Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project

Draft Statement of Common Ground - Hampshire County Council

VOLUME NUMBER: 5

PLANNING INSPECTORATE SCHEME NUMBER: WA010002

APPLICATION DOCUMENT REFERENCE: 5.8

APFP REGULATION: 5(2)(q)

~~May~~23 November 2026

Version ~~0~~1

from Southern Water

Document Control		
Title	Draft Statement of Common Ground - Hampshire County Council	
Version History		
Version	**Date**	**Status/Reason for Issue**
Version 0	21 May 2026	DCO Submission
Version 1	23 November 2026	Deadline 1

Contents

1 Introduction 1
1.1 Overview of the project 1
1.2 Purpose of this Statement of Common Ground 1
1.3 Parties to this statement 2
1.4 Terminology 2
2 Record of post DCO submission engagement 3
3 Statement of Common Ground 5
4 Signatories 49

Tables

Table 1-1: Status terminology 2
Table 2-1: Record of post-submission engagement 3
Table 3-1: Summary of matters 5

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview of the project

1.1.1 Southern Water Services Limited (hereafter referred to as the 'Applicant') is developing proposals for the Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project (the Project). The Project is a water supply scheme that will ensure the Applicant can maintain essential water supplies to customers, especially in a drought, while protecting the rare and sensitive River Test and River Itchen chalk streams.

1.1.2 The Project would use advanced treatment techniques to turn highly treated wastewater, that is usually pumped far out to sea, into purified recycled water at a new water recycling plant in Havant. This purified recycled water would be pumped via a pipeline to the Havant Thicket Reservoir where it would mix with spring water. Water from the reservoir would then be pumped along another pipeline to the Applicant's Otterbourne Water Supply Works where it would be treated to strict drinking water standards before being sent into supply.

1.2 Purpose of this Statement of Common Ground

1.2.1 The purpose of this Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is to set out the areas of agreement and disagreement between the Applicant, and Hampshire County Council (HCC) in relation to the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the Project.

1.2.2 This document has been updated at Deadline 1 to reflect further engagement, progress in resolving outstanding matters and any changes to the parties' positions following submission of the DCO application. References to other Application documents have not been updated from the original submission. Please refer to the latest version of the Guide to the Application (Document reference 1.3, DCO Volume 1) for the list of current versions of documents.

~~1.2.2~~1.2.3 The role of HCC and the other host local authorities in the DCO process is to provide input on matters relating to local planning policy, land use, and the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on their administrative areas. This document aims to support the examination process by setting out the areas of agreement and those requiring further discussion specifically in relation to matters within the local authorities' statutory remit.

~~1.2.3~~1.2.4 This SoCG has been prepared with due regard to guidance issued under Section 50 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008) concerning pre-application processes, including the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (2024) Planning Act 2008: Pre-application stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects ('Pre-application Guidance 2024'). This SoCG should be read alongside HCC's Relevant Representation [RR-121], which sets out HCC's detailed position on matters relevant to the Examination. References in this SoCG are intended to complement, and where appropriate cross-reference, the issues raised in that Relevant Representation.

1.3 Parties to this statement

1.3.1 This SoCG has been prepared by (1) Southern Water Services Limited as the Applicant and (2) Hampshire County Council.

1.3.2 Collectively, Southern Water Services Limited and Hampshire County Council are referred to as 'the parties'.

1.4 Terminology

1.4.1 Table 1-1 outlines the terminology in the status column of Table 3-1. It can be taken that any matters not specifically referred to in Table 3-1 are not of material interest or relevance to the parties' representation and therefore have not been considered in this document.

Table 1-1: Status terminology

Term	Explanation
Matter agreed with other party	Indicates that both Southern Water and HCC have reached a consensus on the specific issue, with no disagreements.
~~Provisional agreement pending application evidence~~	~~Indicates that while consensus has been reached on certain issues, confirmation of agreement is contingent upon HCC reviewing and accepting the supporting evidence.~~
Matters subject to further discussion	Indicates that the specific issues are still under discussion, and no final agreement has been reached yet.
Matter not able to be agreed	Indicates that an agreement on the specific issue has not been reached, and it is unlikely that further discussions will resolve the disagreement.

2 Record of post DCO submission engagement

2.1.1 The Applicant has engaged with HCC throughout the development of the DCO application~~.~~ and continues to engage with HCC following submission of the application.

2.1.2 A comprehensive record of pre-~~-~~application engagement, including statutory consultation carried out under section 42 of the PA 2008, is provided in the Statement of Engagement (Statement of Commonality appended) ~~(Document reference 5.9, DCO Volume 5)~~[APP-072] and the Consultation Report (Document reference 5.1, DCO Volume 5~~).~~) [APP-029].

