

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project

Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

VOLUME NUMBER: 6

PLANNING INSPECTORATE SCHEME NUMBER: WA010002

APPLICATION DOCUMENT REFERENCE: 6.2

APFP REGULATION: 5(2)(a)

May 2026

Version 0



from
**Southern
Water** 

The Southern Water logo consists of three stylized, wavy blue lines of varying lengths, positioned to the right of the text 'Southern Water'.

Contents

1 Introduction 1
 1.1 Purpose of this report..... 1
References 120

Tables

Table 1-1 EIA Scoping Opinion comments and responses 2

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1.1 An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Opinion was sought from the Planning Inspectorate, acting under delegation on behalf of the relevant Secretary of State (SoS), for the Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project (hereafter referred to as 'the Proposed Development') in July 2023. An EIA Scoping Report was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, on behalf of the SoS, under Regulation 10 of The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the 'EIA Regulations') [1]. It set out the proposed scope of works and methods to be applied in carrying out the EIA and the proposed structure of the Environmental Statement (ES).
- 1.1.2 The Planning Inspectorate, on behalf of the SoS, issued an EIA Scoping Opinion for the Proposed Development in August 2023.
- 1.1.3 Table 1-1 contains all comments received from the Planning Inspectorate as set out in the EIA Scoping Opinion, and a response to each. Section 3 of the ES chapters 6 to 20, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), include a topic specific summary of the EIA Scoping Opinion comments along with summary responses.

Table 1-1 EIA Scoping Opinion comments and responses

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
Chapter 1 Introduction			
2.1.1	Paragraph 1.5.4	<p>Phasing of development: <i>The Scoping Report states that the proposed water recycling plant (WRP) is likely to be delivered in two phases, with the first phase producing 20 million litres per day (MI/d) of recycled water at peak operation and the second phase increasing peak output to a total of 60 MI/d recycled water. The assessment in the ES should include consideration of any additional or different impacts arising from the phasing of the Proposed Development, based on the worst case allowed for in the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO). Any assumptions made, for example in respect of the start date and duration of each construction phase, should be explained.</i></p>	<p>It is no longer proposed to deliver the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) in two phases. Single phased delivery is now proposed which has been assessed in the ES.</p>
Chapter 2 Planning legislation and policy			
No comment.			
Chapter 3 Proposed development			
2.1.2	Paragraphs 1.3.8, 1.5.7 and 3.2.1	<p>Maximum output through pipelines: <i>The approximate maximum output of the Proposed Development would be 90 MI/d through the underground pipeline between Havant Thicket Reservoir and Otterbourne Wastewater Treatment Works (WSW). It is stated that this would be during severe drought conditions. The output through other pipelines within the Proposed Development would be between 60 MI/d and 80 MI/d once all phases are operational and there would be a continuous sweetening flow of approximately 20 MI/d.</i></p>	<p>The Proposed Development is a water supply scheme comprising a combination of both water transfer and water recycling technology that would play a major role in making up the shortfall in water supply across the Hampshire supply area, especially in a drought. Drought conditions are defined in ES Chapter 1 Introduction, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), in a footnote. Section 3.6 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>The ES should explain what would comprise severe drought conditions and any assumptions that have been made about the frequency and duration of such conditions for the purposes of assessment. The maximum output required for the sweetening flow should be confirmed and an explanation as to why this volume is required. The ES should clearly define the worst case scenario allowed for within the dDCO and use that as the basis for the final study areas selected for the assessment of effects arising from operation of the Proposed Development.</i></p>	<p>out how the Proposed Development would be utilised relative to drought conditions. Section 3.6 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out the operational details of the Proposed Development during maximum operation which represents the worst case for assessment purposes. This includes expected vehicle movements to the WRP site and Above Ground Plant (AGP) sites. Sections 3.3 and 3.6 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), set out minimum flow parameters and justification.</p>
2.1.3	Paragraphs 1.5.12, 3.1.5 and 3.3.5	<p>Reject water via Eastney transfer tunnel (TT) and long sea outfall (LSO): <i>The Scoping Report states that no physical changes are proposed to the Eastney TT and LSO but the Applicant might need operational powers over the existing infrastructure in the dDCO. Reject water from the WRP would be discharged through this existing infrastructure. The ES should explain the nature of these operational powers and how they would relate to the operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development. Any impact pathways arising from the exercise of such powers should be assessed in the ES where significant effects are likely to occur.</i></p>	<p>Section 3.6 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out the proposed releases from Eastney LSO during maximum and minimum flow operation. During maximum operation in drought conditions the Proposed Development would divert 82MI/d of treated wastewater that is currently released from the Eastney LSO to the WRP. Therefore, the operation of the Proposed Development would reduce the release of treated wastewater from the Eastney LSO. The Eastney TT and Eastney LSO are existing apparatus owned and operated by the Applicant and so it is not seeking any additional powers for operation and maintenance over this infrastructure as part of the Development Consent</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			<p>Order (DCO). A new discharge permit will be submitted (outside of the DCO) to control discharges from the Eastney LSO during operation.</p> <p>An assessment of the worst case environmental effects as a result of the release from the Eastney LSO is presented in ES Chapters 9 Marine biodiversity and ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
2.1.4	Paragraph 3.3.5	<p>Water quality failure event: <i>In a water quality failure event, water would be returned via the reject stream from the proposed WRP to Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) and then discharged via Eastney LSO while a shutdown is initiated.</i> <i>The ES should describe any assumptions made in the assessments about the likely frequency and duration of such an event, and the expected composition of reject water discharged via Eastney LSO. Any likely significant effects should be assessed.</i></p>	<p>Section 3.3 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out the assumptions relating to water quality failures at the WRP.</p> <p>ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), describes the potential composition of reject water that would be discharged via Eastney LSO in the case of a water quality failure or emergency shutdown, and provides an assessment of the water quality effects associated with such events.</p>
2.1.5	Paragraph 3.2.1	<p>Optionality: <i>Options remain under consideration for several components of the Proposed Development, including the underground pipeline between the WRP and Havant Thicket Reservoir, which could be a single continuous tunnel or two separate tunnels, with a connection at Bedhampton Springs. The location and number of intermediate pumping stations (IPS)</i></p>	<p>ES Chapter 4 Consideration of alternatives, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out how the Proposed Development has been refined following the EIA Scoping Opinion including how environmental effects and feedback from consultation and ongoing engagement has been considered.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>and break pressure tanks (BPT) would be dependent on the final underground pipeline route.</i></p> <p><i>The ES should include an indication of the main reasons for the final option(s) chosen, including how environmental effects have been considered. If final options have not been selected at the point of application, the ES should assess all remaining options and identify any measures proposed to mitigate significant adverse effects.</i></p>	<p>While optionality has been reduced as far as practicable. ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out where optionality or flexibility in the design of the Proposed Development has been retained and the reasons for this. These areas of optionality and flexibility have been included in the Order Limits and therefore any likely significant effects have been assessed in the ES.</p>
2.1.6	Section 3.3 and Appendix 2	<p>Works to existing infrastructure:</p> <p><i>The Proposed Development would connect into existing infrastructure at Budds Farm WTW, Otterbourne Water Supply Works (WSW) and Eastney outfall (including the TT and LSO) and proposed development at Havant Thicket Reservoir, which has planning permission.</i></p> <p><i>The ES should include diagrams and figures to illustrate the components of the Proposed Development and demonstrate how it interacts with existing infrastructure and planned development forming part of the wider project, including any mitigation secured for planned developments. The Applicant's attention is drawn to Natural England's comments (Appendix 2 of this Scoping Opinion) about mitigation tree planting secured for Havant Thicket Reservoir project.</i></p> <p><i>The Scoping Report indicates that in some instances upgrade works may be required to existing infrastructure, which may be pursued through separate consenting regimes. In other instances, no physical works are proposed but there would be changes to discharges affecting existing environmental permits.</i></p>	<p>The Works plans (Document reference 2.3, DCO Volume 2) accompanying the ES show how the Proposed Development would interact with existing infrastructure. Section 3.3 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), describes these interfaces and provides further figures and schematics presenting the interfaces.</p> <p>The Proposed Development does not comprise any works at Havant Thicket Reservoir, or within areas where mitigation tree planting is secured for that development. This is because the Proposed Development would use pipelines that have been consented by Portsmouth Water to transfer recycled water from Bedhampton Springs to Havant Thicket Reservoir. For the pipeline element of the Havant Thicket Reservoir project, the assessment takes a worst case approach by assuming that all mitigation planting installed by Portsmouth Water would be removed and then reinstated following construction, in accordance</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>The ES should identify and describe all consequential or related works and/ or changes to permits required as part of the wider project, including those that are proposed to be delivered outside of the DCO. It should confirm the mechanism for delivering these works and the status of any application(s). Any likely significant effects arising from the cumulation of the Proposed Development and such works should be assessed in the ES.</i></p>	<p>with the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) in the areas impacted by the Proposed Development at the Bedhampton Springs site.</p> <p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out that separate upgrade works planned at Otterbourne WSW to address Drinking Water Inspectorate water treatment requirements would facilitate the treatment of flows provided by the Proposed Development. These upgrades are expected to be completed by 2031 well in advance of the operation of the Proposed Development. Any upgrades to Otterbourne WSW will be subject to a separate consenting process.</p> <p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and Consents and Agreements Position Statement (Document reference 5.4, Volume 5), summarises what permits would be required for the Proposed Development.</p> <p>ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes assessment of other developments which are related to or consequential to the Proposed Development.</p>
2.1.7	Paragraph 3.3.23 to 3.3.34	<p>Associated development: <i>The Applicant should clearly define what elements of the Proposed Development are integral to the NSIP, and whether</i></p>	<p>ES Chapter 2 Planning legislation and policy, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out how the Proposed Development is</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>any elements are ‘Associated Development’ under the PA2008 or ancillary matters.</i></p> <p><i>Any proposed works and / or infrastructure required as Associated Development or an ancillary matter (whether on or off-site) should be assessed as part of an integrated approach to environmental assessment. This includes the temporary construction hub, even where this is located outside of the Order limits and may have been consented through a different regime.</i></p>	<p>defined as a project of national significance including the elements that must be consented by a DCO.</p> <p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out the other works that would be required to support construction and operation of the Proposed Development and these are assessed in this ES.</p> <p>Section 3.5 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), also sets out the approach to the construction workers hub. The construction workers hub is expected to be used as a central point for construction workers to assemble prior to transportation to the temporary construction compounds. The construction workers hub would not be used to store materials, plant or other equipment. Due to uncertainty over timing and availability of potential construction workers hub sites, the temporary construction workers hub would be identified by the Contractor, during the construction phase, and it is assumed that it will use an existing suitably consented site for the activities to be undertaken there. Therefore, the construction workers hub is not included in the Order Limits.</p> <p>Any required environmental assessment of environmental effects will already have been undertaken on the existing consented site, and no construction works will take place at that site,</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			<p>therefore the development of the construction workers hub is not assessed in this ES, aside from the following exceptions. ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), considers effects of the construction workers hub on land use. In addition, the environmental effects related to the vehicle movements associated with the construction workers hub are assessed within ES Chapter 6 Air quality and odour, ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health, and ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport all in Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
2.1.8	Paragraphs 3.3.3 and 3.6.4	<p>Development parameters for the WRP: <i>The ES should confirm the final parameters (minimum and maximum dimensions) of the WRP, including any access roads (if required) and parking provision. It should assess any likely significant effects resulting from the construction, operation/ maintenance, or decommissioning of the WRP.</i></p>	<p>Maximum parameters of the WRP site are set out in section 3.3 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Minimum parameters for the WRP site are not presented in this ES or DCO application, as it is considered that the maximum parameters represent the worst case, and no additional likely significant effects are anticipated if the WRP site was delivered below the maximum parameters.</p> <p>The likely significant effects resulting from the construction, operation/ maintenance, or decommissioning of the WRP are assessed as relevant in Section 8 of ES Chapters 6-20, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
2.1.9	Paragraphs 3.3.4 and 3.3.16 to 3.3.20	<p>Above ground plant (AGP): <i>The ES should confirm the maximum number, location and final parameters (minimum and maximum dimensions) of all AGP, including the high lift pumping station (HLPS), IPS and BPT, including any access roads (if required). It should assess any likely significant effects resulting from construction, operation/ maintenance, or decommissioning of the AGP.</i></p>	<p>Maximum parameters of the AGP are set out in ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Minimum parameters for the AGP are not presented in this ES or DCO application, as it is considered that the maximum parameters represent the worst case, and no additional likely significant effects are anticipated if the AGP were delivered below the maximum parameters. The ES assesses the maximum number of AGP required for the Proposed Development and identifies locations for these.</p>
2.1.10	Paragraphs 3.5.4 to 3.5.15 and Appendix 2	<p>Pipeline installation methods and special crossings: <i>The Scoping Report describes a range of pipeline installation methods that could be used, stating that most of the pipeline is likely to be installed using open-cut techniques with a working width of 40m. Trenchless methods may be used where crossings are required that are not suited to open-cut methods.</i> <i>The ES should confirm the methods assumed for each section of pipeline. If flexibility is sought regarding the use of open cut or trenchless techniques, the ES should assess the available options or identify and assess a worst case scenario.</i> <i>The ES should define the applicable parameters for the construction working width and the pipeline trenches for each installation method proposed or apply a worse case. It should</i></p>	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), identifies where trenchless construction techniques would be used, and the use of trenchless construction is secured in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out the parameters for the working width used for open-cut construction which is secured in the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The Outline CEMP also includes a schedule of locations where reduced working widths would be implemented.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>be clear how these parameters are secured through the dDCO or other legal mechanism.</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant’s attention is drawn to the comments of Natural England (Appendix 2 of this Opinion) regarding potential impacts from pipeline crossings of the River Itchen SAC, River Meon and River Hamble. The ES should confirm the proposed crossing technique for these receptors and assess the likely significant effects. Effort should be made to agree the scope of survey required to inform the assessments with relevant consultation bodies.</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant’s attention is drawn to Portsmouth Water’s comments (Appendix 2 of this Opinion) regarding potential constraints to undergrounding of pipeline in several locations and the need to install pipeline above ground. It should be clear within the ES where pipeline is to be installed above ground and the likely significant effects arising from this method should be assessed.</i></p>	<p>Where flexibility in construction techniques has been retained, the topic chapters of the ES set out assumptions to ensure a worst case assessment. ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out that trenchless construction techniques would be used for the crossing of the River Itchen (and Special Area of Conservation (SAC)), River Meon and River Hamble. Engagement has been undertaken with Natural England (NE) and the Environment Agency (EA) to inform the design of the pipeline in these locations and survey methodologies.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with Portsmouth Water regarding above ground pipework in the vicinity of Bedhampton Springs since December 2021 and this engagement continues. Discussion has included placement of pipework, maximum parameters of pipework, and construction techniques.</p> <p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out where the pipeline would be installed above-ground, and this is assessed in the ES.</p>
2.1.11	Paragraphs 3.3.23 to 3.3.32	<p>Temporary site compounds:</p> <p><i>The ES should describe what parameters have been used in the assessment for temporary site compounds, including the total number, locations, dimensions of any buildings and parking numbers.</i></p>	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out the proposed locations of temporary construction compounds as well as the maximum footprint and building heights and</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			<p>expected parking numbers that have been assessed in the ES. ES Figure 1.1 Location of the Proposed Development and Order Limits, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6) shows the locations of the construction compounds.</p>
2.1.12	Paragraphs 3.3.33 to 3.3.34	<p>Temporary water storage lagoons: <i>A temporary lagoon for storage of water is proposed to be located approximately every 3km along the pipeline route. The ES should confirm the maximum number of lagoons proposed, together with their width, depth and volume. It should explain how the land used for the lagoons would be reinstated following construction.</i></p>	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out the proposed number and location of the temporary water storage lagoons as well as their expected parameters. Details of the reinstatement of temporary construction compounds/lagoons is provided in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7).</p>
2.1.13	Paragraphs 3.5.1 to 3.5.2	<p>WRP piling method: <i>The WRP is proposed to be constructed on the site of a former landfill. The Scoping Report states that piling requirements would be informed by assessment of ground conditions to ensure the landfill's integrity is not affected. The Inspectorate considers that the assessment of ground conditions should be undertaken to inform assessment in the ES so that the likely significant effects are fully understood. A piling risk assessment and strategy should also be provided with the ES.</i></p>	<p>ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), includes an assessment of ground conditions effects resulting from works within contaminated land. Outline Foundation Works Risk Assessments (FWRA) (Document Reference 7.4, DCO Volume 7) are provided with the DCO application and include outline versions of the Piling Risk Assessment. The Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) sets out that the Contractor will undertake a Piling Risk Assessment where piles are to be used in areas of potential contamination in line with the EAs Piling and Penetrative Ground Improvement Methods on Land Affected by Contamination: Guidance on</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			<p>Pollution Prevention [2]. The Piling Risk Assessment will be based upon detailed FWRAs. This would be developed post-consent following detailed design of the WRP.</p>
2.1.14	Paragraph 3.6.5	<p>External lighting: <i>The Scoping Report indicates that there would be external lighting at the WRP during operation. No information is provided about external lighting during construction.</i> <i>The ES should describe the location and design of external lighting, including along construction working widths and at construction compounds. Any likely significant effects should be assessed.</i> <i>The design standards that any additional lighting required during construction and operation will be required to meet should also be described in the ES, including any measures incorporated to avoid intrusive lighting impacts for sensitive receptors such as the South Downs National Park (SDNP), which is an International Dark Sky Reserve.</i></p>	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), provides reference to the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) for principles for lighting during the construction phase.</p> <p>Permanent external lighting at the WRP site and AGP would be designed in accordance with relevant regulations, standards and guidance as secured in the Design Principles Document (Document Reference 5.11, DCO volume 5). The likely significant effects of lighting during construction and operation are assessed in ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity and ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Measures to avoid intrusive lighting impacts for sensitive receptors are secured in the Design Principles Document (Document Reference 5.11, DCO volume 5) and summarised in ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity and ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
2.1.15	Paragraphs 3.6.7 to 3.6.14	<p>Development parameters for underground pipelines: <i>The ES should confirm the final parameters (minimum and maximum dimensions) of the underground pipelines and associated components such as isolation valves, air valves and washout chambers. It should also include details of required easements for pipeline maintenance, to ensure that the likely impacts from the Proposed Development are fully understood.</i></p>	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out the typical parameters of the underground pipelines and associated isolation, washout and air valves.</p> <p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out it is anticipated that a protective strip either side of the entire alignment of the pipelines would be required where open-cut or above-ground construction methods have been used to restrict certain activities that could adversely affect the infrastructure and allow access for maintenance. The specific activities that would be permitted within this land will be discussed with relevant landowners as part of the ongoing engagement on the Proposed Development. A protective strip either side of the pipelines would not be required in locations where trenchless or tunnelling construction has been used as these sections would be at a greater depth.</p>
2.1.16	N/A	<p>Natural resources: <i>The ES should include a description of the nature and quantity of natural resources proposed to be used during construction and operation, including:</i> <i>Any additional water supply required, including the predicted volume and source.</i> <i>Substances required for the micro-filtration and advanced oxidation processes, including the predicted volume and source of supply.</i></p>	<p>Use of natural resources, such as energy, and landfill capacity and minerals from Mineral Safeguarding Areas, are assessed in ES Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change and ES Chapter 16 Resources and waste management, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), respectively. ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), provides</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>Energy requirements for the operation of WRP and pumping stations, including the predicted demand and source.</i></p> <p><i>Materials required for the construction, operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development, including any additional material required resulting from the extraction of sand and gravel in affected Minerals Safeguarding Areas (MSA).</i></p> <p><i>Any likely significant effects arising from these matters should be assessed in the ES.</i></p>	<p>information on water use during construction and operation.</p> <p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), provides information on the approach to materials management and the effects related to this are assessed within the ES. It also provides a description of the stages of water recycling which include, for example, the use of ultraviolet light and hydrogen peroxide to remove any remaining impurities and the reuse of minerals such as calcium and magnesium salts. Information related to substances required for the micro-filtration and advanced oxidation processes is summarised in section 3.6 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
2.1.17	N/A	<p>Residues and emissions:</p> <p><i>The ES should include an estimate of expected residues and emissions produced during the construction and operational phases. This should include the predicted volume and composition of waste arising from excavation of the former landfill site to facilitate construction of the WRP.</i></p> <p><i>The Scoping Report indicates that for the underground pipeline installation, IPS and BPT, a cut and fill balance would be targeted. The ES should confirm the predicted volume of soil excavated from these components and any shortfall or remainder from the fill.</i></p> <p><i>The ES should confirm the volume of reject water anticipated to be discharged from the WRP based on the maximum</i></p>	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), provides information on the approach to materials management and the effects related to this are assessed within the ES.</p> <p>Excavation volumes expected as a result of the Proposed Development, including from the former landfill at the WRP site, and their material classifications are reported in ES Chapter 16 Resources and waste management, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), provides additional information on residues and</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>output of the WRP, as well as its predicted chemical composition.</i></p> <p><i>The ES should describe the washout process, including the predicted frequency, chemical composition of the water and the methods for disposal of the water.</i></p> <p><i>The ES should describe the likely residues and emissions from the water recycling process and how these would be managed or disposed of.</i></p> <p><i>Any likely significant effects arising from these matters should be assessed in the ES.</i></p>	<p>emissions produced from the water recycling process and how these would be managed and disposed of including the volume of water released from the Eastney LSO and the expected chemical composition.</p> <p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), provides details on the operating regime for washouts. This sets out that washout valves would be tested and checked approximately every six months during the operation phase, and any releases of source water would be collected directly by a tanker, with no source water discharged to the environment. Because water released from the washout valves would be captured, there is therefore no mechanism to impact on the hydrology and geomorphology of surface watercourses (e.g. as a result of rapid releases into a river channel) or affect water quality (e.g. as a result of differences in water chemistry).</p> <p>In an emergency scenario sections of the pipeline may need to be drained using the washouts. These events are considered operationally exceptional and are not expected during the life of the Proposed Development. This emergency scenario is however assessed in ES Chapter 14 Major accidents and disasters, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
2.1.18	N/A	Demolition:	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), explains that the Proposed

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>The ES should include a description of any demolition works required to facilitate construction of the Proposed Development. Any likely significant effects resulting from demolition works should be assessed.</i></p>	<p>Development will require the demolition, disassembly and/or temporary relocation of a number of small structures. This is assessed in relevant ES topic chapters and relevant measures to mitigate impacts are secured in the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7).</p>
2.1.19	N/A	<p>Construction days and hours: <i>The ES should confirm what construction days and hours have been assumed in the assessment and how these would be secured in the dDCO.</i></p>	<p>The construction programme and standard working hours is provided in ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and reference is provided to the accompanying Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) which secures the construction working days and hours.</p>
2.1.20	N/A	<p>Construction access: <i>The ES should describe the predicted number of vehicle movements, proposed construction access routes and any works proposed to existing roads and/ or access points to facilitate construction. This should include confirmation of any predicted hazardous loads and/ or abnormal indivisible loads (AIL) that would be required. Any likely significant effects resulting from their use should be assessed. Any assumptions, for instance in relation to the volume of soil may need to be brought to or removed from the site, should be explained.</i></p>	<p>Figures 5-1 to 5-29 of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) identify the indicative construction accesses. The construction access routes for HGVs to each temporary construction compound are described in section 5 of the Framework CTMP (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7). ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) assesses the anticipated vehicle movements associated with the temporary construction compound access routes, including any hazardous loads and Abnormal Indivisible Loads.</p> <p>The assumptions that have informed the construction traffic volumes are detailed in section</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			4.6 of the Framework CTMP (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).
2.1.21	N/A	<p>Reference to local planning policy: <i>The Inspectorate notes that several consultation bodies have made comments about errors in referencing to local planning policy within the Scoping Report (Appendix 2). Where the ES describes planning policy, reference should be made to the relevant and up-to-date documents and policies.</i></p>	All relevant and up to date relevant planning policy has been considered and reported against. ES Chapter 2 Planning legislation and policy, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), provides a summary of the up to date position in relation to adopted and emerging development plan policies for each of the host authorities. ES chapters 6 to 19, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), refer to adopted and emerging development plan policies where they are considered to be important and relevant considerations for the ES assessment.
Chapter 4 Consideration of alternatives			
2.2.2	Chapter 4	<p>Order limits: <i>The scoping area shown on Figures 1.1 and 1.2 is proposed to be refined further through scheme development and EIA processes prior to confirmation of the Order limits within the DCO application. The ES should include an explanation of any changes made following scoping, including how environmental effects have been considered in finalising the Order limits.</i></p>	ES Chapter 4 Consideration of alternatives, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out how the Proposed Development has been refined following the EIA Scoping Opinion including how environmental effects, consultation and engagement have been considered. The DCO application includes a Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) which provides a detailed description of how the design of the Proposed Development been developed.
2.2.3	Chapter 4	<p>Alternatives: <i>Paragraph 4.1.4 of the Scoping Report references a separate document, Scheme Development Summary, from the Applicant's consultation in summer 2022, which provides</i></p>	The Scheme Development Report (Document reference 5.10, DCO Volume 5) sets out how the design of the Proposed Development has evolved through the RAPID process up to DCO application

