Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project

The Applicant's responses to submissions at Procedural Deadline A

PLANNING INSPECTORATE SCHEME NUMBER: WA010002

APPLICATION DOCUMENT REFERENCE: 8.8

23 November 2026

Version 0

from Southern Water

Document Control		
Title	The Applicant's responses to submissions at Procedural Deadline A	
Version History		
Version	**Date**	**Status/Reason for Issue**
Version 0	23 November 2026	Deadline 1

Contents

1 Introduction 1
1.1 Purpose of this document 1
1.2 Approach and structure 1
2 The Applicant's responses to submissions at Procedural Deadline A 9

Tables

Table 1-1 The Applicant's approach to responding to submissions 2
Table 2-1 The Applicant's response to PDA-010 from Benjamin Cross and Jennifer Cross 9
Table 2-2 The Applicant's response to PDA-011 and PDA-019 to PDA-022 from David Lock Associates Ltd on behalf of Buckland Development Limited, Registered Proprietors of Land at Roche Court, Registered Proprietors of Southwick Estate, Southwick Estate and Welborne Land Ltd, and Welborne Lane Limited 10
Table 2-3 The Applicant's response to PDA-014 from Kanara Fishery Ltd 10
Table 2-3 The Applicant's response to PDA-016 from Kim Fitzpatrick 11
Table 2-5 The Applicant's response to PDA-018 from Lisa Nops 12
Table 2-6 The Applicant's response to PDA-025 from Viola Langley 13
Table 2-7 The Applicant's response to PDA-026 to PDA-037 from Water Matters Community 14
Table 2-8 The Applicant's response to PDA-038 from Drinking Water Inspectorate 22
Table 2-9 The Applicant's response to AS-035 from John Lane 23
Table 2-10 The Applicant's response to AS-036 from Kate and Matthew Blyth 23

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

1.1.1 The purpose of this document is to provide Southern Water Services Limited's (hereafter referred to as 'the Applicant') responses to submissions made by Interested Parties (IPs) at Procedural Deadline A for the Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project (hereafter referred to as 'the Project').

1.1.2 34 submissions were made by IPs at Procedural Deadline A on 2 November 2026. At the discretion of the Examining Authority (ExA), two additional submissions were accepted following the deadline.

1.1.3 The examination timetable, at Deadline 1, asks for comments on further information or submissions accepted by the ExA. The Applicant has therefore reviewed the Procedural Deadline A submissions and, where appropriate, has responded to them in this document. This includes submissions categorised as Written Representations (WRs) that were made at Procedural Deadline A and were available for the Applicant to respond to at Deadline 1.

1.1.4 In providing responses on further information or submissions accepted by the ExA, including WRs, the Applicant intends to assist the examination of matters raised at Procedural Deadline A, and notes that further WRs will be submitted by IPs at Deadline 1.

1.2 Approach and structure

1.2.1 The Applicant has reviewed the Procedural Deadline A submissions to establish the following.

- Which submissions raise matters requiring a response from the Applicant in this document.
- Which submissions raise matters that have already been addressed in the Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations or other examination submissions.
- Which submissions relate to requests for an Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI) and are addressed through the Applicant's separate submission on the proposed ASI itinerary, and
- Which submissions relate to the examination timetable or other procedural matters and do not require a substantive response from the Applicant.

1.2.2 Where a submission raises a matter requiring a response, the Applicant's response is provided in Chapter 2 of this document.

1.2.3 Table 1-1 identifies each submission made at, or accepted following, Procedural Deadline A. It confirms whether the Applicant has provided a response in this document and, where it has not, explains where the relevant response or information can be found.

Table 1-1 The Applicant's approach to responding to submissions

Examination library reference	Interested Party	Responded to in this document? (Yes/no)	Reason
PDA-005	Portsmouth City Council	No	This submission concerns the examination timetable.
PDA-006	Portsmouth City Council	No	The response to the IP's Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI) request is provided in The Applicant's draft itinerary for an ASI (Document reference 8.10, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-007	Portsmouth Water Limited	No	This submission concerns the examination procedure. The response to the IP's ASI request is provided in The Applicant's draft itinerary for an ASI (Document reference 8.10, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-008	Alexander McLeod on behalf of Suella Braverman	No	For the Applicant's response to the matters raised, please refer to responses RR-ALT-01, RR-ALT-02, RR-WQH-04, RR-WRPR-09 and RR-WRPR-10 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-009	Andrew Richard Wallace Newbery	No	This submission concerns the examination procedure.
PDA-010	Benjamin Cross and Jennifer Cross	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-1 for the Applicant's response to this submission. The Applicant has also considered this submission in The Applicant's draft itinerary for an ASI

Examination library reference	Interested Party	Responded to in this document? (Yes/no)	Reason
			(Document reference 8.10, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-011	David Lock Associates Ltd on behalf of Buckland Development Limited	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-2 for the Applicant's response to this submission. The response to the IP's ASI request is provided in The Applicant's draft itinerary for an ASI (Document reference 8.10, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-012	Havant Climate Alliance	No	For the Applicant's response to the matters raised, please refer to responses to RR reference RR-128 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0). The IP has endorsed submissions from the Water Matters Community [RR-354, PDA-026 to PDA-037], which the Applicant has responded to in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) and in this document.
PDA-013	Johnathan Sweeney, Justin Coles and Mark Hayward	No	The response to the IP's ASI request is provided in The Applicant's draft itinerary for an ASI (Document reference 8.10, DCO Volume 8, Version 0). The Applicant has responded to matters raised by the IP in its response to RR-061, RR-131 and RR-332 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from persons with an interest in land