~~2.1.3 This SoCG has been prepared for submission~~ This version of the SoCG is submitted at Examination Deadline 1 (DL1). It represents an update to the draft SoCG submitted with the DCO application, which had a reporting cut-~~-~~off date of ~~07~~7 May 2026~~. Engagement~~, and has been updated to reflect engagement with HCC ~~has continued beyond this~~ since that date ~~and will remain ongoing throughout the Examination. Accordingly, while this submitted version reflects all engagement up to 07 May 2026, the SoCG will continue to evolve as a live document, with further updates provided as additional discussions take place and outstanding matters progress.~~

~~2.1.4~~2.1.3 ~~This version of the~~, where appropriate. The SoCG is ~~submitted in draft and~~currently unsigned ~~form. The content of this version has nevertheless~~ but has been reviewed and agreed ~~for submission~~ by the relevant officer(s) at HCC. The Applicant confirms that ~~at the reporting cut-off date, this version~~it accurately reflects the matters discussed and the current position between the parties. Formal agreement and signing of the SoCG will be progressed as engagement continues during the Examination.

2.1.4 ~~Since the reporting cut-off date, where necessary~~Where appropriate, bilateral engagement with HCC has continued since submission of the application on unresolved matters from the pre-~~-~~application phase, matters arising during Pre-examination/Examination, and areas where further clarification is required ~~has continued. Where~~ . **Table 2-1** sets out this engagement ~~has occurred, any records relevant to these matters~~. Engagement remains ongoing throughout the Examination, and this SoCG is a live document, which will be ~~set out~~ updated and resubmitted as appropriate to reflect ongoing discussions, progress in ~~future iterations of this section.~~resolving matters, and any changes to the status of issues identified by the parties.

Table 2-1: Record of post-submission engagement

Name	Purpose	Date
SoCG Meeting #1	Review of the Transport related matters in the SoCG, including temporary construction accesses and offsite works	06/10/2026
SoCG Meeting #2	Review of the design principles and health assessment issues	27/10/2026

Name	Purpose	Date
SoCG Meeting #3	Review of the transport related matters in the SoCG, including temporary construction accesses and offsite works.	19/11/2026

3 Statement of Common Ground

3.1.1 Table 3-1 provides a summary of the key matters discussed between the Applicant and HCC in relation to the DCO application for the Project. Each matter is categorised according to its status, as defined in section 1.4. Table 3-1aims to clearly present the areas of agreement, those still under discussion, and any unresolved issues.