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>further detail about alternatives assessed during the development of the project. The Inspectorate considers that this document should be submitted as part of the ES, eg as a technical appendix, together with any other relevant documentation that has been used to inform the consideration of alternatives through the Regulator’s Alliance for Progressing Infrastructure Development (RAPID) gated process.</i></p>	<p>– is a stand-alone document within the DCO application. It is not an appendix to the ES but forms part of the DCO application and therefore is referenced in the ES.</p>
Chapter 5 EIA approach and methodology			
2.2.1	Section 3.7, paragraph 5.2.17, and Appendix 2	<p>Decommissioning effects: <i>The Scoping Report states that effects from decommissioning will be considered but that it is expected these would be similar to or less than construction phase effects.</i> <i>The ES assessment of impacts resulting from decommissioning in each aspect chapter should be proportionate but include a description of the process and methods of decommissioning, land use requirements and estimated timescales. Consideration should also be given to possible changes to the future baseline, including from climate change, which could have a bearing on decommissioning.</i> <i>The Scoping Report states that the Proposed Development is assumed to have a life cycle of a minimum of 100 years. The ES should confirm whether there are any components that may need to be dismantled or replaced on a shorter timeframe and, if so, provide an assessment of decommissioning impacts if significant effects are likely to occur.</i> <i>The Applicant’s attention is drawn to the Environment Agency’s (EA) comments regarding risk posed to the water</i></p>	<p>ES Chapter 5 EIA approach and methodology, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), notes that “<i>The Applicant is not seeking consent for decommissioning... While the Applicant is not seeking consent for decommissioning, reasonably foreseeable effects from decommissioning are assessed within the topic chapters... The assessment of decommissioning effects is concise and proportionate, undertaken on a qualitative basis, based on high-level assumptions and existing knowledge, techniques and equipment. For the majority of topics this means that decommissioning effects are considered to be no greater than during construction of the Proposed Development. This is due to the likely nature and scale of decommissioning activities being similar to or less than construction activities. The assessment of decommissioning effects assumes that works would follow good industry practice and would</i></p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>environment by unused conduits, tunnels and pipes (see Appendix 2 of this Opinion). The Inspectorate considers that these components should be considered in the assessment of decommissioning effects.</i></p>	<p><i>comply with all relevant statutory requirements applicable at the time.”</i></p> <p>Tables 3-24, 3-25, and 3-26 in ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), set out the expected design life of specific WRP, AGP and various components of the Proposed Development. At the end of the expected design life of these assets, the condition of assets would be reviewed to determine the requirement for any maintenance activities. This information has been used in the assessment of maintenance activities during operation.</p> <p>Section 3.7 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out information related to the decommissioning of the Proposed Development, including the expected design life of the components of the Proposed Development. It is anticipated that the programme for decommissioning the components of the Proposed Development would be the similar to the construction programme set out in Section 3.5. It is assumed that buried pipeline infrastructure would be left in situ, once drained and capped and would be guided by industry good practice at the time. Sections under major assets such as road and railways may be filled in with grout depending on industry best practice at the time.</p> <p>Decommissioning risks regarding impacts to controlled waters is assessed in ES Chapter 11</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			<p>Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). This ES presents consideration of future baseline conditions from climate change where relevant within each topic chapter.</p>
2.2.4	Paragraph 5.2.13	<p>Effects arising from temporary construction hub: <i>The Scoping Report states that the temporary construction hub location is unknown and it may be located outside of the scoping area. If this is the case, potential effects would be screened and assessed as appropriate, including through further fieldwork.</i> <i>The Inspectorate considers that effort should be made to discuss and agree the scope of any additional survey and assessment work with relevant statutory consultation bodies once the location of the temporary construction hub is confirmed. Evidence of steps taken and the level of agreement reached should be presented in the ES.</i></p>	<p>See response to ID 2.1.7. The temporary construction workers hub would be identified by the Contractor, during the construction phase, and it is assumed that it will use an existing suitably consented site for the activities to be undertaken there.</p> <p>Any required environmental assessment will already have been undertaken on the existing consented site, and no construction works will take place at that site, therefore the development of the construction workers hub is not assessed in this ES, aside from the following exceptions. ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), considers effects of the construction workers hub on land use. Effects related to the mini-bus vehicle movements between the construction workers hub and the temporary construction compounds are considered in ES Chapter 6 Air quality and odour, ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health, and ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport, all contained in Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
2.2.5	Paragraphs 5.2.17 to 5.2.18	<p>Operational phase effects: <i>The Scoping Report states that the Applicant is not seeking a time limited consent and the operational life will not be specified in the DCO application but as worst case permanent effects of the operational phase, which is assumed to be a minimum of 100 years will be assessed. It is also stated that no significant effects are considered likely for maintenance activities.</i></p> <p><i>Given the expected life of the Proposed Development, the ES should describe whether any major replacement work is likely to be required during its operation and, if so, what it is expected to comprise, together with the frequency and duration of any works. The ES should assess any likely significant effects arising from such activity.</i></p>	<p>Section 3.6 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out the maintenance activities which have been assessed in topic chapters, ES Chapters 6 to 19, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), which includes replacement of equipment. The frequency of replacement activities is informed by the expected design life of Proposed Development components, which is set out in section 3.6 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Replacement activities would comply with the Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) (Document Reference 7.7, DCO volume 7) and all relevant statutory requirements applicable at the time.</p>
2.2.6	Paragraph 5.2.19	<p>Duration of potential effects: <i>The Inspectorate notes that the definition of short term for the construction period covers a relatively long period of time, ie the entirety of the construction period plus 1 year of reinstatement, which could extend to six years. The Inspectorate considers that care should be taken in the determination of significance so that potentially significant construction phase effects are not underreported on the basis that they are short term in duration.</i></p>	<p>Construction is anticipated to be undertaken over a period of approximately five years with intensity and scale of construction of the Proposed Development varying over this period. ES Chapter 3 Description of Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out the anticipated construction programme establishing the likely duration of works in each location. The assessment of construction effects in the ES is based on this programme. ES topic chapters 6 to 19, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), include appropriate definitions of short, medium and long-term for individual topic assessments and topic</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			assessments take account of the duration of effects in the determination of magnitude of impacts and significance of effects.
2.2.7	Paragraphs 5.2.36 to 5.2.37	<p>Flexibility:</p> <p><i>The Inspectorate notes the Applicant’s desire to incorporate flexibility into their draft DCO (dDCO) and its intention to apply a ‘Rochdale Envelope’ approach for this purpose. Paragraph 5.2.37 states that the “...assessment will be based on a realistic worst-case approach. The assessment will establish those parameters likely to result in the realistic worst-case approach and be undertaken accordingly to determine significance.”</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant should make every attempt to narrow the range of options and explain clearly in the ES which elements of the Proposed Development have yet to be finalised and provide the reasons. At the time of application, any Proposed Development parameters should not be so wide-ranging as to represent effectively different developments.</i></p> <p><i>The development parameters, including any limits of deviation, should be clearly defined in the DCO and in the accompanying ES. It is a matter for the Applicant, in preparing an ES, to consider whether it is possible to robustly assess a range of impacts resulting from many undecided parameters. The description of the Proposed Development in the ES must not be so wide that it is insufficiently certain to comply with the requirements of Regulation 14 of the EIA Regulations.</i></p> <p><i>It should be noted that if the Proposed Development materially changes prior to submission of the DCO</i></p>	<p>Section 5.3 of ES Chapter 5 EIA approach and methodology, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) details how the ‘Rochdale Envelope’ has been applied in the ES to set out clearly defined parameters that are used to ensure a worst case assessment. Flexibility has been retained for a few elements of the design and construction methodology which is explained in ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). These areas of optionality and flexibility have been included in the Order Limits and any likely significant effects have been assessed in the ES. The process to narrow the range of options is described in ES Chapter 4 Consideration of alternatives, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<i>application, the Applicant may wish to consider requesting a new scoping opinion.</i>	
2.2.8	Paragraph 5.2.42	<p>Monitoring of mitigation: <i>Paragraph 5.2.41 of the Scoping Report states that proportionate monitoring of mitigation measures will be proposed where appropriate to monitor effectiveness of mitigation. The ES should identify for which mitigation measures monitoring is required and, where it is, describe who would be responsible, the frequency of monitoring, any reporting required, how the need for any remedial action would be ascertained and how this would be implemented. It should be clear how these matters would be secured in the dDCO.</i></p>	<p>Where appropriate, monitoring measures are set out in Section 9 of ES chapters 6 to 19, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) providing details such as the identification of who will be responsible for the monitoring, how it will be reported, how the need for remedial action will be identified, and how this is secured and implemented through the DCO and/or other appropriate control mechanisms. This is reflected in the Commitments Register, ES Appendix 5.5 Commitments Register, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Monitoring measures identified to control construction effects are secured through the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). Where necessary, future monitoring and management measures related to the operation of the Proposed Development are secured through operational management plans including the OEMP (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7) and Outline LEMP (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7), respectively.</p>
2.2.9	Paragraph 5.2.43	<p>Mitigation: <i>The Scoping Report states that mitigation will be secured by way of requirements in the DCO or through other appropriate control mechanisms. Only mitigation measures which are a firm commitment and can be shown to be deliverable should be taken account in the assessment. The DCO application</i></p>	<p>All mitigation that is relied upon in the assessment is secured through the DCO. This is secured through requirements in the DCO and through other appropriate control mechanisms, as summarised in the Commitments Register, ES</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<i>should set out how measures proposed in the ES are secured, which could be through a summary table on mitigation.</i>	Appendix 5.5 Commitments Register, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
2.2.10	Paragraph 5.2.44	<p>Management plans: <i>The Scoping Report identifies various management plans and mitigation strategy documents that will be produced with iterations as the detailed design is developed. It is stated that these would be secured and delivered through the DCO.</i> <i>The Inspectorate considers that drafts or outlines of all management plans and mitigation strategies identified within the ES, which are relied upon to mitigate significant adverse effects, should be submitted with the DCO application. The Applicant should consider submitting a hierarchy of plans document that demonstrates how management plans relate to one another.</i></p>	<p>The ES makes reference to the Design Principles Document (Document Reference 5.11, DCO volume 5) and a number of management plans that contain control measures to avoid, minimise and mitigate adverse effects through design, construction and operation of the Proposed Development. Versions of the management plans are included and secured as part of the DCO. Where outline management plans are secured in the DCO, detailed management plans will be produced and submitted for approval in accordance with the corresponding requirements in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3).</p> <p>The ES includes ES Appendix 5.5 Commitments Register, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) that includes a complete list of all primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures and confirms the securing mechanism for each of them. ES Appendix 5.5 Commitments Register, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) includes a schematic of the DCO architecture showing the relationship between control documents and how they are each secured.</p>
2.2.11	Paragraph 5.2.48	<p>In-combination effects: <i>The Scoping Report states that in-combination effects, ie those that result from the interaction between the individual</i></p>	Where in-combination effects for topics are inherently assessed within topic assessments (e.g. the assessment of amenity effects in ES Chapter

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>effects of the Proposed Development, will be considered within each individual ES aspect chapter.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate considers that this approach is acceptable provided that the ES clearly describes any likely significant effects arising from the interaction of environmental aspects of the Proposed Development during its construction, operation and decommissioning. A summary table within the cumulative effects chapter may assist in this regard.</i></p>	<p>12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), considers the interaction of air quality, noise, landscape and visual, and traffic and transport on individual receptors), these are reported within the assessment section of the individual topic chapters of the ES for effects during construction, operation and decommissioning.</p> <p>In-combination effects that may be experienced by receptors/receptor groups shared by more than one topic that have not been inherently assessed within the topic chapters are presented in ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). This comprises an assessment of the interaction of effects on these common receptors/receptor groups that may result in likely significant in-combination effects. Section 20.9 of ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) provides a summary of residual significant effects.</p>
2.2.12	Paragraphs 5.2.51 to 5.2.52	<p>Transboundary:</p> <p><i>The Inspectorate on behalf of the SoS has considered the Proposed Development and concludes that the Proposed Development is unlikely to have a significant effect either alone or cumulatively on the environment in a European Economic Area State. In reaching this conclusion the Inspectorate has identified and considered the Proposed Development's likely impacts including consideration of</i></p>	<p>Consideration of transboundary effects in presented in section 5.3 of ES Chapter 5 EIA approach and methodology, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>potential pathways and the extent, magnitude, probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impacts.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate considers that the likelihood of transboundary effects resulting from the Proposed Development is so low that it does not warrant the issue of a detailed transboundary screening. However, this position will remain under review and will have regard to any new or materially different information coming to light which may alter that decision.</i></p> <p><i>Note: The SoS' duty under Regulation 32 of the 2017 EIA Regulations continues throughout the application process.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate's screening of transboundary issues is based on the relevant considerations specified in the Annex to its Advice Note Twelve, available on our website at http://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/legislation-and-advice/advice-notes/</i></p>	
2.2.13	Paragraph 5.5.5	<p>Biodiversity net gain (BNG):</p> <p><i>The assessment of BNG reported within the ES should be based on an appropriate metric that allows clear understanding of how gains and losses have been calculated. The ES should clearly distinguish between mitigation for significant adverse effects on biodiversity from wider enhancement measures. It should be clear how and where the delivery of BNG has been secured.</i></p>	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development and ES Chapter 5 EIA approach and methodology, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) distinguish between mitigation for significant adverse effects ('environmental mitigation' in this ES) from wider enhancement measures ('environmental enhancement' in this ES). Enhancement areas are reported within the relevant ES topic chapters but are not considered in the assessments. Locations for environmental mitigation and environmental enhancement are within Environmental Mitigation and Enhancement Areas (EMEsAs), for EMEAs that contain enhancement areas, the differentiation between</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			<p>mitigation areas and enhancement areas is listed in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5) and summarised in Section 3.3 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>BNG calculations have been undertaken for the Proposed Development using the statutory metric. A Biodiversity Gain Plan (Document reference 7.11, DCO Volume 7) has been prepared for the Proposed Development and the delivery of BNG is secured through a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Opportunities to incorporate environmental enhancements, including BNG have been explored to ensure that the Proposed Development 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 and their securing mechanisms 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).</p>
2.2.15	N/A	<p>Assessment of effects arising from discharge of water to surface, ground and coastal water, including from emergency overflow of Havant Thicket Reservoir during operation:</p> <p><i>The Inspectorate considers that the ES should provide an assessment of effects arising from potential changes to water</i></p>	<p>Impacts to water quality are covered within: ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, 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) (including ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>quality arising from all discharges to surface, ground and coastal waters during operation, including from potential emergency overflow/ reservoir overtopping of Havant Thicket Reservoir. This matter is of relevance to several aspects, including terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, marine biodiversity and the water environment, given the potential for downstream impacts to habitats and species. The relevant chapters of the ES should include an assessment of the implications of any changes in water quality of affected aspects.</i></p>	<p>Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document Reference 6.2, Volume 6)). Emergency overflow/ reservoir overtopping of Havant Thicket Reservoir will be managed by Portsmouth Water as operator of Havant Thicket Reservoir, which would be required regardless of the Proposed Development, therefore this scenario is not assessed in the ES. The potential for an interaction between Havant Thicket Reservoir and the Proposed Development is examined in section 19.8 of ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
2.2.16	N/A	<p>Assessment of effects arising from construction on a former landfill site: <i>The Inspectorate considers that the ES should provide an assessment of effects arising from construction of the WRP on the former landfill, in respect of the potential release of leachates and gases. The assessment should consider human, ecological and water receptors. The Applicant's attention is drawn to the comments of the EA, Natural England, Havant Borough Council and East Hampshire District Council, and Rowlands Castle Parish Council (Appendix 2 of this Opinion) in this regard.</i></p>	<p>Proposed Development specific Ground Investigations (GI) have been undertaken within the WRP site. The GI involved the collection of geo-environmental samples, groundwater, surface water and ground gas monitoring. Soil, soil-leachate, groundwater and surface water samples were scheduled 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). Hydrogeological Impact Assessments and Outline FWRAs (Document reference 7.4, DCO Volume 7) have been undertaken for the WRP to identify and discuss appropriate mitigation measures protective of human health, groundwater, surface water and</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			<p>ecologically sensitive sites. A Hydrogeological Impact Assessment has been prepared in ES Appendix 19.3 Hydrogeological Impact Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). With regards to Piling Risk Assessments, these will be developed post-consent (forming part of the detailed FWRAs) following detailed design of the WRP. Outline versions of the FWRAs are provided in the Outline FWRA (Document reference 7.4, DCO Volume 7) which includes outline versions of the Piling Risk Assessment.</p> <p>ES Chapter 11 Land Quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), assesses the potential effects associated with construction of the WRP on human health, groundwater, surface water and ecologically sensitive sites with respect to the migration of leachates and ground gas.</p>
2.2.17	N/A	<p>Assessment of effects to the SDNP: <i>The Inspectorate considers that the assessment of effects to the SDNP should include consideration of the special qualities of the SDNP and all relevant guidance and baseline data, including the SDNP Management Plan, Viewshed Study Report and tranquillity mapping.</i></p>	<p>The Applicant engaged on the assessment methodology with the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) and has set out in the ES how the assessment has taken account of the setting and special qualities of the SDNP, including tranquillity, and potential in combination effects between landscape and noise and vibration. An assessment of the likely effects on the purposes and Special Qualities is set out in the following sections of ES Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6): section 13.8 of ES Chapter 13</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			Landscape and visual and section 17.8 of ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health.
Chapter 6 Air quality and odour			
3.1.1	Paragraphs 6.6.6 to 6.6.8 and Table 6-9	<p>Impacts on human and ecological receptors from odour during construction:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report identifies the potential for odour emissions during excavation works for the WRP due to the proposed location on a former landfill site. It is proposed to scope this matter out of assessment based on no significant odour issues being raised as part of another scheme located on the former landfill site, which has been granted planning permission, and that any odour produced would be short in duration (ie the duration of the excavation works) and could be adequately mitigated to avoid adverse effects.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate acknowledges that a previous planning permission may have been granted in the vicinity of the proposed WRP location. However, this relates to a different form of development and limited information has been presented as to whether the nature of the construction activities is comparable. The Inspectorate considers that there is a potential impact pathway, as ground works associated with the Proposed Development have the potential to release odour, which could affect human receptors. Limited information has been provided about the likely duration of these works. The Inspectorate considers that the ES should provide an assessment of impacts from odour emissions to human receptors for the construction phase of the WRP or demonstrate that no likely significant effects would occur and agreement from relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	<p>A qualitative assessment of odour is undertaken in the ES Chapter 6 Air quality and odour, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), alongside the implementation of robust mitigation measures set out in the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). This is deemed sufficient to proactively address and control odour issues during the earthwork programme of the WRP site. These comprehensive measures demonstrate a commitment to managing and mitigating odour impacts and also provide a multi-faceted approach to ensure environmental impact is minimised during construction activities.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<i>Any mitigation relied upon should be clearly described in the ES and secured through the DCO.</i>	
3.1.2	Paragraph 6.6.9 and Table 6-9	<p>Impacts on human and ecological receptors from dust and particulate matter during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that the activities involved in the operation of the Proposed Development have inherently low dust generation potential. The Inspectorate agrees that the operation of the Proposed Development is unlikely to produce dust on a scale that would result in significant effects. This matter can be scoped out of further assessment.</i></p>	No further action required.
3.1.3	Paragraph 6.6.10 to 6.6.11 and Table 6-9	<p>Impacts on human and ecological receptors from road traffic emissions during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report states that whilst the operation of the Proposed Development may result in changes to traffic flows on the surrounding road network, it would not be of a scale that would result in significant air quality effects on human and ecological receptors as the daily movements fall below the screening criteria in the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) guidance published in 2017.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate agrees that providing traffic flows are confirmed as being less than the IAQM criteria for detailed assessment, and subject to our comments at ID 3.1.6 and 3.1.8 of this Scoping Opinion, this matter can be scoped out. The ES should also demonstrate that cumulative vehicle movements with other developments would not exceed the IAQM thresholds based on worst case assessments. If such confirmation is not possible, an assessment should be provided.</i></p>	<p>ES Chapter 6 Air quality and odour, Volume I (Document 6.1, DCO Volume 6) compares the operational traffic flows associated with the Proposed Development against the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) screening criteria. The approach to assessment of ecological features is in-line with NEA001 [3] instead of using JNCC thresholds. Furthermore, as described in section 6.5 of ES Chapter 6 Air quality and odour, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), traffic data is derived from a post pandemic year (2023). Cumulative operational flows have not been screened because any assessment of operational traffic was scoped out of ES Chapter 18 Traffic and Transport, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). This approach was discussed with stakeholders at the EIA Emissions and Transport EIA Working Group held on 16 September 2025, and was later agreed via email.</p>

