby Club to reflect the revised Portsmouth Water pipeline route.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Portsmouth Water, HCC	DR3204	In relation to the proposed design refinement at Bedhampton, Portsmouth Water emphasised that any future construction and operational interfaces around Bedhampton Water Treatment Works would need to be carefully coordinated with Portsmouth Water, including in relation to the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) obligations around the site.	N	Further engagement has been undertaken with Portsmouth Water to discuss the interface and connection works at Bedhampton Springs. Subsequent engagement with HCC has been undertaken as part of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) to discuss the minor potential works at the Brookside Road/Bedhampton Road Junction. These potential works have been agreed with HCC, should access to construction

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Portsmouth Water stated that it would continue to discuss the detail of those interfaces with the Applicant. HCC stated that the Highway Authority would need a greater understanding and details of the proposed changes to the Brookside Road/Bedhampton Road Junction before the County Council would agree that those were necessary.		compound B1-1 for articulated lorries not be feasible from the A27 on-slip.
Winchester City Council (WCC), HCC	DR3205	WCC stated that Pipeline Sections A and B were located outside of the Winchester Local Authority Area and therefore deferred comments to the relevant authorities. HCC stated traffic management and management of public access along footpath Havant 30 was important in the area in regard to public safety. HCC referred to the interactions with (Public Rights of Way) PRow through Leigh Park which were set out in response to the PRow Management Plan (Dec 2024 issue 1).	N	The Framework Rights of Way Management Plan (RoWMP) (Appendix to Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)) sets out the approach to mitigation and management for PRow including Havant 30. The Applicant has engaged with HCC on the strategies set out in the Framework RoWMP. The Project no longer proposes works at Leigh Park.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
HCC	DR3206	HCC noted the compound location changes and the area for temporary off-site highway works.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
HCC	DR3207	HCC stated that Section A covered the area around Staunton Country Park and Section B covered the area south of Staunton Country Park to the Water Recycling Plant (WRP). HCC stated that the Minerals and Waste Authority noted this alteration brought more of the pipeline easement within the Mineral Safeguarding Area. As the County Council was still awaiting the final Mineral Resource Assessment, the additional areas should have been included in any future calculations regarding mineral potential. The Mineral Safeguarding Area in Havant mostly included brick clay, and if so, the Council suggested that the consultants should approach operating brickworks to ascertain any interest in the resources.	N	Following the approval in 2025 of Portsmouth Water's application for two new pipelines between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir, the Applicant's backup option for pipelines between the WRP site and Havant Thicket Reservoir was not progressed any further. Therefore, no works are proposed between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir as part of the Project. The Applicant's DCO application will seek to authorise the use of Portsmouth Water's Pipelines to transfer recycled water between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir. Further information on the removal of the backup option is contained in section 5 of the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5). As such, the Project's interaction with the Mineral Safeguarding Area has reduced. The assessment of impacts on mineral resources included in the Application reflects the design for which development consent is sought, as set out in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 16 Resources and waste

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				management (Document reference 6.1, ES Volume 6).
HCC	DR3208	The Council noted that the additional construction compound at Bedhampton Springs conflicted with the Kingscroft Access. The Council stated that prior to the commencement of the DCO works, the residential site would likely be occupied, and the access amendments implemented, which should be appropriately reflected within the assessment work. The Council acknowledged that at Havant Rugby Club, the compound arrangements reflected those agreed with the Highway Authority as part of the Portsmouth Water pipeline application and therefore the Council supported DR3.	N	Subsequent engagement with HCC has been undertaken with regards to access and highway works to inform the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7). It has been demonstrated that the additional construction compound (B1-3) would not impact the consented access for the Kingscroft residential development. The Project no longer includes any works at Havant Rugby Club due to the removal of the backup option for pipelines between the WRP site and Havant Thicket Reservoir as explained in the response to issue DR3207 above.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR3209	A respondent stated their interest regarding design refinements 3 and 4. A respondent stated that it was not clear where the Applicant proposed to construct the tunnel shafts between the WRP and West Street. The respondent stated that this information was required in order to judge the impact on local roads, residents,		The shafts for construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Bedhampton Springs would be located at the WRP site, at construction compound B1-1 and construction compound B1-2, which are shown on Sheet 3 and 4 of the Works plans (Document reference 2.3, DCO Volume 2). ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6)

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		public open space and sensitive parts of the conservation area. In addition, the respondent queried if the shafts were located within the compound areas shown on the consultation material. A respondent also questioned how the mature tree line would be protected and how much compensation residents would be offered if they live close to the tunnel shaft at Hooks Farm Way. A further respondent stated that the extension of the reservoir inlet pipe further into Havant Thicket Reservoir would mean that the water quality modelling would be out of date.		considers impacts on the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area. Following the Spring 2025 Consultation, Havant Borough Council (HBC) approved Portsmouth Water's planning application for two new pipelines between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir. These pipelines are needed by Portsmouth Water to enable the filling and abstraction of spring water from the new reservoir. As such, the backup option (as presented at the Spring 2025 Consultation) which included a tunnel shaft near Hooks Farm Way was not progressed any further. The location of the inlet pipe to Havant Thicket Reservoir would be delivered by Portsmouth Water, and this has informed water quality modelling that has informed the ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). This sets out that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the Water Environment Regulations. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration of water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir. The shafts for construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Bedhampton

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Springs would be located at the WRP site, at construction compound B1-1 and construction compound B1-2, which are shown on Sheet 3 and 4 of the Works Plans (Document reference 2.3, DCO Volume 2).
Wider Community	DR3210	The respondent stated that they wanted the following amendment to be made to the 'preferred' option in both documents to ensure clarity. Respondents asked for an amendment to be made to the documents to clarify that the recycling plant joins the flow arising from the Bedhampton Spring and where it will mix and will not be connected to Bedhampton Spring. The respondent noted that similarly, the return flow pipeline should go directly to the recycling plant and then onto Otterbourne and it should have been made clear that there would be no direct connection to Bedhampton Springs source water.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. Design refinement 3 as part of the Spring 2025 Consultation made clear that the connection at Bedhampton Springs would be to Portsmouth Water's proposed pipelines that would transfer spring water to and from Havant Thicket Reservoir. To confirm, the Pipelines proposed by the Applicant would transfer recycled water from the WRP site to Bedhampton Springs, and source water from Bedhampton Springs back to the WRP site (before transfer to Otterbourne Water Supply Works (WSW)). The Project would not connect into Bedhampton Springs itself, rather the pipelines that Portsmouth Water are delivering as described above.
Wider Community	DR3211	The respondent stated that they supported the proposal for a new temporary road from the slip road off the A27 to Mill Lane	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		for abnormal loads, in order to prevent damage to the old railway bridge. The respondent noted that this would be a positive step as it would keep heavy loads out of Old Bedhampton.		
Wider Community	DR3212	The respondents opposed routing construction traffic through Old Bedhampton and the conservation area and instead suggested that all heavy vehicles should use the new temporary access from the A27 slip road, which would be better suited and safer. They highlighted the potential risks to a historic railway bridge and questioned the need to upgrade the Brookside Road/Bedhampton junction if heavy loads were diverted. They also noted that the alternative route via Kingscroft Lane would be unsafe for temporary traffic. The respondent called for urgent discussions with the Highway Authority to consider routing all construction traffic via the proposed alternative to reduce noise, vibration, and congestion in the residential area.	N	The significant traffic management needed to make a temporary access from the A27 safe for all construction vehicles was not considered acceptable to National Highways. This access is however proposed to be used for a small number of larger construction vehicles and mitigation will be implemented to ensure this can be achieved safely. Access to this area for the remainder of construction traffic through Old Bedhampton will be managed in line with the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) which has been developed in consultation with HCC. This approach has been determined through engagement with NH and HCC.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	DR3213	The respondent noted that changes to the shaft and compound location at Havant Rugby Club were shown on the Applicant's map. The respondent stated that these were an improvement, but that there would still be a significant on the Rugby Club, St Thomas Moore School and the local community, and a loss of public open space. The respondent questioned if there would be an option of a longer tunnel to run to an area of open space further north where the impact on the community would be less, especially as there was not a proposal to join the Portsmouth Water pipeline at this point.	N	Following the Spring 2025 Consultation, HBC approved Portsmouth Water's planning application for two new pipelines between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir. These pipelines are needed by Portsmouth Water to enable the filling and abstraction of spring water from the new reservoir. As such, the backup option (as presented at the Spring 2025 Consultation) which included a tunnel shaft near Hooks Farm Way (Havant Rugby Club), is no longer included in the Project.
Wider Community	DR3214	The respondents objected as they felt that there had been limited communication between the Applicant and those that would be affected by the design refinement. The respondents were concerned about the impact Design Refinement 3 would have on the local community and how this would impact accessibility to public open space. The respondents noted that they felt there would be a high level of disturbance for	N	Following the Summer 2024 Statutory Consultation, the Applicant wrote to landowners in December 2024 to provide the opportunity to meet and discuss their comments further, to better understand possible impacts. As part of the Statutory Spring 2025 Consultation, the Applicant also contacted landowners and/or their representatives who were impacted by design refinements to ensure they were aware of the consultation timescales, where information

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		those living close to the intermediate tunnel shaft B2-2 by Hooks Farm. A respondent question what compensation these residents would receive.		would be available on the website and offered meetings to discuss the Project changes. The Applicant's then provided written responses to landowners who provided feedback to the Summer 2024 and Spring 2025 Statutory Consultations via letters which were sent to landowners and their representatives in December 2025 and January 2026. The Applicant has carefully evaluated site and route options against a range of planning and environmental criteria, including potential impacts on land use. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) and ES Chapter 3 Description of Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out the process the Applicant has taken to refine the pipeline route, whilst ES Chapter 4 Consideration of alternatives (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) details the other options considered. The Spring 2025 Consultation was aimed specifically at consulting local communities on the design refinements that might affect them. Following the Spring 2025 Consultation, HBC approved Portsmouth Water's planning application for two new pipelines between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Reservoir. These pipelines are needed by Portsmouth Water to enable the filling and abstraction of spring water from the new reservoir. As such, the backup option (as presented at the Spring 2025 Consultation) is no longer included in the Project, thereby reducing impacts on the local community and open space.
Wider Community	DR3215	The respondents stated that refinements under Design Refinement 3 were sensible adjustments and good improvements.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Wider Community	DR3216	A respondent stated that they were still unclear of impacts that pipeline sections A, B and D would have on Bedhampton Road and more specifically on their home. The respondent believed that constructing pipelines and sewage recycling traffic would harm Bedhampton, opposing construction traffic through Old Bedhampton due to existing congestion.	N	ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) considers the impacts on Bedhampton Road. The Project is not anticipated to lead to any significant residual effects to Bedhampton Road. Access to this area through Old Bedhampton and along Bedhampton Road will be managed in line with the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) which has been developed in consultation with HCC.
Wider Community	DR3217	The respondent stated that the proposal for a new temporary slip road off the A27 to Mill Lane for abnormal loads to prevent damage to the bridge over the railway	N	It would not be safe for all construction vehicles to use an access from the A27, however this access is proposed to be used for a small number of large construction

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		seemed like a good idea but suggested that it should be used for all construction traffic to keep heavy loads out of residential areas with narrow lanes.		vehicles and mitigation will be implemented to ensure this is managed safely. Access to this area through Old Bedhampton will be managed in line with the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) which has been developed in consultation with HCC. This approach has been determined through engagement with NH and HCC.