Table 3-1: Summary of matters

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
Principle of development					
HCC-2025-0031	Need case	HCC offers qualified support to the principle of exploring use of water recycling technology and infrastructure to supply future needs, and ongoing measures to improve water efficiency, reduce leaks, and secure additional sources of supply. A targeted objective of this project should be a net gain to the environmental quality of potable and discharge water. HCC is not able to provide specific comment on the strength of the draft needs case.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position following consultation on the draft need case in May 2025. This position reflects ongoing engagement between the parties since then.	Case for the Project (Document reference 5.6, DCO Volume 5, Version 1).	Matter agreed with other party.
DCO and planning					
HCC-2024-0103	Decommissioning	HCC raised concerns over the DCO drafting approach to be adopted to the decommissioning phase given narrative provided within the Environmental Statement (ES). It is acknowledged that there is a requirement to assess the decommissioning impacts with the ES work and this is understood. HCC wishes to ensure that due consideration is secured in terms of assessing and mitigating the highway impact in this future scenario given the potential impacts to the highway.	The components of Project are assumed to have a design life of up to 100 years, however the operational life could be longer than this. The condition of the components of the Project would be reviewed at the end of their expected design life to determine whether they remain in a viable condition to continue to operate after this time or whether further maintenance or replacement would be appropriate. The specific method of decommissioning of the Project at the end of its operational life is uncertain at present as the engineering approaches will evolve over this time. Any decommissioning works in connection with the Project would be undertaken using good industry practice and taking account of any relevant obligations to landowners under the relevant land agreements, the environmental baseline at the time, and would comply with all relevant statutory requirements applicable at the time. Any decommissioning works would take place in the context of the regulatory framework in place at that time, which may include a requirement to seek additional consents, permits or licences. The Applicant has explained through engagement that this was the position as set out by the Planning Inspectorate in the ES Appendix 5.2 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Opinion~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-105].	ES Appendix 5.2 EIA Scoping Opinion~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-105]	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
HCC-2025-0079	Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan - Action Plan and Section 106 Agreement	HCC is seeking confirmation that the Applicant will remain accountable for the delivery of the Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP). The Applicant needs to maintain overall control and ownership of the travel plan and implementation of the measures included to ensure compliance with the consent. Each individual measure within the action plan (including the Travel Plan Coordinator (TPC)) also needs to be costed to allow calculation of the bond/cash deposit required to be secured through an appropriate agreement.	The Contractor will be responsible for appointing the TPC and implementing the Travel Plan, given that it relates to construction workers and not staff employed by the Applicant. The hours assigned to each measure will be committed in the detailed CWTP, to be submitted post-DCO consent.	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2025-0069	Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan - approval mechanism	An overall approval and monitoring mechanism for the documents should be agreed across all relevant parties to ensure the DCO drafting reflects the cross-organisation requirements and allows for streamlined approval and monitoring. HCC understands that the document would likely be approved by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) through engagement with the relevant HA.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position and confirms that the Framework CWTP is appended to the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7),~~[APP-415], and therefore, both documents would be approved together. It is envisaged that the document would be approved by the LPA through engagement with the relevant HA.	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2023-0001	Other Highway Matters - highway accesses	HCC acknowledges that the proposed temporary and permanent site accesses (for which detailed plans have been prepared and largely agreed) will not form part of the consenting powers of the DCO. Whilst 'Order Limits' will be included, the final form of access will be subject to further approval. HCC is satisfied that sufficient design work has been undertaken to provide comfort that a safe form of access can be provided in the majority of each location and will review the protective provisions when submitted.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position and notes that the protective provisions are included in the Draft DCO ~~(Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3) to~~[APP-023] give the LHA the right to approve the detailed design of highway works, inspect works during and after construction, and certify completion to their reasonable satisfaction, ensuring their functions and assets are protected.	Draft Development Consent Order ~~(PDF Version) (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3).~~[APP-023].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2024-SC-0027	Other Highway Matters - mitigation planting and reinstatement	HCC requested the inclusion of mitigation planting details and tree and hedgerow removal details. Any loss of highway trees or hedges needs to be identified. The removal of any highway asset in accordance with HCC's Technical Guidance Note 15 would be subject to a Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees (CAVAT) payment and HCC would not support planting on highway land directly by the applicant. HCC seeks the provisions within the mitigation planting strategy to reflect this position of a mitigation payment. It is accepted that the details and payment amounts are a matter that can be agreed post DCO. Agreement will need to reached still regarding the mitigation planting.	~~Vegetation~~The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position and notes that vegetation removed to facilitate construction, including within the highway, will be reinstated in line with the reinstatement strategy set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7, Version 1) informed by the ES Appendix 13.5 Arboricultural Impact Assessment~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)~~ [APP-175] - [APP-176] and hedgerow surveys. ~~Mitigation~~ Detailed mitigation planting ~~details and~~, tree and hedgerow removal ~~details~~, and reinstatement proposals will be developed post-consent~~.~~, informed by the ES Appendix 13.5 Arboricultural Impact Assessment and hedgerow survey information. This commitment is reinforced by the Outline Construction Environmental Management	Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Document reference 7.5, DCO Volume 7, Version 1). ES Appendix 13.5 Arboricultural Impact Assessment~~, Volume II~~ [APP-175] - [APP-176] Draft Development Consent Order [APP-023]. Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference ~~6.2~~7.1, DCO Volume ~~6).~~7, Version 1 for document 1 of 3, [APP-413] and [APP-414] for documents 2 and 3)	Matters subject to further discussion.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