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.1.4	Paragraph 6.6.12 and Table 6-9	<p>Impacts on human and ecological receptors from Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) and machinery emissions during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report Proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that the only source of emissions to air during operation would be from back-up diesel generators used for minimum periods in emergency use. The Inspectorate agrees that the use of these back-up generators is unlikely to have significant effects but does not have sufficient information to exclude the possibility of likely significant effects. The Inspectorate considers that this matter should be assessed in the ES or it should demonstrate why significant effects are not likely to occur and agreement from relevant consultation bodies that the matter can be scoped out of assessment. The ES should confirm the likely frequency and duration of emergency generator use, the number of generators that would be required and their location.</i></p>	<p>The comments on the effects of NRMM and machinery emissions on human and ecological receptors during operation is duly acknowledged. Agreement with local planning authorities for this to be scoped out was sought and agreed at the EIA Emissions and Transport Working Group meeting held on 3 November 2023. ES Chapter 6 Air quality and odour, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), provides information on the proposed emergency generators, including the likely frequency and duration of emergency generator use, number of generators and approximate locations in terms of which sites they would be installed at.</p>
3.1.5	Paragraph 6.6.13 and Table 6-9	<p>Impacts on human and ecological receptors from odour emissions during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that there would be no changes to Budds Farm WTW and the secondary treated effluent entering the proposed WRP has been shown to have an odour concentration of below 1.0 ou_E/m²/s which is “the lowest concentration at which odour can be detected in laboratory conditions by 50% of a human test panel”.</i></p> <p><i>On this basis, the Inspectorate is content to scope this matter out of further assessment but details of the surveys undertaken at other sites should be provided within the ES together with confirmation of any records of odour complaints</i></p>	<p>Operations at Budds Farm WTW would remain unchanged. The WRP site utilises the wastewater from the existing treatment process which has minimal odour potential, resembling river water rather than wastewater odours. Typically, secondary treated wastewater processes do not necessitate detailed odour assessments due to their low emissions. The WRP site would not introduce any additional odour impacts during its operational phase.</p> <p>Additionally, confirmation from Havant Borough Council (HBC) regarding the absence of recent odour-related complaints, along with only a few</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<i>from the existing operation. Any best practice measures or other mitigation, including design measures to avoid impacts, should be clearly secured through the dDCO.</i>	<p>complaints received by the Applicant in recent years, highlights the rarity of odour issues at Budds Farm WTW.</p> <p>Given that the Proposed Development does not involve modifications to the odorous components of Budds Farm WTW, utilises wastewater with minimal odour potential, it is not expected to contribute to any odour-related issues during its operation. Therefore, separate odour assessments for the operational phase of the WRP site are not deemed necessary. ES Chapter 6 Air quality and odour, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) presents a summary of recent odour complaints received at Budds Farm.</p>
3.1.6	Paragraph 6.5.24 and 6.7.5	<p>Designated habitats: <i>In determining whether any of the identified European sites should be taken forward for assessment of air quality impacts, reference should also be made to Natural England’s guidance relating to assessment of road traffic emissions under the Habitats Regulations, NEA001.</i></p>	<p>NEs NEA001 guidance [3] has been followed for the assessment of ecological features during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. The scope of this assessment was agreed at EIA Working Groups and follow up communications between November 2024 and March 2025 with NE.</p>
3.1.7	Paragraph 6.7.2	<p>Baseline data collection: <i>The Scoping Report proposes to use local authority monitoring data, Defra background mapping and modelling to establish the baseline air quality conditions. It is not proposed to undertake any specific monitoring for the Proposed Development. The Inspectorate considers that this is an acceptable approach given the nature of the Proposed Development and availability of other data sources, which demonstrate that EQS are currently not exceeded across most of the study area. The ES should explain what approach</i></p>	<p>The ES reports the baseline data collected from local planning authorities and, in accordance with relevant guidance, indicates the years affected by COVID-19 restrictions. Importantly, data from these affected years was not used for the assessment to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the air quality assessment. The assessment considered data from the APIS [4]. At the EIA Emissions and Transport Working Group on 3 November 2023, it was agreed with attendees that</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>has been taken to use of baseline data affected by restrictions during the Covid-19 pandemic, with reference to relevant guidance and any agreement with consultation bodies. The Inspectorate considers that reference should also be made to data available from the Air Pollution Information System (APIS) in respect of background air quality at designated nature conservation sites.</i></p>	<p>monitoring data from the local planning authorities would be sufficient to inform the baseline monitoring, as detailed in ES Chapter 6 Air quality and odour, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.1.8	Table 6-6	<p>Road traffic screening criteria: <i>In applying the 0.15% increase or more of existing annual average daily traffic (AADT) (over 5 years) threshold from Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) Guidance on Decision-making Thresholds for Air Pollution (2021) to ascertain potential for significant effects, consideration should be given to the implications of restrictions during the Covid-19 pandemic in determining the AADT.</i></p>	<p>Following consultation with NE, the approach to assessment presented in the NEA001 guidance was adopted instead of the JNCC approach, therefore this specific point is no longer relevant. However, the importance of considering the implications of restrictions during the Covid-19 pandemic in determining the AADT is acknowledged. To ensure the assessment is not influenced by COVID-19-related data anomalies, a baseline year of 2023 has been selected, which is post the impacts of COVID-19 with respect to traffic figures. This approach aims to provide a robust evaluation of likely significant effects.</p>
3.1.9	N/A	<p>Human receptors: <i>The ES should include a figure to identify the final study areas for the air quality assessment, including the location of human receptors that have been considered (in addition to ecological receptors, as shown on Figure 6.1 in Volume III).</i></p>	<p>ES Figure 6.2 Air quality construction dust and fine particulate matter buffers (inc. trackout), Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6) presents the locations of ecological receptors (as polygons) and human receptors (inhabited areas on the basemap) that are located (or partially located) within the construction dust and particulate matter buffers. It should be noted that impacts on human receptors as a result of construction traffic was screened out on the basis</p>

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			of Proposed Development traffic flows not exceeding the IAQM and EPUK guidance 2017 screening criteria.
Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage			
3.2.1	Paragraph 7.6.15	<p>Effects to heritage assets located near to the Eastney TT and Eastney LSO during construction:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report states that no physical works are anticipated to the Eastney TT and Eastney LSO during construction of the Proposed Development. As a result, no physical disturbance or change to the setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets are considered likely as result of including this existing infrastructure within the Order limits, aside from the connection at Budds Farm WTW which would be assessed.</i></p> <p><i>On the basis described in the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that the construction of the Proposed Development is unlikely to result in significant effects to heritage assets located in proximity to the Eastney TT and LSO and is content to scope this matter out of further assessment. This matter should be revisited if physical works are required. For clarity, the ES should confirm which assets are scoped out of the assessment on that basis and evidence any agreement with relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	<p>The scope of assessment for direct physical effects reflects only those heritage assets within the Order Limits where physical works are required as part of the Proposed Development. Therefore, this scope excludes any heritage assets that are within the Order Limits pertaining to the LSO and Eastney TT but are outwith the 500m study area identified for the ES assessment.</p> <p>The scope for the assessment of change to setting arising from the Proposed Development was agreed with the relevant consultees at the EIA Working Group for Historic Environment and Landscape on 31 October 2023, and is presented in ES Appendix 7.6 Heritage assets settings scoping appraisal, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and summarised at paragraphs 7.5.6 to 7.5.11 of ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.2.2	Paragraph 7.6.16	<p>Effects from works at the proposed Havant Thicket Reservoir during construction:</p> <p><i>The Inspectorate agrees that effects arising from the construction of the Havant Thicket Reservoir (aside from those relating to construction of the proposed pipeline and connections) do not need to be assessed on the basis that the DCO would not need to cover these matters as planning</i></p>	<p>Assessment of the cumulative effects of the Proposed Development with the Havant Thicket Reservoir Project is set out in ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and associated appendices.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>permission has already been granted. However, the ES should also assess the cumulative construction effects of the Proposed Development and Havant Thicket Reservoir in the event that the planning permission has not been implemented (and therefore the effects of the project do not form part of the baseline).</i></p>	
3.2.3	Paragraph 7.6.18	<p>Effects to heritage assets located near to the Eastney TT and Eastney LSO during operation:</p> <p><i>Paragraph 7.6.18 states that “no physical works or visible change” are proposed at the Eastney TT and Eastney LSO during operation of the Proposed Development. Effects to designated and non-designated heritage assets during operation are proposed to be scoped out of further assessment. On the basis described in the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate is content to scope out effects to heritage assets located near to the Eastney TT and Eastney LSO during operation. However, should any additional maintenance of the Eastney TT and Eastney LSO be required beyond the existing arrangements that has the potential to affect heritage assets, this should be assessed in the ES where significant effects are likely to occur. The Inspectorate’s comments at ID 3.2.2 apply equally to this matter.</i></p>	<p>It is not anticipated that there would be new/additional maintenance of the Eastney TT and Eastney LSO and no physical disturbance or perceptual change would arise. These effects are therefore scoped out with no further action required.</p>
3.2.4	Paragraph 7.6.18	<p>Effects to heritage assets located near to Havant Thicket Reservoir during operation:</p> <p><i>The Applicant proposes to scope out this matter on the basis that there will be no physical works or visible change to the Havant Thicket Reservoir during operation.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate agrees that the operation of the Proposed Development is unlikely to impact heritage assets located</i></p>	<p>See response to ID 3.2.2.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<i>adjacent to Havant Thicket Reservoir and is content for this matter to be scoped out of further assessment. The Inspectorate’s comments at ID 3.2.2 apply equally to this matter.</i>	
3.2.5	Table 7-8	<p>Direct physical effects on designated heritage assets during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report states that operation of the Proposed Development would not cause direct physical effects to designated assets. On this basis, the Inspectorate agrees that direct physical effects, as defined within the Scoping Report (change to the fabric of an asset, hydrological change resulting in different ground conditions that could result in subsidence of buildings or other physical changes) to heritage assets can be scoped out of further assessment.</i></p>	No further action required.
3.2.6	Table 7-8	<p>Direct physical effects on non-designated heritage assets during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report describes that potential hydrological changes leading to desiccated or inundated ground could result in direct physical effects. At this stage, the Inspectorate does not have sufficient information about known or unknown archaeological remains and deposits, and potential hydrological changes as a result of the existence of the Proposed Development to exclude the possibility of significant effects. The Inspectorate considers that this matter should be assessed in the ES or it should be demonstrated why significant effects are not likely to occur and agreement from relevant consultation bodies that this matter can be scoped out of further assessment.</i></p>	Section 7.8 of ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), presents the assessment of these potential effects (where such effects may arise from inundation or dewatering/desiccation).
3.2.7	Table 7-8	Indirect physical effects on designated and non-designated heritage assets during operation:	No further action required.

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>The Applicant proposes to scope out indirect physical effects during operation on the basis that physical effects would only occur during construction. Based on information in the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate notes that the operation of the Proposed Development is not likely to generate indirect effects such as vibration, changes in ground conditions or dust deposition that would have an impact pathway to designated and non-designated heritage assets. On that basis, the Inspectorate is content for this matter to be scoped out of further assessment.</i></p>	
3.2.8	Table 7-8	<p>Temporary change to the setting of heritage assets during operation: <i>The Inspectorate agrees that temporary changes to the setting of heritage assets are unlikely to occur during operation and is content for this matter to be scoped out of further assessment.</i></p>	No further action required.
3.2.9	Paragraph 7.4.2	<p>Study area: <i>The Scoping Report states that a general study area of 500m from the site boundary for non-designated assets and 1km for designated assets will be used to collect detailed information on the cultural heritage baseline to be used in the assessment. However, paragraph 7.4.2 notes that consideration will also be given to designated assets within 3km of the visible elements of the Proposed Development due to the potential effects caused by changes to their setting.</i> <i>The ES should clarify the relationship between the study areas proposed and explain how the 500m and 1km study areas have been selected. It should identify and describe any designated assets located outside of the 1km study area and</i></p>	<p>The rationale for the establishment of the study areas and the selection of designated heritage assets for further assessment is presented in ES Appendix 7.6 Heritage assets settings scoping appraisal, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and summarised at paragraphs 7.5.6 to 7.5.11 of ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). These study areas and asset selection were confirmed with relevant consultation bodies through the Historic Environment and Landscape EIA Working Group as detailed in ES Chapter 7</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>within 3km of the site that may be affected by the Proposed Development. The ES should also explain how these designated assets were identified with reference to information obtained by site walkover, setting assessment, and Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). Effort should be made to agree the study area and heritage assets to be scoped into the assessment with the relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	<p>Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) also sets out how designated heritage assets have been identified with reference to these study areas in combination with the ZTV and by information obtained by site walkover and the settings assessment, and that these heritage assets have been agreed with consultees.</p>
3.2.10	Section 7.4	<p>Palaeolithic and mesolithic finds: <i>The Applicant's attention is drawn to Winchester City Council's comments (Appendix 2 of this Scoping Opinion) in relation to palaeolithic and mesolithic finds. In order to ensure a robust baseline in the ES, the Applicant is advised to refer to the data from the Jacobi and Wymer collections in addition to the Historic Environment Record (HER).</i></p>	<p>The Jacobi and Wymer Collections have been referenced in the collation of the Geoarchaeological Desk-based Assessment presented in ES Appendix 7.4 Geoarchaeological desk-based assessment and landscape characterisation, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), and the development of the archaeological baseline presented in section 7.7 of ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.2.11	Section 7.5 and Appendix 2	<p>Baseline conditions: <i>The Applicant's attention is drawn to Historic England's comments (Appendix 2 of this Scoping Opinion) in relation to assets on the Heritage at Risk register. In order to ensure a robust baseline in the ES, the Applicant is advised to refer to any relevant information from this data source about Fort Widley, Fort Southwick, Brambridge House and Southwick Conservation Area. The location of Southwick Conservation Area should be identified on a figure within the ES.</i></p>	<p>Reference has been made to the Heritage at Risk Register in section 7.7 'Baseline conditions' of the ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), as relevant to the assessment of the Proposed Development. Southwick Conservation Area is shown on ES Figure 7.3 Designated heritage assets within the</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			extended study area, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6).
3.2.12	Paragraph 7.7.4	<p>Archaeological surveys: <i>The Applicant should ensure that the information used to inform the assessment is robust and allows for identification of heritage assets likely to be impacted by the Proposed Development. The Applicant should make efforts to agree the need and extent for intrusive archaeological investigations with relevant consultation bodies. Where necessary to inform the assessment and any mitigation required thereafter, intrusive investigations should be completed prior to submission of the DCO application and reported in the ES.</i></p>	<p>Section 7.3 of ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out the technical engagement that was undertaken on surveys (including intrusive investigations) with Hampshire County Council (HCC) and Winchester City Council. Archaeological geophysical survey (ES Appendix 7.3 Detailed gradiometer survey report – Phase 1, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 7.8 Detailed gradiometer survey report - Phase 2, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) has been carried out. These provide further information on the predicted archaeological conditions within the Order Limits and cover approximately 75% of the area of the Order Limits.</p> <p>Targeted trial trenching has been carried out and is reported at ES Appendix 7.9 Trial trenching reporting, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), providing more detailed information on archaeological remains in the locations surveyed. Evaluation of geoarchaeological deposits has been carried out through monitoring GI works, which is reported in ES Appendix 7.5 Geoarchaeological monitoring reporting, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). This provides a refined understanding of the location and value of geoarchaeological deposits within the Order Limits.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			<p>This information has been considered in developing the baseline (section 7.7) and Assessment (section 7.8) presented in ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). An Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) (Document reference 7.6, DCO Volume 7) has been submitted as part of the DCO application which sets out the strategy for further survey and evaluation.</p>
3.2.13	Table 7-4	<p>Determining heritage importance: <i>The ES should explain how heritage importance will be assigned to Registered Parks and Gardens (RPGs) and confirm the grade at which each RPG considered in the assessment is listed.</i></p>	<p>The significance assessment methodology presented in section 7.5 of ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out the valuation of designated Parks and Gardens.</p>
3.2.14	Paragraph 7.9.8	<p>Site specific mitigation measures: <i>The Scoping Report states that “any further site-specific measures will be determined post-consent as the Proposed Development is progressed in a specific and bespoke manner.”</i> <i>For the avoidance of doubt, the ES should assess all likely significant effects to archaeology and cultural heritage and identify the mitigation required to address adverse effects. Mitigation should be secured in the DCO. Whilst some mitigation may be in draft or outline at DCO application, this should provide a clear framework through which detail can be developed.</i></p>	<p>Mitigation proposals have been developed during the course of the project. These proposals are discussed at sections 7.4 and 7.9 of ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), as well as detail contained in the Outline WSI (Document reference 7.6, DCO Volume 7), which sets out appropriate measures to identify appropriate scope and method of mitigation proposals following consent. All proposed mitigation is secured in the DCO, as set out in ES Appendix 5.5 Commitments Register, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), as set out in response to ID 2.2.10.</p>

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.2.15	N/A	<p>Non-designated heritage assets: <i>For clarity, the assessment of effects to non-designated heritage assets should include consideration of areas of non-designated historic landscape character and buildings that are non-designated heritage assets (i.e., not just locally listed buildings).</i></p>	<p>An assessment of the effects of the Proposed Development on non-designated built heritage assets and valued historic landscape elements (e.g. historic parks) as identified in the Hampshire and Winchester HER has been undertaken and is presented at section 7.8 of ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity			
3.3.1	Table 8-8 and Table 8-12	<p>Statutory and non-statutory designated sites over 200m from the scoping area (excluding European sites, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and those hydrologically connected to the Proposed Development during construction and operation: <i>The Applicant proposes to scope these matters out on the basis that due to the distance and lack of potential impact pathways present and through implementation of best practice measures no likely significant effects on statutory and non-statutory designated sites located over 200m from the scoping area are anticipated.</i> <i>The Inspectorate notes a discrepancy between Table 8-8 and 8-12 of the Scoping Report with Table 8-8 requesting to scope out designated sites and Table 8-12 requesting to scope out both statutory designated sites and non-statutory designated sites. For the avoidance of doubt, the Inspectorate considers that the Applicant is requesting to scope out the assessment of both statutory and non-statutory designated sites over 200m from the scoping area (excluding European sites, SSSIs and those hydrologically connected to the Proposed Development).</i></p>	<p>All statutory and non-statutory designated sites within 2km of the Order Limits and any sites hydrologically connected to the Proposed Development are scoped into the assessment. Section 8.5 of ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), presents further clarity on the study areas for ecological features, including the Zone of Influence (ZoI) and potential impact pathways. Survey methodologies (which also define the scoping area) have been shared and agreed with NE and the EA.</p> <p>Section 8.4 of ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), details good practice measures relied upon to avoid significant effects to ecological features and how they are secured through management plans.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>In the absence of further information relating to receptors and potential impact pathways, the Inspectorate is not in a position to scope out these matters from the assessment. The Inspectorate considers that all sites with hydrological connectivity to the Proposed Development should be scoped in. In the absence of evidence demonstrating clear agreement with relevant statutory bodies, the ES should include an assessment of these matters or the information referred to demonstrating agreement with the relevant consultation bodies and the absence of likely significant effects. The ES should clearly define and justify the scoping area with agreement from relevant consultation bodies where possible. The ES should identify any best practice measures relied upon to avoid significant effects and explain how these are secured through the dDCO.</i></p>	
3.3.2	Table 8-8	<p>Eurasian beaver during construction and operation: <i>The Applicant proposes to scope out an assessment of Eurasian beaver from the ES on the basis that the species is not considered to be present within the scoping area due to no records being identified in the desk study and catchments within the study area not being connected to any known release sites. On this basis, the Inspectorate agrees that an assessment of beavers can be scoped out of the ES.</i></p>	<p>This is scoped out of the assessment because no records were identified within the desk study and there is no connectivity to catchments where there have been official releases of this species.</p>
3.3.3	Table 8-8 and Appendix 2	<p>Great crested newt (GCN) during construction and operation: <i>The Applicant intends to offset the effects of the Proposed Development on GCN by obtaining a licence through the Natural England (NE) District Level Licensing (DLL) scheme. The Inspectorate understands that the DLL approach includes strategic area assessment and the identification of</i></p>	<p>Where the local planning authority is signed up to a GCN District Licensing (DL) scheme an assessment of effects on GCN has not been carried out, since any potential adverse effects will be mitigated through the DL. This is consistent with the EIA Scoping Opinion (ES Appendix 5.2 EIA Scoping Opinion, Volume II (Document reference</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>risk zones and strategic opportunity area maps. The ES should include information to demonstrate whether the Proposed Development is located within a risk zone for GCN. If the Applicant enters into the DLL scheme, NE will undertake an impact assessment and inform the Applicant whether their scheme is within one of the amber risk zones and therefore whether the Proposed Development is likely to have a significant effect on GCN. The outcome of this assessment will be documented on an Impact Assessment and Conservation Payment Certificate (IACPC). The IACPC can be used to provide additional detail to inform the findings in the ES, including information on the Proposed Development's impact on GCN and the appropriate compensation required.</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant's attention is drawn to the comments from Havant Borough Council and East Hampshire District Council (Appendix 2), noting that these authorities state they are not part of a DLL scheme for GCN. If it is not possible to use the DLL, the ES should include a full assessment of any effects on GCN resulting from the Proposed Development.</i></p>	<p>6.2, DCO Volume 6). Two local planning authorities located within the GCN desk study area are not signed up to a GCN DL scheme, these are Portsmouth City Council (PCC) and HBC. A review of the GCN baseline within PCC and HBC was undertaken and is provided in section 8.7 of ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). This concluded that GCN are considered absent from the GCN Zol located within PCC and HBC due to a lack of suitable habitat, as confirmed by the desk study and field surveys. Therefore, there is no pathway to impact and GCN within PCC and HBC are not considered further.</p> <p>A DL Report has been produced by NatureSpace detailing the outcome of the assessment, the second-stage compensation requirement (which will be finalised post-consent), mitigation requirements and the commitment to using DL is set out in the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). This report demonstrates that the DL route can be used for the DCO application. A post-consent reassessment will be carried out to appropriately quantify the actual planned impacts and the resulting DL conditions and an impact plan will be embedded in the detailed CEMP(s) and submitted for approval to the relevant planning authority. On approval, a certificate from NatureSpace will be commissioned and submitted to HCC confirming compliance with the DL.</p>