Examination library reference	Interested Party	Responded to in this document? (Yes/no)	Reason
			(Document reference 8.6, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-014	Kanara Fishery Ltd	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-3 for the Applicant's response to this submission. The response to the IP's ASI request is provided in The Applicant's draft itinerary for an ASI (Document reference 8.10, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-015	Keith Gordon Meadmore	No	The IP has endorsed submissions from the Water Matters Community [RR-354, PDA-026 to PDA-037], which the Applicant has responded to in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) and in this document.
PDA-016	Kim Fitzpatrick	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-4 for the Applicant's response to this submission.
PDA-017	Laura Cooper	No	The Applicant has responded to matters raised by the IP in its response to RR-186 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from persons with an interest in land (Document reference 8.6, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-018	Lisa Nops	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-5 for the Applicant's response to this submission.
PDA-019	David Lock Associates	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-2 for the Applicant's response to this

Examination library reference	Interested Party	Responded to in this document? (Yes/no)	Reason
	Ltd on behalf of Registered Proprietors of Land at Roche Court		submission. The response to the IP's ASI request is provided in The Applicant's draft itinerary for an ASI (Document reference 8.10, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-020	David Lock Associates Ltd on behalf of Registered Proprietors of Southwick Estate	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-2 for the Applicant's response to this submission. The response to the IP's ASI request is provided in The Applicant's draft itinerary for an ASI (Document reference 8.10, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-021	David Lock Associates Ltd on behalf of Southwick Estate and Welborne Land Ltd	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-2 for the Applicant's response to this submission. The response to the IP's ASI request is provided in The Applicant's draft itinerary for an ASI (Document reference 8.10, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-022	David Lock Associates Ltd on behalf of Welborne Land Limited	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-2 for the Applicant's response to this submission. The response to the IP's ASI request is provided in The Applicant's draft itinerary for an ASI (Document reference 8.10, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-023	Stephen Potts	No	The response to the IP's ASI request is provided in The Applicant's draft itinerary for an ASI (Document reference 8.10, DCO Volume 8, Version 0). The Applicant has responded to matters raised by the IP in its response to RR-315 and RR-316 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from persons with an interest in land

Examination library reference	Interested Party	Responded to in this document? (Yes/no)	Reason
			(Document reference 8.6, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-024	Terry Brennan	No	The response to the IP's ASI request is provided in The Applicant's draft itinerary for an ASI (Document reference 8.10, DCO Volume 8, Version 0). The Applicant has responded to matters raised by the IP in its response to RR-336 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from persons with an interest in land (Document reference 8.6, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-025	Viola Langley	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-6 for the Applicant's response to this submission.
PDA-026	Water Matters Community	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-7 for the Applicant's response to this submission. The response to the IP's ASI request is provided in The Applicant's draft itinerary for an ASI (Document reference 8.10, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-027	Water Matters Community	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-7 for the Applicant's response to this submission.
PDA-028	Water Matters Community	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-7 for the Applicant's response to this submission.
PDA-029	Water Matters Community	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-7 for the Applicant's response to this submission.

Examination library reference	Interested Party	Responded to in this document? (Yes/no)	Reason
PDA-030	Water Matters Community	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-7 for the Applicant's response to this submission.
PDA-031	Water Matters Community	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-7 for the Applicant's response to this submission.
PDA-032	Water Matters Community	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-7 for the Applicant's response to this submission.
PDA-033	Water Matters Community	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-7 for the Applicant's response to this submission.
PDA-034	Water Matters Community	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-7 for the Applicant's response to this submission.
PDA-035	Water Matters Community	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-7 for the Applicant's response to this submission.
PDA-036	Water Matters Community	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-7 for the Applicant's response to this submission.
PDA-037	Water Matters Community	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-7 for the Applicant's response to this submission.
PDA-038	Drinking Water Inspectorate	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-8 for the Applicant's response to this submission.
AS-035	John Lane	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-9 for the Applicant's response to this submission.

Examination library reference	Interested Party	Responded to in this document? (Yes/no)	Reason
AS-036	Kate and Matthew Blyth	Yes	Please refer to Table 2-10 for the Applicant's response to this submission. The response to the IP's ASI request is provided in The Applicant's draft itinerary for an ASI (Document reference 8.10, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).

2 The Applicant’s responses to submissions at Procedural Deadline A

2.1.1 The following tables set out the Applicant’s response to submissions made at Procedural Deadline A. For each submission where the Applicant has provided a response, the table lists the Examination Library reference and provides a summary of the new or additional issues raised.

Table 2-1 The Applicant’s response to PDA-010 from Benjamin Cross and Jennifer Cross

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant’s response
PDA-010	Landowner engagement	Concerns that the Project would intrude on the residential property by routing through a garden. The EIA Scoping Report scopes out impact on residential property which is not the case in this location.	The Applicant acknowledges the EIA Scoping Report [APP-104] scopes out the assessment of temporary loss of gardens as an individual receptor from the assessment set out in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture [APP-091]. As stated in ES Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture [APP-091] residential gardens are considered and assessed within the definition of residential property. As set out in the respondent’s submission AS-027, this land is currently used as a paddock for the grazing of horses. The Order Limits are screened from the residential property by a hedgerow boundary and the Applicant considers this land as agricultural land which is assessed in Chapter 12 Land use and agriculture [APP-091]. It is the Applicant’s view that this land does not comprise a residential garden. The Applicant acknowledges that, during the construction of the Project, the respondent will not be able to use land occupied by the working width but confirms that the Contractor will seek to mitigate the impact of the temporary construction works as far as reasonably practicable. The Applicant confirms that the details of these arrangements will be provided following the detailed design of the Project. The respondent may be entitled to claim compensation for disturbance arising out of the temporary use of the land for construction of the Project, in line with the compensation code. The Applicant welcomes further engagement with the respondent in order to explore potential mitigations on the overall temporary impact on the land. The Applicant confirms that none of the restrictions set out in Schedule 5 to the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-023] will prohibit the respondent from continuing to use the land for the existing equestrian use once construction is complete. Land will be restored to its original condition following the installation of the pipeline in accordance with Outline Soil Resource Management Plan (SRMP) which forms Appendix B of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan – 1 of 3 documents (CEMP) (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1), and which will be developed further into a detailed SRMP prior to commencement of construction.