			Plan (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), which includes specific landscape and visual mitigation commitments. In particular, commitment LVI2 requires temporary works areas to be reinstated following construction, while commitment LVI3 requires replacement planting and landscape reinstatement where vegetation has been removed as part of the Proposed Development. These measures are further addressed through Draft DCO [APP-023] Requirement 25, which controls the removal of trees and hedgerows and requires the relevant approvals to be obtained. Article 25 of the Draft DCO [APP-023] provides the necessary powers to fell or lop trees and hedgerows for the authorised development. Where those powers affect highway trees or hedgerows, the relevant highway authority controls secured through the DCO, including the protective provisions and applicable approvals for highway works, will apply. The Applicant will continue to engage with HCC on the treatment of affected highway trees, including the application of HCC's CAVAT methodology and Technical Guidance Note 15 where appropriate. The parties will seek to agree any remaining matters through the Examination.		
HCC-2024-0183	Other Highway Matters - Road Safety Audit	HCC requested a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) is completed for all permanent accesses which required physical changes to the highway (pre-DCO) and noted a RSA may be required for the busier temporary construction accesses (post-DCO consent). HCC is unclear on the Applicant's position for providing the RSA given that they have stated a Stage 1 RSA is being prepared. HCC considers that the audits are required to inform the Applicant's position that a safe and suitable access arrangement can be provided on the highway. This is considered by the HA to be a critical decision-making document. HCC requires reassurance that the indicative accesses are achievable, and RSA is an important evidence base for this.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's comment and considers that the permanent site accesses (aside from the proposed Water Recycling Plant (WRP)) site would not require a Stage 1 RSA given no physical changes are proposed to the adopted highway. A Stage 1 RSA is being prepared for the proposed WRP site access but will not form part of the DCO application documents. Additionally, Stage 1 RSAs have been prepared for locations where permanent physical alterations are proposed to the public highway. These will be issued for information during Examination.		Matters subject to further discussion.
HCC-2022-0128	Permits	HCC is of the understanding that the Applicant may seek to disapply or amend the Permit Scheme (permitting works on the highway). HCC's position	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position. The Applicant's Draft DCO ~~will make provision~~[APP-023] provides for the Permit Scheme to ~~be~~	Draft Development Consent Order [APP-023].	Matters subject to further discussion.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		is that the permit scheme should not be disapplied within the DCO. HCC is yet to see the details of the proposed amendments to the permit scheme application in how it relates to the DCO. HCC therefore reserves its position on whether these amendments would be appropriate, practical or acceptable.	~~followed~~apply where ~~it applies. Some~~ relevant. Draft DCO [APP-023] Article 13 (Application and modification of a permit scheme) sets out a number of modifications to the operation of the Permit Scheme ~~are proposed as it relates~~in relation to the Project ~~which~~. These modifications are intended to ensure ~~consistency with the urgency of~~ that the Permit Scheme operates effectively alongside the powers sought through the DCO, reflecting the need for ~~new~~timely delivery of nationally significant water resources infrastructure and ~~to provide a timely~~ providing an efficient mechanism for the resolution of any disputes arising in connection with permits. HCC confirmed by email on 16 October 2026 that questions of clarity remain about what these modifications apply to. For example, regarding the expectation that the permit scheme will apply to all highway works, not just street works. The parties will seek to agree any remaining matters through the examination.		
HCC-2024-SC-0020	S106 Scope - or alternative approval mechanism	HCC will need a Section 106 or alternative approval mechanism for the Travel Plan (including approval and monitoring reasonable fees) and potentially for compliance with the S278 process, should that be agreed as an appropriate approval mechanism for integrating the DCO requirements with HCC's adopted processes and procedures. This should also include amendments to PRoW where these are more significant and permanent.	The Applicant considers that a Section 106 agreement is unlikely to be necessary, subject to the Draft DCO requirements and protective provisions ~~(Document Reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3)~~[APP-023] securing the relevant matters. The Section 278 process is not proposed to be used. Instead, protective provisions are included in the Draft DCO ~~(Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3)~~[APP-023] to give the LHA the right to approve the detailed design of highway works, inspect works during and after construction, and certify completion to their reasonable satisfaction, ensuring their functions and assets are protected.	Draft Development Consent Order ~~(PDF Version) (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3).~~[APP-023].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2022-0124	Section 58a New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 - restrictions to works in all or part of a street following substantial street works	HCC places Section 58a restrictions on areas of newly surfaced highway to prevent trenching by utility companies and protect the integrity of the Highway. Where such notices are in place HCC seeks to agree where emergency works are necessary for full carriageway or half carriageway width reinstatement. This capability should be reflected within the future DCO requirements. If the Project is to utilise an area subject to Section 58a HCC requests full or half carriageway reinstatement. HCC agrees that the permitting scheme process will seek to resolve this matter of section 58a restrictions as it would typically do so.	The Applicant intends to disapply the effect of moratoria applied under the terms of a Permit Scheme or provisions of New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (NRSWA). Such moratoria should not delay the implementation of urgently needed water resources infrastructure. The conditions of any Permit for the conduct of such works is a matter to be resolved in the ordinary course of the operation of the Permit Scheme or via protective provisions, as the case may be.		Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