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.3.4	Table 8-8 and paragraphs 8.5.38 to 8.5.39	<p>Terrestrial invertebrates during construction and operation:</p> <p><i>This Applicant proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that the desk study identified a small number of records of notable terrestrial invertebrates within the study area. In addition, given the habitats to be crossed by the Proposed Development, it is considered highly unlikely that the assemblages present are of sufficient importance to result in likely significant effects. The Applicant further states that the habitats to be affected by the Proposed Development are widespread throughout the scoping area and as such, it is anticipated that despite temporary habitat losses there would be sufficient habitat remaining in any one location to sustain the assemblages present.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate notes that both Scoping Report Volume I Main Report and Scoping Report Volume II Appendices refer to suitable habitat for diverse invertebrate assemblages, which include nationally rare and scarce species within the scoping area. In the absence of further baseline information relating to notable invertebrate assemblages and potential impact pathways, the Inspectorate is not in a position to scope out these matters from the assessment.</i></p> <p><i>The ES should provide an assessment of these matters where there is potential for likely significant effects to occur or demonstrate that no likely significant effects would occur with agreement from relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	<p>Terrestrial invertebrates are included in the assessment and within ES Appendix 8.8 Other notable fauna, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Baseline information is provided in section 8.7, with subsequent impact assessment in section 8.8 of ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.3.5	Paragraph 8.8.8	<p>Surveys for reptiles, National Vegetation Classification (NVC) and hedgerows:</p>	<p>Hedgerow and NVC survey scope and methodologies were agreed with NE in 2024, the results of these surveys are presented within ES Appendix 8.2, Habitats, Volume II (Document</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>The Scoping Report states that reptile surveys, NVC surveys and hedgerow surveys will be undertaken where preliminary surveys identify the potential for effects.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate notes that the Scoping Report identifies records of reptile species near to and within the scoping area, and 110.8km of hedgerow within the scoping area.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate agrees with the approach set out but where further surveys are scoped out, the ES must present a clear justification for this approach. Effort should be made to agree the survey scope and methodology with relevant consultation bodies.</i></p> <p><i>Please note the Inspectorate’s comments at ID 3.8.21 of this Scoping Opinion regarding hedgerows.</i></p>	<p>reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Due to the abundance of suitable habitat to support reptiles within the Order Limits, and the largely temporary nature of the impacts from the Proposed Development, it was considered proportionate to assume a level of presence of common reptile species at all components of the Proposed Development and mitigate accordingly. However, if the potential for likely significant effects became apparent in specific locations, for example if passive displacement for reptiles was considered inappropriate due to a lack of suitable habitat to displace to, targeted surveys would be undertaken. Further detail is provided within ES Appendix 8.8, Other notable fauna, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and is summarised in section 8.7 of ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>The ES includes information about the outcomes of arboricultural surveys, and how they have informed the habitat assessment. This is presented within section 8.7 of ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.3.6	Table 8-12 and paragraphs 8.5.53 to 8.5.55	<p>Other notable species during construction and operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report does not propose species’ specific surveys for hedgehog, brown hare and harvest mouse and Table 8-12 does not identify whether these species are to be scoped in or out of the assessment. Baseline information in</i></p>	<p>Due to the abundance of suitable habitat within the Order Limits and the largely temporary nature of the impacts from the Proposed Development, it was considered proportionate to assume a level of presence of these species and mitigate accordingly as summarised in section 8.5 of ES Chapter 8</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>the Scoping Report states that the desk study has returned records of hedgehog and harvest mouse within the scoping area and a record of brown hare within 150m of the scoping area. The ES should assess effects on these species, based on robust survey data or provide justification for scoping them out including evidence of agreement with relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	<p>Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). These species have been scoped in, and baseline information is presented in ES Appendix 8.8 Other notable fauna, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The baseline is also summarised in section 8.7, and the impact assessment detailed within section 8.8 of ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.3.7	N/A	<p>Ancient woodland and veteran trees during construction and operation: <i>The Scoping Report identifies that there are areas of ancient woodland and veteran trees within 200m of the scoping area. For the avoidance of doubt, the ES should assess any likely significant effects to ancient woodland and veteran trees from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development.</i></p>	<p>No construction will be undertaken within ancient woodland. Baseline information detailing the presence of ancient woodland is given within ES Appendix 8.2 Habitats, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The baseline is also summarised in section 8.7, and an assessment of likely significant effects on ancient woodland and veteran trees, where applicable, is presented in section 8.8 of ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.3.8	N/A	<p>Operational effects: <i>The Scoping Report has not addressed the following potential impact pathways during operation of the Proposed Development:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>airborne pollution (eg from vehicle emissions);</i> • <i>run-off;</i> • <i>damage to or loss of habitat;</i> 	<p>An assessment of run-off, damage to or loss of habitat, killing and injury of protected or notable species and disturbance or displacement of protected or notable species through habitat loss or fragmentation during operation is presented in section 8.8 of ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Impacts of ecological features from dust, particulate matter (ID</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>killing and injury of protected and notable species; and</i> <i>disturbance/ displacement of protected and notable species through habitat loss and fragmentation.</i> <p><i>The ES should include an assessment of these impact pathways or otherwise demonstrate why likely significant effects would not occur and agreement from relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	<p>3.1.2) and road traffic emissions during operation (ID 3.1.3) were scoped out within the EIA Scoping Opinion, as detailed in section 6.3 of ES Chapter 6, Air quality and odour, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>Assessment of damage to or loss of habitat in the intertidal/marine environment during operation is presented in section 9.8 of ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.3.9	Table 8-3 and Paragraph 8.4.4	<p>Field surveys:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report states that due to the size of the study area, it would not be appropriate to survey in its entirety but that fields surveys will be undertaken within the scoping area and a buffer distance. It is unclear as to the exact location of field surveys proposed. Assessment in the ES should be based on robust baseline data including field surveys. The extent of survey area should be clearly explained and justified in the ES for each receptor assessed. The survey effort should include areas of land proposed for mitigation of significant adverse effects. Given that the study area for habitats is stated to be 200m as the maximum distance for indirect effects from air and water, the Inspectorate considers that the survey area buffer for terrestrial habitats should be 200m not 50m. Effort should be made to agree the location of field surveys with relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	<p>The terrestrial habitat survey area is the Order Limits plus 50m rising to up to 200m for habitats likely to be sensitive to hydrology impact and includes areas of land proposed for mitigation. Further clarity is provided in section 8.5 of ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), regarding survey areas for ecological features.</p> <p>Survey methodologies were shared with NE and the EA for review and agreed in 2024. The assessment presented in section 8.8 of ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) is based on robust baseline data including field surveys.</p>
3.3.10	Table 8-3, Paragraph 8.4.4, and Appendix 2	<p>Bird surveys:</p> <p><i>It is unclear whether the quoted field survey area of 50m buffer from the scoping area for terrestrial habitats and protected/notable species includes birds. The ES should</i></p>	<p>The field survey methodology is presented in ES Appendix 8.5 Ornithology, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), and is summarised in section 8.5 of ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>confirm and justify the spatial extent of bird surveys undertaken and should consider whether any areas of functionally linked land (FLL) would be affected by the Proposed Development.</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant's attention is drawn to Natural England's comments (Appendix 2) regarding the potential for the Proposed Development to affect FLL of Special Protection Areas (SPA) scoped into the assessment.</i></p>	<p>freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), where the spatial extent of bird surveys is outlined and justified. The methodology was shared within NE for review and agreed in 2024. The assessment in section 8.8 considers potential effects on functionally linked land relating to National Site Networks.</p>
3.3.11	Section 8.5, Table 8-6 and Appendix 2	<p>Potential disturbance of fish due to noise and vibration effects associated with construction activities:</p> <p><i>The Applicant's attention is drawn to the EA's comments (Appendix 2 of this Scoping opinion) regarding the absence of a baseline description for fish in the terrestrial and freshwater environment, and potential effects to fish and incubating eggs from drilling in proximity to these environments. The ES should identify the locations where fish could be affected by impacts from drilling and include a baseline description based on robust data, ie including the EA's Ecology and Fish Data Explorer. Where there is potential for likely significant effects to occur to fish from drilling during construction of the Proposed Development, these should be assessed in the ES. Effort should be made to agree the scope and method of baseline data gathering and assessment with relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	<p>Freshwater survey methodologies were shared with NE and the EA for review and agreement in 2024. No concerns have been raised. Those locations where fish could be affected by impacts from noise and vibration (including from construction drilling) are included in this assessment. The field survey methodology is given in ES Appendix 8.9 Freshwater ecology, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and is summarised in section 8.5 and the assessment of likely significant effects is presented in section 8.8 of ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.3.12	Table 8-6	<p>Spread of Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS) and disease:</p> <p><i>The ES should consider the potential for INNS and disease to be spread via the transfer of water, particularly between catchments and provide an assessment where there is potential for likely significant effects to occur.</i></p>	<p>The baseline information for INNS is provided in section 8.7 and subsequent impact assessment is detailed in section 8.8 of ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The INNS baseline</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			and assessment also consider the potential for pathogens to be spread. In addition, the potential for spread of disease spread is also scoped in and is considered for badgers and amphibians in section 8.8 of ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
3.3.13	N/A	<p>Confidential annexes: Public bodies have a responsibility to avoid releasing environmental information that could bring about harm to sensitive or vulnerable ecological features. Specific survey and assessment data relating to the presence and locations of species such as badgers, rare birds and plants that could be subject to disturbance, damage, persecution, or commercial exploitation resulting from publication of the information, should be provided in the ES as a confidential annex. All other assessment information should be included in an ES chapter, as normal, with a placeholder explaining that a confidential annex has been submitted to the Inspectorate and may be made available subject to request.</p>	Confidential bird survey and assessment data, including Schedule 1 breeding birds, is provided in ES Appendix 8.5 Ornithology, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Confidential badger survey and assessment data is provided in ES Appendix 8.3 Badger, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity			
3.4.1	Paragraph 9.3.7	<p>Sand eel surveys: <i>Paragraph 9.3.7 of the Scoping Report highlights the likely presence of two sand eel species within the study area and states that geophysical surveys were conducted which provide an indication of the sediments that can generally infer areas suitable for sand eel (and other fish species) spawning. It is further stated that as effects on juvenile fish and eggs will be assessed, further investigation of sand eels specifically</i></p>	Benthic surveys and eDNA sampling have been undertaken to inform the baseline description around the Eastney LSO for investigation of any presence of sand eel and suitable habitat for sand eel using non-intrusive methods. The specification of these surveys was discussed with the Marine Management Organisation (MMO), NE and the EA as part of the Technical Working Group meetings

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>would not add value to the EIA. It is proposed to scope out additional surveys on that basis.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate does not consider that the Applicant has provided sufficient justification as to why sand eel surveys are not required. Surveys should be undertaken to inform the baseline description unless agreement is reached with relevant consultation bodies that these are not required. Evidence of this agreement should be provided in the ES.</i></p>	<p>in May, June, July, August, and September 2023 with specifications issued for their review in May 2023. Feedback on these surveys specifications was received in March 2024 post survey completion and this was acknowledged. The survey report was reviewed by NE in October 2025 without comment. Additional desk study on sand eel habitat suitability was conducted and presented to NE, the MMO and the EA as part of the TWG meeting on 22 January 2026 in which agreement was reached that sand eel surveys are not required. Nevertheless, a precautionary assessment approach is taken in the ES to assume the presence of sand eel and to assess potential effects on sand eel.</p> <p>The baseline information for sand eel is provided in section 9.7 of ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>Benthic survey results are provided in ES Appendix 9.10 Eastney Long Sea Outfall benthic ecology survey, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>eDNA sampling and data is provided in ES Appendix 9.11 Eastney Long Sea Outfall environmental DNA sampling and analysis, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.4.2	Paragraph 9.4.3	<p>Effects arising from underground pipelines between the WRP and Havant Thicket Reservoir and Otterbourne WSW during construction and operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report states that these components of the Proposed Development would have no interaction with the marine environment and are therefore proposed to be scoped out further assessment. The Inspectorate agrees that effects from these components can be scoped out on the basis described in the Scoping Report.</i></p>	<p>These effects are scoped out with no further action required.</p>
3.4.3	Tables 9-21 and 9-27	<p>Potential effects on marine ecology from the introduction and/or INNS during construction and operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that no physical works are taking place with direct connection to the marine environment and there is therefore no pathway for INNS to enter the water column. The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of further assessment on the basis described in the Scoping Report.</i></p>	<p>Works within the marine environment have been revisited due to the inclusion of a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) outfall in the design of the WRP site as part of the Proposed Development after the EIA Scoping Opinion was issued. The SuDS outfall would be constructed in the tidal section of Hermitage Stream and would release surface water flow from the WRP site. There is now a potential pathway for INNS to enter water column during construction and operation, therefore potential effects of introduction of INNS are now scoped in.</p> <p>Primary measures are considered for the SuDS outfall and tertiary measures on avoiding introduction of INNS are set out in the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). These are presented in section 9.4, section 9.5 and the assessment of likely significant effects is set out in section 9.8 of ES Chapter 9 Marine</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
3.4.4	Tables 9-21 and 9-27	<p>Potential effects on marine ecology (mammals and fish) from visual disturbance (human presence, vehicle movement and light pollution) during construction and operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that the seal haul-out site present within Langstone Harbour is thought to be over 2km from the terrestrial works and that, given the current usage of the harbour, seals using it are likely to be used to changes to the visual baseline. There would be no connectivity between tunnelling activity and the water column, so fish would not be affected.</i></p> <p><i>Reference has been made within the Scoping Report to the potential presence of harbour porpoise, bottlenose dolphins and minke whales within the study area but these are not referred to in Table 9-21.</i></p> <p><i>Based on the information in the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that it is unlikely that any marine mammals would be close enough to the location of works to be visually affected. However, as described at ID 2.1.4 of this Scoping Opinion, the ES should include information about external lighting.</i></p> <p><i>On that basis, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of further assessment.</i></p>	<p>The addition of the SuDS has not required any change in the scope of assessment in relation to the potential effects on marine mammals and fish from visual disturbance. Measures on avoiding light pollution during construction are set out in the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) and cross-referenced in ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>Information about lighting design principles avoiding light impact during operation is included in the Design Principles Document (Document Reference 5.11, DCO volume 5) and cross-referenced in ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.4.5	Tables 9-21 and 9-27	<p>Temporary habitat loss during construction:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that there would be no connectivity between tunnelling activity and seabed habitats, as entry and egress of the pipeline would be in the terrestrial environment.</i></p>	<p>Pollution derived habitat loss is considered in the assessment as part of pollution events during construction for all marine biodiversity receptors. Measures on reducing pollution events during</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>It is noted that the potential for pollution events to affect marine biodiversity during construction is proposed to be scoped into the assessment, given the potential for spills into the marine environment. However, the Scoping Report does not address the possibility of likely significant effects on habitats as a result of accidental releases of drilling fluid. The Inspectorate does not have sufficient information at present to exclude the possibility of likely significant effects from temporary habitat loss arising from pollution events. The ES should include an assessment of this matter or demonstrate why significant effects are not likely and agreement from relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	<p>construction are set out in the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). Works within the marine environment have been revisited in view of the WRP site SuDS outfall being incorporated into the Proposed Development after the EIA Scoping Opinion was issued. Given this change temporary habitat loss in the tidal section of Hermitage Stream is considered in the assessment in a worst case scenario as described in section 3.5 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>These are presented in section 9.5 and section 9.8 of ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.4.6	Tables 9-22 and 9-27	<p>Direct habitat loss during operation: <i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that there is no land take or construction proposed within the marine environment that would result in the direct loss of marine habitat during operation. Noting that potential for indirect impacts to marine habitats arising from changes to discharge from the Eastney LSO are scoped into the ES (Table 9-20 of the Scoping Report), the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of further assessment the ES on the basis described in the Scoping Report.</i></p>	<p>Works within the marine environment have been revisited in view of the WRP site SuDS outfall being incorporated into the Proposed Development after the EIA Scoping Opinion was issued. Potential direct habitat loss is therefore considered in the assessment. However, the walkover survey shows that habitat in the Hermitage Stream bank at the assumed location of SuDS outfall is a revetment (artificial hard structure). This is not a priority habitat but an artificial marine habitat which will be replaced by the SuDS outfall structure. The hard substrate communities currently on the existing structures will eventually colonise the new</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			structures, creating a similar habitat. Therefore, no permanent marine habitat loss is anticipated. These are presented in section 9.5 and section 9.8 of ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
3.4.7	Table 9-27	<p>Underwater noise and vibration associated with construction of the proposed underground pipeline between Budds Farm and the proposed WRP on marine habitats during construction:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that the noise and vibration generated is likely to be highly localised and temporary in nature; the marine habitats identified in the Scoping Report are not sensitive to underwater noise and vibration. The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES on the basis described in the Scoping Report.</i></p>	No further action required.
3.4.8	Table 9-27	<p>Underwater noise and vibration from the proposed underground pipeline between Budds Farm and the proposed WRP during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out for all marine ecology receptors on the basis that underwater noise and vibration would only be generated during the construction phase. The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of further assessment on the basis described in the Scoping Report.</i></p>	No further action required.
3.4.9	Table 9-27	<p>Pollution events (from use of plant and machinery) during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out as during operation no works are planned to take place using</i></p>	Management and control measures during operation that would be in place to avoid potential pollution events are secured in an OEMP

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>substantial plant and best practice measures would be in place making the probability of significant effects from pollution negligible.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES on the basis described in the Scoping Report. The ES should describe the management and control measures that would be in place to avoid potential pollution events and confirm how these are secured through the dDCO.</i></p>	<p>(Document Reference 7.7, DCO volume 7) submitted as part of the DCO application.</p>
3.4.10	Table 9-27	<p>Changes in effluent discharge from Eastney LSO during construction:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that no change to the effluent currently discharged from the Eastney LSO would occur during the construction phase. The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES on the basis described in the Scoping Report.</i></p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
3.4.11	Paragraph 9.1.5	<p>Effects to marine birds:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report states that potential effects on birds that use the marine environment will be considered only within the ES Chapter Terrestrial and Freshwater Biodiversity to avoid repetition.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate considers that this approach is acceptable provided that the assessment in the ES Chapter Terrestrial and Freshwater Biodiversity includes consideration of potential effects to birds in the marine area, such as wading birds, which may be affected by construction works near the harbour. Cross reference should be made in the ES Chapter Marine Biodiversity to the location of these assessments</i></p>	<p>For marine birds that use the marine environment and the potential effects, appropriate cross-references are provided to the appropriate sections in ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) to avoid repetition.</p>
3.4.12	Table 9-2	<p>Sites designated for marine mammals:</p>	<p>The nearest SAC where grey seal is a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection, is the Isles of Scilly Complex SAC which is over</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>Table 9-2 of the Scoping Report states that the zone of influence (Zol) for sites designated for marine mammals is 30km. The Scoping Report states that grey seals are reported to conduct mean round trips of 39.8km.</i></p> <p><i>The ES should confirm whether there are any designated sites where seal is a qualifying feature beyond the 30km Zol that could be affected by the Proposed Development and, if so, where likely significant effects could occur these should be assessed in the ES.</i></p>	<p>380km away. Typically, grey seal is reported to conduct mean round trips of 39.8km related to journeys returning back to the same haul-out locations, so their daily transit is likely to be less than 20km. Therefore, it is confirmed that no designated sites with grey seal as a qualifying feature beyond the 30km Zol could be affected.</p>
3.4.13	Section 9.7	<p>Proposed assessment methodology:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report provides a detailed explanation of how the significance of effects would be determined, based on the relevant guidance from the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM). However, no description has been provided of the methods that will be used to assess impacts and whether these will be quantitative or qualitative. The methodologies used for the assessments must be described and their use justified with reference to appropriate guidance and/or agreement with the relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	<p>The ES sets out the methodology that has been used to assess the magnitude of impact on the marine environment and that the methodology used is justified by reference to appropriate guidance/ publications and water quality modelling undertaken for the Proposed Development that has been agreed with the relevant consultation bodies.</p> <p>The assessment methodologies are set out in section 9.5 of the ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.4.14	Paragraph 9.7.1	<p>Underwater noise modelling:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report states that a decision as to whether underwater noise modelling is required will be taken following completion of geophysical survey to inform the drilling methodology for the proposed pipeline between Budds Farm WTW and the WRP.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate considers that this work should be undertaken in time to inform the EIA. If underwater noise modelling is determined to be required, this should also be submitted with the ES and used to inform the assessment of</i></p>	<p>The ES considers the potential for underwater noise propagation and provides an assessment of effects on marine biodiversity with a focus on fish. The assessment findings have been shared with the relevant consultation bodies (MMO, EA and NE) in the Technical Working Group meeting in umulativeary 2025 where it was agreed that underwater noise modelling is not needed.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>disturbance effects. If it is not required, the ES should include a justification for why it is had not been undertaken, including evidence of agreement with relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	
3.4.15	Paragraph 9.5.2	<p>Marine Conservation Zones (MCZs): <i>The Scoping Report identifies that the Bembridge MCZ is within study area 2. Several MCZs are in the vicinity of the Eastney LSO, which have not been considered within the Scoping Report, namely, Utopia and Selsey Bill and the Hounds. These MCZs should be included in the assessment where there is potential for likely significant effects to occur or the ES should demonstrate the absence of likely significant effects with agreement from the relevant consultation bodies. The assessment of effects to Bembridge MCZ should include consideration of cumulative effects arising from the Sandown water recycling scheme.</i></p>	<p>The ES demonstrates the absence of likely significant effects on the MCZs with agreement from the relevant consultation bodies (MMO, EA and NE).</p> <p>As identified in the Habitats Regulations Assessment – Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment and Marine Conservation Zone Assessment – Stage 1 Assessment (Document reference 5.2, DCO Volume 5), only Bembridge MCZ is considered to be hydrologically connected to the Eastney LSO as it is situated within two tidal excursions (as elaborated in Table 9-8 of ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6)). Utopia MCZ and Selsey Bill and the Hounds MCZ are further than two tidal ellipses from the Eastney LSO and thus have not been assessed further.</p> <p>Cumulative effects arising from the Isle of Wight Water Recycling Project has been considered in ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and associated appendices.</p>
3.4.16	Figure 9.1 in Volume III	<p>Study areas: <i>Figure 9.1 in Volume III shows three study areas, including Study Area 3 relating to construction works, which is not referenced in the Main Scoping Report in Volume I. The ES</i></p>	<p>The ES concludes that it should include study areas 1 and 2 only. Study area 3 was erroneously included in the EIA Scoping Report (ES Appendix 5.1 EIA Scoping Report, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Section 9.5 of ES</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<i>should explain how Study Area 3 relates to the assessment of effects.</i>	Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) discusses the justification for defining study areas and relationship to the assessment of effects.
Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change			
3.5.1	Paragraphs 10.6.2 to 10.6.3	<p>Decommissioning effects: <i>The Inspectorate agrees that decommissioning effects can be scoped out of the greenhouse gas (GHG) assessment based on the information presented in the Scoping Report. Please refer to the Inspectorate’s comments at ID 2.2.1 of this Scoping Opinion in respect of the climate change resilience (CCR) and in-combination climate change impact (ICCI) assessments.</i></p>	<p>The EIA Scoping Opinion (ES Appendix 5.2 EIA Scoping Opinion, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) agreed that decommissioning effects for the carbon assessment could be scoped out. In accordance with a precautionary approach, carbon emissions during decommissioning have been considered on a high level basis.</p> <p>A high level CCR assessment for the decommissioning phase has also been undertaken and is presented in the ES Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). In addition, a high level ICCI assessment has been undertaken and is included in ES Appendix 10.3 In-combination Climate Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.5.2	Paragraphs 10.6.9 to 10.6.10	<p>CCR assessment during construction: <i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out a CCR assessment for the construction phase of the Proposed Development on the basis that construction is expected to take place within the next 15 years and any gradual changes to climatic conditions are not anticipated to impact this period. Paragraph 10.6.10 states that any climate related extreme weather events would be managed through construction management plans.</i></p>	<p>These comments are acknowledged, and the CCR assessment for the construction phase of the Proposed Development is set out in section 10.8 of ES Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>The Inspectorate does not consider sufficient evidence has been provided to scope this matter out of the assessment given the potential length of the construction period (circa 5 years) and possibility of it being extended further through phased delivery, as described in the Scoping Report. The CCR assessment should assess climate risks during the construction phase (such as extreme temperatures, extreme precipitation or storm events) where significant effects are likely. The assessment outcome should be used to inform measures within the construction management plans. Please refer to the Inspectorate’s comments at ID 2.2.10 of this Scoping Opinion regarding management plans.</i></p>	
3.5.3	Paragraph 10.7.1	<p>ICCI assessment during construction: <i>For the same reasons as set out in ID 3.5.2 above, the Inspectorate does not agree to scope this matter out of the ES.</i></p>	<p>These comments are acknowledged, and the ICCI assessment, ES Appendix 10.3 In-combination Climate Change Impact assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), includes an assessment of climate risk during the construction phase of the Proposed Development</p>
3.5.4	Paragraphs 10.8.13 to 10.8.14	<p>Cumulative effects within GHG emissions assessment: <i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out cumulative effects in the GHG assessment on the basis that GHG emissions released to the atmosphere are inherently cumulative in nature due to the global effects of climate change. The Inspectorate is content with this approach and agrees to scope out cumulative effects in the GHG emissions assessment.</i></p>	<p>An assessment of emissions from unrelated cumulative developments is scoped out of the assessment in the ES. An assessment of related and consequential projects has been included in ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) which takes account of downstream GHG emissions.</p>
3.5.5	Paragraphs 10.8.15 to 10.8.16	<p>In-combination effects within GHG emissions assessment:</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>The Scoping Report states that as the receptor for the GHG emissions assessment is the global atmosphere there are no common receptors with other environmental aspects.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate is content with this approach and agrees to scope out in-combination effects in the GHG emissions assessment.</i></p>	
3.5.6	Paragraphs 10.8.32 to 10.8.33	<p>In-combination effects within CCR assessment:</p> <p><i>The Inspectorate agrees that the receptors for the CCR assessment are the Proposed Development itself and any associated infrastructure leading to no common receptors between the CCR assessment and other environmental aspect chapters.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate agrees to scope out this matter from further assessment.</i></p>	No further action required.
3.5.7	Paragraph 10.6.6	<p>Operation and maintenance:</p> <p><i>The ES should ensure that the GHG emissions associated with maintenance of all elements of the Proposed Development have been considered within the GHG emissions assessment.</i></p>	This agrees with the EIA Scoping Report, which states that “GHG emissions will be quantified from activities associated with the operation and any required maintenance of assets during delivery of their function and services”. The carbon emissions associated with maintenance activities are considered in the carbon assessment for the operational phase of the Proposed Development.
3.5.8	Paragraph 10.8.12	<p>Assessment scenarios:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report describes that the Proposed Development is a drought resilience scheme to develop capacity to address future forecasts for water deficits and as such development of representative scenarios to determine the effect of GHG emissions is not only a case of comparing emissions with and without the Proposed Development in place. It is stated that the establishment of assessment</i></p>	The definition of the final assessment scenario is provided within the ES Chapter 10 Carbon and climate change, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), which was undertaken in accordance with the ISEP guidance. This provides context and a justification for the scenario adopted, as well as any limitations.