Table 2-2 The Applicant's response to PDA-011 and PDA-019 to PDA-022 from David Lock Associates Ltd on behalf of Buckland Development Limited, Registered Proprietors of Land at Roche Court, Registered Proprietors of Southwick Estate, Southwick Estate and Welborne Land Ltd, and Welborne Lane Limited

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
PDA-011 and PDA-019 to PDA-022	Location of AGP	Suggestions of ASI locations and a proposed alternative location for Intermediate Pumping Station F (IPS-F) which would have a decreased impact on local receptors, landscape and Welborne Garden Village.	The Applicant has noted the proposed ASI locations, and the suggested alternative location for IPS-F (Work No. 5A). The location for IPS-F has been selected due to the low environmental impact and the ability to integrate the site into the existing and future landscape. The Scheme Development Report [APP-073, APP-074 and APP-075] explains the process that was undertaken to select the location of IPS-F. IPS-F has been sited to avoid Welborne Garden Village land identified for allotments/recreation and avoid overhead power lines. It was identified to benefit from existing access and natural screening from an adjacent copse of trees and was considered to be less visually prominent in this location. The Design Principles for IPS-F (see the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5, Version 1)) include proposals for woodland and scrub planting and hedgerow enhancement. These proposals will help to provide further visual screening for future residents of Welborne Garden Village, integrate IPS-F within the landscape and improve habitat connectivity. The Applicant prepared a technical note which was issued to the respondent's representatives on 15 May 2026, which detailed the scheme development process undertaken for IPS-F and considered suggested alternatives, including the site suggested in this submission. The alternative IPS-F location is not considered to be a suitable location as it is directly adjacent to ancient woodland at Carpenters Copse. Additionally, the Applicant understands that the Welborne Garden Village development will be installing various utilities within this land. Locating IPS-F alongside these utilities and the Pipeline would present deliverability challenges, which would be exacerbated due to the presence of ancient woodland to the east and the need to maintain an appropriate buffer. The Applicant most recently met with the respondent on the 10 November 2026 to discuss their feedback further.

Table 2-3 The Applicant's response to PDA-014 from Kanara Fishery Ltd

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
PDA-014-001	Location of the proposed pipeline route	The Applicant's previous consultation documentation set out that the crossing of the River Itchen should be located within clay and outside the chalk, to avoid impacting aquifers and threatening water quality.	As set out in Section 5.11 of the Scheme Development Report - 1 of 3 documents [APP-073], the crossing of the River Itchen was selected as it is not located within chalk geology. At the proposed crossing point the cohesive (clay rich) London Clay is approximately 8m thick with a further 11m of more granular London Clay and 12m of Lambeth Group sediments before the Chalk is encountered. The crossing is proposed to be located within the cohesive London Clay. The potential for impacts to the underlying chalk aquifer is not considered likely

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
			given this thickness of overlying sediments. The ES does not report any significant effects on the River Itchen.
PDA-014-002	Location of the proposed pipeline route	Moving the crossing of the River Itchen 100m downstream would significantly reduce the risk of damage to the chalk bed as in this location the clay stratus is thicker, the river is shallower and the river bed is firmer. This would provide long-term environmental safety for the chalk stream.	The Pipeline would be installed at a minimum depth of 10m below the bed of the River Itchen, which is secured in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5, Version 1). ES Appendix 11.2 Geotechnical and geo-environmental reports – 10 of 18 documents (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6, Version 1) shows borehole BH505 alongside the proposed alignment. Placing the tunnel crown at a depth of at least 10m below the river bed provides over 6m of London Clay above the tunnel crown, providing a high degree of protection to the river. The Applicant therefore considers that moving the Pipeline further south is not necessary, because the proposed location can be constructed in a way that avoids impacts on the River Itchen.

Table 2-4 The Applicant's response to PDA-016 from Kim Fitzpatrick

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
PDA-016-001	Consultation	There has been a lack of consultation with residents in the proximity of construction compound L-10, including Lordswood.	Extensive consultation has been undertaken on the Project, with public consultations being held in 2022, 2024 and 2025, which directly consulted residents in the Colden Common and Highbridge areas. The proposed location for construction compound L-10 east of Highbridge Road (B3335) was first identified at the Applicant's Summer 2024 Consultation. Residents in the Colden Common and Highbridge area were sent leaflets notifying them of the consultation and inviting participation. A consultation event was held in Colden Common on the 27 June 2024. The consultation included plans identifying construction compound L-10 and typical construction compound details. The Applicant consulted residents in Colden Common and Highbridge again in Spring 2025 on refinements to the design in this area, however this consultation did not identify any refinements to construction compound L-10 itself, instead refinements to the pipeline route to the east were consulted on. Residents were also notified of the consultation. The Applicant's approach to consultation is set out in the Consultation Report [APP-029].
PDA-016-002	Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity	Construction compound L-10 would impact the wildlife and biodiversity that have been introduced into the area.	The Applicant recognises the importance of the habitats at this location to terrestrial biodiversity, including bats, birds, invertebrates, small mammals and reptiles, and the measures taken to enhance biodiversity. It is noted that sections of the habitats will be temporarily impacted for the construction of the Project, including the land proposed for construction compound L-10. However, areas of habitat outside of the Order Limits are retained and therefore available for biodiversity during construction. The Applicant is