Table G25-49 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 4 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
East Hampshire District Council (EHDC), Portsmouth Water, Hampshire County	DR4201	EHDC noted that they had assessed the new information and that any comments on the updated water quality information would be made by HBC. EHDC added that the new Design Refinement 4 was the only proposed refinement falling within the Council's local authority boundary and therefore acknowledged the Design Refinement 4 proposed connection point and route to	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Consultation Report Appendix G – Statutory Spring 2025 Consultation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Council (HCC)		Havant Thicket Reservoir from Staunton Country Park. All respondents acknowledged that the draft Limits of Deviation had changed and extended to include pipeline areas into Havant Thicket Reservoir. Respondents also noted that the draft Order Limits would remain the same as they encompassed Havant Thicket Reservoir site as a whole, that Design Refinement 4 related to the Applicant's backup pipeline option, including the connection points within Havant Thicket Reservoir site and Staunton Country Park, and that the location of construction compound B2-1 was shown within the Country Park grazing land.		
Portsmouth Water	DR4202	Portsmouth Water noted that if the Applicant needed to rely upon the backup pipeline option, it would be crucial that the ongoing construction and eventual operation of Havant Thicket Reservoir would not be compromised by the interfacing with the Project. Portsmouth Water stated that they would be seeking assurance through the DCO process on these matters and that Portsmouth Water	N	Following the Spring 2025 Consultation, HBC approved Portsmouth Water's planning application for two new pipelines between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir. These pipelines are needed by Portsmouth Water to enable the filling and abstraction of spring water from the new reservoir (application reference: APP/24/00405). As such, the backup option for pipelines between the Water Recycling

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		would continue to discuss the detail of these interfaces with the Applicant in the coming months.		Plant (WRP) site and Havant Thicket Reservoir (as presented at the Spring 2025 Consultation) was not progressed any further. The Applicant's DCO application will seek to authorise the use of Portsmouth Water's Pipelines to transfer recycled water between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir. Further information on the removal of the backup option is contained in section 5 of the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5). The Applicant has continued to engage with Portsmouth Water on the interface between the two projects.
HCC	DR4203	HCC believed there was insufficient certainty about the compound's constraints and requested further details, including the duration, activities, and specifically potential traffic impacts on Staunton Farm. Concerns were raised about public disturbance and its effect on visitor numbers and income. HCC noted that submission of a restoration and aftercare plan submitted to and approved by the County Council would be required and that both would need to be undertaken at the developer's cost whether	N	Following the approval in 2025 of Portsmouth Water's application for two new pipelines between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir, the Applicant's backup option for pipelines between the WRP site and Havant Thicket Reservoir was not progressed any further. Therefore, no works are proposed between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir as part of the Project. The Applicant's DCO application will seek to authorise the use of Portsmouth Water's Pipelines to transfer recycled water between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir. Further information on the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		undertaken by the developer themselves or via contributions to HCC. The Council added that an environmental management plan required the inclusion of plans in regard to biodiversity and may also include details related to seed collection and banking, as well and protecting the site's topsoil. The Council raised that ground compaction was a concern in respect of the proposed compound, potentially causing uneven ground and hindering restoration, with mitigation measures of temporary surface protection surfaces (mats or unbound gravel) suggested. Additionally, it was noted that existing Higher Level Stewardship grants on High Lawn may need suspension during construction.		removal of the backup option is contained in section 5 of the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5). As such, Staunton Farm and High Lawn are no longer included in the design of the Project.
Winchester City Council (WCC), HCC	DR4204	WCC stated that the design refinement was not within their local authority area and that the Council deferred comments to the relevant authorities. HCC questioned what the easement would be for the proposed pipeline across the site. HCC commented in respect of fees associated with the change of land use to a proposed compound. HCC stated that it	N	Following the approval in 2025 of Portsmouth Water's application for two new pipelines between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir, the Applicant's backup option for pipelines between the WRP site and Havant Thicket Reservoir was not progressed any further. Therefore, no works are proposed between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir as part of the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		would be standard practice to receive payment for the land use, also incorporating the loss of amenity. The County Council stated that in the case of the compound proposed related to Design Refinement 4, the location's current use was for livestock grazing.		Project. The Applicant's DCO application will seek to authorise the use of Portsmouth Water's Pipelines to transfer recycled water between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir. Further information on the removal of the backup option is contained in section 5 of the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5). As such, Design Refinement 4 is no longer part of the Project.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR4205	The respondents commented on Design Refinement 4 noting that in their view, the proposed change showing the inlet position in Havant Thicket Reservoir had changed and that as a result the modelling was out of date. They added that the water quality modelling was already considered to be out of date as the position of the inlet pipe shown in Figure 1.1 inset map was different to the 2024 Future Water drawings, which was stated to show it extending further east into Havant Thicket Reservoir previously. It was also noted that Design Refinement 4 - Figure 10 also indicated a different extent for the inlet pipeline.		Following the approval in 2025 of Portsmouth Water's application for two new pipelines between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir, the Applicant's backup option for pipelines between the WRP site and Havant Thicket Reservoir was not progressed any further. Therefore, no works are proposed between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir as part of the Project. The Applicant's DCO application will seek to authorise the use of Portsmouth Water's Pipelines to transfer recycled water between Bedhampton Springs and Havant Thicket Reservoir. Further information on the removal of the backup option is contained in section 5 of the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				As such, Design Refinement 4 is no longer part of the Project. The location of the inlet pipe to Havant Thicket Reservoir would be delivered by Portsmouth Water, and this has informed water quality modelling that has informed the ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). This sets out that water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir would be consistent with the definition of 'high' status for a lake water body under the Water Environment Regulations. Operation of the Project would not, therefore, result in a deterioration of water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir.

Table G25-50 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 5 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
National Highways (NH), Hampshire County Council (HCC)	DR5201	NH advised that any changes in the pipeline route would need to be considered in relation to the required geotechnical and structural technical approvals.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment and will seek the relevant technical approvals from NH. The Order Limits at Harts Farm Way covers all land and highway required for the Project.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		HCC noted that a small section of Harts Farm Way was excluded from the Draft Order Limits HCC noted that this area constituted highway land and therefore any changes to this section could be consented and included as part of any required S278 agreement. The Council did further advise that the Applicant should consider if the small section of Harts Farm Way should be included within the red line.		
Portsmouth Water	DR5202	Portsmouth Water noted that as part of the Spring 2025 Consultation, the size of the Project's 'Construction Compound D-1' had been reduced. Portsmouth Water considered that whilst this reduced the impact on the delivery of Portsmouth Water's Farlington to Nelson Pipeline project, it noted that residual impacts would remain should the timing of delivery of the Projects overlap. Portsmouth Water stated that further discussions were required regarding this compound as Portsmouth Water had its	N	The applicant has used the information shared during these discussions to minimise an impact to any of the operational developments by Portsmouth Water. Timelines have been compared and currently demonstrate no clash or impact between the projects. Consultation will continue throughout the detail design, post consent, to ensure no clash in construction activities Collaboration between the Applicant and Portsmouth Water has taken place throughout the development of the Project and is ongoing to manage the commercial, operational and delivery interfaces between

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		own development plans for this site that should not be compromised by the Applicant's Project.		the Project and Havant Thicket Reservoir. The Applicant has sought to avoid and minimise any impacts on Portsmouth Water's operational assets, and construction timelines for both projects confirm no expected conflicts. Collaboration will continue throughout the detailed design stage to avoid any conflicts in construction activities. The Development Consent Order (DCO) (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3) will include protective provisions to safeguard statutory undertaker's assets and provide for further engagement during the detailed design and construction phase.
Winchester City Council (WCC), HCC, Portsmouth City Council (PCC)	DR5203	WCC and HCC stated that Design Refinement 5 was located outside of the Councils' respective Local Authority Areas and that comments would be deferred to the relevant Councils. PCC acknowledged that the proposed change comprised a change to the route of the tunnel.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
PCC	DR5204	PCC considered that it appeared as though the extent of the proposed Compound D-1 was located within Local Greenspace.	N	Construction compound D-1 is not located in local greenspace in PCC's local plan, or in green space in its emerging local plan.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		PCC sought confirmation that, upon completion of the Project that the Applicant would ensure that this location of Compound D-1 would be returned to its original state and that there would be no above ground, permanent development proposed in that area.		However, the compound is located in a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and will be returned to its original condition. There would be no permanent above ground infrastructure retained at this site.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR5205	The respondent queried what the impact of the west end of the Section D tunnel would be on the Site of Special Scientific Interest.	N	No works are proposed within the Site of Special Scientific Interest. The ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) considers the potential for indirect impacts on this site. ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) is particularly relevant.