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>scenarios will be an ongoing process, but it is likely that the GHG assessment will consider scenarios associated with iterations of the design. This is stated to be in accordance with Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) guidance. The final assessment scenario used should be described in the ES, together with a rationale for its selection and explanation of any limitations in the approach.</i></p>	
Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions			
3.6.1	Paragraph 11.6.12 and Table 11-15	<p>Impacts on geologically sensitive sites during construction and operation: <i>On the basis that no geologically sensitive sites have been identified within the scoping area or the 250m buffer zone, the Inspectorate is content that significant effects are not likely to occur. Impacts on geologically sensitive sites during construction and operation can be scoped out of further assessment.</i></p>	<p>Although route refinement has been undertaken following the submission of the EIA Scoping Report (ES Appendix 5.1 EIA Scoping Report, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6)), it remains the case that the Order Limits do not interact with any geologically sensitive sites.</p>
3.6.2	Paragraph 11.6.13 and Table 11-15	<p>Direct impacts associated with operation and maintenance: <i>The Inspectorate considers there is a lack of information provided with regards to the likely maintenance activities associated with the proposed WRP and HLPS to support the proposed scope out of this matter. The Inspectorate also notes the quantities of chemicals required for operation of the proposed WRP (paragraph 3.6.4 of the Scoping Report). Accordingly, the Inspectorate is not in a position to scope out this matter for the WRP and HLPS. Direct impacts associated with operation and maintenance of the proposed WRP and HLPS should be assessed in the ES where significant effects are likely to occur or the ES should demonstrate why these</i></p>	<p>An assessment of potential operational impacts of the WRP site, which includes the relevant pumping stations, includes an assessment of maintenance activities that may be required during the operational phase, is provided within the ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>The EIA Scoping Report (ES Appendix 5.1, Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and EIA Scoping Opinion (ES Appendix 5.2, Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) used a title for a design component of 'High Lift Pumping Station (HLPS). Whilst pumping stations are still required at</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>are not likely with agreement from relevant consultation bodies.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate is content that direct impacts associated with operation and maintenance of the other elements of the Proposed Development are not likely to result in significant effects and can be scoped out.</i></p>	<p>the WRP site they no longer are titled 'HLPS'. It should be noted that pumping stations would be located at the WRP site to pump process waste to Budds Farm WTW via the existing sewer network, recycled water to Bedhampton Springs and source water from Havant Thicket Reservoir to Otterbourne WSW (see ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6)).</p>
3.6.3	Sections 11.4 and 11.5, and Appendix 2	<p>Study area and baseline data:</p> <p><i>The study area and scope of ground investigation should have sufficient coverage to ensure that the baseline conditions are understood for all areas where significant effects are likely to occur. The Applicant should make effort to agree the scope of ground investigation with relevant consultation bodies, including local authorities.</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant's attention is drawn to the EA's comments (Appendix 2) regarding karstic features of the ground conditions and the potential for increased risk of rapid movement of water and potential contaminants. The Inspectorate considers that the final study area selected should be informed by an understanding of these conditions to ensure that a robust assessment.</i></p>	<p>Proposed Development specific GIs have been undertaken for each component part of the Proposed Development. The coverage of each phase of the Proposed Development specific GI (Phase 0, 1, 2, 3A, 3B and 3C) is discussed within the ES appendices to ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). As well as providing general coverage of the areas within the Order Limits, some locations specifically targeted areas of concern with regards to land quality and ground conditions.</p> <p>Engagement with stakeholders with regards to the scope of the Proposed Development specific GIs has been undertaken. This engagement was undertaken in relation to the potential effects that may occur as a result of the GIs.</p> <p>Discussion about the presence of karstic features is included in ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			6.1, DCO Volume 6) with cross references made to the ES Appendix 19.3 Hydrogeological Impact Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), and ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
3.6.4	Section 11.6	<p>Scope of assessment – remediation: <i>The ES should include a full description of any remediation which may be required and confirm how this is to be secured. The ES should assess any likely significant effects which could occur as a result of remediation. Any assumptions in this regard (for example, traffic movements, waste handling, and contaminated land) should be clearly stated in the ES.</i></p>	<p>Remediation requirements are not yet confirmed for all elements of the Proposed Development as, in some instances, they depend on detailed design and the completion of further post-consent ground investigations (as discussed below). Where this is the case, it is not possible to describe specific remediation measures within the ES. However, where remedial measures have already been identified and requirements are clear, these are discussed within the ES, with an outline remediation strategy for the WRP included within ES Appendix 11.2 Geotechnical and geo-environmental reports, Volume II (document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The identified remediation measures include, for example, the incorporation of ground gas protection measures into the design of the WRP site, as well as details of materials handling and disposal methods (see the assessment provided within ES Chapter 16 Resources and waste management, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6)). Whether remediation requirements are known or not yet confirmed, any necessary remediation works would be undertaken in accordance with relevant guidance and legislation in place at the</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			<p>time of the works, with the measures bespoke to the risks identified. These bespoke measures may include, but are not limited to, ground gas protection measures, venting systems, bespoke drainage, removal of soils deemed to pose an unacceptable risk to either the Proposed Development or nearby land quality and ground conditions receptors etc.</p> <p>Further post-consent ground investigation, including monitoring should it be considered necessary, will be undertaken in areas considered to potentially pose an unacceptable risk to land quality and ground conditions receptors. The findings of the post-consent ground investigation will be interpreted and compared against relevant screening criteria, this will aid in the determination of whether an unacceptable risk is posed and informing whether a remediation strategy is required. Where remediation strategies are required, these will be issued post-consent as separate documents and be developed following the guidance provided in the EA's Land Contamination Risk Management Framework as described within the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7).</p>
3.6.5	Paragraphs 11.6.4 to 11.6.5	<p>Effects on groundwater during construction: <i>In addition to the pathways identified, the assessment should consider the potential for contamination of groundwater from storage of oils, fuel and chemicals, where this is required</i></p>	<p>An assessment of the potential impacts to groundwater, inclusive of potential impacts associated with the storage and usage of oils, fuels and chemicals is contained within section 11.8 of ES Chapter 11 Land quality and ground conditions, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<i>during construction, the Inspectorate notes that this matter is scoped in for operation.</i>	6), and relevant mitigation measures are set out in the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7).
3.6.6	Figure 11.6 in Volume III	<p>Figures: <i>Figures accompanying Chapter 11 of the Scoping Report (Figure 11.6, sheets 1 to 6) do not contain a key/ legend. Relevant figures accompanying the ES Land Quality and Ground Conditions assessment should clearly present baseline information.</i></p>	The land quality and ground conditions study area and baseline conditions are shown in ES Figures 11.1 to 11.6, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6). All figures include a key.
Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture			
3.7.1	Paragraphs 12.6.28, 12.6.30 to 12.6.32 and Table 12-8	<p>Demolition of residential properties and ancillary structures, community facilities, commercial property and agricultural buildings/ property - construction and operation; and Temporary loss of gardens or car parking areas – construction and operation: <i>On the basis that the Proposed Development does not require the demolition of any such properties/ structures/ facilities, or the temporary loss of gardens or car parking areas, the Inspectorate is content that these matters can be scoped out of further assessment. The Scoping Report confirms that should demolition become necessary, an assessment will be undertaken in the ES.</i></p>	There is no requirement for the demolition of residential properties, community facilities, commercial property and primary agricultural buildings/property or the loss of gardens or car parking areas for construction or operation of the Proposed Development. However, there is a requirement for the demolition, disassembly and/or temporary relocation of a number of ancillary structures in a number of individual locations, the assessment in ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) identifies these locations and reports on any likely significant effects.
3.7.2	Paragraphs 12.6.37 to 12.6.41 and Table 12-8	<p>Direct effects on residential property, community land and facilities, commercial property and land, development land and agricultural land (resulting from temporary loss of access and boundary features) during operation:</p>	No further action required.

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>Considering the nature and characteristics of the Proposed Development, the Inspectorate considers that significant effects during operation are unlikely. Direct effects on residential property, community land and facilities, commercial property and land, development land and agricultural land (resulting from temporary loss of access and boundary features) during operation can be scoped out.</i></p>	
3.7.3	Paragraphs 12.6.38 and 12.6.39 and Table 12-8	<p>Direct effects on community land and facilities, and commercial property and land (resulting from temporary or permanent loss of commercial land) during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report identifies the potential for permanent loss of community land and facilities and commercial property and land, and this matter has been scoped into the construction phase assessment (paragraphs 12.6.8 and 12.6.12). The Scoping Report proposes to report these as permanent construction effects and to scope these matters out for the operational phase (paragraphs 12.6.38 and 12.6.39 and Table 12-8).</i></p> <p><i>Providing the ES assessment conclusions for areas of permanent loss clearly reflect the duration of impact, the Inspectorate is content with this approach and that a separate assessment of these matters for the operational phase is not required. Direct effects on community land and facilities, and commercial property and land (resulting from temporary or permanent loss of commercial land) during operation can be scoped out.</i></p> <p><i>The ES should clearly identify which areas of community land and facilities, and commercial property and land are to be temporarily lost during construction and which are to be permanently lost. Losses should be quantified.</i></p>	<p>Section 12.8 of ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), identifies which areas of community land and facilities and commercial property and land would be temporarily and permanently lost, and reports the duration of temporary losses. The assessment for the ES quantifies temporary and permanent losses. Where there is permanent loss of land, this is explicitly discussed in the assessment.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.7.4	Paragraphs 12.6.26 and 12.6.40 and Table 12-8	<p>Impacts on development land (including those resulting from temporary or permanent loss of development land; and future sterilisation of land allocations or committed schemes) during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report explains that the Proposed Development would result in the permanent loss of employment land and potentially, the permanent loss of land allocated for housing. These matters have been scoped into the construction phase assessment (paragraphs 12.6.15 to 12.6.17). The Scoping Report proposes to report this as a permanent construction effect and to scope out an assessment of impacts on development land during the operational phase (paragraphs 12.6.26 and 12.6.40; Table 12-8).</i></p> <p><i>Providing the ES assessment conclusions for areas of permanent loss clearly reflect the duration of impact, the Inspectorate is content with this approach and that a separate assessment of these matters for the operational phase is not required. Impacts on development land during operation can be scoped out.</i></p> <p><i>The ES should clearly identify which areas of development land are to be temporarily lost during construction and which are to be permanently lost. Losses should be quantified.</i></p>	<p>Section 12.8 of ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), identifies which areas of development land would be temporarily and permanently lost, and reports the duration of temporary losses. The assessment for the ES quantifies temporary and permanent losses. Where there is permanent loss of development land, this is explicitly discussed in the assessment.</p>
3.7.5	Paragraphs 12.6.27 and 12.6.41 and Table 12-8	<p>Impacts on agricultural land (including those resulting from temporary or permanent loss of agricultural land) during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report identifies the potential for permanent loss of agricultural land due to proposed AGP or permanent wayleaves for pipelines and this matter has been scoped into the construction phase assessment (paragraph 12.6.21). The Scoping Report proposes to report this as a permanent</i></p>	<p>The approach to the assessment of impacts on agricultural land is set out in section 12.5 of ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Additional information regarding the agricultural land surveys undertaken to support the assessment is provided in ES Appendix 12.1</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>construction effect and to scope out an assessment of impacts on agricultural land during the operational phase (paragraph 12.6.27 and Table 12-8). Providing the ES assessment conclusions for areas of permanent loss clearly reflect the duration of impact, the Inspectorate is content with this approach and that a separate assessment of these matters for the operational phase is not required. Impacts on agricultural land during operation can be scoped out. The ES should quantify the amount of agricultural land that would be temporarily and permanently lost as a result of the Proposed Development by Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) grade.</i></p>	<p>Agricultural Land Quality, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Further information regarding the temporary and permanent effects on agricultural land is provided in ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Section 12.8 of ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) quantifies the area of agricultural land that would be temporarily and permanently lost as a result of the Proposed Development. Where there is permanent loss of agricultural land, this is explicitly discussed in the assessment.</p>
3.7.6	Paragraphs 12.6.33 to 12.6.36 and Table 12-8	<p>Impacts on soils during construction: <i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out this matter on the basis that construction would comply with established best practice soil management measures, including preparation of the four management plans listed in paragraph 12.6.35 of the Scoping Report. The Inspectorate is not in a position to scope this matter out of the ES without further details of the likely measures to be included in the management plans and how these would be secured through the dDCO. Accordingly, the ES should include an assessment of effects on soils or provide evidence of agreement with relevant consultees that this matter can be scoped out and an absence of LSE. The ES should identify the best practice measures and explain how these are secured through the dDCO.</i></p>	<p>Impacts on soils during construction are scoped in for further consideration, see section 12.8 of ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). An Outline Soil Resource Management Plan (SRMP) is appended to the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) and sets out good practice soil management measures that would be implemented.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.7.7	Paragraph 12.6.42 and Table 12-8	<p>Impacts on soils during operation: <i>Considering the nature of the Proposed Development, the Inspectorate agrees that significant effects on soils during operation are unlikely and that this matter can be scoped out of further assessment.</i> <i>However, if any maintenance or repair works are required which would result in disturbance or other impacts to soils, the ES should identify the best practice measures relied upon to ensure that significant effects do not occur and explain how these are secured through the dDCO.</i> <i>Please refer to the Inspectorate’s comments at ID 2.2.10 of this Scoping Opinion regarding management plans.</i></p>	<p>The OEMP (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7) makes reference to the detailed SRMP which would be produced and submitted for approval in accordance with the CEMP requirement in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3). The detailed SRMP would include soil protection measures to be applied to any monitoring, maintenance, repair or replacement works that occur during the operation of the Proposed Development and that affect soil resources. The Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) contains the Outline SRMP which sets out measures such as avoiding routine access at times of year when soils are susceptible to damage, and measures to reinstate soils should access be required for emergency repairs, for example.</p>
3.7.8	Paragraphs 12.6.24 and 12.6.25 and Table 12-5	<p>Sensitive receptors: <i>The Scoping Report identifies potential for impacts on the amenity of users of community facilities and commercial properties, where these “...are particularly sensitive to changes in their operating environment”.</i> <i>Table 12-5 sets out value sensitivity criteria, but it is unclear how receptors “particularly sensitive” to changes in their operating environment would be identified. The ES should explain the approach to identifying and determining the sensitivity of receptors. Effort should be made to agree the sensitive receptors with relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	<p>Section 12.5 of ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), includes criteria describing the sensitivity of receptors (including very high sensitivity) and explains the methodology that has been followed to identify these receptors. This has been discussed with the relevant stakeholders at the Community EIA Working Group.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.7.9	Paragraph 12.7.3	<p>ALC surveys: <i>The Scoping Report states that the baseline will include data from agricultural land surveys to identify the extent of best and most versatile (BMV) land that will be impacted permanently by the Proposed Development. The study area for the survey(s) should have sufficient coverage to ensure that the baseline conditions are understood for all areas of agricultural land where significant effects are likely to occur, noting that this should include locations of permanent construction impacts considering the Applicant’s approach to assessment as addressed in ID 3.7.6 of this Scoping Opinion. The Applicant should make effort to agree the scope and method of the ALC survey with relevant consultation bodies, including local authorities.</i></p>	<p>ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes data from agricultural land surveys to identify the extent of BMV land that would be impacted permanently (as well as temporarily) by the Proposed Development. The scope and findings of these surveys have been discussed with the relevant stakeholders, including local planning authorities, NE and the Community EIA Working Group.</p> <p>The approach to the assessment of impacts on BMV agricultural land is set out in section 12.5 of ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Further information regarding the agricultural land surveys that have been undertaken to support the assessment is provided in ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and ES Appendix 12.1 Agricultural Land Quality, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).</p>
Chapter 13 Landscape and visual			
3.8.1	Paragraph 13.3.2	<p>Night-time photography: <i>The Scoping Report states that no concerns were raised by consultation bodies at a meeting of its Historic Environment and Landscape EIA Working Group in respect of its proposal not to undertake night-time photography. No information is presented about why this approach is proposed but the Inspectorate notes that nighttime lighting effects are proposed to be scoped into the ES.</i></p>	<p>The location of viewpoints was circulated to stakeholders by email on the 1 June 2023, ahead of discussion at the third EIA Working Group on the 7 June. Feedback received either at the meeting or by email, informed subsequent summer fieldwork photography. An update to the viewpoint locations, including those proposed for night-time photography, were presented at the fourth EIA</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>The Inspectorate considers that the assessment of night-time lighting effects in the ES should be informed by baseline night-time photography. Effort should be made to agree the location and number of viewpoint locations with relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	<p>Working Group on the 31 October, and subsequently shared by email on the 6 December 2023. Agreement on the viewpoints, including those proposed for night-time photography was confirmed individually by stakeholders by email throughout the month. ES Figure 13.10 Night-time baseline, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6) represents the night-time baseline, and ES Figure 13.23 Viewpoint photograph, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6), shows night-time photography for the agreed viewpoints.</p>
3.8.2	Paragraph 13.6.5 and Table 13-23	<p>Below ground pipeline in tunnel during construction: <i>The Scoping Report states that there would be no changes to the landscape or visual baseline during construction from installation of pipeline within tunnel aside from at launch sites and intermediate shaft sites (which would be assessed in the ES).</i> <i>The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out on the basis explained in the Scoping Report.</i></p>	<p>No additional information is provided in the ES, regarding effects of the pipeline within the tunnel. The ‘launch sites’ (temporary trenchless crossing construction compounds) have been assessed in section 13.8 of ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and their visibility has been considered in determining the extent of potential views of the Proposed Development during construction, as illustrated on the ZTVs (ES Figure 13.18 Zone of Theoretical Visibility (construction, bare earth – whole Proposed Development) and ES Figure 13.19 Zone of Theoretical Visibility (construction, with screening – Proposed Development), Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6)).</p>
3.8.3	Paragraph 13.6.6	<p>Havant Thicket Reservoir during construction: <i>The Scoping Report states that proposed changes to the Havant Thicket Reservoir relate to the storage of recycled</i></p>	<p>This matter is not considered within ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>water and not the physical structure, and therefore changes to the landscape or visual baseline are not likely.</i></p> <p><i>Chapter 3 of the Scoping Report identifies that physical changes are proposed at the Havant Thicket Reservoir during construction. The reservoir is in proximity to several landscape designations shown on Figure 13.1 in Volume III of the Scoping Report.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate does not have sufficient information to exclude the possibility of likely significant effects during construction from activities at Havant Thicket Reservoir. Accordingly, the ES should include an assessment of effects on this matter or provide evidence of agreement with relevant consultees that this matter can be scoped out and an absence of LSE.</i></p>	<p>The Proposed Development considered in the EIA Scoping Report (ES Appendix 5.1 EIA Scoping Report, Volume I (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) included potential physical changes at Havant Thicket Reservoir during construction. The Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) Report assessed two options for enabling the transfer between the WRP site and Havant Thicket Reservoir: Option 1 did not propose physical changes to Havant Thicket Reservoir, while Option 2 did. Option 2 has since been removed from the Proposed Development, as described in ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>The Proposed Development includes only Option 1, which involves no physical changes to Havant Thicket Reservoir and no associated effects. This meant that several landscape receptors assessed in the PEI Report would no longer be affected by the Proposed Development, the list of landscape and visual receptors to be removed from the scope of the landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) were presented and agreed with stakeholders at the ninth EIA Working Group session on the 9 June 2025.</p> <p>As such, this matter is not considered further within ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.8.4	Paragraph 13.7.9	<p>Local landscape character areas (LLCAs): <i>The Scoping Report states that the Applicant will assess impacts to landscape character at a range of scales, from national to local, using published landscape character assessments and its own defined LLCAs to draw distinction between localised and wider ranging effects. The LLCAs are shown on Figure 13.3 of Volume III of the Scoping Report. However, Table 13-23 summarising matters to be scoped in or out does not include LLCAs.</i></p> <p><i>For avoidance of doubt, the ES should include an assessment of impacts to LLCAs, where significant effects are likely to occur. This may form part of the overall assessment to district level landscape character but it should be clear what effects are predicted at the more granular scale. To inform this assessment the ES should also include a description of the baseline character of the LLCAs. Evidence of any agreement reached with relevant consultation bodies as to the assessment approach should be included in the ES.</i></p>	<p>The ES includes a detailed description of each LLCA and the likely impacts and effects of construction, operation, along with details of agreement on the approach with relevant consultation bodies.</p> <p>ES Appendix 13.3 Landscape baseline and effects, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), includes LLCA details. In ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), the baseline character is provided in section 13.7, including the definition of LLCAs defined by the Applicant to address the local scale, and the impacts and effects are described in section 13.8.</p> <p>A summary of engagement with the Joint Officers Group (JOG) and EIA Working Groups is summarised in section 13.3 of ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.8.5	Table 13-23	<p>Below ground pipeline in tunnel during operation: <i>The Scoping Report states that there would be no changes to the landscape or visual baseline during operation from installation of pipeline within tunnel.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of further assessment on the basis explained in the Scoping Report, but the ES should confirm that no easements are required for maintenance of these pipeline sections that would affect above ground landscaping.</i></p>	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) explains that protective strips of land either side of the pipeline alignment are required only where the pipeline is constructed using open-cut methods to enable access for maintenance and protect pipeline integrity. The ES does not identify a requirement for protective strips in relation to sections of the Pipeline constructed using trenchless or tunnelling techniques, where</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			<p>the pipeline is below-ground and access for operation and maintenance is via shafts.</p> <p>As these sections would not alter existing landscape features, no landscape mitigation is required. Therefore, ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) assumes that protective strips for operation and maintenance would not require removal of any above-ground vegetation along sections of the pipeline constructed via tunnelling.</p> <p>Regarding sections of the pipeline constructed via open-cut excavation, the Outline LEMP (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) sets out restrictions on planting including limitations on plant size and species in proximity to the pipeline.</p>
3.8.6	Table 13-23	<p>Eastney LSO during construction and operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report states that no works are anticipated to the Eastney LSO. Paragraph 3.1.5 states that Eastney LSO may not be subject to physical works but is an area over which the Applicant may need operational powers. Paragraph 3.2.2 states that the existing infrastructure would be used for release of reject water.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of further assessment on the basis explained in the Scoping Report. This matter should be revisited if physical works are subsequently found to be required.</i></p>	<p>No physical works to the Eastney LSO are required and this is scoped out of the LVIA.</p>
3.8.7	Table 13-23	<p>Havant Thicket Reservoir during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report states that there would be no changes to the landscape or visual baseline during operation as the proposed works relate to the storage of recycled water.</i></p>	<p>The Proposed Development does not require any physical works to Havant Thicket Reservoir and therefore this is scoped out of the LVIA (ES</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out on the basis explained in the Scoping Report. This matter should be revisited if physical works are subsequently found to be required.</i></p>	<p>Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I, (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6)). Portsmouth Water may however need to increase fencing due to the operation of the Proposed Development. This is included as part of the assessment of related and consequential projects in ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and associated appendices.</p>
3.8.8	Table 13-23	<p>Havant Borough townscape areas TCA 2b, 2c, 7d, 7e and 7g during operation: <i>The Scoping Report states that there would be no changes to the landscape or visual baseline during operation as the tunnel shafts will be capped.</i> <i>The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out on the basis explained in the Scoping Report, but the ES should confirm that no easements are required for maintenance of these pipeline sections that would affect above ground landscaping.</i></p>	<p>This matter is not considered within ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The Proposed Development considered in the EIA Scoping Report (ES Appendix 5.1 EIA Scoping Report, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) included potential physical changes to Havant Thicket Reservoir during construction. This option has been removed from the Proposed Development. The list of landscape and visual receptors to be removed from the scope of the LVIA were presented and agreed with stakeholders at the EIA Working Group session on 9 June 2025.</p>
3.8.9	Table 13-23	<p>Motorists on the A27/ M27, B2177 and local road networks during construction and operation: <i>The Scoping Report states that these are “low sensitivity receptors with sequential views unlikely [to result in] significant effects.” No further explanation is presented as to the predicted change from baseline to support this assertion and the description of baseline conditions in the Scoping</i></p>	<p>The preliminary desk study, including a series of ZTV maps, and fieldwork indicate that there would be views from the B2177 but no effects on users of the A27 and M27. The LVIA has identified and assessed the impacts and effects on road users with reference to viewpoints along the B2177.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>Report indicates that motorists on these roads would be able to see several components of the Proposed Development. The significance matrix at Table 13-21 indicates that a significant effect could be determined to low sensitivity receptors if there is a very high or high magnitude of impact. The Inspectorate does not have sufficient information to exclude the possibility of likely significant effects to these receptors. The ES should include an assessment or further evidence to demonstrate why significant effects are not likely, including agreement with relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	<p>The list of receptors and location of viewpoints for LVIA, were circulated to stakeholders by email on 1 June 2023, ahead of discussion at the third EIA Working Group on 7 June 2023. An update to receptors was presented at the fourth EIA Working Group on 31 October 2023, and subsequently shared by email on 6 December 2023. Agreement was confirmed individually by stakeholders by email throughout the month.</p> <p>Theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development during construction and operation is presented in ES Figure 13.18 to ES Figure 13.21, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>Detailed impacts and effects on road users are presented in ES Appendix 13.4 Visual baseline and effects, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.8.10	N/A	<p>Other landscape character areas (LCAs):</p> <p><i>The Inspectorate notes that there are some LCAs listed in Table 13- 12 and shown on Figure 13.2 in Volume III of the Scoping Report that are not addressed in Table 13-23. For example, LCA 7h South East Hampshire Downs and LCA 10b Portsmouth harbour. It is unclear whether it is proposed to scope these LCAs in or out of assessment.</i></p> <p><i>The ES should include an assessment of impacts to all LCAs where significant effects are likely to occur, unless otherwise agreed with relevant consultees.</i></p>	<p>The ES assess the effects on LCAs defined at the national and county level with reference to published studies, and at the local level with reference to LLCA defined by the Applicant. Table 13-5 of ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), presents which LCAs have been scoped in or out of the LVIA.</p> <p>ES Figure 13.13 National Character Areas, ES Figure 13.14 Hampshire Integrated Character Assessment, and ES Figure 13.17 Local Landscape Character Areas, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6), show the location</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			of all landscape and townscape character areas considered in the assessment and these are cross-referenced in related tables and text.
3.8.11	Paragraph 13.2.18	<p>Guidance: <i>The Inspectorate considers that Historic England’s published setting advice, The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) (GPA3) is of relevance to the assessment of effects to the landscape setting of heritage assets. The Applicant should consider the production of dynamic and kinetic assessments that engage with movement through the landscape (not just fixed point views), including in relation to motorists (please refer to the Inspectorate’s comments at ID 3.8.9 of this Scoping Opinion).</i></p>	The LVIA has identified viewpoints which are representative of kinetic views along roads and promoted Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and people’s views from heritage assets which take in their landscape setting. These are detailed within ES Appendix 13.4 Visual baseline and effects, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and their location is shown in ES Figure 13.22 Representative viewpoints, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6).
3.8.12	Table 13-11	<p>Baseline data: <i>In addition to the data sources listed, the description in the ES should also include reference to soils, water and historic landscape character where these features contribute towards the landscape character. This may be by cross-reference to information within other chapters of the ES as relevant to avoid duplication.</i></p>	In section 13.8 of ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), the LVIA references these features and characteristics by citing published studies and map evidence and by cross-reference to information within other chapters of the ES to inform the assessment.
3.8.13	Paragraph 13.5.15 and Figure 13.4, Volume III Figures	<p>Viewpoint locations: <i>The Scoping Report states that 107 viewpoints have been defined to represent visual receptors. The viewpoint locations are shown on Figure 13.4 in Volume III of the Scoping Report.</i> <i>The ES should include evidence of any agreement or otherwise reached with the relevant planning authorities as to the final viewpoint selection.</i></p>	The location of viewpoints for assessment has been agreed with relevant stakeholders and provided in the ES. This is set in section 13.3 of ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The final selection of viewpoints is shown on ES Figure 13.22 Representative viewpoints, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6). Refer also to ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
3.8.14	Paragraph 13.6.3	<p>Removal of trees with Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs), veteran or ancient trees or protected hedgerows: <i>The Inspectorate considers that this would amount to a permanent change and should be assessed as such (not a temporary construction effect).</i></p>	This is assessed within section 13.8 of ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
3.8.15	Paragraph 13.7.4	<p>Assessment methodology SDNP: <i>The Scoping Report states that the assessment methodology for setting impacts to the SDNP will be developed further in the ES in consultation with the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA).</i> <i>The ES should include evidence of any agreement reached with SDNPA about the assessment methodology and describe any matters that are outstanding. It should be clear how the assessment has taken account of the special qualities of the SDNP, including tranquillity. In this regard, the ES should also consider potential in combination effects between landscape and noise and vibration.</i></p>	<p>The ES describes engagement and evidences the agreements reached with stakeholders, including the SDNPA. This is presented in sections 13.3 of ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>The Applicant discussed the LVIA methodology with the SDNPA and sets out in the ES how the assessment has taken account of the setting and Special Qualities of the SDNP, including tranquillity, and potential in-combination effects between landscape and noise and vibration. This is presented in sections 13.7 and 13.9 of ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.8.16	Tables 13-3 and 13-7	<p>Determining value attached to landscape and views: <i>The ES should set out the justification used for assigning value and sensitivity to receptors where this has involved the application of professional judgment and provide evidence of any agreement reached with relevant consultation bodies. It should be clear how the value of individual elements such as trees, hedgerow and agricultural land has been considered within the determination of value.</i></p>	The LVIA explains how judgements relating to the value attached to the landscape and views has been reached, within ES Appendix 13.2 Landscape and visual impact assessment methodology, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The ES describes engagement and evidences the agreements reached with stakeholders.