HCC-2022-0072	DCO Powers - reinstatement	All temporary construction accesses will need to be reinstated to the LHA satisfaction and suitable provision for this will need to be made within the DCO. Appropriate approval mechanisms for the reinstatement should be secured appropriately within the DCO requirements and the HCC welcomes sight of the proposed protective provisions. HCC will review the protective provisions as they emerge as they relate to reinstatement.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's comment and is addressing this matter. The Applicant confirms that the protective provisions are included in the ~~draft~~draft DCO ~~(Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3)~~[APP-023] to address reinstatement requirements.	Draft Development Consent Order ~~(PDF Version) (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3).~~[APP-023].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2023-0041	DCO Powers	HCC is yet to see the draft DCO but understands that proposed protective provisions will be included to enable the Highway Authority (HA) to authorise works on the highway. This provision is welcome and would seek to ensure that the provisions align with established processes as far as possible. HCC will be able to update its position on this once the DCO provisions have been reviewed.	The Applicant discussed this at a bilateral meeting with HCC on 25 March 2026. The Applicant has included protective provisions for the benefit of Local Highway Authorities (LHA) in its ~~draft~~dDraft DCO ~~(Document reference 2.3, DCO Volume 2),~~[APP-023], the effect of which will be to streamline existing processes via the DCO.	Draft Development Consent Order ~~(PDF Version) (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3).~~[APP-023].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2024-0191	DCO Powers - nightworks	HCC is seeking to maintain powers to direct night works through NRSWA where works are located on the highway or require traffic management on the highway and the needs of NRSWA specify nightworks would be beneficial. HCC is in agreement with the Applicant; however, it understands further discussion is required with Winchester City Council (WCC), which has raised concerns with the approach.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position and confirms that WCC has requested further engagement on the suitability of some of the locations identified for nighttime works.	Traffic Management Strategy ~~(Document reference 7.3, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-416]. Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1 for document 1 of 3, [APP-413] and [APP-414] for documents 2 and 3).	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2025-0005	DCO Powers – Construction Worker Hub	HCC acknowledges that the construction worker hub location will be resolved at a later date to allow for commercial flexibility at this stage. HCC is concerned that the hub is not included within the Order Limits, as its location, use and securing mechanisms are unclear, limiting the ability to assess trip profiles, mitigation measures and how assumptions would be enforced through the DCO. This remains a significant matter of principle, and HCC has not been presented with the work undertaken by the Applicant to address these concerns and welcomes sight of the information to conclude discussions on this matter. The Transport Assessment (TA) as updated (including associated trip patterns) will be reviewed by HCC and will provide a response accordingly.	The Applicant confirms that the hub is described in ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) [APP-082]~~ and the ES Appendix 18.1 TA~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188]. While the hub location is not yet confirmed, defined parameters include proximity to the pipeline and the strategic road network, and it will not be used for Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV). Forecast construction worker trips are assessed in the TA and demonstrate no perceptible traffic impact. An initial review confirms that suitable locations are available within the study area.	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-082]. ES Appendix 18.1 Transport Assessment~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188]).	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
HCC-2025-0038	DCO Powers - Stand-Off distances	HCC seeks clarity and agreement on the definition of the highway boundary and pipeline stand-off distances where highways and Public Rights of Way (PRoW) are affected, citing implications for highway maintenance and future works. HCC welcomes the sight of the boundary implications through the referenced submission documents, and HCC will need to consider whether there are resulting maintenance implications on existing highway assets. HCC considers that it is necessary to maintain the ability to undertake its statutory maintenance requirements as directed through the Highways Act. It is noted that the Applicant has confirmed the stand-off distances, and HCC will advise if any of these require further discussion where they affect the highway asset. HCC requested further clarification is required about the 7-12m protection zone around the proposed pipeline and whether these impact the operation or future development of land which has highway status. This raises concern to HCC that restrictions will be placed which could impact the operation or delivery of future highway infrastructure. HCC would still like to discuss further if there are to be restrictions around the pipeline and where this might impact the highway.	The Applicant confirms that the Works Plans ~~(Document reference 2.3, DCO Volume 2)~~[APP-012] - [APP-014] and Access and Rights of Way plan ~~(Document reference 2.4, DCO Volume 2)~~[APP-015] - [APP-016] comply with the 2009 Regulations and that the stand-off distances reflect SW's standard guidance, increased only due to the wider pipeline proposed. The Applicant is not seeking easements for highways owned by the LHA. Instead, the Applicant intends to discuss protected provisions through Third-Party Agreements and will utilise the NRSWA to install the necessary apparatus during construction. There may be locations where land adjacent to the highways, such as verges, lies outside the highway boundary but is still owned by the LHA. In these instances, the Applicant will seek to negotiate easements, as is being done with other private landowners.	Works Plans ~~(Document reference 2.3, DCO Volume 2).~~[APP-012] - [APP-014]. Access and Public Rights of Way plan ~~(Document reference 2.4, DCO Volume 2).~~[APP-015] - [APP-016].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2022-0123	DCO Powers - reinstatement from trenching	HCC is of the understanding that pipeline instalment which will cross a highway will be trenchless and open-cut crossings – this necessitates discussions about the requirements for highway reinstatement. In cases where trenching cannot be avoided, HCC understands that the Applicant will ensure reinstatement. This is now confirmed by the Applicant. HCC expects further information on the proposed approach to highway reinstatement. The Applicant confirmed in April 2026 that the Project has a mixture of trenchless and non-trenchless (open-cut) crossings of highway assets. The Description of the Proposed Development ~~(ES Chapter 3)~~[APP-082] refers to trenched open-cut construction and describes the indicative working arrangements. The Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5, Version 1) describes open-cut installations at road intersections, providing reference to minimum installation depths. The Project will provide a	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development~~,~~ ~~Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-082]. Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5, Version 1).	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		schedule of open-cut pipeline installation crossings of Highway Assets.			