Table G25-51 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 6 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Winchester City Council (WCC), Portsmouth	DR6201	WCC stated that it was their understanding that this part of the development was within both Winchester and Portsmouth Local Authority areas.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
City Council (PCC)		WCC expressed that it was the Council's understanding that the footprint for the above ground plant was larger to allow for security features and that this area included an increase to the Draft Order Limits for mitigation and to change the route following updated ecological information. PCC noted the need for additional fencing around the above ground plant as required by the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (Defra) which would result in an increase in footprint for the proposed Break Pressure Tank and Intermediate Pumping Station PCC also noted that integrating Break Pressure Tank and Intermediate Pumping Station into the existing landscape would reduce visual impacts and would comprise of cutting the site further into the hillside to reduce height above ground level and thereby mitigate the increase in footprint of the site.		
WCC	DR6202	WCC stated that the documents submitted had not addressed the concerns raised by WCC at the previous 2024 consultation regarding the impact of the height of the	N	Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) has considered impacts on historic features and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Above Ground Plant on the historic environment.		characteristics. Further engagement was undertaken with WCC following the Spring 2025 Consultation, where it was explained that the site specific design principles for Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E will control the detailed design of this site. Design Principle BPT/IPS-E_5 controls the maximum building/structure height and includes a commitment for Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E to be embedded into the hillside to reduce its overall height in the landscape. Further, Design Principle BPT/IPS-E_1 will ensure that the detailed design is sensitive to the historical and landscape context. Please refer to the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5).
HCC	DR6203	HCC provided comment stating that the extension of the Draft Order Limits did not encompass any additional highway under the control of HCC, and therefore the County Council provided no further comments on this site related to Design Refinement 6. HCC added that any additional construction/remedial work that would	N	ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) considers vehicle movements associated with all elements of the Project.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		generate additional vehicle trips should be accounted for appropriately in the supporting evidence base and control documents.		
PCC	DR6204	PCC outlined the Council's understanding of the changes proposed under Design Refinement 6 and for these to comprise alterations to the Draft Order Limits and Draft Limits of Deviation to reduce impacts on protected species, that there would be changes to the landscaping and planting proposals and that there was a proposal of a chalk grass habitat enhancement in the field to the west and some interspersed planting which would help blend the new landscaping and promote habitat connectivity. PCC questioned whether the mitigation area would be a permanent feature or whether it would revert to another use later.	N	Further engagement with PCC has confirmed the proposed management approach to EMEA in this location. The Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) sets out the landscaping, environmental mitigation, and enhancement measures that will be delivered alongside Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E. This includes measures to mitigate views from the north through a screening landform. The design principles also set out environmental enhancements that will be delivered in the field to the west of Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E, comprising chalk grassland enhancement.
PCC	DR6205	PCC stated it was the Council's position that Design Refinement 6 would not be considered to result in an increase in flood risk caused by the development, however, noted that the potential for run-off towards	N	The Applicant has engaged with PCC on the approach to drainage at Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E. This approach is set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (ES Appendix 19.1 Flood Risk Assessment, Volume 11 (Document

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		the existing repeater station building, would need to be considered. In addition, the Council advised that the Construction Environment Management Plan would need to consider material/mud from the site not being transported on to the surrounding road infrastructure. The Council also stated that at the application stage there would also need to be a more detailed consideration of how the proposed site, Intermediate Pumping Station E, would drain. The Council confirmed that the Policy Team had already liaised with the Applicant on the proposed Above Ground Plant as part of Design Refinement 6 and that the section of Local Greenspace on which it sits had been removed from the draft proposals map. The Council noted that the larger footprint does not overlap any other Local Greenspaces.		reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) and the appended SuDS Strategy. Drainage proposals at Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E have been discussed with PCC and this has informed the drainage design set out in the Flood Risk Assessment. A small perimeter bund has been proposed to divert run off to the adjacent Diffuse Swale system. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) includes measures for avoiding the spread of material onto the highway.
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	DR6206	A respondent stated that Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E was not necessary in an area of natural beauty.	N	A detailed site selection process has been undertaken for Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E. This

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				process involved consideration against engineering, environmental and planning criteria as set out in the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) and ES Chapter 4 Consideration of alternatives (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E is necessary at this location due to the topography of the Pipeline between the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) site and Otterbourne Water Supply Works (WSW) and has been determined by hydraulic modelling.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR6207	A respondent stated that their understanding was that Design Refinement 6 impacted on hedgerows and protected species' activity as well as contributing to 'urbanisation' of what was a rural landscape.	N	The Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) sets out the mitigation and enhancement measures that will be implemented to mitigate visual impacts and integrate Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E into the landscape. Where vegetation removal cannot be avoided, reinstatement planting will be undertaken in accordance with Design Principle GDP_17. Design Principles BPT/IPS-E_15 and BPT/IPS-E_18 include proposals to deliver hedgerow planting to

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				help screen views. BPT/IPS-E_13 will ensure that suitable protected species mitigation is delivered. Design Principle BPT/IPS-E_5 controls the maximum building / structure height and includes a commitment for Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E to be embedded into the hillside to reduce its overall height in the landscape. Further, Design Principle BPT/IPS-E_1 will ensure that the detailed design is sensitive to the historical and landscape context whilst BPT/IPS-E_2 ensures that a new screening landform is provided to the north and east. Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E is required in this location as a result of the topography of the pipeline route between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW. The location of Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E has been identified to reduce impacts on the landscape character. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the process that was undertaken to select the site for Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E. An assessment of the landscape and visual impacts of Break Pressure

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E is set out in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	DR6208	The respondent stated that the development extended the urban area further into a rural landscape on Portsdown Hill and raised concerns about significant visual impact and setting a precedent for further expansion. They highlighted that a large industrial building would be visually prominent and recommended native landscaping and construction materials, like red brick, to reduce its visual footprint. It also emphasised the presence of protected species and the need to carefully avoid impacts, particularly by minimising damage to hedgerows through alternative construction methods to preserve habitat connectivity.		Design Principles BPT/IPS-E_1 and BPT/IPS-E_6 set out measures that will be adopted to integrate Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E within the landscape and ensure the detailed design of buildings (including finishes) and fencing has regard to local context. Please refer to the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). Design Principle BPT/IPS-E_13 will ensure that suitable protected species mitigation is delivered. Where vegetation removal cannot be avoided, reinstatement planting will be undertaken in accordance with Design Principle GDP_17. Design Principles BPT/IPS-E_15 and BPT/IPS-E_18 include proposals to deliver hedgerow planting to help screen views. Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E `is required in this location as a result of the topography of the pipeline route between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW. The location of Break Pressure

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E has been identified to reduce impacts on the landscape character. The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out the process that was undertaken to select the site for Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E. An assessment of the landscape and visual impacts of Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E is set out in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
Wider Community	DR6209	Respondents expressed that the proposal to put a pressure tank and pumping station right near one of the Portsdown Hill viewpoints seemed inappropriate. They suggested that there existed views in all directions at the top of the hill which would be extensively impacted by adding a pumping station. Further concern was raised toward the possibility of increased noise pollution in an area for leisure and recreational uses. They stated that even with the additional proposed planting and landscaping the Project would result in impacts.		A detailed site selection process has been undertaken for Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E. This process involved consideration against engineering, environmental and planning criteria as set out in the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) and ES Chapter 4 Consideration of alternatives (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E is necessary at this location due to the topography of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW and has been determined by hydraulic modelling.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of the noise and vibration impacts as a result of the Project. Design Principle BPT/IPS-E_5 controls the maximum building / structure height and includes a commitment for Break Pressure Tank/Intermediate Pumping Station E to be embedded into the hillside to reduce its overall height in the landscape. Further, Design Principle BPT/IPS-E_1 will ensure that the detailed design is sensitive to the historical and landscape context whilst BPT/IPS-E_2 ensures that a new screening landform is provided to the north and east. As per Design Principle BPT/IPS-E_4, the detailed design will consider ways to reduce noise and vibration. Please refer to the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5).

Table G25-52 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 7 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Winchester City Council (WCC)	DR7201	WCC stated that they had no comments to make regarding this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Hampshire County Council (HCC)	DR7202	HCC stated that this change had refined the crossing location of Pigeon House Farm Lane. In response, the Highway Authority had no concerns around this change.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR7203	The respondent stated that they had no comments to make regarding this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Table G25-53 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 8 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Winchester City Council (WCC), Hampshire County	DR8201	WCC and HCC stated that they had no comments to make regarding this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Council (HCC)				
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR8202	The respondent stated that they had no comments to make regarding this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Table G25-54 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 9 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Winchester City Council (WCC), Fareham Borough Council (FBC)	DR9201	WCC stated that the Design Refinement 9 and Intermediate Pumping Station F (IPS-F) was not within their local authority area and that comments should be sought from the appropriate Council. FBC stated that whilst they have no overriding objections regarding the Design Refinement, concerns are raised regarding the need for such an additional area to expand the Above Ground Limits of Deviation from the summer 2024 proposals to include an EMEA. They stated that further discussions and clarification	N	The Applicant has undertaken further engagement with FBC, to explain that additional fencing is required at Intermediate Pumping Station F for security purposes as required by Defra, resulting in the increase of the Limits of Deviation for IPS-F. Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of the landscape and visual effects. Engagement has also been undertaken with FBC to develop the design principles for IPS-F, which are set out in the Design Principles