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
			committed to reinstating all habitats to their pre-construction habitat type and condition, secured by the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7, Version 1). Within the ES, the impact assessment for biodiversity is detailed within ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1).
PDA-016-003	Construction impacts and effects	Concern about the construction working hours, noise, lighting and traffic impacts and a request to consider alternative sites.	Construction works would be managed in line with the Outline CEMP – 1 of 3 documents (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1), which sets out the construction working hours and measures to manage noise and light emissions. The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [APP-415] would manage construction vehicle movements. The respondent has suggested that the Applicant consider land at Gracelands Civil Engineering and Groundworks and Highbridge Farm as alternative sites for construction compound L-10. The former option would result in the displacement of businesses in this location, and would potentially require the demolition of buildings and infrastructure. An alternative construction compound at Highbridge Farm is not preferred for a number of reasons, including that it would lengthen the pipeline route, the crossing under the railway line would not be at a perpendicular angle, there would need to be two crossings under the River Itchen instead of one, and there is potential for greater impacts to residential properties on Lordswood and ancient woodland at Lord's Wood.

Table 2-5 The Applicant's response to PDA-018 from Lisa Nops

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
PDA-018	Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity	Concerns about developments in the Itchen catchment and developers polluting rivers, and a suggestion that measures should be incorporated to prevent harm to the aquatic environment.	The Project will play a major role in making up the shortfall in water supply across the Applicant's Hampshire supply area, while protecting the unique chalk rivers in Hampshire, the River Test and River Itchen, through a reduction in abstractions. The Project will be constructed using trenchless construction under the River Itchen, to avoid and reduce potential impacts to the watercourse and associated habitats. The Pipeline will be installed at a minimum depth of 10m under the River Itchen, as secured in the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5, Version 1). Measures to protect the environment during the construction phase are secured through the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1 for document 1 of 3) ([APP-413] and [APP-414] for documents 2 and 3). The extensive assessments in the ES confirm that there will not be any likely significant effects on the aquatic environment during the construction and operation of the Project. The impact assessment for biodiversity is detailed within ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity (Document

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
			reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1). Impacts on the marine environment are assessed in ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1).

Table 2-6 The Applicant's response to PDA-025 from Viola Langley

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
PDA-025	Alternatives	Expression of support for Water Matters Community, concerns about general environmental impacts, and the need to consider natural solutions.	The Applicant has responded to matters raised by Water Matters Community [RR-354] in the Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0). Construction and operational phase effects associated with the Project are assessed within the ES topic chapters (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1). Mitigation, monitoring and management measures identified through the EIA are secured through the draft DCO [APP-023] and associated management plans, including the Outline CEMP (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1 for document 1 of 3) ([APP-413] and [APP-414] for documents 2 and 3), the Framework CTMP [APP-415], the Outline LEMP (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7, Version 1), the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Document reference 7.6, DCO Volume 7, Version 1), the Operational Environmental Management Plan [APP-422], the Invasive Non-Native Species Biosecurity Plan [APP-425] and ES Appendix 19.9 Outline Water Monitoring Plan [APP-204]. Alternatives were considered through both the 2019 Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP19) and the subsequent options appraisal as part of the RAPID process in 2021, noting that whilst pursuing the preferred WRMP19 strategy for a desalination plant at Fawley, the Applicant continued to investigate strategic alternatives as a contingency in case desalination proved undeliverable. Those alternatives were thoroughly assessed through the options appraisal process and the Project was determined to be the best value solution of those considered, following which it became the preferred strategy over desalination. The Applicant's final draft Water Resources Management Plan 2024 (fdWRMP24) confirmed the Project as the selected option for providing the scale of water supply needed in the timescale required representing better value for customers than the next highest-ranking option. The Scheme Development Report [APP-073, APP-074, APP-075] sets out the process undertaken to select the Project.

Table 2-7 The Applicant's response to PDA-026 to PDA-037 from Water Matters Community