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			This is presented in sections 13.3, 13.7 and 13.9 of ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
3.8.17	Paragraph 13.7.37	<p>Photomontages: <i>The Scoping Report states photographs and photomontages will be prepared in accordance with Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 06/19 (TGN 06/19) and that some Type 4 photomontages will be prepared for selected viewpoints.</i> <i>The Inspectorate considers that effort should be made to agree the number and location of photomontages, including Type 4 photomontages, with relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	The Applicant agreed the location of viewpoints for photomontages (LI Type 4) with relevant local planning authorities, including the SDNPA and HCC. Photographs and photomontages (LI Type 4) have been prepared in accordance with Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 06/19 (TGN 06/19). A summary of engagement on viewpoints is presented in section 13.3 of ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
3.8.18	Paragraph 13.9.5	<p>Ancient woodland: <i>The Scoping Report states that loss of ancient woodland will be avoided wherever practicable in line with the National Policy Statement (NPS) for Water Resources Infrastructure (WRI).</i> <i>If the Proposed Development results in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland, the ES must provide details of the proposed compensation strategy and the wholly exceptional reasons for such loss.</i></p>	The Proposed Development would not result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats. Section 13.4 of ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out how the design principles (Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5)) and mitigation measures have been considered in the LVIA, including the avoidance of sensitive areas.
3.8.19	Paragraph 13.9.6	<p>Mitigation planting: <i>The ES should set out what opportunities have been considered for advanced planting and confirm which are proposed to be taken forward and which have been discounted, together with the reasons. The ES should include a management plan for mitigation planting demonstrating how it will be maintained to ensure it reaches the extent and</i></p>	Opportunities for advanced planting within the Environmental Mitigation and Enhancement Areas (EMEAs) are identified in section 13.4 of ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The exact locations are a matter for post-consent and have not been identified at this stage and have not

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<i>quality of mitigation assumed in the assessment of residual effects at Year 15 of operation of the Proposed Development.</i>	<p>been relied upon in the ES for mitigation. The Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) includes a requirement to consider opportunities for early/advanced planting, as this relates to construction programming and does not influence the final design.</p> <p>The Outline LEMP (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7) sets out how mitigation planting will be implemented and maintained to reach its mitigation objectives by Year 15 of operation.</p>
3.8.20	Paragraph 13.9.7	<p>Design objectives and principles: <i>The Inspectorate welcomes the Applicant’s commitment to providing plans that illustrate type, extent and function of mitigation for landscape and visual impacts. The Inspectorate considers that a clear benchmark should be established within the ES as the basis for implementation of design mitigation.</i></p>	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) sets out the design objectives that have guided scheme development, including the approach to avoiding likely significant effects and developing primary mitigation. It also describes mitigation and enhancement opportunities through the Outline LEMP (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7), while the Indicative Environmental Masterplan appended to the Design Approach Document (Document Reference 5.12, DCO Volume 5) illustrates their spatial extent and anticipated types.</p>
3.8.21	N/A	<p>Hedgerow and tree surveys: <i>The Inspectorate notes that the Proposed Development has the potential to affect existing hedgerows and trees during construction and operation. It is considered that surveys should be undertaken to establish the baseline condition for these landscape features. Effort should be made to agree the</i></p>	<p>The ES includes information about the outcomes of habitat and arboricultural surveys and how they have informed the LVIA and the efforts that the Applicant has made to agree the survey scope with relevant consultation bodies.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>survey scope with relevant consultation bodies. The ES should include information about the outcomes of the surveys.</i></p>	<p>Please see ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), section 13.7 of ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), ES Appendix 13.3 Landscape baseline and effects, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 13.5 Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.8.22	N/A	<p>Seascape character: <i>The Scoping Report makes limited reference to seascape character and the potential for impacts to it from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. Whilst this may form part of the overall landscape assessment, the ES should set out any specific seascape guidance that has been used to inform the assessment and describe the baseline conditions of seascape character areas that could be affected.</i></p>	<p>Sections 13.2, 13.7, and 13.8 of ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), indicates that there would be limited impacts on seascape due to the location and context of the WRP site and topography which prevents intervisibility between the rest of the Proposed Development and the coast. This ES sets out specific seascape guidance that has been used to inform the assessment and describe the baseline conditions of seascape character areas that could be affected.</p>
3.8.23	N/A	<p>Landscape features <i>It should be clear in the ES how the assessment has considered individual landscape features of relevance, eg woodlands, rivers, drainage, fields, roads and settlements.</i></p>	<p>The ES explains how the assessment has considered individual landscape features of relevance, e.g. woodlands, rivers, drainage, fields, roads and settlements and how these combine to inform the character of the landscape within the study area.</p> <p>This is presented in section 13.7 of ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and ES Appendix 13.3 Landscape baseline and effects, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).
3.8.24	N/A	<p>Published landscape character assessment areas: <i>The Inspectorate notes that the landscape character assessment areas shown on Figure 13.2 are not entirely consistent with those described in Tables 13-12 and 13-23 of Volume I of the Scoping Report, with many additional areas identified in these tables. For example, the Havant Borough townscape areas referenced in ID 3.8.8 of this Scoping Opinion are not annotated on Figure 13.2. Figures in the ES should include information about the location of all landscape and townscape character areas considered in the assessment and there should be consistency across documents forming part of the ES</i></p>	<p>A suite of figures is included in ES Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6). These show the location of all landscape and townscape character areas considered in the assessment clearly cross-referenced in related tables and text: ES Figure 13.13 National Character Areas, ES Figure 13.14 Hampshire Integrated Character Assessment, and ES Figure 13.17 Local Landscape Character Areas, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6). Published Landscape Character Assessments and relevant landscape receptors are listed in Table 13-5 of ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
Chapter 14 Noise and vibration			
3.9.1	Paragraphs 14.5.10 to 14.5.12 and Table 14-14	<p>Indirect temporary or permanent road traffic vibration impacts during construction and operation: <i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that the vibration from heavy vehicles is caused by movement over irregularities and the highways authority has a duty to maintain the road network. The Applicant confirms that a commitment will be made in a construction traffic management plan (CTMP) to reinstate the road surface condition if it is damaged by the Proposed Development. This means there would be no pathway for impacts. In addition,</i></p>	<p>Road traffic vibration impacts are scoped out as agreed. The Framework CTMP (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) details construction traffic management measures, including a proposition for highway condition surveys to be undertaken before and after the construction period, to identify whether construction activities have negatively impacted highway conditions. The scope of these surveys will be discussed and agreed with the</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>the Scoping Report states that an increase in heavy goods vehicles (HGV) on roads with existing irregularities would not result in a change to the vibration emitted.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out on the basis set out in the Scoping Report. However, the ES should provide further details of the likely measures envisaged to mitigate effects and how these would be secured through the dDCO.</i></p> <p><i>Please refer to the Inspectorate’s comments at ID 2.2.10 of this Scoping Opinion regarding management plans.</i></p>	<p>relevant highway authorities (HCC and PCC) and set out in the detailed CTMPs. Repair of any damage caused by construction traffic would reduce the potential for traffic-induced vibration effects.</p>
3.9.2	Paragraph 14.5.13	<p>Noise and vibration from underground pipelines during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report states that the proposed pipeline will be buried and noise from the flow of water is considered unlikely to be perceptible at receptor locations. The use of industry good practice in the design of the pipeline will ensure smooth flow.</i></p> <p><i>Based on the information in the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of further assessment. The ES should confirm the industry good practice measures incorporated into the design of the pipeline.</i></p>	<p>The industry good practice measures incorporated into the pipeline design are identified in section 15.4 of ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.9.3	Paragraph 14.5.16	<p>Noise and vibration from Havant Thicket Reservoir during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report states that the works associated with the Proposed Development at Havant Thicket Reservoir comprise only storage of recycled water and no plant.</i></p>	<p>No further action required.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<i>Based on the information in the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of further assessment.</i>	
3.9.4	Table 14-14	<p>Direct temporary noise and vibration during operation: <i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter as no temporary impacts will be generated during the operation phase.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate does not have sufficient information about the possibility of any temporary noise and vibration that may occur during operation, for example through maintenance and renewal works. The ES should include an assessment or demonstrate that significant effects are not likely to occur with evidence of agreement from relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	Further information on maintenance activities has been provided in section 15.3 of the ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), which is considered sufficient to scope out these activities, except noise from generator testing. This matter was agreed with local planning authorities through the Emissions and Transport EIA Working Group sessions, notably on 3 November 2023. Generator testing noise impacts are assessed in ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
3.9.5	Table 14-14	<p>Indirect temporary road traffic noise during operation: <i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that no temporary road traffic noise impacts will be generated during the operation phase.</i></p> <p><i>Based on the information in the Scoping Report and noting that road traffic movements during operation are predicted to be circa 57 per day, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</i></p>	No further action required.
3.9.6	Table 14-14	<p>Direct permanent noise impacts during construction: <i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that no permanent impacts would occur during construction.</i></p>	No further action required.

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>Based on the information in the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</i></p>	
3.9.7	Paragraphs 14.5.14 and Table 14-14	<p>Direct permanent vibration impacts during construction and operation (from AGP): <i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that impacts during the construction phase would be temporary and that vibration levels at the AGP during operation would be controlled by standard design measures such as pump balancing and antivibration mounts.</i> <i>Based on the information in the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES. The ES should describe the sources of vibration and the predicted vibration level with these design measures implemented.</i></p>	<p>A description of the potential sources of vibration is provided in section 15.3 of ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), and measures to control these impacts are identified in section 15.4. Vibration levels from construction of AGP have been predicted and assessed, as described in section 15.8 of the ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The information in section 15.3 and 15.4 of ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) demonstrates that significant effects from operational vibration would not occur; hence, predictions are not deemed necessary. This matter was agreed with local planning authorities through the Emissions and Transport EIA Working Group sessions, notably on 3 November 2023.</p>
3.9.8	Paragraphs 14.5.15 and Table 14-14	<p>Indirect permanent road traffic noise impacts during construction and operation: <i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that impacts during the construction phase would be temporary and, whilst there would be additional vehicle movement during operation for maintenance activities, it would be a low number of vehicles and the associated noise impacts would be negligible. Paragraph 14.5.15 of the</i></p>	<p>No further action required.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>Scoping Report provides an indication of the expected vehicle movements.</i></p> <p><i>Based on the information in the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of further assessment.</i></p>	
3.9.9	Paragraphs 14.4.4	<p>Study area for direct construction impacts:</p> <p><i>The Inspectorate agrees that Eastney TT can be excluded on the basis that the Scoping Report confirms that no physical works are proposed at this existing infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate does not agree that Havant Thicket Reservoir can be excluded from the assessment scope as information in the Scoping Report indicates that physical construction works are proposed at the reservoir.</i></p> <p><i>Consideration should also be given to the potential for cumulative effects between the Proposed Development and Havant Thicket Reservoir as described at ID 2.1.6 and Table 3.14 of this Scoping Opinion. Accordingly, the ES should include an assessment of this matter or evidence of agreement with relevant consultees that this matter can be scoped out and an absence of LSE.</i></p>	<p>The Proposed Development does not include physical construction works at the Havant Thicket Reservoir and the exclusion of this from the assessment scope was agreed with local planning authorities through the Emissions and Transport EIA Working Group. An assessment of potential cumulative effects with the consented Havant Thicket Reservoir Project is undertaken in ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and associated appendices.</p>
3.9.10	Paragraph 14.4.4	<p>Study area for direct operational impacts:</p> <p><i>The ES should confirm the final study area used in the assessment and explain how it has been selected by reference to relevant guidance.</i></p>	<p>The study area for direct operational phase noise impacts is identified in section 15.5 of the ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), this section also explains the guidance used in selection of the study areas.</p>
3.9.11	Paragraphs 14.6.4, 14.6.11 and 14.6.34	<p>Baseline noise surveys:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report proposes to undertake baseline noise surveys only at locations where construction noise effects would exceed one month and where there would be direct</i></p>	<p>The potential for construction works to overrun is addressed by incorporating worst case assumptions regarding the works durations into the assessment, as described in section 15.6 of ES</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>operational noise effects, ie noise from buildings and plant. It is stated that for other construction effects, baseline noise levels are not required in the assessment based on guidance in BS 5228-1.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate considers that this approach as acceptable, subject to confirmation in the ES as to:</i></p> <p><i>how the assessment has allowed for any potential for construction works to overrun;</i></p> <p><i>how construction noise at public open space will be assessed, as paragraph 14.6.11 suggests that this will require baseline noise levels; and</i></p> <p><i>where likely significant effects from construction traffic noise are identified, baseline surveys should be completed or a justification as to why this is not required.</i></p> <p><i>Effort should be made to agree the survey approach with relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	<p>Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). If construction works overrun, the mitigation measures in the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) would ensure that impacts are no worse than those assessed in the ES.</p> <p>Section 15.5 of the ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), describes the assessment methodology for construction noise impacts on non-residential receptors, including public open spaces. This assessment includes consideration of baseline noise levels, which are identified either through measurements or using strategic noise mapping data.</p> <p>The assessment methodology for construction traffic noise impacts (outlined in section 15.5 of the ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6)) is based on noise level calculations; hence, a baseline sound survey is not deemed necessary to inform this assessment.</p> <p>Section 15.3 of ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), describes the direct technical consultation undertaken and confirms that the proposed survey methodology was agreed with the local planning authority officer where the survey was located.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.9.12	Paragraph 14.7.2	<p>Assumptions: <i>The Scoping Report states that the assessment of construction impacts will be based on information provided by the early works contractor, and that depending on the level of detail, worst-case assumptions may have to be made. Where assumptions have been made, the ES should contain a statement with the rationale behind them.</i></p>	<p>The assumptions made and the rationale are detailed in section 15.6 of the ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.9.13	N/A	<p>Figures: <i>The ES should include figures showing the location of receptors considered in the assessment.</i></p>	<p>ES Figure 15.1 Noise and vibration direct effects study areas, sensitive receptors and monitoring locations, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6), shows the locations of all the receptors considered in the noise and vibration assessment.</p>
3.9.14	N/A	<p>Vibration baseline: The ES should explain the vibration baseline that has been used in the assessment, or otherwise confirm why a baseline is not required.</p>	<p>The assessment methodology for construction vibration impacts described in section 15.5 of the ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), accords with relevant technical guidance, which details impact criteria that depend solely on construction vibration levels, irrespective of baseline. Operational vibration impacts are scoped out of the assessment. Hence, baseline vibration level data are not required for the assessment. This matter was agreed with local planning authorities through the Emissions and Transport EIA Working Group sessions.</p>
Chapter 15 Resources and waste management			