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		regarding its purpose would need to take place to fully consider the design and landscape visual implications of this change. The Council expressed an understanding that this was mainly due to Defra's security fencing requirements. The Council added that it had reviewed relevant information and consulted stakeholders about route impacts and amendments to the Intermediate Pumping Station F near Welborne Garden Village. The Borough Council highlighted that the IPS-F proposed location was within a sensitive location in a designated Area of Special Landscape Quality in the adopted Fareham Local Plan 2037, its proximity to the boundary of Welborne Garden Village, and concerns about visibility from Portsdown Hill and Public Rights of Way (PRoW). The respondent noted that the Council's Tree Officer had no comments on this element, whilst the Council's Ecology team highlighted that the EMEA would potentially allow for the expansion of the		Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). This includes measures that will control the detailed design of IPS-F so that impacts on the landscape are reduced and contains the measures that will be implemented to mitigate and reduce visual effects of IPS-F. Design Principle IPS-F_5 sets out measures that will be adopted to ensure the detailed design of buildings (including finishes) and fencing has regard to local context. As per Design Principle IPS-F_4, at the detailed design stage, consideration will be given to embedding the building into the existing levels to reduce its visibility. As per Design Principle IPS-F_6, new woodland creation is proposed to integrate with the existing woodland.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		small, wooded parcel immediately to the south. The Council's Urban Designer expressed concerns about the need for such an extensive additional area for the pumping station, unless it was required for more plant, structures, or parking. The respondent stated that further detailed consideration was necessary, especially at the detailed design stage, to ensure adequate robust landscaping would be provided to mitigate the visual and design impacts on the wider Area of Landscape Quality and future residents of Welborne Garden Village. The Council suggested that continued engagement with the Borough Council would be essential on these matters.		
HCC	DR9202	HCC agreed that the diversion of footpath 103 was acceptable mitigation in principle, however, expected that the diversion be within a green corridor, with a 2m wide surface, and not a field edge or cross field path. They stated that the corridor should be a minimum of 12m wide providing 5m wide offset to hard boundaries greater than 1m in height (presumed fencing greater	N	This response and further engagement with HCC has informed the Framework Rights of Way Management Plan (RoWMP) (Appendix to Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)) which will control the management of PRow. The PRow will be diverted and enhanced as per Design Principle IPS-F_2.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		than 1m high) with vegetation/hedging to screen the proposed fencing and structures within the site. They stated that details of the proposed diversion should be submitted to and approved by the County Council prior to commencement.		Please refer to the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5).
HCC	DR9203	The County Council highlighted that the Welborne development intended to divert PRow in this area, and the relative timing of this scheme and that scheme should be considered. The County Council, as the Local Highway Authority, also suggested that the extended order limits to be overlaid with the Welborne red line plan to understand any implications on the masterplan layout.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment and is aware of the Project's interface with the Welborne development. This response and further engagement with HCC have informed the Framework RoWMP (Appendix to Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)) which will control the management of PRow. Further, at the detailed design stage, opportunities for a holistic approach on environmental enhancement and connectivity will be sought with the Welborne Garden Village development as per Design Principle IPS-F_1, as set out in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5).
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR9204	The respondent stated that they had no comments to make regarding this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Table G25-55 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 10 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Winchester City Council (WCC), Hampshire County Council (HCC)	DR1020 1	WCC stated that the Design Refinement 10 was not within the Council's local authority area and that comments should be sought from the appropriate Council. HCC stated that it had no comments to make regarding this Design Refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Fareham Borough Council (FBC)	DR1020 2	FBC noted that there was an error on Design Refinement 10 where the location was referred to as being north of Junction 27 of the M27. The Council commented that it should state north of Junction 10 of the M27.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment and apologises for this error. It is correct that Design Refinement 10 is north of Junction 10 of the M27 (not Junction 27).
FBC	DR1020 3	FBC stated that amendments had been sought to avoid protected species and veteran trees. Other changes were noted by the Council to include the provision of an EMEA, which would be located between the pipeline route and a designated Ancient Woodland/Site of Importance for Nature Conservation known as Carpenters Copse. FBC noted the Council's expectation that the Applicant had sent consultation leaflets to the residential property owners on the northwest side of	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. As outlined in Appendix F.12 (Spring 2025 Consultation Approach to Consultation), the Applicant sent postcards to those generally within 250m of the draft Order Limits. Therefore, some residents living on Forest Lane were informed about the Project, the consultation, and how to provide feedback.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Forest Lane, informing them of the route changes proposed and the potential impacts during construction.		
FBC	DR1020 4	FBC noted that the Council's Tree Officer, as well as the Council Ecologist raised no objection to the proposals, and the Ecologist was stated to recognise the great opportunity to expand the Ancient Woodland/ Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. Overall, the Borough Council raised no objections to the Design Refinement 10.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR1020 5	The respondent stated that it was their view that the proposed changes outlined in Design Refinement 10 would result in greater noise and vibration levels than those initially anticipated in the Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) Report as were presented during the Summer 2024 Consultation. They raised concerns that increased levels of disturbance were likely to have a negative impact on the residents in the area, necessitating further mitigation measures and a reassessment of the potential environmental impacts on the surrounding community.	N	As noted in the consultation information, this design refinement resulted in the pipeline being moved slightly further to the south west and therefore slightly closer to residential properties on Forest Lane. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) sets out measures that will be implemented during the construction phase to mitigate and reduce noise and vibration impacts. An assessment of the potential noise and vibration impacts arising as a result of the Project, including Design Refinement 10, is set out in ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration,

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and effects on sensitive receptors were found to be not significant.
Wider Community	DR1020 6	The respondent stated that they had no comments to make on this Design Refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Table G25-56 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 11 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Winchester City Council (WCC), Hampshire County Council (HCC)	DR1120 1	WCC stated that the design refinement was not within their local authority area and that comments should be sought from the appropriate Council. HCC stated that they had no comments to make regarding this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Fareham Borough Council (FBC)	DR1120 2	The Borough Council stated that the amendments sought to avoid protected species identified along this part of the route. The Council stated that no objections had been received from the Council's Tree Officer, Ecologist or Urban Designer on this design refinement and in	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		light of the information provided the Borough Council raised no objections to Design Refinement 11.		
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR11203	The respondent stated that they had no comments to make regarding this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Table G25-57 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 12 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
WC Winchester City Council (WCC)	DR12201	WCC stated that the Council had no comments to make regarding this Design Refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Hampshire County Council (HCC)	DR12202	HCC noted that the details of the construction access arrangements were yet to be provided to the Highway Authority. The Council noted that therefore, whether the amendments were appropriate from an access perspective could not be determined at that stage.	N	The Applicant has undertaken further engagement with HCC on access proposals which has informed the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		The Council agreed that the visibility splays subject to falling within highway land would not need to be included within the draft Order Limits.		
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	DR12203	The respondent stated that while the Design Refinement 12 itself had no specific impact upon their land, concern was raised about the installation of the pipe across their land.	N	The Applicant has engaged with affected parties to understand the potential impacts of the construction and operation of the Project on them and discuss their individual circumstances. Engagement will continue with affected parties to address ongoing concerns and reach voluntary agreements where possible. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) sets out how the Project will avoid, reduce and mitigate effects on the environment and surrounding area during construction. Land will be required temporarily for construction of the Pipeline in this location. Following installation of the Pipeline, the land will be reinstated to its existing condition in accordance with the reinstatement strategy set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7).
PIL	DR12204	The respondent stated that the proposed minor modifications to the alignment to avoid veteran trees had been noted. It was stated that the changes in themselves were not consequential as the route of the pipeline itself was exceptionally consequential to their land. The respondent continued to raise their objection to the Project on this basis.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. Veteran trees are afforded great weight in environmental and planning policy, and therefore the design of the Project needs to ensure that impacts to these are reduced as far as practicable. For more information, please see the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) which additionally sets out how the routing of the Pipeline between the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) site and Otterbourne Water Supply Works (WSW) been developed. This sets out how the Applicant has sought to reduce environmental impacts, minimise disruption to landowners and ensure efficient operation of the pipeline. Mitigation will be implemented during the construction phase, which is set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR1220 5	The respondent stated that they had no comments to make regarding this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Table G25-58 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 13 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Soberton Parish Council	DR1320 1	The respondent stated that further information would be required on the pipeline going through Wickham and any impact that it might have on the River Meon and wildlife habitat.	N	Sheets 13, 14 and 15 of the Works Plans (Document reference 2.3, DCO Volume 2) shows the Pipeline between the Water Recycling Plant site (WRP site) and Otterbourne Water Supply Works (WSW) in the proximity of Wickham. ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) which consider the impact of the Project on the River Meon and any associated habitat. No significant effects on the River Meon or associated habitats are reported in either chapter.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Winchester City Council (WCC)	DR1320 2	WCC stated that it was understood that the draft Order Limits had been changed to reduce the impact on Wickham Park Golf Club and an additional trenchless crossing had been proposed to provide flexibility for the detailed design stage.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
WCC	DR1320 3	WCC stated that it should be noted that there was a high potential for archaeological remains in this area and advised that this should be considered as part of the DCO documents. In addition, the Council stated that the amended layout would impact on Wickham Meadow Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), which would need to be considered within the ES.	N	ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out an assessment of the effects on the historic environment and details the mitigation required. The Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Document reference 7.6, DCO Volume 7) sets out the proposed outline scope and commitments to archaeological survey, mitigation and subsequent reporting and publication to be undertaken post-consent. The Order Limits have been updated to avoid direct impacts to Wickham Meadow SINC. Indirect impacts are assessed within ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), which provides a detailed impact assessment on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, including Wickham Meadow SINC. A range of measures have been embedded into the Project design to

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				avoid or reduce environmental effects. Through the implementation of mitigation, no residual likely significant adverse effects on ecological features from the Project are anticipated.
Hampshire County Council (HCC)	DR1230 4	HCC acknowledged that an additional access had been added to the Order Limits, being that of the existing access to Wickham Park Golf Club. It was stated that the Highway Authority would need a greater understanding of its intended use before the principal of this access use could be agreed.	N	Further engagement has been undertaken with HCC on access proposals, which has informed the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR1320 5	The respondents stated that, despite the proposed design refinements, there would still result in an identified impact on vegetation and related ecological systems. A response highlighted that the loss of vegetation could lead to cascading effects on local biodiversity and the broader ecosystem. Whilst acknowledging the option for additional trenchless crossings, respondents emphasised the need to assess their feasibility, environmental benefits, and potential trade-offs. The respondents believed a more detailed	N	The information provided as part of the Spring 2025 Consultation in respect of Design Refinement 13 made clear that no new environmental effects would result from the proposed changes. ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) assesses impact on the associated habitats of the River Meon, SINC's and vegetation. The Project has evolved through a detailed scheme development process which considered engineering, environmental and planning criteria as set out in the Scheme