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
PDA-026	Landscape and visual	Concerns about landscape and visual impacts at listed locations raised alongside suggested locations for ASI.	The landscape and visual matters mentioned have previously been raised by Water Matters Community in RR-354 and are addressed in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0), as follows: • Permanent landscape and visual effects of the Water Recycling Plant, including effects on the character and views around Langstone Harbour and Broadmarsh Coastal Park: Addressed in RR-LVIA-01. • Selection and representativeness of viewpoints and visualisations, including Broadmarsh Coastal Park (VP016), Hayling Island (VP004), Farlington Marshes (VP017 and VP133) and Portsdown Hill (VP108): Addressed in RR-LVIA-04. • The omission of a Year 15 forward projection at certain viewpoints, and the assessment of Year 15 effects in summer rather than winter: Addressed in RR-LVIA-12. • Night-time landscape and visual effects and lighting: Addressed in RR-LVIA-03 and RR-LVIA-05. • Landscape and visual effects associated with the above-ground pipework at Old Bedhampton: Addressed in RR-LVIA-06. The following additional matter is addressed below: • Views from the Portsdown Hill Road have been assessed with reference to VP108, located further west along Portsdown Hill Road. This point was selected and agreed with relevant local planning authorities as it is representative of both road users and nearby residential receptors. Visual effects at VP108 were assessed as not significant. The landscape and visual assessment is presented in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual [APP-092]; with detailed baseline descriptions and assessments for each viewpoint provided in ES Appendix 13.4 Visual baseline and effects [APP-174]. The viewpoint locations are shown in ES Figure 13.22 Representative viewpoint [APP-327], and the supporting winter and summer photography and visualisations are provided in ES Figure 13.23 Viewpoint photography [APP-328 to APP-372 – 45 documents].
PDA-027-001	Consultation	There was a lack of consultation prior to the selection of the Project in 2021.	The Applicant notes this comment and has addressed these matters in the Applicant's response to RR-CON-02 and RR-CON-03 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-027-002	Legislation, policy and permits	Gaps in the existing regulatory framework mean that the Project would result in effects on people and the environment. There is also a lack of independent audit and control.	The Applicant notes this comment and has addressed these matters in the Applicant's response to RR-LPP-02 and RR-LPP-03 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0). Please also refer to Appendix F of The Applicant's written summaries of oral submissions

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
			at OFH1 and ISH1 and post hearing actions (Document reference 8.9, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) for further information about the relationship between the DCO application and other regulatory regimes.
PDA-027-003	Carbon and climate change	Operation of the Project requires a significant amount of carbon and energy.	The Applicant notes this comment and has addressed these matters in the Applicant's response to RR-CCC-01 and RR-CCC-02 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-027-004	Alternatives	Whether reasonable alternatives to the Project were considered, whether the site selection for the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) was adequate, and whether the consideration of alternatives meets the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Water Resources Infrastructure (NPSWRI) and the EIA regulations.	Regarding the consideration of alternatives to the Project, see the Applicant's response to RR-ALT-01 and RR-ALT-02 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0). Regarding the WRP site selection, see the Applicant's response to RR-LWRP-01 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-027-005	Cumulative effects	Concern that the assessment of cumulative effects with other proposed water recycling projects is adequate, and whether the cumulative effects on hedgerows with other pipeline projects has been assessed.	Please refer to RR-CEF-01 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0). This details how 'other development' projects were identified for consideration in the cumulative effects assessment in ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects [APP-099]. The full methodology for identifying developments considered in the cumulative effects assessment is set out in section 20.5 of ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects [APP-099]. ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1) provides a detailed impact assessment of the Project on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, including hedgerows. The Project has been designed to reduce impacts on wildlife corridors and habitat fragmentation where practicable. Mitigation measures include retaining existing landscape features (including hedgerows) where reasonably practicable, a reduced working width at hedgerow and watercourse crossings and implementation of measures such as temporary fencing to help maintain habitat connectivity to the wider landscape, for protected species, including bats and dormouse. This is detailed in the Outline CEMP – 1 of 3 documents (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1). The Applicant is committed to reinstating all habitats to their pre-construction habitat type and condition, secured by the Outline LEMP (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7, Version 1). With the range of measures embedded into the Project design to avoid or reduce environmental effects, including on hedgerows, no residual likely significant adverse effects on ecological features are anticipated. ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects [APP-099] and ES Appendix 20.2 Cumulative effects assessment [APP-209] identifies two 'other