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.10.1	Paragraphs 15.6.6, 15.6.15, 15.6.17 to 15.6.18 and Tables 15-6, 15-7 and Table 15-15	<p>Consumption of material resources associated with the Proposed Development during construction and operation:</p> <p><i>Regarding construction, Tables 15-6 and 15-7 of the Scoping Report set out the quantities of aggregates and manufactured materials consumption (respectively) at which the Applicant considers a likely significant effect would occur. On the basis that aggregate and manufactured material consumption does not exceed the quantities set out in Tables 15-6 and 15-7, the Inspectorate is content that a significant effect is unlikely. Consumption of material resources associated with the Proposed Development during construction can be scoped out of further assessment.</i></p> <p><i>Regarding operation, the Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that quantities of the materials required would be "...negligible in relation to the supply chain capacity". Having regard to the nature and characteristics of the operational Proposed Development, the Inspectorate is content that a significant effect is unlikely. Consumption of material resources associated with the Proposed Development during operation can be scoped out of the ES assessment.</i></p> <p><i>Please refer to the Inspectorate's comments at ID 2.1.16 of this Scoping Opinion regarding natural resources required.</i></p>	<p>No further action required.</p> <p>The scope of the Proposed Development has not altered sufficiently between that the design considered in the development of the EIA Scoping Report, and the design considered in this ES to give rise to a meaningful likelihood of the thresholds set out in 15-6 and 15-7 of the ES Appendix 5.1 EIA Scoping Report, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) being exceeded.</p>
3.10.2	Paragraphs 15.6.6 and 15.6.21 and Table 15-15	<p>Impacts on MSAs and safeguarded minerals and waste infrastructure during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report identifies potential impacts on MSAs and safeguarded mineral and waste infrastructure sites that are present in the vicinity of the Proposed Development, including</i></p>	<p>The Minerals Safeguarding Assessment is presented in ES Appendix 16.1 Minerals Safeguarding Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and assesses the temporary and permanent construction effects from the Proposed Development on mineral resources.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>the risk that they could be sterilised. This matter has been scoped into the construction phase assessment (paragraphs 15.6.4 and 15.6.5).</i></p> <p><i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of impacts during the operational phase, as this “...would not result in any further effects”.</i></p> <p><i>Providing the ES assessment conclusions for areas that would be permanently sterilised clearly reflect the duration of impact, the Inspectorate is content with this approach and that a separate assessment of these matters for the operational phase is not required. Impacts on MSAs and safeguarded minerals and waste infrastructure during operation can be scoped out.</i></p> <p><i>The ES should clearly identify which MSAs and safeguarded mineral and waste infrastructure sites are to be temporarily impacted/ lost during construction and any which are to be permanently sterilised.</i></p>	<p>This assessment identifies where the Proposed Development coincides with a Safeguarded Mineral Resource. The location of the Proposed Development in relation to the Safeguarded Mineral Resources Areas is displayed on ES Figure 16.1 Proposed Development and Mineral Safeguarded Sites and Mineral Consultation Areas, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.10.3	Paragraphs 15.6.6, 15.6.19 to 15.6.20 and Table 15-15	<p>Disposal of waste associated with the Proposed Development during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of waste generated during operation, stating that the quantities would be “...negligible in relation to the regional generation of industrial and commercial waste”. Liquid discharges generated during operation of the proposed WRP would be assessed in the Water Environment Chapter of the ES. Having regard to the nature and characteristics of the operational Proposed Development, the Inspectorate is content with this approach. Impacts from waste generated</i></p>	<p>Agreement to scope out operational waste generation from the waste management assessment - no further action required.</p> <p>Types and quantities of waste are presented ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p>during operation can be scoped out of assessments in the Resource and Waste Management ES Chapter.</p> <p>Please refer to the Inspectorate’s comments at ID 2.1.17 of this Scoping Opinion regarding predicted volumes of waste.</p>	
3.10.4	Paragraphs 15.4.6 to 15.4.7 and Appendix 2	<p>Waste study area:</p> <p>The Applicant’s attention is drawn to the comments of Hampshire County Council (Appendix 2), which indicate that the information presented in the Scoping Report about management of inert waste may be inaccurate. The final study area selected as the basis of assessment should be informed by accurate data and effort should be made to agree the approach with relevant consultation bodies.</p>	<p>The baseline calculations have been undertaken using the most up to date Waste Data Interrogator data (released September 2025) to inform the baseline regions for the assessment. The destination of landfilled waste originating in Hampshire has been used to define the expansive study area. The is set out in section 16.7 of ES Chapter 16 Resources and waste management, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>A meeting with the Emissions and Transport EIA Working Group was held on 8 November 2023 to discuss scoping responses. Within this session the stakeholders agreed with the use of the latest available data published in the Waste Data Interrogator by the EA to set the baseline region. A meeting on 1 February 2024 was held to discuss and agree the approach to assessment. The is set out in section 16.3 of ES Chapter 16 Resources and waste management, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.10.5	Section 15.5 and Appendix 2	<p>Baseline conditions:</p> <p>The Applicant’s attention is drawn to the comments of Hampshire County Council (Appendix 2), which identify information of relevance to the baseline in respect of additional safeguarded sites within the Hampshire Minerals</p>	<p>The Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan Partial Update, Local Aggregate Assessments and Annual Monitoring Reports have been used to inform the current and future baseline as part of the assessment on safeguarded minerals within ES</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<i>and Waste Plan and data available in the Hampshire Local Aggregate Assessment. The Inspectorate considers that this information should be used to inform the baseline description in the ES.</i>	Chapter 16, Resources and waste management, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). These reports have also been used to inform the Mineral Safeguarding Assessment (ES Appendix 16.1 Mineral Safeguarding Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)). The information from these reports has been used to understand the current landbank availability within Hampshire to assist with the 'Needs Assessment' presented in section 7. The purpose of the needs assessment is to compare the need of the Proposed Development with the need for mineral resources.
3.10.6	Paragraphs 15.8.2 to 15.8.3	Management Plans: <i>Please refer to the Inspectorate's comments at ID 2.2.10 of this Scoping Opinion regarding management plans.</i>	Noted, a Site Waste Management Plan will also be prepared by the Contractor as secured by the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7).
Chapter 16 Socio-economics, tourism and health			
3.11.1	Paragraph 16.6.12	Impacts on tourism within the SDNP during construction: <i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out tourism effects on the SDNP as a whole during construction on the basis that no likely significant effects are anticipated at this stage given the limited area of impact relative to the approximately 1,600 square kilometre coverage of the SDNP and that individual strategic tourism receptors in affected areas of the SDNP will be assessed.</i> <i>Therefore, the Inspectorate agrees that impacts on tourism within the SDNP as whole during construction can be scoped out on the basis set out in the Scoping Report. However, the</i>	Impacts on tourism in the SDNP as a whole are scoped out as agreed. Impacts on individual strategic tourism receptors are scoped in as agreed. No part of the Proposed Development Order Limits intersects with the SDNP but in some places the 500m buffer around the Order Limits intersects with the SDNP. Section 17.7 of ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) explains how strategic tourism receptors have been identified for inclusion in the assessment.

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>ES should include an assessment of impacts to all individual tourism receptors within the SDNP where significant effects are likely and explain how such effects would impact its purpose and Special Qualities. It should clearly identify individual receptors that could be affected and the rationale for inclusion or exclusion from the assessment. Efforts should be made to agree the approach with relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	<p>Impacts on all other tourism-related receptors (including hotels, restaurants and other tourism-related businesses) are assessed in ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>The assessment provided in section 17.8 of ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) considers the potential impacts on tourism receptors within the SDNP, where relevant and proportionate, such as Marwell Zoo. Assessment of effects on individual receptors includes consideration of the effect on the purpose and Special Qualities of the SDNP.</p> <p>The Community EIA Working Group sessions were established and used to discuss the scoped in strategic tourism receptors with the relevant stakeholders. Those present at these sessions included the SDNP, Civil Aviation Authority, relevant local planning authorities, Historic England, National Highways, NE, NHS Hampshire and the SDNPA. The Working Group provided regular opportunities to review and provide feedback on the assessment approach for socio-economics and tourism.</p>
3.11.2	Table 16-18	<p>Impacts on tourism within the SDNP during operation: <i>The Inspectorate agrees that operation of the Proposed Development is unlikely to result in significant effects on tourism in the SDNP and is content for this matter to be scoped out from further assessment.</i></p>	No further action required.

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.11.3	Paragraph 16.6.13	<p>The following specific health determinants: indoor environment, diet and other lifestyle choices, workplace conditions, housing and social or community influences (such as racism or social exclusion) during construction:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report states that these health determinants are not relevant to the Proposed Development.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate agrees that the Proposed Development is not likely to result in significant effects on these health determinants and is content for them to be scoped out of the ES.</i></p>	No further action required.
3.11.4	Paragraph 16.6.14	<p>Impacts to strategic tourism receptors during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report states that operation of the Proposed Development would not result in likely significant effects from disruption to strategic tourism receptors including changes in or loss of access. It is stated that any effects from maintenance activities would be minimal or temporary in nature.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate does not have sufficient information about the likely maintenance activities, and the requirement for any easements, to exclude the possibility of effects to strategic tourism receptors. This matter should be assessed in the ES where significant effects are likely, or confirmation should be provided as to how maintenance activities will be managed to avoid impacts to open space and access.</i></p>	The assessment of effects on access to strategic tourism receptors is provided in section 17.8 of ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). In relation to open space any access requirements for maintenance would be at a frequency low enough to not result in effects on population health. Section 17.8 (in the Operational effects, Access to strategic tourism receptors subsection) of ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) assess the impacts on access to strategic tourism receptors as a result of operational and maintenance activities. The impact on both Marwell Zoo and The Royal Armouries at Fort Nelson is neutral and not significant.
3.11.5	Paragraph 16.6.14	<p>Impacts on Walking, Cycling and Horseriding (WCH) provision, including Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) and open spaces during operation:</p>	Potential impacts on walkers, cyclists and horse riders during operation have been considered in section 17.8 of ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health, Volume I (Document reference

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>The Scoping Report states that operation of the Proposed Development would not result in likely significant effects on the access to WCH provision and any effects arising from maintenance activities on PRoWs and open spaces would be minimal or temporary in nature.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate’s comments at ID 3.11.4 apply equally to this matter.</i></p>	<p>6.1, DCO Volume 6). No impacts on this health determinant during operation have been identified. Section 17.8 of ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) considers the ways in which operation could potentially impact on levels of access to green space, recreation and physical activity. It has been determined that there would be no impact on this health determinant during operation.</p>
3.11.6	Paragraph 16.6.15	<p>Effects on employment from impacts on allocated employment land during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report states that effects on employment from impacts on allocated employment land would be limited to the construction phase of the Proposed Development and would be assessed in the ES as permanent construction effects.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate is content to scope out effects on employment from impacts on allocated employment land during operation from further assessment on the basis described in the Scoping Report provided that the assessment of the construction phase includes consideration of the long-term impacts from loss of the employment land.</i></p>	<p>The assessment of effects on employment from impacts on allocated land during construction considers the long-term impacts from loss of the employment land. Refer to section 17.8 of ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) for further detail. No permanent loss of employment land is reported.</p>
3.11.7	Paragraph 16.6.16	<p>Health determinants: access to health, open space and nature, social care and other social infrastructure during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out this matter on the basis that there would be no change to the access provision to health, open space and nature, social care and other social infrastructure during operation of the Proposed Development.</i></p>	<p>No further action required.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<i>The Inspectorate is content with this justification and agrees to scope this matter out from further assessment, subject to comments at ID 3.11.5 regarding access to open space.</i>	
3.11.8	Paragraph 16.6.16	<p>Health determinants: access to work and training during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report states that during operation of the Proposed Development there would be few additional employment and training opportunities created, so the population level benefit would not be significant. On this basis, the Inspectorate is content for this matter to be scoped out of further assessment.</i></p>	No further action required.
3.11.9	Paragraph 16.6.16	<p>Health determinants: social cohesion effects during operation:</p> <p><i>The Inspectorate agrees that operation of the Proposed Development is unlikely to result in significant effects on social cohesion and is content for this matter to be scoped out from further assessment.</i></p>	No further action required.
3.11.10	Paragraph 16.6.16 and Table 16-18	<p>Health determinants: accessibility and travel during operation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report states that impacts would relate to permanent construction impacts that affect access and provision of PRoW. Construction impacts are proposed to be assessed in the ES. The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out on the basis set out in the Scoping Report.</i></p>	No further action required.
3.11.11	Table 16-18	<p>Impacts on tourist accommodation during operation:</p> <p><i>The Inspectorate agrees significant effects on tourist accommodation is unlikely during operation of the Proposed Development and is content for this matter to be scoped out from further assessment.</i></p>	No further action required.

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.11.12	Section 16.5 and Appendix 2	<p>Baseline conditions: <i>The Applicant's attention is drawn to the comments of United Kingdom Health and Security Agency (UKHSA) and Hampshire County Council (Appendix 2 of this Scoping Opinion) regarding the availability of baseline data from Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA). The ES should include relevant data from these documents.</i></p>	<p>The ES uses relevant data from the JSNA in section 17.7 of ES Chapter 17 Socio-economic, tourism and health, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), in relation to the percentage of the population exposed to air pollution. The ES includes reference to additional relevant data from the JSNA as appropriate in relation to the health and social baseline.</p>
3.11.13	N/A	<p>Strategic tourism receptors: <i>The ES should provide a clear definition of strategic tourism receptors and clearly set out which receptors may be affected by all phases of the Proposed Development.</i></p>	<p>A definition of strategic tourism receptors, and an explanation of how these have been identified, is provided in section 17.5 and 17.7 of ES Chapter 17 Socio-economic, tourism and health, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). These receptors are shown in ES Figure 17.4 Strategic tourism receptors, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.11.14	N/A	<p>Baseline information for PRowS, cycleways and bridleways: <i>The Inspectorate notes from paragraph 17.7.9 of the Scoping Report that Strava analysis will be used to ascertain existing usage of PRowS. The ES should explain how existing usage of cycleways and bridleways have been ascertained and identify any limitations in the use of Strava analysis and how these have been bridged in the assessment. Effort should be made to agree any requirement for baseline surveys with relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	<p>Usage of cycleways and bridleways is reported in ES Chapter 18 Traffic and Transport, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), which includes information provided through engagement with the relevant highway authorities. This information identified the cycleways and bridleways that are considered high use, and this information is presented in Table 18-5 and section 18.7 of ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Existing usage of cycleways and bridleways has therefore not been included in the health assessment of this chapter to avoid repetition.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			<p>Through this engagement, the Applicant has been able to draw on authoritative and locally informed insight to identify high-use routes, which provides a more reliable basis for the assessment than Strava data. While Strava can offer useful supplementary information, it is a sporting app and, when used in isolation, does not provide a sufficiently robust representation of all non-motorised users. For this reason, Strava data has not been relied upon as the primary evidence source.</p>
Chapter 17 Traffic and transport			
3.12.1	Paragraph 17.6.9 and Table 17-8	<p>Traffic impacts during operation including: Delay (driver) Delay (bus passenger) Accidents and safety Severance</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope these matters out on the basis that traffic flows on the local road network would not exceed the thresholds in the Institute of Environmental Assessment (1993) Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic (GEART). It is indicated that there would be circa 57 additional vehicles per day on the local road network. The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES on the basis set out in the Scoping Report. The ES should confirm the predicted daily traffic movements during operation for all vehicle types.</i></p>	<p>The predicted daily traffic movements during operation for all vehicle types are set out within section 12 of the Transport Assessment, included in ES Appendix 18.1 Transport Assessments, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.12.2	Paragraph 17.6.8 to 17.6.9 and Table 17-8	<p>Hazardous loads during construction and operation: <i>The Scoping Report states that this matter can be scoped out on the basis that there will be no hazardous loads required during construction and the number of hazardous loads required during operation of the Proposed Development is not considered to be significant according to GEART.</i> <i>The Inspectorate agrees that since no hazardous loads are required during construction, this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</i> <i>The Inspectorate does not agree that this matter can be scoped out for operation. The ES should include an estimate of the number and composition of any hazardous loads. The ES should include an assessment of any likely significant effects or demonstrate why these are not likely with agreement from relevant consultation bodies.</i> <i>Please note the Inspectorate’s comments at ID 3.12.5 of this Scoping Opinion regarding GEART.</i></p>	<p>The scope of the assessment has been amended to reflect these comments in the EIA Scoping Opinion. Hazardous loads during the construction and operation phases have been scoped in and are presented in section 18.8 of ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The methodology reflects ISEP (2023) Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement [5].</p>
3.12.3	Table 17-2 and Appendix 2	<p>Strava heat maps: <i>The Scoping Report states that Strava heat maps will be used as a data source to understand the usage of routes by non-motorised users. The ES should explain why this is a robust data source for establishing baseline conditions.</i> <i>Please refer to the Inspectorate’s comments at ID 3.11.14 of this Scoping Opinion. The Applicant’s attention is also drawn to the comments from Havant Borough Council in Appendix 2 of this Opinion.</i></p>	<p>Strava heat maps were potentially going to be used to provide some supporting data, however it is recognised that, as a sporting app, it would not provide a robust data source to understand the usage of routes by all non-motorised users. HCC were approached for potential secondary data but confirmed they did not have any relevant data available.</p> <p>Given pedestrian demand is not needed for the traffic and transport assessment when adopting the agreed methodology set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), and the Strava data would have distorted the assessment, the</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			exclusion of this data from the assessment is considered appropriate.
3.12.4	Section 17.5	<p>Baseline conditions: The Applicant’s attention is drawn to the comments of Hampshire County Council regarding the description of the existing road network and presence of national cycle network (NCN) route 22. The baseline description in the ES should provide an accurate representation of the baseline conditions.</p>	Baseline conditions reflect comments provided by HCC, including the reference to the presence of Route 22 of the NCN. See section 18.5 of the ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
3.12.5	Paragraph 17.2.4	<p>Guidance: <i>The Scoping Report refers to Institute of Environmental Assessment guidance titled Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic (1993).</i> <i>The Inspectorate notes that this guidance was replaced by new IEMA guidance titled Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement in July 2023.</i></p>	The ISEP 2023 Guidelines [5] were released after the EIA Scoping Report (ES Appendix 5.1 EIA Scoping Report, Volume I (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) was submitted to the SoS. The assessment methodology in section 18.5 of ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), reflects the latest guidelines.
3.12.6	Paragraph 17.3.6	<p>Shipping of materials: <i>The Applicant states that, although the delivery of materials is currently anticipated to be by road, there is a scenario where delivery via sea may be required. If deliveries by sea are proposed, the ES should provide details including frequency, anticipated routes and assess any related impacts where significant effects are likely to occur.</i></p>	No deliveries would be made by sea and therefore there is no potential for any significant effects to occur.
3.12.7	Paragraph 17.7.5	<p>Modelling methodology: <i>For the avoidance of doubt, the ES should contain a clear and full description of the methodology for any modelling used within the assessment. This should include the software and data sources used and any assumptions or limitations.</i></p>	This is presented in the ES Appendix 18.1 Transport Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.12.8	Paragraph 17.7.41	<p>Abnormal indivisible loads (AIL): <i>The ES should include a description of the expected number of AILs and the proposed routeing. Any mitigation measures required to facilitate the delivery of AILs should be detailed in the ES and any resultant likely significant effects assessed.</i></p>	<p>Potential AILs movements have been identified and detailed in the Framework CTMP (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7), which is submitted as part of the DCO application. ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), includes an assessment of these movements in the construction stage. No AIL movements are anticipated in the operation phase.</p>
Chapter 18 Water environment			
3.13.1	Paragraph 18.6.24	<p>Direct disturbance of surface and groundwaters during operation: <i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that activities associated with the operation of the Proposed Development would not result in direct disturbance of surface water or groundwater bodies and that any routine intrusive maintenance work would be small scale and localised.</i> <i>The Scoping Report does not consider potential events such as a burst or breakage to the pipeline and leakage during operation on surface water bodies. The ES should provide an assessment of these matters where there is potential for likely significant effects to occur or demonstrate the absence of a likely significant effect with agreement from relevant consultation bodies.</i> <i>The Inspectorate agrees that given the spatial extent and limited duration of likely future maintenance activities, significant effects are unlikely to occur to groundwaters and is content to scope this matter out of further assessment.</i></p>	<p>ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) considers impacts that are considered to be reasonably foreseeable as a consequence of the construction, routine operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The potential impacts of routine maintenance and pipeline leakage on surface and groundwaters are therefore considered in section 19.8 of ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Emergency scenarios are considered operationally exceptional. The potential impacts of emergency scenarios such as a pipe burst or breakage are therefore considered in ES Chapter 14 Major accidents and disasters, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.13.2	Paragraph 18.6.25	<p>Increased sediment supply during operation: <i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that routine or unplanned maintenance work which could result in increased sediment supply would be infrequent and limited to discrete areas of the Proposed Development. In addition, it is stated that best practice mitigation measures for preventing and limiting soil erosion and turbid runoff would be in place.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate agrees to scope this matter out of the ES based on information in the Scoping Report. The ES should include a description of the best practice mitigation measures proposed and confirm how these would be secured in the DCO.</i></p>	<p>As summarised in section 19.4 of ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), maintenance activities during the operational phase that require excavation are subject to good practice measures described in and secured by the OEMP (Document Reference 7.7, DCO volume 7).</p>
3.13.3	Paragraph 18.6.26	<p>Changes to groundwater flow during operation: <i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that changes to groundwater flows would be assessed as part of the construction phase assessments and that, once constructed, the underground infrastructure will not have any further likely significant effects on groundwater flows to those assessed during the construction phase.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate is content to scope this matter out of further assessment on the basis set out in the Scoping Report provided that the construction phase assessment considers the long-term impacts of the infrastructure installed on subsurface flow patterns and volumes including through areas of sensitive geological faulting and spring flow.</i></p>	<p>The assessment presented in section 19.8 of ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) considers the long-term effects of subsurface infrastructure on subsurface flow patterns and volumes as a result of construction.</p> <p>Maintenance activities during the operational phase that require excavation will be subject to good practice management measures described in and secured by the OEMP (Document Reference 7.7, DCO volume 7).</p>
3.13.4	Table 18-9	<p>Havant Thicket Reservoir and receiving watercourses water quality during construction: <i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that no water would be present in the reservoir during</i></p>	<p>No further action required. There will be no construction activities associated with the Proposed Development that could affect water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir during</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>construction resulting in no pathway for impact. Given the lack of impact pathway during construction, the Inspectorate agrees to scope this matter out of further assessment.</i></p>	<p>construction. Potential impacts on water quality in downstream water bodies such as Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Langstone Harbour will be controlled by good practice construction stage drainage management and pollution prevention and control measures secured in the DCO through the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7).</p>
3.13.5	Table 18-9	<p>Coastal water quality during construction: <i>The Applicant proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that there are no activities directly within transitional or coastal water bodies during construction.</i> <i>The Inspectorate agrees to scope this matter out on the basis set out in the Scoping Report. This matter should be revisited if the scope of construction activity changes.</i></p>	<p>As described in ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), the SuDS outfall from the WRP site would require construction within the tidal Hermitage Stream (which forms part of the Langstone Harbour transitional water body). An assessment of potential impacts on the transitional water body is therefore presented in section 19.8 of ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) and section 4 of ES Appendix 19.2 Water Environment Regulations compliance assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.13.6	Table 18-4	<p>Drainage strategy: <i>The Scoping Report states that a drainage strategy will be developed for the Proposed Development. The Applicant should provide a draft/outline version of the drainage strategy and demonstrate how this will be secured through the dDCO or other legal mechanism. Potential construction phase impacts should also be addressed in the drainage strategy.</i></p>	<p>Construction-stage drainage management measures are described in and secured by the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7). The Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) Strategy for above-ground infrastructure are shown in Annex A of ES Appendix 19.1 Flood Risk Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) and secured by a requirement</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3).
3.13.7	Paragraph 18.5.14, 18.5.37, 18.5.69 and 18.5.84	<p>Flood Zones: <i>The Scoping Report identifies Flood Zones across the study area however does not include sub-categories, such as an area of high probability (Flood Zone 3a) or functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). The ES should provide an accurate and consistent description of the baseline flood risk for each element of the Proposed Development and the description should clearly distinguish between Flood Zones, including Flood Zones 3a and 3b where relevant.</i></p>	ES Appendix 19.1 Flood Risk Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), provides a description of baseline flood risk in the study area, including Flood Zones 3a and 3b. A summary is provided in section 19.1 of ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
3.13.8	Paragraph 18.7.15 and Table 18-7	<p>Sensitivity of receptors: <i>The Scoping Report states that the assessment methodology for groundwater will adopt the methodology set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standard LA 113 Road drainage and water environment. Table 18-7 of the Scoping Report provides definitions of sensitivity for the purposes of water receptors and flood risk. Table 18-7 does not include a 'Very High' category of receptor sensitivity commonly used when applying an approach informed by the DMRB. Deviation from this approach has potential to undervalue or underestimate the significance of effect. Where the assessment deviates from established guidance, the Applicant should ensure that this is clearly stated and suitably justified in the ES. The Applicant should seek agreement with the relevant consultation bodies regarding the methodology used in the assessment and evidence this in the ES.</i></p>	<p>As set out in section 19.3 of ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), the Applicant has engaged with the EA, NE and the Lead Local Flood Authorities through the Biodiversity and Water Environment EIA Working Group. The approach to defining receptor value and sensitivity has been discussed, and a technical note providing more detail was issued to stakeholders for discussion. Comments were received and addressed in ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>The assessment methodology described in section 19.5 of ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), reflects the EIA Working Group discussions.</p>
3.13.9	Paragraph 18.8.6	<p>Three-dimensional modelling: <i>The Scoping report states that due to the complexities of the hydrogeological regime, it is considered that the Proposed</i></p>	The Applicant has consulted with the EA, which has agreed to the assessment approach. This is described in section 19.5 of ES Chapter 19 Water