HCC-2025-0001	DCO Powers - trenchless crossing design	HCC supports the technical principles of the Trenchless Crossings Highways Assets Technical Note, but requires further clarity on legal mechanisms, geotechnical risk management and approvals, including a DCO requirement for ground investigation and submission of Ground Investigation and Geotechnical Design Reports in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) CD 622. HCC will review the revised strategy.	Pipeline access and trenchless crossings are within the draft Order Limits and will be delivered in accordance with DMRB standards (including CD 622 and CG 300), with updated Technical Approval Strategy, geotechnical risk management and staged approvals progressed through continued engagement and secured through the DCO and post-consent processes. The Applicant is preparing an update to the Trenchless Crossings Highways Assets Strategy document to be agreed by the HA.		Matter agreed with other party
HCC-2022-0126	DCO Powers Lane Rental	The Lane Rental Scheme is currently under development within the Hampshire area and is expected be adopted before commencement of this Project (estimated 2027-28). HCC will require compliance with the terms of the Lane Rental Scheme and for this not to be disapplied within the DCO. HCC welcomes further engagement once the DCO provisions have been shared.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's comment. The Applicant notes that the ~~draft~~Draft DCO ~~(Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3)~~[APP-023] does not include any provision to modify or disapply the forthcoming HCC Lane Rental Scheme. On this basis, the Applicant considers that there is no requirement for the Scheme to be referenced within the protective provisions. The Applicant further notes that the emerging Lane Rental Scheme includes specific provisions allowing for discounts in respect of works associated with Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP). In light of this, the Applicant considers that there is limited justification for seeking to disapply the Scheme through the DCO, as the Scheme itself already provides a mechanism to recognise and appropriately manage essential NSIP-related works. Notwithstanding the above, the Applicant remains open to ongoing engagement with HCC to monitor the implementation of the Scheme and to ensure that its operation does not unduly constrain or delay the delivery of the authorised development. Should any material conflicts arise, the Applicant and HCC will continue to explore proportionate and pragmatic solutions through established coordination mechanisms.	Draft Development Consent Order ~~(PDF Version) (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3).~~[APP-023].	Matter agreed with other party.
Design and construction					
HCC-2025-0088	Design and construction – Design Principles (highways)	HCC understands that the design principles are not to relate to highway matters and that controls and design principles for highway matters are to be secured through other control documents (primarily the Framework CTMP). It is HCC's understanding that the design principles are related to the Above	The Applicant ~~acknowledges HCC's position. The Applicant clarifies~~has clarified the respective roles of Requirements 3 and 8 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO [APP-023] in relation to the detailed design of highway infrastructure during the meeting with HCC on 27 October 2026.	Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5~~),~~, Version 1). Draft Development Consent Order [APP-023].	Matters subject to further discussion.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		Ground Plants (AGP). This should be confirmed by the Applicant. The February 2026 version of the draft Design Principles contains former WRP_5 Inclusivity and accessibility and former WRP_6 Footpath verges. No HCC comments have been provided due to lack of clarity as to how these principles will be applicable to highway matters. In March 2026 the Applicant explained that the detailed design Requirement will include an obligation to construct the authorised development in accordance with the Design Principles. For the WRP and AGP, details will be submitted and approved by the relevant LPA (in consultation with relevant parties). The Design Principles are of limited relevance to the matters likely to be of concern to highway authorities. It is not the intention to add any further principles in relation to highway design.	Requirement 3 sub-paragraph (1) of the Draft DCO [APP-023] requires that the ~~General~~authorised development to be constructed substantially in accordance with the relevant design principles. This applies across the Project where the relevant highway related Design Principles ~~(GDP)~~Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5, Version 1), including those relating to inclusivity and accessibility (WRP_5), access positioning (WRP_6), maximum width of the permanent vehicle access (WRP_7), maximum combined width of the shared use surface and safety margin (WRP_8) and environmental mitigation: shared use surface safety margins (WRP_19), are applicable ~~to the entire Project whilst the Site-Specific Design Principles (SSDP)~~. However, the secondary approval mechanism under Requirement 3 sub-paragraph (3) of the Draft DCO [APP-023] is more limited and relates to the external appearance of the above ground installations. It is therefore not the mechanism through which the detailed design of highway accesses and associated highway infrastructure would be approved. For highway works, the indicative designs for the permanent and temporary accesses are ~~relevant to Project components~~appended to the Framework Construction Management Plan (CTMP) [APP-415]. These drawings provide a benchmark and starting point for the subsequent detailed design, rather than fixing the final design at this stage. Requirement 8 paragraphs (1) and (2) of the Draft DCO [APP-023] provide the mechanism for approval of the detailed CTMP by the relevant planning authority in accordance with the Framework CTMP [APP-415]. This retains flexibility for detailed design after the contractor is appointed, while ensuring the contractor cannot depart from the indicative approach without the relevant detailed approvals. Requirements 3 and 8 of the Draft DCO [APP-023] should also be read alongside the highway specific protective provisions in Schedule 10, Part 4 sub-paragraphs 33 to 36 of the Draft DCO [APP-023], which provide further controls in respect of the approval of plans for highway operations and the role of the relevant Local Highway Authority. The purpose and effect of Requirements 3 and 8 of the Draft DCO [APP-023] further explained in the Explanatory Memorandum [APP-024]. Taken	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) [APP-415]. Explanatory Memorandum to Draft Order [APP-024]	