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
			pipeline schemes' for inclusion in the cumulative effects assessment which are: • The pipeline from Bedhampton Springs to Havant Thicket Reservoir, consented by Portsmouth Water. • The Farlington to Nelson pipeline, being delivered by Portsmouth Water. The assessment presented in ES Appendix 20.2 Cumulative effects assessment [APP-209] demonstrates there would not be any residual likely significant cumulative effects between the Project and these other pipeline schemes.
PDA-027-006	Socio-economic, tourism and health	A request to consider health, recreation and wellbeing matters, including public confidence in the operation of the Project, the potential health impacts on consumers rejecting tap water, and the adequacy of improvement funds for coastal erosion and footpath improvements.	Please see RR-WRA-04, RR-WRA-05, RR-WRA-06 and RR-WRA-11 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) for the Applicant's response to health and well-being matters as a result of the introduction of recycled water. Please see RR-PFC-20 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) for the Applicant's response to comments on the Broadmarsh Coastal Park Improvement Fund.
PDA-027-007	Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity	Concern that the Habitats Regulation Assessment does not provide sufficient information on the impact on the Solent, including in combination effects with other water recycling projects. Concern that the effects of construction of the WRP site has not been considered.	Please refer to RR-TFB-14 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) for the Applicant's response on Habitats Regulation Assessment and its consideration of in-combination effects with other water recycling projects. Please refer to RR-TFB-05, RR-TFB-06 and RR-TFB-09 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) for the Applicant's response to the effects of construction of the WRP site, including impacts associated with land potentially affected by contamination and Solent Waders and Brent Geese.
PDA-027-008	Land quality and ground conditions	Whether odour and leachate migration can be mitigated and controlled during construction.	Please refer to RR-LQGC-02 and RR-LQGC-15 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) for the Applicant's response to matters relating to leachate migration, and to RR-LQGC-07 for a response to matters relating to odour.
PDA-027-009	Landscape and visual	Whether and landscape and visual impact of the WRP site and above ground pipework at Bedhampton Springs has been adequately assessed.	Please refer to the Applicant's response to PDA-026.
PDA-027-010	Need case	Concern that there isn't a proven need for the Project, or that it is overstated.	Please refer to the Applicant's response to RR-NC-04 and RR-NC-09 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
			public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0), as well as the WRMP Position Statement [PDA-004].
PDA-027-011	Use of Havant Thicket Reservoir for the storage of recycled water	Request to consider the adequacy of assessment of impacts on ecology including the risk of bioaccumulation, whether there should be mitigation for the streams south of Havant Thicket Reservoir, and whether there are risks to the benefits delivered by Havant Thicket Reservoir.	As set out in RR-WEN-03 and RR-WQH-04 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) concerning chemicals in recycled water from the Budds Farm pilot plant, concentrations of contaminants of emerging concern (CECs) in the recycled water discharged to Havant Thicket Reservoir are expected to be very low. Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that some CECs have the potential to bioaccumulate, whereby substances are progressively taken up and retained within organisms, potentially resulting in increasing concentrations over time, even where environmental concentrations are low. The environmental fate, behaviour and bioaccumulation pathways of many CECs remain poorly understood. Although water quality modelling indicates that the reservoir will provide suitable conditions to support a diverse aquatic ecosystem, the species that will ultimately inhabit the reservoir are not yet known. These uncertainties make it difficult to reliably assess the potential for bioaccumulation and associated ecological effects within the reservoir. Nonetheless, given the very low concentrations anticipated, together with further dilution and dispersion within the reservoir, the potential for significant ecological effects associated with bioaccumulation is considered to be low. With respect to the marine environment, as set out in the responses to RR-WEN-01 and RR-WEN-02 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) concerning chemicals in the Long Sea Outfall (LSO) discharge, the potential for significant bioaccumulation of persistent contaminants is similarly considered to be low, given the extremely low concentrations anticipated and rapid dilution within the receiving waters. Consequently, any associated ecological effects on marine food webs within Langstone Harbour and the Solent arising from the Project are considered negligible. The Applicant will continue to engage with the Environment Agency and review emerging scientific evidence on CECs, with monitoring and management measures reviewed and adapted as appropriate in response to new findings. This will be controlled by the environmental permit that will apply to the output of recycled water and the reject stream from the Water Recycling Plant. Despite the acknowledged uncertainties associated with CECs, the overall assessment of the Project's potential impacts on freshwater and marine ecology, as set out in ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1) and ES Chapter 9 Marine biodiversity (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1), is considered to be robust, and the conclusion that no significant adverse ecological effects are anticipated remains appropriate.

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
			For the consideration of water quality and ecology on Havant Thicket Reservoir see the Applicant's responses to issues raised on the theme of water quality at Havant Thicket Reservoir in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0). The Applicant's responses to RR-UHTR-06, RR-UHTR-08, RR-UHTR-18 and RR-WQH-15 within The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) address the impact of the Project on benefits associated with Havant Thicket Reservoir.
PDA-027-012	Water environment	Concern that a number of matters relating to the water environment and water quality have not been assessed or adequately considered.	Matters relating to water quality in Havant Thicket Reservoir and water bodies that will receive compensatory flows (including CECs) are addressed through the Applicant's responses on water environment (including RR-WEN-03, RR-WEN-08, RR-WEN-09 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0)) and water quality at Havant Thicket Reservoir (including RR-WHQ-02, RR-WHQ-04 and RR-WHQ-05, RR-WHQ-08, RR-WHQ-10 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0)). For further information about the relationship between the DCO and the existing environmental permit regime, please refer to Action Point ISH-06 and to Appendix F of The Applicant's written summaries of oral submissions at OFH1 and ISH1 and post hearing actions (Document reference 8.9, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-027-013	The draft DCO	Whether powers sought in the draft DCO relating to Havant Thicket Reservoir are necessary and justified.	Please refer to the Applicant's responses to issues raised on the draft DCO in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0), reference RR-DCO-01 to RR-DCO-37.
PDA-027-014	Legislation, policy and permits	Request that the National Policy Statement (NPS) accordance table submitted at Deadline 1 shows areas where compliance is contested, not only where a policy is addressed. It is requested that the National Policy Statement accordance table expressly covers paragraphs 1.4.7, 3.8.3 and section 3.5.	The Applicant has provided detailed policy analysis within the Planning Policy Statement (Document reference 5.5, DCO Volume 5, Version 2). As requested by the ExA, the Applicant has, for Deadline 1, produced an NPS Accordance Table (Document reference 8.11, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) which provides signposting to where each policy of the NPSWRI is addressed in the Planning Policy Statement (Document reference 5.5, DCO Volume 5, Version 2) and any other references made to that policy throughout the DCO application submission (primarily in the ES). The Applicant does not, in this NPS Accordance Table (Document reference 8.11, DCO Volume 8, Version 0), report on the position of any third party where they might contest compliance. The Applicant notes that NPSWRI policies 1.4.7 and 3.8.3 and section 3.5 are already addressed in the Planning Policy Statement (Document reference 5.5, DCO Volume 5, Version 2). The Applicant can confirm that the NPS Accordance Table (Document reference 8.11, DCO Volume 8, Version 0)