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>Development cannot be sufficiently defined in a full scale three-dimensional model to accurately represent the processes occurring and how they may be affected by the Proposed Development. It is proposed to use analytical and two-dimensional conceptual models to inform the assessment.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate considers that efforts should be made to agree the modelling approach with relevant consultation bodies. Modelling should be sufficient to inform a robust assessment of likely significant effects in the ES.</i></p>	<p>environment, 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).</p>
3.13.10	18.7.13 and Appendix 2	<p>Nutrient levels:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report identifies a number of nature conservation sites which have been classified as failing condition due to elevated nutrient levels and for which nutrient neutrality is required to be demonstrated to enable development. The ES should take account of any solutions for nutrient neutrality of Diffuse Water Pollution Plans currently being developed or mitigated. The Applicant's attention is drawn to Natural England's comments (Appendix 2 of this Scoping Opinion).</i></p>	<p>The Applicant notes the potential issues regarding nutrient supply to protected areas within the Solent and River Itchen catchments, the requirement to demonstrate nutrient neutrality, and Natural England's comments on the EIA Scoping Report. A detailed assessment of the potential impact of the Proposed Development on nutrient loads in the Solent and Itchen catchments is presented in ES Appendix 19.7 Nutrient Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The Proposed Development will not affect the delivery of nutrient mitigation within either catchment.</p>
3.13.11	N/A	<p>Existing flood defences:</p> <p><i>The Applicant's attention is drawn to Havant Borough Council and East Hampshire District Council's comments about existing sea defences reaching the end of their serviceable life. The assessment of flood risk for the WRP should include consideration of any potential future change in risk from sea level rise including the implications arising from a change to existing defences.</i></p>	<p>ES Appendix 19.1 Flood Risk Assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), provides an assessment of flood risks to the Proposed Development including the WRP site. The Flood Risk Assessment includes consideration of any potential future change in flood risk from climate change, including the implications arising from a change to existing defences.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
Chapter 19 Cumulative effects assessment			
3.14.1	N/A	No matters have been proposed to be scoped out of the assessment	Approach has not changed.
3.14.2	19.3.10	<p>Cumulative effects assessment methodology: <i>The Scoping Report identifies the proposed search parameters for cumulative projects. In addition to the parameters listed, the following projects should also be considered (as relevant) in the ES:</i></p> <p><i>Planning permissions and DCOs that are older than 5 years if there is evidence that these could have been subject to a longer implementation period or are multi-phase projects where later construction phases could coincide with the Proposed Development.</i></p> <p><i>NSIPs and planning applications that are subject to adopted scoping opinions.</i></p> <p><i>Refused planning application that are subject to appeal procedures not yet determined.</i></p>	<p>The methodology for identifying projects is detailed in section 20.5, Table 20-9 of ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). All projects noted in the EIA Scoping Opinion (ES Appendix 5.2 EIA Scoping Opinion, Volume II (Document Reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) have been considered for inclusion in the cumulative effects assessment.</p>
3.14.3	19.3.16	<p>Assessment of other existing development and/ or approved development: <i>The Scoping Report states that an assessment of all shortlisted tier 1 and 2 projects will be provided where possible, and all shortlisted tier 3 projects where possible, although this may be qualitative and at a very high level. The Inspectorate considers that any likely significant cumulative effects arising from the Proposed Development and shortlisted tier 1, 2 and 3 projects should be provided in the ES. Any gaps and/ or uncertainty in the assessment should be explained.</i></p>	<p>All shortlisted projects (Tier 1, 2 or 3) have been considered in the cumulative effects assessment presented in ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.14.4	Section 19.6	<p>Assessment of in-combination effects: <i>The Scoping Report states that significant in-combination effects will be reported in the relevant aspect chapters of the ES. The Inspectorate agrees with this approach subject to the ES clearly setting out the methodology used for the assessment, the impact pathways considered and the significant effects arising from in-combination effects (as distinguished from other aspect effects) together with any additional mitigation required to address them.</i></p>	<p>Section 20.5 of ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), sets out the assessment methodology used for cumulative and in-combination effects. Where in-combination effects for topics are inherently assessed within topic assessments (e.g. the assessment of amenity effects in ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), considers the interaction of air quality, noise, landscape and visual, and traffic and transport on individual receptors), these are reported within the assessment section of the individual topic chapters of the ES for effects during construction, operation and decommissioning.</p> <p>In-combination effects that may be experienced by receptors/receptor groups shared by more than one topic that have not been inherently assessed within the topic chapters are presented in section 20.7 of ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>The assessment concludes there are no in-combination likely significant effects, and no additional mitigation arising from the in-combination assessment is identified above the measures outlined in the relevant ES Chapters 6-19, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.14.5	N/A	<p>Cut-off date for assessment: <i>The ES should state any cut-off date that has been used in respect of identifying cumulative projects for the assessment and explain why this date has been selected, and any steps proposed to update the assessment during any examination.</i></p>	<p>The cut-off date used for the ES cumulative effects assessment has been confirmed in section 20.6 of ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Section 20.6 also outlines the steps proposed to update the assessment during examination.</p>
3.14.6	N/A	<p>Phasing: <i>The Scoping Report (eg paragraph 1.5.4) states that the Proposed Development is likely to be delivered in two phases, with an initial phase of approximately 20 Ml/d increasing through the second phase to 60 Ml/d of recycled water.</i> <i>The ES should include an assessment of any likely significant cumulative and in-combination effects that would arise from a phased approach, using the worst case phasing scenario that would be allowed under the DCO.</i></p>	<p>Single phased delivery is now proposed which has been assessed in the ES.</p>
3.14.7	N/A	<p>Location plan: <i>The ES should include figure(s) showing the location of longlisted and shortlisted projects for the assessment of cumulative effects.</i></p>	<p>The shortlisted projects are shown on ES Figure 20.1 Projects considered as part of the cumulative effects assessment (shortlist), Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6). As set out in the Local Authority Draft Statements of Common Ground (Document reference 5.8, Volume 5), it was agreed with the Joint Officers Group that this figure would not show the projects on the longlist that are not shortlisted, due to the large number of projects.</p>
3.14.8	N/A	<p>Related/ consequential development: <i>The ES should assess any likely significant cumulative effects arising from the Proposed Development and other</i></p>	<p>ES Ch 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) includes an assessment of related and</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>development which is related or consequential to it, but which is proposed to be consented or delivered separately. This includes development which may be subject to permitted development rights. The ES should clearly distinguish between Proposed Development for which development consent is sought and any other development.</i></p> <p><i>Please refer to the Inspectorate’s comments at ID 2.1.6 of this Scoping Opinion about expected works at existing infrastructure sites required to facilitate the Proposed Development.</i></p>	<p>consequential projects that arise due to the Proposed Development. The projects, including utility connections, are set out in ES Appendix 20.1 List of ‘other developments’ – longlist and shortlist, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). Where these related and consequential projects have the potential to give rise to a significant cumulative effect, they are assessed and presented in ES Appendix 20.2 Cumulative Effects assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).</p>
Chapter 20 Topics scoped out			
3.15.1	Section 20.2 and Volume II Appendix 20-1, paragraph 1.6.3	<p>Major accidents and disasters – Control of Major Accidents and Hazards (COMAH) sites:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report seeks to scope this matter out on the basis that no COMAH sites have been identified within 4.8km of the Proposed Development (using the Health and Safety Executive’s (HSE) mapping) and that the Proposed Development would not be a COMAH site or a Hazardous Substances Consent (HSC) site. Based on the reasoning and evidence presented in the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate is content that risks to or from the Proposed Development from this matter is not likely to result in significant effects and can be scoped out of the assessment.</i></p>	<p>The Proposed Development itself will not be a COMAH site and no COMAH sites have been identified within 4.8km of the Proposed Development. Additional detail has been added to section 14.4 of ES Chapter 14 Major accidents and disasters, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.15.2	Section 20.2 and Volume II Appendix 20-1,	<p>Major accidents and disasters during decommissioning:</p> <p><i>Please refer to the Inspectorate’s comments at ID 2.2.1 of this Scoping Opinion. For matters that the Inspectorate has not agreed to scope out in respect of risk of major accidents</i></p>	<p>Effects from decommissioning of the Proposed Development are considered to be no greater than those identified during the construction phase and are therefore assessed to be of the same</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
	paragraph 1.7.7	<i>and disasters, the ES should also include an assessment of the decommissioning phase where significant effects are likely to occur.</i>	significance as those assessed for construction. Refer to Table 14.8 of ES Chapter 14 Major accidents and disasters, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), for the construction risk identification and assessment. Refer to section 3.7 of ES Chapter 3 Description of Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) for further information on decommissioning.
3.15.3	Section 20.2 and Volume II Appendix 20-1, Section 1.3 and paragraph 1.8.1	<p>Major accidents and disasters – activities within the scope of other health and safety legislation:</p> <p><i>The Inspectorate is content that there is other legislation through which potential health and safety impacts arising from health and safety at work and construction design and management would be controlled. The ES should identify any requirements of other regulatory regimes including relevant legislation and any permits or licences, together with any progress made towards securing these where they may impact on the effectiveness or delivery of avoidance or mitigation measures.</i></p>	<p>Relevant health and safety regulatory regimes are included in the ES, along with requirement.</p> <p>Details on the progress to securing the permits and licenses required for the construction and operation of the Proposed Development are provided in the Other Consents and Licences Position Statement (Document reference 5.4, DCO Volume 5). With regard to effectiveness of mitigation, this will be monitored where appropriate. Requirements for monitoring are set out in ES topic chapters 6 to 19, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) providing details such as the identification of who will be responsible for the monitoring, how it will be reported, how the need for remedial action will be identified, and how this is secured and implemented through the DCO and/or other appropriate control mechanisms. This is reflected in the Commitments Register, ES Appendix 5.5 Commitments Register, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).</p>

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.15.4	Section 20.2 and Volume II Appendix 20-1, Annex A	<p>Major accidents and disasters during construction and operation – widespread electricity failure, system failures and attacks:</p> <p><i>Based on the reasoning and evidence presented in the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate is content that risks to or from the Proposed Development from these matters during construction and operation are not likely to result in significant effects provided that they are adequately managed through the mitigation measures identified. The Inspectorate’s comments at ID 2.2.10 of this Scoping Opinion regarding submission of outline or draft management plans with the DCO application are of relevance to these matters. On that basis, these matters can be scoped out of the assessment.</i></p>	<p>The DCO is accompanied by ES Appendix 5.5 Commitments Register, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6), that lists all proposed mitigation measures and confirms how they will be secured. These are primarily secured through design documents and environmental management plans. Further details are presented in the response to ID 2.2.10.</p> <p>Mitigation for the risk of malicious attacks is set out and secured in the OEMP (Document reference 7.7, DCO Volume 7).</p>
3.15.5	Section 20.2 and Volume II Appendix 20-1, Annex A,	<p>Major accidents and disasters during construction and operation – fire:</p> <p><i>The Applicant’s attention is drawn to Havant Borough Council and East Hampshire District Council’s comments (Appendix 2) in respect of fire risks arising from development at a former landfill site, which could result in major accidents and disasters. The Inspectorate does not have sufficient information to exclude likely significant effects from such a risk. The ES should include an assessment of this matter or demonstrate why significant effects are not likely to occur with agreement from relevant consultation bodies. Any mitigation required should be explained within the ES. The Inspectorate’s comments at ID 2.2.10 of this Scoping Opinion regarding submission of outline or draft management plans with the DCO application are of relevance to these matters.</i></p>	<p>An assessment of the risk and mitigation required for a fire event is presented in section 14.8 of ES Chapter 14 Major accident and disasters, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>The DCO is accompanied by ES Appendix 5.5 Commitments Register, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) that lists all proposed mitigation measures and confirms how they will be secured. These are primarily design documents and environmental management plans. Further details are presented in the response to ID 2.2.10.</p>

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
3.15.6	Section 20.2 and Volume II Appendix 20-1, Annex A	<p>Major accidents and disasters during construction and operation – explosion from unexploded ordnance (UXO) and nuclear explosion:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report explains that a UXO risk check has been undertaken, which “identifies that the land area is classed as low risk for UXO with the marine area classed as moderate risk.” It is stated that a risk check would be undertaken to cover the entire Proposed Development and included within future stages of the EIA. It is unclear whether this means prior to DCO application submission or at a later stage. A management plan with mitigation measures is also proposed. No information is provided about what the risk check comprises or the geographic extent of coverage. The Proposed Development is also located within a 5km buffer of a nuclear submarine port but no information is provided about any potential impact pathways or mitigation that might be required.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate does not consider that sufficient evidence has been provided to scope this matter out of the assessment. The ES should include baseline information about UXO risk for the study area, which is sufficient to identify any likely significant effects arising from construction of the Proposed Development and the mitigation required to address such effects. The ES should identify potential impact pathways to and from the nuclear site and any mitigation required to address such effects based on relevant guidance from the relevant local authority and/ or Office of Nuclear Regulation. The ES should describe how any mitigation required would be secured. The ES should include an assessment unless there is evidence of an absence of likely</i></p>	<p>A UXO risk check has been undertaken and presented in ES Appendix 14.2, UXO risk assessment report, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). The risk is assessed and mitigation set out in ES Chapter 14 Major accidents and disasters, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>As set out in ES Chapter 14 Major accidents and disasters, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), engagement has been undertaken with the Ministry of Defence (MoD) to confirm that neither the Southampton Docks nuclear submarine port nor the Proposed Development would be likely to impact each other in a manner exceeding that of other land uses in the vicinity. The distance between them is illustrated in ES Figure 14.1 Southampton Docks nuclear submarine port location in relation to the Proposed Development, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6). This approach was confirmed with Local Planning Authorities in the Resilience Working Group meeting on the 2 December 2024. As such, it has been confirmed that there is an absence of likely significant effects and the risk has been scoped out of the assessment.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<i>significant effects and agreement with relevant consultation bodies.</i>	
3.15.7	Section 20.2 and Volume II Appendix 20-1, Annex A	<p>Major accidents and disasters during construction and operation – bird strike:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report identifies a risk arising from the introduction of lagoons as part of the Proposed Development, which could result in an increase in bird numbers flying into the flight path of Southampton Airport. It seeks to scope this matter out on the basis that a risk assessment would be completed to identify the potential for significant effects and measures recommended to reduce risk. The Inspectorate does not consider that sufficient evidence has been provided to scope this matter out of the assessment in the absence of the bird strike risk assessment. This matter should be assessed in the ES where the risk assessment concludes that there are potential likely significant effects. The risk assessment should be appended to the ES and the ES should describe how any mitigation would be secured.</i></p>	<p>A risk assessment report has been shared with Southampton Airport. Engagement has been undertaken with Southampton Airport to agree appropriate mitigation, summarised in section 14.4 of ES Chapter 14 Major accidents and disasters, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), for the risk of bird strike during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. This mitigation is secured through the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7).</p>
3.15.8	Section 20.2 and Volume II Appendix 20-1, Annex A	<p>Major accidents and disasters during operation – industrial accidents and pollution, including flooding from high pressure water pipe leak:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report seeks to scope out impacts from industrial accidents, including those arising from the transport and storage of hazardous chemicals and rupture of high pressure pipelines.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate does not have sufficient information to exclude the possibility of likely significant effects from a risk of major accidents and disasters arising from industrial accidents and pollution. The ES should include an</i></p>	<p>The assessment of and mitigation required for industrial accidents, pollution and flooding events from a high pressure water pipe is presented in section 14.4 of ES Chapter 14 Major accidents and disasters, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>The DCO is accompanied by ES Appendix 5.5 Commitments Register, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) that lists all proposed mitigation measures and confirms how they will be secured. These are primarily design</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>assessment of these matters, which should be informed by the conclusions of the further risk assessments and studies referenced in Annex A, Appendix 20-1 of Volume II of the Scoping Report. Any mitigation required should be explained within the ES. The Inspectorate’s comments at ID 2.2.10 of this Scoping Opinion regarding submission of outline or draft management plans with the DCO application are of relevance to these matters. Where reference is made to Southern Water documents in respect of measures, the documents or relevant extracts of them should be appended to the ES and it should be explained how these relate to other recognised industry guidance or standards.</i></p>	<p>documents and environmental management plans. Further details are presented in the response to ID 2.2.10.</p>
3.15.9	Section 20.2 and Volume II Appendix 20-1, Annex A	<p>Major accidents and disasters during construction and operation – matters addressed within other ES aspect chapters:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out assessment of the following risk events on the basis that they will not lead to a major accident and/ or disaster, and would be assessed in other ES aspect chapters:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>flooding (during construction);</i> <i>severe weather (during construction and operation);</i> <i>air quality (dust during construction);</i> <i>transport accidents (during construction and operation, aside from hazardous loads, which are considered at ID 13.15.8 in terms of industrial accidents); and</i> <i>pollution incidents (during construction).</i> <p><i>In several instances, the Scoping Report states that risks associated with these events would be mitigated by</i></p>	<p>The potential for an interaction between Havant Thicket Reservoir and the Proposed Development is examined in section 19.8 of ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). No other potential major accidents or disasters arising from the interaction of the Proposed Development with Havant Thicket Reservoir are identified in ES Chapter 14 Major accidents and disasters, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p> <p>The DCO is accompanied by ES Appendix 5.5 Commitments Register, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) that lists all proposed mitigation measures and confirms how they are secured. These are primarily design documents and environmental management plans. Further details are presented in the response to ID 2.2.10.</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>completion of further risk assessment together with implementation of management plans and control measures. The Inspectorate is content with the proposed approach subject to our comments in ID 2.2.10 of this Scoping Opinion regarding submission of outline or draft management plans as part of the DCO application.</i></p> <p><i>Regarding flooding, the ES should provide further detail of how the risk identification exercise in Annex A of Appendix 20-1, Volume II of the Scoping Report has considered the potential for major accidents or disasters arising from interaction of the Proposed Development with Havant Thicket Reservoir, including any additional considerations under the Reservoirs Act 1975 (as identified in paragraph 3.10.2 of the NPS for Water Resources Infrastructure).</i></p>	<p>As set out in the Planning Policy Statement (Document reference 5.5, DCO Volume 5), paragraphs 3.10.2 and 3.10.3 relate to new reservoirs covered by the National Policy Statement for Water Resources Infrastructure and are not directly relevant to this application because the Applicant is not seeking to construct or operate a new reservoir under the scope of this DCO application.</p>
3.15.10	Section 20.2 and Volume II Appendix 20-1, Annex A	<p>Major accidents and disasters during operation – air quality and system failures:</p> <p><i>Based on the reasoning and evidence presented in the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate is content that risks to or from the Proposed Development from these matters are not likely to result in significant effects. These matters can be scoped out of the assessment.</i></p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
3.15.11	Section 20.3	<p>Shipping and navigation:</p> <p><i>Based on the information presented in the Scoping Report, ie that there are no direct works in the marine aquatic environment, the Inspectorate agrees that there are no impact pathways to shipping and navigation in the marine aquatic environment during operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. These matters can be scoped out of the ES.</i></p>	<p>This matter has been revisited, since works to construct the WRP site SuDS outfall are now proposed in the marine environment, in the tidal reach of Hermitage Stream. The outcome is presented in section 5.2 of the ES Chapter 5 EIA approach and methodology, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Effects due to the SuDS outfall on the marine aquatic environment are presented in ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity,</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>The Inspectorate notes potential for materials to be delivered by marine vessel during construction and, if used, this would be via existing port procedures. Chapter 15 of the Scoping Report indicates that some materials may be sourced from global markets; a predicted volume is not provided but Table 15-15 states that the quantities required are negligible in relation to supply chain capacity.</i></p> <p><i>On this basis, the Inspectorate considers that it is unlikely there would be a significant effect on shipping and navigation during construction. However, if deliveries are proposed via ports, the ES should describe the expected type and volume of materials, together with evidence that these can be handled via existing port procedures.</i></p> <p><i>If there are changes to the Proposed Development which result in works being proposed within the marine aquatic environment, this matter should be revisited. The ES should include an assessment of any likely significant effects to shipping and navigation arising from such works or otherwise explain why significant effects would not occur, together with evidence of agreement to the approach from relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	<p>Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). The impacts from the SuDS outfall and the approach to assessment were discussed with stakeholders at the Biodiversity and Water Environment EIA Working Group held on 11 September 2025. As set out in the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) Draft Statement of Common Ground (Document reference 5.8, Volume 5), the MMO are in agreement with the scoping out of the shipping and navigation assessment from the EIA.</p> <p>There would not be any deliveries proposed via ports.</p>
3.15.12	Section 20.4	<p>Coastal and marine processes:</p> <p><i>Based on the information presented in the Scoping Report, which states that there are no works proposed with a direct connection to the marine aquatic environment and that effects from changes to discharge volumes and concentrations from the existing Eastney LSO would be considered as part of the marine biodiversity and water environment assessments (as described at Tables 3.4 and 3.13 of this Scoping Opinion) the Inspectorate agrees that assessment of effects to coastal and</i></p>	<p>This matter has been revisited, since works to construct the WRP site SuDS outfall are now proposed in the marine environment, in the tidal reach of Hermitage Stream. The impacts from the SuDS outfall and the approach to assessment were discussed with stakeholders at the Biodiversity and Water Environment EIA Working Group held on 11 September 2025. A description of how the SuDs outfall would be constructed is presented in section 5.2 of the ES Chapter 5 EIA</p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
		<p><i>marine processes can be scoped out of the ES as a separate matter.</i></p> <p><i>If there are changes to the Proposed Development which result in works being proposed within the marine aquatic environment, this matter should be revisited. The ES should include an assessment of any likely significant effects to coastal and marine processes arising from such works or otherwise explain why significant effects would not occur, together with evidence of agreement to the approach from relevant consultation bodies.</i></p>	<p>approach and methodology, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Effects on the marine biodiversity and the water environment are presented in ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity and ES Chapter 19 Water environment, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), respectively, and these two chapters conclude that there are no likely significant effects associated with the construction, operation or decommissioning of the SuDS outfall at the WRP site.</p>
3.15.13	Section 20.5	<p>Other marine users:</p> <p><i>The Inspectorate’s comments at ID 3.15.2 of this Scoping Opinion also apply to other marine users.</i></p>	<p>ES Chapter 5 EIA approach and methodology, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), notes that “<i>The Applicant is not seeking consent for decommissioning... While the Applicant is not seeking consent for decommissioning, reasonably foreseeable effects from decommissioning are assessed within the topic chapters in accordance with the EIA Scoping Opinion (Scoping Opinion ID 2.2.1). The assessment of decommissioning effects is concise and proportionate, undertaken on a qualitative basis, based on high-level assumptions and existing knowledge, techniques and equipment. For the majority of topics this means that decommissioning effects are considered to be no greater than during construction of the Proposed Development. This is due to the likely nature and scale of decommissioning activities being similar to or less than construction activities. The assessment of decommissioning effects assumes</i></p>

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project
 Environmental Statement – Appendix 5.3 Response to EIA Scoping Opinion

ID in EIA Scoping Opinion	EIA Scoping Report reference	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	Response to EIA Scoping Opinion
			<p><i>that works would follow good industry practice and would comply with all relevant statutory requirements applicable at the time....”</i></p> <p>Decommissioning effects have been considered and assessed qualitatively for the marine biodiversity receptors and are presented in ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).</p>
3.15.14	Section 20.6	<p>Heat and radiation:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report states that as the Proposed Development is a water transfer and water recycling project, it would not generate any emissions of heat and/ or radiation that could result in significant effects. It is therefore proposed to scope these matters out of the ES. The Inspectorate has considered the nature and characteristics of the Proposed Development and agrees that heat and radiation can be scoped out of the ES.</i></p>	No further action required.
Chapter 21 Structure and content of the Environmental Statement			
2.2.14	Paragraph 21.3.2	<p>ES technical appendices:</p> <p><i>The Scoping Report includes a (non-exhaustive) list of documents that will be used to inform the ES, either as technical appendices or standalone reports. The Inspectorate considers that documents forming part of the assessment in the ES should be incorporated as technical appendices so that the ES presents a comprehensive report of the EIA.</i></p>	All technical appendices are presented in ES Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

References

- [1] UK Parliament, *The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017*, 2023.
- [2] Environment Agency, “Piling and Penetrative Ground Improvement Methods on Land Affected by Contamination: Guidance on Pollution Prevention,” May 2001. [Online]. Available: <https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20140329082415/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/scho0501bitt-e-e.pdf..> [Accessed May 2025].
- [3] Natural England, “Natural England’s approach to advising competent authorities on the assessment of road traffic emissions under the Habitats Regulations (NEA001),” 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4720542048845824>.
- [4] UK Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, “Air Pollution Information System,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.apis.ac.uk/>. [Accessed August 2025].
- [5] Institute of Sustainability and Environmental Professionals, “Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement,” July 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.iema.net/media/5mrmquib/iema-report-environmental-assessment-of-traffic-and-movement-rev07-july-2023.pdf>.



from
Southern
Water. 

The Southern Water logo graphic consists of three white, stylized wavy lines that resemble water waves, positioned to the right of the word "Water".