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		evaluation of these options was essential to ensure the final design minimised environmental harm. Although the trenchless method proposed was welcomed for the River Meon crossing, a respondent suggested it should be used more extensively along the entire route as this could reduce damage to SINC's and hedgerows.		Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) and ES Chapter 4 Consideration of alternatives, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The design of the Project has sought to reduce impacts on ecological features such as trees, hedgerows and SINC's. This includes the use of trenchless construction and reduced working width (RWW)s where practicable. As per Design Principles GDP_12 and GDP_13, the detailed design is committed to protect the environment (including ecology) and retain existing features such as wildlife corridors and vegetation where reasonably practicable. Please refer to the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5).
Wider Community	DR13206	The respondent stated that they had no comments to make regarding this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Table G25-59 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 14 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)	DR1420 1	SDNPA noted the Design Refinement 14 and stated that these would be unlikely to have any greater impact on the South Downs National Park.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Winchester City Council (WCC), Hampshire County Council (HCC)	DR1420 2	WCC stated an understanding that the draft Order Limits had been changed to accommodate an alternative construction access following comments from Hampshire Highways. WCC also stated that it was the Council's understanding that the above ground plant had an increased footprint to allow for security features and compound areas had been adjusted to avoid trees. HCC noted that Design Refinement 14 related to the access from Titchfield Lane had been flagged on behalf of the Applicant to HCC consideration.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
WCC	DR1420 3	WCC noted that the proposal would bring the proposed compounds and access track closer to the listed buildings adjacent. The Council advised that this requires further consideration within the DCO documents.	N	ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of the Project on relevant listed buildings including those at Park Place and Little Park

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Mansions; no significant effects are reported on these receptors.
WCC, HCC	DR1420 4	WCC stated that there was a high potential for archaeological remains in this area which should be considered as part of the DCO documents. HCC noted that Footpath Wickham 2a was now outside of the draft Order Limits, which was supported by the Countryside Services team at the County Council. Despite this Design Refinement, HCC stated that footpath Wickham 1 would still require temporary diversion or temporary closure.	N	ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) noted that this site was subject to geophysical survey (ES Appendix 7.3 Detailed gradiometer survey report – Phase 1, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) suggesting the presence of a Roman road and related roadside ditches and possible pitting. The Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Document reference 7.6, DCO Volume 7) sets out the proposed outline scope and commitments to archaeological survey, mitigation and subsequent reporting and publication to be undertaken post-consent. Further engagement with HCC on the treatment of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) has informed the Framework Rights of Way Management Plan (Appendix to Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)) which will control the management of PRoW diversions and/or closures such as Wickham 1.
WCC	DR1420 5	WCC noted that the proposed changes would result in the loss of vegetation in this	N	The loss of trees in this location is considered within ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		area including an area of mixed deciduous woodland that was covered by a Tree Protection Order (TPO). The Council stated that the area was considered to be a priority habitat comprising protected trees and therefore the loss would need to be considered within the ES.		freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Mitigation for this loss and enhancement proposals are included in the design principles for Intermediate Pumping Station G (IPS-G) as set out in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) (see Design Principles IPS-G_5, IPS-G_6 and IPS-G_7). The draft Development Consent Order (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3) sets out the locations where works will be required to trees protected by TPOs.
HCC	DR14206	HCC stated that the amendments to the draft Order Limits at this location did not resolve the access concerns previously raised by the Highway Authority regarding access to compound H-1. The Council acknowledged that a new access proposal from Titchfield Lane had been identified, in response to earlier comments questioning the suitability of the access arrangements from Park Place Farm Nursery for construction. HCC stated that this new access was intended for operational use, which was of less concern due to lower vehicle frequency and size.	N	Further engagement with HCC has been undertaken on the temporary access to construction compound G-7, and this has informed the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7). Potential management measures have been discussed to enable safe and suitable access to the construction compound and these will be confirmed in the detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan, to be agreed post-DCO consent.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		The Council identified that the proposal relied on the removal of some trees, including protected ones under Tree Protection Orders. The Council expressed concerns about the feasibility of this access, particularly regarding the extent of tree removal needed to achieve adequate visibility and noted that managing access via banksman control on Titchfield Lane would not be considered appropriate in the Highway Authority's view.		
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	DR14207	The respondent stated that they were grateful to be involved in the discussions surrounding this design refinement. The respondent requested that the Applicant and its consultants initiate a collaborative design review process with both Catesby Estates and the landowners. They suggested that this should include technical engagement with the relevant engineering teams on the alignment of the pipeline particularly to the northern boundary, the location and specification of IPS-G, the access arrangements off Titchfield Lane and associated haul routes	N	The site for IPS-G has been located to align with the boundary of this field as far as practicable without introducing bends to the pipeline. Introducing bends would impact the hydraulics which could require additional pumping. Access arrangements in this location are shown on the Access and Rights of Way Plans (Document reference 2.4, DCO Volume 2), and these proposals have been discussed with HCC to inform the Framework Construction Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7). The Applicant has considered the potential for land to become developed and has amended

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		and the location and extent of any environmental mitigation areas.		the design of the Project where it intersects with land that is allocated in an adopted or emerging local plan, and where there is a live or approved planning application. The Applicant has confirmed that no planning application has been made at this site, and the site is not allocated for residential development in WCC's adopted or emerging local plan. Therefore, it would not be reasonable for the design of the Project to be implicated when there is no certainty that a development will come forward in this location. Following the statutory consultations, the Applicant invited landowners who provided feedback to meet and discuss their comments further, to better understand possible impacts. Please see the Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Document reference 4.4, DCO Volume 4) for the current status of negotiations of voluntary land agreements with affected landowners.
PIL	DR14208	The respondent noted that no detailed proposals for the pumping station had been provided, raising their concerns. They requested details on the design, siting, and associated features to assess likely	N	The detailed design for the Above Ground Plant (AGP) sites would be undertaken post consent. ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) has assessed the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		impacts. The respondent also asked for the plan to be reverted back to the Summer 2024 layout for IPS-G, citing its smaller footprint as less disruptive. The respondent expressed their view that the current Project proposals were seen as hindering future agricultural use and land development in the area.		maximum parameters for IPS-G. The Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) sets out the design principles for IPS-G, which includes measures to mitigate visual and environmental impacts and implement environmental enhancements. Additional fencing is required at IPS-G for security purposes as required by Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), resulting in the increase of the Limits of Deviation for IPS-G. ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of the landscape and visual effects. The Applicant has considered the potential for land to become developed and has amended the design of the Project where it intersects with land that is allocated in an adopted or emerging LP and where there is a live or approved planning application. The Applicant has confirmed that no planning application has been made at this site, and the site is not allocated for residential development in WCC's adopted or emerging LP. Therefore, it would not be reasonable for the design of the Project to be implicated

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				when there is no certainty that a development will come forward in this location. As per preliminary design principle PDP_1 (see the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5)), the Applicant has taken the approach to minimise land take, whilst ensuring sufficient space and access for efficient construction and operation, through route and site selection and optimising site layouts. ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) contains an assessment of the likely significant effects on land use and agriculture as a result of the Project.
PIL	DR14209	The responded sought clarification regarding what environmental mitigation meant in relation to the Design Refinement. It was acknowledged that details were limited, however, it was stated that in their opinion the land used for environmental mitigation was large and unnecessary. The respondent requested that the mitigation land be minimised or removed	N	Section 6.1 of the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out that findings from the EIA were used to determine the location of mitigation proposals where impacts were identified. Environmental mitigation at IPS-G is required to ensure that visual impacts are reduced, and other environmental impacts as a result of pipeline construction are mitigated. Design Principles IPS-G_5, IPS-G_6 and IPS-G_7 set out the mitigation and enhancement proposals at IPS-G which includes new woodland, scrub and hedgerow

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		entirely and not used to offset other landholdings. The respondent noted that the current location prevented access from the western barns into their land, which they stated was unacceptable. It was stated that the mitigation land be redrawn and emphasised the need to keep the new access off Titchfield Lane permanently. Respondents accepted some screening around the pumping station but believed the rest of the mitigation land should be along the northern boundary to reduce impact on farming and future development.		planting to provide visual screening, landscape integration and biodiversity enhancements. Please refer to the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). The proposed temporary construction access from Titchfield Lane is proposed to be temporary, and vegetation would be reinstated following completion of construction works in this location. The final design of the environmental mitigation and enhancement (EMEA) in this location will ensure access to the field is retained.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR14210	The respondent stated that the relocation of access to Park Place Farm Nursery, was unacceptable due to the impact on the surrounding area. The respondent continued to state that the proposed change would necessitate the removal of additional vegetation within an area that is protected by a TPO.	N	This design refinement moved the construction access from next to Park Place Farm Nursery to a new temporary access point closer to the junction with Blind Lane and Winchester Road. The existing access next to Park Place Farm Nursery would only be used for a small number of operational vehicles. Mitigation for loss of trees at this new temporary access location would be provided in accordance with Design Principle GDP_17. Please refer to the Design