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
			provides the relevant signposting to the relevant locations of the Planning Policy Statement (Document reference 5.5, DCO Volume 5, Version 2) that contain this analysis.
PDA-027-015	Use of Havant Thicket Reservoir for the storage of recycled water	Concern that the description of development does not give weight to changes to Havant Thicket Reservoir, that notices were misleading, and the Project has not been categorized correctly.	Please see RR-UHTR-04 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) for the Applicant's response regarding the description of the use of Havant Thicket Reservoir. The Applicant understands the respondents to be concerned with the manner in which the Planning Inspectorate has categorised the Project. This is something that is not in the control of the Applicant. The description of the Project is clear, however.
PDA-027-016	Socio-economic, tourism and health	Concern that customers will reject tap water and turn to bottled water or home treatment, which has health, environmental and economic costs, and that this has not been assessed.	Please see Applicant's response to PDA-027-006 above and RR-WRA-05 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-027-017	Legislation, policy and permits	That the application lacks robust information and independent scrutiny needs to be secured.	Please see RR-EIAA-01 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) for the Applicant's response regarding a lack of information on the impacts and effects of the Project. Please see RR-LPP-03 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) for the Applicant's response to suggestions that a bespoke monitoring, audit and enforcement regime should be secured through the DCO.
PDA-027-018	EIA approach and methodology	That decommissioning, the residual waste stream from the treatment process, pipeline washouts, flexibility and maximum parameters have not been assessed.	Please see RR-LQGC-12 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) for the Applicant's response regarding the assessment of decommissioning. Please see RR-WRPR-19 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) for the Applicant's response regarding the management and disposal of sludge produced by the water recycling plant treatment processes. Please see RR-CIE-05 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) for the Applicant's response regarding pipeline washouts. Please see RR-EIAA-05 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0) for the Applicant's response

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
			regarding the assessment of maximum parameters and how they have been secured in the DCO.
PDA-027-019	Legislation, policy and permits	Request for the benefits provided by the Project to be identified, distinguishing between those delivered by Havant Thicket Reservoir.	The benefits of the Project are clearly set out in the Case for the Project (Document reference 5.6, DCO Volume 5, Version 1) and are clearly distinguishable from those being delivered as part of the Havant Thicket Reservoir scheme.
PDA-028	The water recycling process	Comment on topics that Water Matters Community will be speaking to at ISH1, comprising the persistence of pharmaceuticals and their Transformation Products and the risk of persistent PFAS & other contaminants building up in the Havant Thicket Reservoir. The submission includes copies of two research papers on these topics.	The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of work to evaluate a range of currently relevant CECs across the treatment process (see RR-WHQ-04, 05, 16, 17, 22 and 23 and RR-WEN-03, 04 and 05 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0)), continues to work with the regulatory agencies in the UK, and taken consideration of international best practice. The Applicant notes that, by definition, CECs are an evolving area of understanding and has therefore adopted a precautionary approach with the provisions in the WRP concept design. Over and above solutions provided in, for example, Singapore, the WRP design includes for granular activated carbon post treatment that provides an established capability to remove any residual contaminants that have passed through the multi barrier upstream process or formed as transformation products. For further information about the relationship between the DCO and the existing environmental permit regime, please refer to Action Point ISH-06 and to Appendix F of The Applicant's written summaries of oral submissions at OFH1 and ISH1 and post hearing actions (Document reference 8.9, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-029	Water environment	Comment on topics that Water Matters Community will be speaking to at ISH1, comprising PFAS in the Solent coastline waters, PFAS within sewage discharges to the marine environment, and the impact of combined sewer overflows on the marine environment. The submission includes copies of five research papers on these topics.	Please see the Applicant's response to matters relating to the water recycling process in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0), RR-WRPR-01 to RR-WRPW-26. Matters concerning PFAS and other CECs and potential impacts on the marine environment have previously been raised by Water Matters Community in RR-354 and are addressed through the Applicant's responses on the water environment (RR-WEN-01, RR-WEN-02, RR-WEN-03, RR-WEN-04, RR-WEN-05, RR-WEN-06 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0)) and water quality at Havant Thicket Reservoir (RR-WHQ-04 and RR-WHQ-05 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0)). For further information about the relationship between the DCO and the existing environmental permit regime, please refer to Action Point ISH-06 and to Appendix F of The Applicant's written summaries of oral submissions at

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
			OFH1 and ISH1 and post hearing actions (Document reference 8.9, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-030	The water recycling process	Comment on topics that Water Matters Community will be speaking to at ISH1, comprising information provided by the EA in response to an Environmental Information Request (EIR) relating to CIP4 priority substances at Budds Farm WTW data and pre-application guidance for RAPID water recycling schemes.	Matters concerning CIP4 substances, other CECs and the Budds Farm WTW pilot plant data have previously been raised by Water Matters Community in RR-354 and are addressed through the Applicant's thematic responses on water environment (RR-WEN-03 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0)) and water quality at Havant Thicket Reservoir (RR-WHQ-04 and RR-WHQ-05 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0)). It is not the role of the DCO to speculate about how such substances will be regulated in the future. The Applicant will comply with the conditions of the environmental permit, ensuring that the recycled water does not cause harm to the environment. For further information about the relationship between the DCO and the existing environmental permit regime, please refer to Action Point ISH-06 and to Appendix F of The Applicant's written summaries of oral submissions at OFH1 and ISH1 and post hearing actions (Document reference 8.9, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-031	The water recycling process	CIP4 priority substances – sample data – Budds Farm WTW (see PDA-030 above).	See the response to PDA-030.
PDA-032	The water recycling process	Comment on topics that Water Matters Community will be speaking to at ISH1, comprising information from the Queen Alexandra Hospital, Cosham in response to an EIR relating to the hospitals permits and discharges to the public sewer.	Please see the Applicant's response to RR-WRPR-03 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0), which addresses concerns that the water recycling process cannot fully remove CECs, including PFAS and pharmaceuticals. The response notes that the results of the pilot plant trial demonstrate that CEC concentrations in the recycled water are considerably lower than those in the treated wastewater from Budds Farm WTW. Matters concerning CECs are addressed through the Applicant's thematic responses on water environment (RR-WEN-03 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0)) and water quality at Havant Thicket Reservoir (RR-WHQ-04 and RR-WHQ-05 in The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations from members of the public and businesses (Document reference 8.7, DCO Volume 8, Version 0)). It is not the role of the DCO to speculate about how such substances will be regulated in the future. The Applicant will comply with the conditions of the environmental permit, ensuring that the recycled water does not cause harm to the environment. For further information about the relationship between the DCO and the existing environmental permit regime, please refer to Action Point ISH-06 and to Appendix F of The Applicant's written summaries of oral