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
			together with Schedule 10 and Part 4 protective provisions, these mechanisms establish the framework through which HCC, as Local Highway Authority, will retain the relevant controls over the detailed design of highway infrastructure.		
HCC-2025-0040	Design and construction	HCC as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority (MWPA) would like to emphasise the importance of the inclusion of the following test for this design principle, *'The principles of designing sustainable use of materials and minimising out waste should be incorporated throughout the design'*. (GDP_4 Sustainable resources and materials). This has now been reflected (April 2026). All previous comments provided on the design principles that related to highways, traffic and transport are no longer applicable (as is currently understood).	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position and confirms that the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5, Version 1) GDP_4 Sustainable resources and materials includes the principle proposed by HCC.	Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5, Version 1).	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2025-0003	Environmental Mitigation and Enhancement Areas	HCC raised concerns that locations of some proposed mitigation planting and improvement measures where proposed on highway land. Through bilateral engagement, HCC and the Applicant agree that Environmental Mitigation and Enhancement Areas (EMEA) will avoid adopted highway land.	The Applicant confirmed at the 12 June 2025 bilateral meeting with HCC that EMEA will not cross or be located within adopted highway land. The EMEA are identified within the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5, Version 1).	Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5, Version 1).	Matter agreed with other party.
Air quality and odour					
HCC-2024-SC-0041	Air quality and odour - assessment	Only a preliminary assessment of the traffic impacts resulting from the Project has been considered in the air quality assessment. Agreement is therefore sought between the Applicant and the LHA on the likely highway impacts, from which point public health impacts can be meaningfully reviewed and commented on. Construction traffic impact flows (data) have not been issued or reviewed by HCC, and it is understood that at this stage detailed air dispersion modelling related to the one link road has not been ruled out. HCC will review the modelling, if undertaken, to comment on local health impacts.	The Applicant has received finalised construction phase traffic data and significant effects at human receptors were screened out on the basis that the changes in traffic flows did not trigger the need for further assessment, except at two locations. One of which (Harts Farm Way) did not have any human receptors within 200m. The other was based on supplementary traffic data which was outside of the Traffic and Transport study area. Furthermore, monitored pollutant concentrations within the vicinity of these receptors were well within, and therefore meeting, the air quality objective and have been for a number of years, such that the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) at this location (Eastleigh AQMA No.2 (M3)) was revoked in August 2025. Finalised project construction traffic along the road link in Eastleigh AQMA No. 1 (A335) does not trigger the need for a detailed modelling assessment of human health impacts. Finalised operational traffic data was received and reviewed and did not trigger the need for further assessment. It was agreed at Emissions and Transport EIA Working Group (WG) Session#10-11 meeting on 16		Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
			September 2025 and in follow up correspondence that emissions from the small number of additional vehicles attributable to operational traffic from the project-alone are therefore likely to be not perceptible and on that basis cumulative operational phase vehicle movements was not assessed in relation to air quality.		
HCC-2025-0042	Air quality and odour - assessment	The assessment of road traffic emissions indicates only a marginal increase in transport emissions, which is insufficient to trigger human health screening under current criteria. Both construction and operational traffic are expected to remain below thresholds requiring detailed air dispersion modelling for human health impacts. Preliminary data shows only one road link triggers a detailed assessment, but it is not within 200m of any human health receptors. However, HCC suggested the following points to provide further assurances for residents around the air quality impacts on health from traffic related to the Project: • Requested inclusion of a map showing operational routes and AQMA boundaries, with summarised air quality data. • Ensure future compliance statements for PM2.5 are evidenced and included in Project documentation. • Confirmation that population health and vulnerability assessments are detailed, using the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and reflecting local health inequalities. • Encouraged ongoing engagement and transparency with affected communities, especially around priority locations. HCC (Public Health Authority) will review the ES Chapter 17 and the Outline CEMP after submission and review amenity impacts during the construction phase.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position. The Applicant clarified that: • The reference to the revoked AQMA was in relation to construction traffic only and is not specifically relevant to the operational phase discussion (the operational phase discussion is more general and is to demonstrate that operational traffic flows will be well below any of the screening criteria that have been used). • Having looked at the 2025 Defra background maps for particulate matter, the current annual mean PM2.5 objective and the 2028 annual mean PM2.5 objective are both predicted to be met. Given that human health has been scoped out of the construction phase assessment of road traffic emissions, it is not likely that a significant effect will be caused by construction road traffic emissions. In addition to this, 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) contains commitments that project related vehicles will adhere to Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) standards for light duty vehicles and LEZ standards for heavy duty vehicles. The health assessment included in ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health~~, Volume I~~ (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1) has considered potential health effects from changes in air quality. Effects on physical health have been scoped out, as the scale of change in pollutant concentrations during construction and operation would not significantly increase exposure or affect health outcomes at population level. Effects on wellbeing associated with neighbourhood amenity have also been considered, including air quality, noise, visual and traffic effects. Amenity effects were identified during construction, but air quality was not considered to contribute to these effects due	Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1 for document 1 of 3, [APP-413] and [APP-414] for documents 2 and 3). ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health~~, Volume I~~ (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1).	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
			to the small scale of change. No effects were identified during operation.		
Habitats and ecology					
HCC-nsc-065	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology - assessment	HCC is satisfied that the Applicant's approach to ecology is acceptable, including Road Verges of Ecological Importance (RVEI) and Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and that the HCC issue can be closed. This is subject to the LPA involved in the scheme finding the ecological details acceptable, as is their statutory role.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position.	ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity~~, Volume I~~ (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1).	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-nsc-066	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology - assessment	HCC is satisfied that the Applicant's approach to ecology at Portsdown Hill is acceptable and the issue can be closed. This is subject to the LPA involved in the scheme finding the scheme's ecological details acceptable, as is their statutory role.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position.	ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity~~, Volume I~~ (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1).	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-nsc-068	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology - mitigation	HCC is satisfied that the Applicant's approach to mitigation hierarchy is acceptable, and the issue can be closed. This is subject to the LPA involved in the scheme finding the scheme's ecological details acceptable, as is their statutory role.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position.	ES Chapter 5 EIA approach and methodology~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-084]. ES Chapter 8 Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity~~, Volume I~~ (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1~~, DCO Volume 6~~).	Matter agreed with other party.