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). The Draft Development Consent Order (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3) sets out the locations where works will be required to trees protected by TPO.
Wider Community	DR1421 1	The respondent raised concerns with the proposal to move the access point further along Titchfield Lane. The respondent stated that this would entail removal of a significant number of established trees and vegetation from the roadside.	N	ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of the Project on vegetation/habitats. Mitigation for loss of trees at this new temporary access location would be provided in accordance with Design Principle GDP_17. Please refer to the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5).
Wider Community	DR1421 2	The respondent stated that they had no comment to make regarding this Design Refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Table G25-60 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 15 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Winchester County Council (WCC)	DR1520 1	The Council stated that they had no comment to make on this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Hampshire County Council (HCC)	DR1520 2	HCC noted a reminder that the Highway Authority had concerns over access arrangements to compound J-1 due to the tree lined nature of St Annes Road. The Council further noted that the order limits did not identify any revisions to the proposals to access this compound area. The Council referred to comments that were made elsewhere in respect of Design Refinement 14 on behalf of the Countryside Services team at the Council and stated that in respect of Design Refinement 15 the relevant footpath 'Shedfield 13' would still require either temporary diversion or closure.	N	Further engagement with HCC has been undertaken on the access proposals in this location, and this has informed the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7). The Applicant has also engaged HCC on the approach to the treatment of Public Right of Way (PRoW) which has informed the Framework Rights of Way Management Plan (Appendix to Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)) which will control the management of PRoW diversions and/or closure such as at Shedfield 13.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR1520 3	The respondent stated that in their opinion, this modification would not only undermine the ecological value of the area but also breach regulations intended to preserve important tree cover. They stated that further consultations and alternative	N	This design refinement did not introduce any woodland or trees to the Order Limits. ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of the Project on vegetation/habitats.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		solutions should have been explored to mitigate these impacts and ensure compliance with environmental protections.		Mitigation for loss of trees at this new temporary access location would be provided in accordance with Design Principle GDP_17, please refer to Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5).
Wider Community	DR15204	The respondent stated that they had no comment to make on this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Table G25-61 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 16 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Winchester City Council (WCC)	DR16201	The Council understood that the draft Order Limits had been increased for mitigation areas to be included. The Council identified that there was potential for archaeological remains that should be included in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), however the Council further noted that the archaeological evaluation and mitigation work should also be progressed as it would be required.	N	ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out an assessment of the effects of the Project on the historic environment taking the worst case pre-mitigation assumption that any and all archaeological remains within the Order Limits would be removed during construction works. Mitigation would comprise a combination of micro-siting of intrusive works where reasonably practicable with investigative mitigation where effects could not be avoided and sensitive restoration of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				earthworks and landscape features (e.g. hedgerows) where appropriate. Remains which are mitigated by avoidance during construction would not be further disturbed during maintenance as there would be no requirement for access or works beyond the areas previously disturbed by construction.
HCC	DR1620 2	HCC stated they had no comments on this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR1620 3	The respondent stated that they had no comment to make on this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Table G25-62 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 17 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Natural England (NE)	DR1720 1	NE stated that design refinement 17 had the potential to have impacts on protected species and noted that this may have implications for the licensing process.	N	The potential for impacts on protected species has always been present for the crossing of Sandy Lane. To ensure appropriate mitigation for this species, the Order Limits were amended to provide

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				sufficient space for mitigation on either (or both) sides of the road if required. Draft protected species licences are included with the DCO submission (see Protected Species Licensing (Document reference 7.14, DCO Volume 7.14)). These have been shared with NE, including a Letter of No Impediment appended to the licence documents issued. Mitigation measures detailed within the licence are secured within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7).
WCC	DR1720 2	The Council stated that it was understood that the draft Order Limits had been increased to enable mitigation areas to be included and that the layout had changed following discussions with landowners.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
WCC, HCC	DR1720 3	WCC noted that the proposed layout included mitigation land along the medieval deer park boundary, which could impact the below-ground heritage assets and advised that this should be considered within the EIA. WCC indicated that this might require excavations and survey	N	As noted in section 7.9 of the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5), following the Spring 2025 Consultation, this EMEA (formerly EMEA_J_6) was removed from the Project as further environmental assessment found that the proposals would not be appropriate given the adjacent historic deer park. ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage (Document

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		assessments to determine final requirements. HCC observed, in respect to footpath Curdridge 4, that the draft Order Limit for ecological mitigation and the enhancement area would extend over this footpath (Park Lug). HCC requested clarification that this would not impact the Public Right of Way (PRoW) more than previous limits and emphasised the need for suitable offsetting of any planting from the PRoW surface.		reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out an assessment of the effects on the historic environment (including Bishop's Waltham deer park) and details the mitigation required. The Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Document reference 7.6, DCO Volume 7) sets out the proposed outline scope and commitments to archaeological survey, mitigation and subsequent reporting and publication to be undertaken post-consent. The Order Limits were refined further in this location following this design refinement at the Spring 2025 Consultation, which resulted in the avoidance of the PRoW in this location.
HCC	DR1720 4	HCC, acting as the Local Highways Authority, stated that the EMEA encompassed the highway on Sandy Lane. The Council stated that these works would not be supported within highway land.	Y	The environmental mitigation and enhancement (EMEA) in this location was subsequently amended to avoid highway land.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR1720 5	The respondent stated that they had no comment to make on this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Table G25-63 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 18 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Winchester City Council (WCC)	DR1820 1	WCC noted that the draft Order Limits had been amended to avoid root protection areas, including shifting the River Hamble trenchless crossing north to prevent vegetation loss. The Council observed that the revised location of compound J3 overlapped with the Roman road alignment, which could increase the potential for impacting below-ground heritage assets. The Council emphasised that further information on these impacts and specific archaeological mitigation should be included in the ES particularly concerning the entry and exit launch pits for the trenchless crossing areas near or on the Roman road crossing the River Hamble.	N	ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out an assessment of the effects on the historic environment (including this Roman road) and details the mitigation required. The Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Document reference 7.6, DCO Volume 7) sets out the proposed outline scope and commitments to archaeological survey, mitigation and subsequent reporting and publication to be undertaken post-consent. It is considered that this design refinement could have greater potential for impact to heritage assets, however investigations and mitigation will be undertaken in this location, as well as across the Project. It was also considered that this impact could be mitigated whereas the previous design would have intersected with veteran trees which are afforded a high level of protection by planning and environmental policy.
WCC	DR1820 2	The Council stated that the proposed environmental mitigation and enhancements between construction	N	ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out an assessment of

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		compound J-3 and construction compound K-2 should also require consideration for potential archaeological impacts in the EIA and appropriate evaluation / mitigation measures included in the ES.		the effects of the Project on the historic environment taking the worst case pre-mitigation assumption that any and all archaeological remains within the Order Limits would be removed during construction works. Mitigation would comprise a combination of micro-siting of intrusive works where reasonably practicable with investigative mitigation where effects could not be avoided and sensitive restoration of earthworks and landscape features (e.g. hedgerows) where appropriate.
Hampshire County Council (HCC)	DR18203	HCC expressed the understanding that this design refinement was based on construction compound changes. The Council noted that River Hamble and Ford Farm were northwest of Botley Road. The Council, acting as the relevant Minerals and Waste Authority, noted that the revised construction compounds now fell within the safeguarded buffer zone of Bishop's Waltham Water Treatment Works and possibly Bishop's Waltham Depot. It was noted that whilst the Applicant operated the Water Treatment Works, the County Council expected assurance that the operation of the Water Treatment Works would not be affected and sought	N	Design Refinement 18 included a change to the location of construction compound J-3, including the associated access. The strategy to enable safe and suitable access to this construction compound is set out in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7). There are no other traffic impacts associated with this design change. The Applicant confirms that this design refinement would not impact the operation of these sites, which are located east of the River Hamble, as the Order Limits would be west of the River Hamble.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		clarification on how the Bishop's Waltham Depot had been considered or how Amey UK PLC (the operator) had been considering mitigation.		
HCC	DR1820 4	HCC noted that, as part of this design refinement, the footpath Bishops Waltham 502 would now be on the perimeter the draft Order Limit along the west bank of the River Hamble. The County Council sought clarification that this would not impact the Public Rights of Way (PRoW) any more than previous limits, as well as ensuring suitable offsetting of any planting from the PRoW surface.	N	This design refinement would not adversely impact the PRoW on the west bank of the River Hamble. The Order Limits were extended up to the River Hamble to include an EMEA. These works would consider the existing PRoW and measures regarding the PRoW would be in accordance with the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7). Design principle PL_20 in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) sets out that environmental enhancements in this area will consider the potential for enhancements to the PRoW alongside river bank restoration and riparian grassland creation.
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	DR1820 5	The respondent stated that the realignment of the tunnel under the railway line, river Hamble to the west of Tree Field Farm was a great improvement, as it saved the removal of mature trees and the poly	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		tunnels. The respondent also stated that the previously proposed crossing point would have been dangerous for traffic on the Botley Road as it was considered immediately at the bottom of a steep hill. The new entrance was stated to be on the level and impact less landowners.		
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR1820 6	The respondent stated that they had no comment to make on this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Table G25-64 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 19 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Winchester City Council (WCC), Hampshire County Council (HCC)	DR1920 1	Both WCC and HCC confirmed they had no comments on this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Wider Community	DR1920 2	The members of the wider community who responded to Design Refinement 19 stated or showed that they did not have any comments to make on this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Table G25-65 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 20 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)	DR2020 1	SDNPA stated that Winchester Road marked the boundary of the South Downs National Park and noted that the proposed construction access was located just outside the boundary. SDNPA further stated that this was an unlit stretch of road, marked by mature field boundaries.	N	The ES includes an assessment of the impacts of the Project on the South Downs National Park and identifies mitigation where required. The temporary construction access for construction compound K-6 has been discussed with Hampshire County Council (HCC) and the potential management measures to enable safe and suitable access are outlined the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7). The detailed access strategy, including potential lighting, would be confirmed in the detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) which would be produced post-DCO

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				consent for agreement with the relevant stakeholders.
SDNPA	DR2020 2	The Authority noted the commitment to minimising vegetation removal and suggested that consideration should be given to the ecological impact even considering the effect of the temporary removal of the hedge may have to wider habitat connectivity.	N	ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) considers the loss of habitats in this location and the impact on wider connectivity and includes assessment of temporary removal of vegetation, including hedgerows. The Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) includes a commitment to reduce vegetation loss across the Project.
Winchester City Council (WCC)	DR2020 3	WCC referenced the proposed Break Pressure Tank K (BPT-K) and noted that the Council understood that an alternative temporary access had been proposed following discussions with WCC highways and that the footprint of the above ground plant had been increased to provide additional security features. It was further stated that the Council understood that the draft Order Limits had been amended following discussions with landowners to include mitigation land.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
WCC, Hampshire County Council (HCC)	DR2020 4	WCC highlighted that the above ground plant would be located within the Historic Park and Garden of Winters Hill and that the proposed new access appears to result in the removal of additional vegetation, thereby it would likely result in additional visual impacts that should be considered within the ES. HCC stated that the Design Refinement showed removal of Sciviers Lane for access purposes for the construction period but retaining usage for operational access. HCC, as the relevant Highway Authority, stated that removal of Sciviers Lane for construction traffic was supported. The acceptability for the use as an operational access route was noted to depend on additional information communicated through the emerging Framework CTMP (i.e. access arrangements, vehicle type and frequency of movements).	N	ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) consider the historic and visual effects to Wintershill respectively. Proposals for mitigation of this adverse effect and for enhancement of the surviving designed landscape are set out in the design principles for BPT-K as set out in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). Visual impacts have been considered in the ES, which acknowledges visibility of the proposed BPT-K and identifies potential significant effects. This informed a range of embedded mitigation measures, as set out in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5), including limiting the building height to a maximum of 5.6m above existing ground level and embedding the structures into the existing hillside, to reduce visibility, use of locally appropriate materials and a colour palette, informed by a colour assessment. This was presented to stakeholders at the EIA Working Group on 18 September 2025 and was also discussed in bilateral meetings