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
			submissions at OFH1 and ISH1 and post hearing actions (Document reference 8.9, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-033	The water recycling process	The Southern Water register of Trade Effluent Permits, filtered to display information relating to the Budds Farm WTW catchment.	See the response to PDA-032.
PDA-034	The water recycling process	Comment on topics that Water Matters Community will be speaking to at ISH1, comprising the water recycling pilot plant data.	Please see the Applicant's response to action reference ISH1-01 in Section 3.2 of The Applicant's written summaries of oral submissions at OFH1 and ISH1 and post hearing actions (Document reference 8.9, DCO Volume 8, Version 0), in which further information on the pilot plant methodology is provided as well as the raw data. This further information is proved in The Applicant's response to ISH1 post hearing action 1(a) (Document reference 8.17, DCO Volume 8, Version 0). The output of the WRP will be controlled by an environmental permit and is beyond the scope of the DCO Examination. For further information about the relationship between the DCO and these regulatory regimes, please refer to Action Point ISH-06 and to Appendix F of The Applicant's written summaries of oral submissions at OFH1 and ISH1 and post hearing actions (Document reference 8.9, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).
PDA-035	The water recycling process	Water Matters Community analysis of the water recycling pilot plant data.	See the response to PDA-034.
PDA-036	The water recycling process	Budds Farm WTW water recycling pilot plant data summary.	See the response to PDA-034.
PDA-037	The water recycling process	Peel Common WTW water recycling pilot plant data summary.	See the response to PDA-034.

Table 2-8 The Applicant's response to PDA-038 from Drinking Water Inspectorate

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
PDA-038	Legislation, policy and permits	Statement of Drinking Water Inspectorate's (DWI) regulatory role in relation to the Project.	The Applicant welcomes the DWI's submission [PDA-038] confirming the scope of its regulatory remit in relation to the Project, that it has no objection in principle to recycled water and that the Applicant has adequately addressed its regulatory requirements to date through the RAPID gated process. The Applicant also welcomes confirmation that responsibility for compliance on drinking water quality remains with water companies under the Water Industry Act 1991, the Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations 2016 and other applicable requirements and that neither the RAPID process nor the DCO process removes or replaces those obligations. The Applicant has set out an overview of the process it will go through for obtaining the necessary drinking water approvals from the DWI at the appropriate point in the Project lifecycle in

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
			Appendix D of The Applicant's written summaries of oral submissions at OFH1 and ISH1 and post hearing actions (Document reference 8.9, DCO Volume 8, Version 0).

Table 2-9 The Applicant's response to AS-035 from John Lane

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
AS-035	Construction impacts and effects	Residents concerned by impact of construction compound L-10 on Highbridge Road and lack of consultation with them.	See the Applicant's response to PDA-016-001 and PDA-016-003.

Table 2-10 The Applicant's response to AS-036 from Kate and Matthew Blyth

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
AS-036-001	Consultation	Nearby affected residents were not consulted on the proposed site for construction compound L-10.	See the Applicant's response to PDA-016-001.
AS-036-002	Landowner engagement	Concern about the rights sought over their property and compensation.	Sheet 25 of the Works Plans – 3 of 3 documents [APP-014] details the works to be undertaken in the vicinity of the respondent's property. The Applicant confirms that the respondent's property is not within the Order Limits and therefore, no rights or works are being proposed by the Applicant at the respondent's property. The Applicant confirms that the respondent has previously been written to as a Category 3 interest to the Project. A Category 3 interest does not own or occupy land directly affected by the Project but has been identified as an interest who might be entitled to make a relevant claim for compensation under statutory provisions. The Applicant notes that compensation may be claimed for any reasonable and substantiated losses arising as a result of construction works, in accordance with the Compensation Code. The Applicant will assess compensation on a case-by-case basis, subject to the production of evidence and proof of loss. The Applicant has engaged with the respondent directly on this point by telephone conversation on 5 November 2026 and provided a response to their queries via email on 12 November 2026.
AS-036-003	Traffic and transport	There is not adequate mitigation for access using Highbridge Road and therefore the construction compound cannot be accessed safely.	The Applicant acknowledges the Respondents concerns regarding the use of Highbridge Road for construction access and the risk to local road users. A Framework CTMP [APP-415] has been prepared in support of the Project and is secured in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [APP-023]. This management plan includes measures to reduce disruption associated with construction traffic, including restrictions to Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) movements in network peak hours. Construction access routes are also fixed for HGVs. From

Reference	Theme	Summary of issue raised	The Applicant's response
			construction compound L-10, HGVs would be required to route westbound on Highbridge Road towards Colden Common and then northbound towards the M3. ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport [APP-097] includes an assessment of effects with regards to road safety and did not identify any significant effects during construction or operation, including along Highbridge Road.
AS-036-004	Construction impacts and effects	Concern about the construction working hours, noise, duration and impacts on the environment.	See the Applicant's response to PDA-016-002 and PDA-016-003.


WATER
for LIFE®
from
Southern
Water®