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				with WCC on 09 September 2025 and with the SDNPA on 15 September 2025. The Applicant has worked to keep stakeholders informed throughout the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) process and engage on proposed mitigation. The LVIA is presented in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), supported by ES Appendix 13.4 Visual baseline and effects, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), with photography and photomontages presented in ES Figure 13.23 Viewpoint photography, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6). Further engagement on the operational access has been undertaken with HCC, this has included explaining that the operational access from Scivier's Lane was removed from the Project, and operational access to BPT-K would use an existing access track from Winters Hill. This is explained in the Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5).
HCC	DR2020 5	HCC noted that a new operational access from Winters Hill, an existing but poor condition highway with limited visibility,	N	The Applicant can confirm Sciviers Lane will not be used to access BPT-K. Further engagement with HCC has been undertaken

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		was supported as a better option than Sciviers Lane. The Highway Authority endorsed including this access option in the scope. However, the Council identified that this route crosses footpath Upham 20 and runs along footpath Bishops Waltham 42a. To protect PRow and public safety, increased motorised vehicle use along this route should be minimised. If a safe management plan was in place and this option proved safer than Sciviers Lane, it would be supported by the Highway Authority. The Council expressed a willingness to collaborate with the Applicant to address issues related to Winters Hill and Public Right of Way (PRow) management.		regarding the impact of the revised operational access from Winters Hill on footpaths Bishops Waltham 42a and Upham 20. The access road has been reviewed to confirm operational vehicles associated with BPT-K would not have a safety impact on the PRow.
HCC	DR2020 6	HCC, as the relevant Highway Authority, stated that the new temporary construction access to BPT-K appeared to be more appropriate as access would be direct from the B2177 (Winchester Road). It was added that the access arrangement details would need to be agreed to ensure appropriate visibility could be achieved given the tree lined boundary between the	N	Further engagement with HCC has been undertaken on the approach to construction accesses including for BPT-K. This has informed the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		existing field and the highway. It was confirmed that the Highway Authority support this temporary access option in principle.		
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR2020 7	The respondent expressed concern about using Sciviers Lane for construction traffic, noting it is a narrow, winding lane. They referenced Design Refinement 20, which stated that Sciviers Lane would be unsuitable for construction traffic but was retained in the draft Order Limits as it might still be needed for operational access. The respondent acknowledged that two alternative permanent access routes had now been identified, with the most suitable being the access from the B2177, which would require some upgrading but would offer easier access than Sciviers Lane. They asked for clarification on why Sciviers Lane was still retained in the draft Order Limits for operational access if alternative options were available and it was deemed unsuitable for construction vehicles.	N	This design refinement included two options for operational access to BPT-K in the draft Order Limits, one from Scivier's Lane and one from Winters Hill. The Applicant has now removed the Scivier's Lane option from the Project's design and will utilise the existing access track from Winters Hill during operation. Access would be taken from Winchester Road (B2177) during construction.
Wider Community	DR2020 8	This member of the wider community stated that they did not have any	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		comments to make on this design refinement.		

Table G25-66 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 21, and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA), Hampshire County Council (HCC)	DR2120 1	SDNPA welcomed the increase in the draft Order Limits to provide appropriate environmental mitigation and enhancements. The respondent also suggested that there existed opportunities to link to the wider habitat type to ensure maximum benefits and added that this should be incorporated into the Design Principles. HCC stated that the Highway Authority noted that areas for the environmental enhancement should not include areas of the adopted highway where possible, due to the maintenance implications.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. As per Design Principle PL_23, creation of other neutral grassland habitat is proposed at this location to link to the wider habitat type for the purposes of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). Please refer to the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). The Applicant has confirmed with HCC that this environmental mitigation and enhancement area does not include highway land.
Winchester City Council (WCC),	DR2120 2	WCC acknowledged that the draft Order Limits had been increased to allow for environmental mitigation land.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Table G25-67 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 22 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)	DR2220 1	SDNPA noted that the revised draft Order Limits would be in closer proximity to the National Park boundary than previously proposed. The respondent requested that the Applicant considers any additional mitigation measures which could be required regarding construction methods and management.	N	The ES includes an assessment of the impacts of the Project on the South Downs National Park and identifies mitigation where required. ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) contains an assessment of landscape and visual effects resulting from the Project. The assessment identifies that effects on the South Downs National Park would be limited by the predominantly temporary nature of construction activities, the localised extent of works, and the retention of intervening landform and vegetation between the Order Limits and the South Downs National Park boundary. Views of Break Pressure Tank K (BPT-K) from within the South Downs National Park would be possible, with potential significant effects. This informed a range of embedded mitigation measures, as set out in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5), including limiting the building height to a maximum of 5.6m above existing ground level and embedding the structures into the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				existing hillside, to reduce visibility, use of locally appropriate materials and a colour palette, informed by a colour assessment. This was presented to stakeholders at the EIA Working Group on 18 September 2025 and was also discussed in bilateral meetings with WCC on 9 September 2025 and with the SDNPA on 15 September 2025. The Applicant has worked to keep stakeholders informed and engage on proposed mitigation.
SDNPA	DR2220 2	SDNPA referred the Applicant to standing advice from the Forestry commission (FC) and guidance from the Woodland Trust (WT) in respect of the veteran tree situated around which the draft Order Limits have been drawn.	N	The Project has been designed in line with Woodland Trust, FC and NE guidance for veteran trees.
Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC)	DR2220 3	EBC acknowledged that the Applicant had undertaken a veteran tree survey in response to feedback provided at Summer 2024 Consultation. However, the Council said that it was unable to provide detailed feedback on whether this design refinement could reduce impact. It added that while the change was considered positive, it was	N	ES Appendix 13.5 Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) identifies the trees within the Order Limits, and considers the worst case impacts in line with the approach to construction of the Project that is set out in ES Chapter 3 Description of Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Construction of the Project will be managed by an Outline

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		unable to validate whether the proposed space provided is suitable and whether any other aspects of construction would influence this tree.		Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7), which sets out the measures that will be implemented to avoid and reduce environmental impacts, including to trees. Following this design refinement, which was presented at the Spring 2025 Consultation, the Applicant refined the design of construction compound L-1 further to have regard to feedback from the landowner, which moved the construction compound further from trees in this location.
Winchester City Council (WCC), Hampshire County Council (HCC)	DR2220 4	WCC acknowledged Design Refinement 22 but noted it was located outside of the Winchester district and therefore had no comments. HCC noted no comments on Design Refinement 22.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR2220 5	The respondent stated that they had no comment to make on this design refinement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Table G25-68 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 23 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Winchester City Council (WCC), Hampshire County Council (HCC)	DR2320 1	Respondents acknowledged Design Refinement 23 but provided no comments.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider community	DR2320 2	The respondent stated they had no comment in respect to Design Refinement 23.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Table G25-69 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 24 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC)	DR2420 1	EBC expressed support for the wet grassland enhancement habitats as Design Refinement 24 proposed. However, the Council queried if there was scope to be more ambitious and make significant enhancements to the watercourse itself, given Bow Lake's reported 'poor'	N	The Applicant has noted this comment and has engaged further with EBC on this matter. As per Design Principle PL_29, there are proposals to deliver grassland enhancements at this location. Please refer to the Design

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		ecological condition. The Council understood that this would be supported by the adjoining landowners and would assist the Applicant reach Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and corporate targets.		Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). A Biodiversity Gain Plan (Document reference 7.11, DCO Volume 7) detailing how the statutory BNG metric has been applied to the Project is included with the DCO application. Opportunities to incorporate environmental enhancements, including BNG, have been explored to ensure that the Project does not just remediate or offset any identified effects to the receiving environment, but also improves the receiving environment and provides benefits to the local community. These measures are detailed within ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), the Biodiversity Gain Plan (Document reference 7.11, DCO Volume 7) and will be delivered through environmental mitigation and enhancement areas and offsite. Ongoing engagement with EBC through the EIA Working Group regarding offsite BNG opportunities has been undertaken. This includes exploring opportunities at Bow Lake.
EBC	DR2420 2	EBC raised concerns that the amended proposed pipeline route would be	N	Where the Order Limits have got closer to Flood Zones 2 and 3 (north of Bow Lake)

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		marginally closer to the flood zones adjacent to Bow Lake. Clarification was requested on how close this would be. The Council outlined concerns that if the proposed pipeline route were to run too close to the watercourse, this could preclude/ restrict any further river restoration. The Council explained the desire for river restoration to be delivered as part of the Project which could remove the risk outlined. However, it was noted that sufficient room between the pipeline and the existing watercourse alignment must be provided.		mitigation would be implemented to manage this as detailed in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The pipeline will be installed at the minimum depths set out in Design Principle PL_4 and construction works will take place at least 10m from the Bow Lake watercourse. Please refer to the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5). A Biodiversity Gain Plan (Document reference 7.11, DCO Volume 7) detailing how the statutory BNG metric has been applied to the Project is included with the DCO application. Opportunities to incorporate environmental enhancements, including BNG have been explored to ensure that the Project does not just remediate or offset any identified effects to the receiving environment, but also improves the receiving environment and provides benefits to the local community. These measures are detailed within ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), the Biodiversity Gain Plan (Document reference 7.11, DCO Volume 7) and will be delivered through

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Consultation Report Appendix G – Statutory Spring 2025 Consultation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				environmental mitigation and enhancement areas and offsite.
Winchester City Council (WCC), Hampshire County Council (HCC)	DR2420 3	WCC acknowledged that proposed pipeline Section L crossed WCC and EBC. The Council also noted the proposed changes. HCC, acting as the Highway Authority, requested that areas for the environmental enhancement should not include areas of the adopted highway where possible due to the maintenance implications.	N	Environmental mitigation and enhancement areas in this location have been identified to avoid highway land.
WCC	DR2420 4	WCC raised that the new proposed access from Church Lane would result in several impacts such as an increase in noise and vibration, vegetation loss and the proposed changes along Portsmouth Road would also bring the Project closer to the South Downs National Park. The Council requested that these impacts are considered within the ES and that further information regarding replanting schedules post construction would also be required. HCC acknowledged Design Refinement 24 in its feedback.	N	The environmental impacts associated with the construction access from Church Lane are considered in the ES. ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) include an assessment of the Project in terms of noise and vibration, vegetation loss and landscape and visual effects with respect to the South Downs National Park (SDNP). The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7)

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				includes details about replanting requirements.
HCC	DR2420 5	HCC supported the removal of Bishopstoke Lane for the use by construction vehicles routing to and from the compounds. The Council noted, however, that the new proposed access at Church Lane remains to be agreed via the Framework Construction Management Plan but also noted that there were no immediate concerns around the proposed location.	N	Further engagement has been undertaken with HCC on the proposed construction accesses, which has informed the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).
HCC	DR2420 6	HCC said that the proposed Design Refinement 24 from Mortimers Lane (B3037) near Lower Upham to Highbridge Road (B3335), west of Brambridge would have minimal effect on how much of the pipeline easement is within the Mineral Safeguarding Area. The Council added that the Mineral Resource Assessment will be required to understand the consultant's assessment of how to deal with extracted minerals.	N	Impacts on mineral resources are considered in ES Chapter 16 Resources and waste management Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). A Mineral Safeguarding Assessment is presented in ES Appendix 16.1 Mineral Safeguarding Assessment, Volume II (DCO document reference 6.2). As assessment of the significance of the effects of the Project on Mineral Safeguarding Areas has been undertaken and presented in ES Chapter 16 Resources and waste management Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The assessment concluded there to be no significant effect on the Mineral Safeguarding Area with the

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				implementation of tertiary mitigation. For further details on mitigation see ES Chapter 16 Resources and waste management Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7).
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	DR24207	The respondent confirmed that they had reviewed information provided on Design Refinement 24. The respondent said that there had been no consultation with landowners about what enhancements might constitute and added that they strongly objected to them. It was outlined that the reason for the objection was that the land is used for productive agricultural purposes and any proposal to reduce the productive capacity of the land was opposed. The respondent added that the Applicant had the ability to provide mitigation either on its own land, off-site or by 'purchasing appropriate Biodiversity Net Gain credits'.	N	The Project is seeking consent to deliver environmental enhancements, but these will only be implemented subject to securing agreements with landowners. Where mitigation is included in the Project, this needs to be delivered within the Order Limits to ensure adverse environmental effects are mitigated. There are several environmental mitigation and enhancement areas proposed within this Design Refinement which include mitigation for protected species, habitat creation and enhancement, and potential opportunities for further habitat enhancement.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		The respondent requested that proposed mitigation and enhancement were to be removed from the landholding discussed.		
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider community	DR2420 8	A respondent queried if moving the proposed pipeline section to avoid two established trees was cost effective and queried what was the cost benefit of these changes.	N	Veteran trees are afforded great weight in environmental and planning policy, and therefore the design of the Project needs to ensure that impacts to these are reduced as far as possible, and this design refinement would ensure this.
Wider community	DR2420 9	A respondent said that the level of environmental damage for the overall proposed pipeline route was unacceptable. It was acknowledged that Design Refinement 24 now avoided veteran trees, however, they noted that the proposed pipeline route traversed through several Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and many hedges. Therefore, potentially impacting numerous protected species, including bats and hazel dormice, which were said to rely on these features for commuting and dispersal.	N	ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) assesses the impact of the Project on protected species, including bats and hazel dormice. The Project has been designed to avoid SINCs where practicable. Reduced working widths (RWW) will be implemented at hedgerow and treeline crossings to reduce vegetation loss. As per Design Principles GDP_12 and GDP_13, the detailed design is committed to protect the environment (including ecology) and retain existing features such as wildlife corridors and vegetation where reasonably practicable. Please refer to the Design Principles

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
				Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5).

Table G25-70 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinement 25 and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)	DR2520 1	SDNPA acknowledged that the draft Order Limits as part of Design Refinement 25 had been increased to provide appropriate mitigation and enhancements. The respondent said that as the proposed draft Order Limits would now be closer to the train line, the Applicant was encouraged to consider opportunities to provide habitat connectivity as part of the Design Principles.	N	Design Principles PL_30 (wet woodland creation and tree protection) and PL_31 (enhancement of Otterbourne Stream and floodplain and coastal grazing marsh) set out the mitigation and enhancement measures that will be implemented in this location. Please refer to the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5).
Winchester City Council (WCC)	DR2520 2	WCC noted that highway works, and alternative construction access had been proposed following discussions with the Highway Authority. As a result, further extensions had been proposed to the Draft Order Limits for environmental mitigation and to facilitate a Public Right of Way diversion.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Hampshire County Council (HCC)	DR2520 3	HCC confirmed that the new access provision at Otterbourne Water Supply Works was proposed within the private area of the new road, and therefore, the Highway Authority had reported no comments at Spring 2025 Consultation. However, HCC noted that Otterbourne Lane and Kiln Lane junction were included to facilitate potential highway works to allow construction movements and added that it was unclear what these proposed additional works would entail. The Highway Authority stated that it may wish for any changes to be kept in place and therefore this should be an option for discussion depending on the works undertaken.	N	The Otterbourne Lane/Kiln Lane junction has been included in the Order Limits given works would likely be required at this junction to facilitate construction access. Potential works to the Otterbourne Hill/Kiln Lane mini-roundabout, including the possibility for permanent works, have been discussed with HCC as part of the engagement on the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7). Various options have been developed, however the preferred option would be developed by the Contractor post-DCO consent and agreed as part of the detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan. The potential for the works to be retained permanently can be explored with HCC once the detailed design has been agreed.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider Community	DR2520 4	A respondent said that proposed Design Refinement 25 was a <i>“good and creative use of an existing water industry asset through which the recycled water can be distributed to users”</i>. They added that they were fully supportive of repurposing existing infrastructure to	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		reduce the carbon footprint across the entirety of the Project.		

Table G25-71 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinements (collective) and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
Natural England (NE), Health and Safety Executive	DRCOL 201	The Health and Safety Executive confirmed there were no changes in their views to those provided in the Summer 2024 response as a result of the 25 Design Refinements proposed. NE confirmed that it had reviewed all 25 Design Refinements and noted no major concerns at this stage due to many of the Design Refinements having been identified to limit environmental loss. NE also said that it encourages the Applicant to limit environmental loss further where possible when construction begins. The Applicant was also encouraged to seek further opportunities for additional enhancements beyond what had been	N	As per Design Principles GDP_12 and GDP_13, the detailed design is committed to protect the environment and retain existing features such as wildlife corridors and vegetation where reasonably practicable. The Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) sets out the final list of environmental mitigation and enhancement area works that will be delivered by the Project. This has been informed by the findings of the ES.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		proposed within the 25 Design Refinements.		

Table G25-72 Summary of issues raised on the theme of design refinements (multiple) and the Applicant's response

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
Prescribed bodies and local authorities Section 42(1)(a)				
South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA), Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC), Portsmouth Water (PW), Winchester City Council (WCC), Hampshire County Council (HCC), Fareham Borough Council	DRM201	The respondents noted that they had reviewed the proposed Design Refinements, with a number referring back to their 2024 response. Respondents noted which design refinements impacted them and which ones they addressed in their comments in more detail.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Consultation Report Appendix G – Statutory Spring 2025 Consultation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
(FBC), Portsmouth City Council (PCC)				
National Highways (NH), Havant Borough Council (HBC), East Hampshire District Council (EHDC), Environment Agency (EA), Canal & River Trust	DRM202	NH stated that they had no further comments in relation to any Design Refinements they had not previously mentioned in their prior comments (Design Refinements 1,2,3 and 5). HBC, the Canal & River Trust, EHDC and the EA all stated that they had no specific comments to make regarding any of the design refinements. HBC stated that the design refinements did not require any updates to the comments it issued during the Summer 2024 consultation. However, they emphasised that all previous comments remain valid and should continue to be taken into consideration.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
EBC	DRM203	EBC stated that there were other examples of positive Design Refinements other than the ones they had commented on, however, the Council were unable to validate them without access to an	N	ES Appendix 13.5 Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) sets out the trees that would be impacted by the Project.

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		Arboricultural survey and impact assessment. The Council stated that more detailed information was required in order to provide final comments on the locations of the pipeline limits, locations and mitigation areas.		Arboriculture survey results were shared with local authorities, including EBC, in January 2026.
HCC	DRM204	HCC stated that as the Local Highway Authority any traffic implications and additional access requirements would need to be understood and reflected appropriately in the supporting documentation.	N	Further engagement has been undertaken with HCC to develop the construction access proposals, and this has informed the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).
Person with an Interest in the Land Section 42(1)(d)				
PIL	DRM205	A respondent raised concerns about design refinements 1, 2 and 3, regarding subsidence to their property.	N	There is no risk of subsidence as a result of these design refinements. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) sets out measures that will be implemented to ensure this.
Wider community Section 47 and Section 48				
Wider community	DRM206	The respondents stated that all of the design refinements were of interest to them, and one respondent directed the reader to their comments on design	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Consultation Report Appendix G – Statutory Spring 2025 Consultation

Consultee	Issue code	Summary of issue raised	Project change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response
		refinements 4 and 6 specifically which they had commented on previously within other comments.		



from
Southern
Water® 