Biodiversity and nature conservation					
HCC-2024-0177	Biodiversity Net Gain/Environmental Net Gain	HCC supports the Applicant's approach to ecology and to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) for Hampshire.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position.	Biodiversity Gain Plan ~~(Document reference 7.11, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-426].	Matter agreed with other party.
Landscape and visual impact					
HCC-2025-0039	Landscape and visual impact - assessment	HCC agrees that viewpoints from key trails have been addressed within the ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-092].	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position.	ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-092].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2025-SC-0002	Landscape and visual impact - mitigation	HCC agrees that the visual impacts along Footpath Havant 45 have been addressed within the inclusion of mitigation in the Framework Rights of Way Management Plan (RoWMP) appended to the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] submitted with the DCO application. HCC agrees that viewpoints from key trails have been addressed within the ES Chapter	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position.	ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-092]. Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		13 Landscape and visual~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-092].		of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	
Noise and vibration					
HCC-2024-SC-0044	Noise and vibration - mitigation	HCC requested further information about how the noise and vibration control measures during construction will be assessed and implemented- including a scheme for monitoring noise levels. Noise and vibration, as environmental health issues, are considered at the LPA level and therefore not a direct consideration for HCC. However, the overarching public health assessments are at an insufficient level and require a more granular scale to allow for consideration of public health impacts, cumulative impacts, and their suitable avoidance, mitigation, and/or compensation. Therefore, HCC Public Health requires improved assessment and scheme-wide methodology - the site specific details can be provided as requirements of the DCO allowing for consideration by the relevant LPA. HCC Public Health Authority will review the submitted ES Chapter 15 noise and vibration; the Outline CEMP and the detailed CEMP to be submitted by the Contractor. HCC acknowledges that the Outline CEMP commits to implementing an Environmental Management System which will include procedures for dealing with complaints.	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)includes the application of a Section 61 consent, which will require noise (and where appropriate, vibration) assessments to be undertaken and Best Practicable Means measures set out to manage noise associated with the construction of the Project. 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)secures the environmental measures required during construction works, based on information from the EIA and feedback from statutory consultees, stakeholders, and consultation responses. All topics covered by the ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6),~~ [APP-094], including noise and vibration are referred at Table 5-1 Environmental measures to be adopted during construction. Details of construction noise monitoring will be provided in the detailed CEMP to be submitted by the Contractor. Environmental health issues are considered under ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health~~, Volume I~~ (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1).	Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1 for document 1 of 3, [APP-413] and [APP-414] for documents 2 and 3). ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-094]. ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health~~, Volume I~~ (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1).	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2025-0012	Traffic Management Strategy - nighttime works	HCC Public Health Authority will keep under review the assessed impacts of the required nighttime works on noise-sensitive receptors. HCC notes that WCC has raised potential concerns with some specific locations for nighttime works, and these are subject to further engagement. HCC Public Health Authority will consider the health impacts and suitability of proposed mitigation if required.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position. Nighttime works in any one location on the highway are expected to last for less than one month and the TMS ~~(Document reference 7.3, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-416] states that these works will be limited to a maximum of 10 days within a 15-day period. This short duration is below the minimum threshold for noise impacts to cause a potentially significant effect, as discussed through engagement in EIA WG sessions. Engagement has been undertaken with the relevant LPA to provide details of the proposed night-time working in their district/borough, the mitigation measures that will be included to minimise the potential for disturbance, and the justification for excluding works which are shorter than 10-days from the scope of the noise and	ES Chapter 15 Noise and vibration~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-094]. Traffic Management Strategy ~~(Document reference 7.3, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-416].	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
			vibration assessment (as effects are not significant). The Applicant' assessment approach has been discussed during engagement with the LPAs. WCC has raised potential concerns with some specific locations for nighttime works, and these are subject to further engagement.		
Resources and waste					
HCC-2024-SC-0045	Non-hazardous waste landfill capacity and development waste	The Hampshire Minerals and Waste Planning Authority (HMWPA) is satisfied that the issue has been addressed, subject to securing in the DCO either an acceptable Soil Resources Management Plan as required by 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), or a suitable mechanism for the submission and approval, by the HMWPA, prior to commencement, of a Soil Management Plan.	The Applicant acknowledges the HMWPA's position.	Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1 for document 1 of 3, [APP-413] and [APP-414] for documents 2 and 3).	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2022-0064	Resources and waste management - baseline	It is acknowledged that the 100 metres buffer is applied specifically around residential properties in accordance with the Supplementary Planning Document Minerals and Waste Safeguarding in Hampshire adopted in February 2016.	The Applicant acknowledges the HMWPA's position.		Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2024-0189	Resources and waste management - baseline	The HMWPA supports the prior extraction of soft sand from Five Oaks Farm, in principle, to prevent sterilisation. The onus is on the landowner to pursue agreement with the developer to resolve the issue of the development of sand extraction at the Five Oaks Site, as well as the appropriate permissions from the HMWPA - but continue to bear in mind soft sand resource safeguarding and sterilisation policies of the HMWP (2013) and the emerging HMWP update.	The HMWPA supports the prior extraction of soft sand from Five Oaks Farm, in principle, to prevent sterilisation. The onus is on the landowner to pursue agreement with the developer to resolve the issue of the development of sand extraction at the Five Oaks Site, as well as the appropriate permissions from the HMWPA - but continue to bear in mind soft sand resource safeguarding and sterilisation policies of the HMWP (2013).	ES Appendix 16.1 Mineral Safeguarding Assessment, ~~Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~[APP-183].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2024-0159	Resources and waste management - assessment	The HMWPA supports the structured approach to assessing regional waste capacity impacts in the ES. HMWPA understands and is satisfied that 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) includes measures to produce, implement and maintain a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) in accordance with the waste hierarchy and circular economy principles.	The Applicant acknowledges the HMWPA's position.	Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1 for document 1 of 3, [APP-413] and [APP-414] for documents 2 and 3). ES Chapter 16 Resources and waste management, ~~Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~[APP-095].	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
HCC-2024-SC-0029	Resources and waste management - assessment	The HMWPA supports the Applicant's justification, as set out in ES Appendix 16.1 Mineral Safeguarding Assessment~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6),~~ [APP-183], that incidental extraction is the most practicable approach for the development.	The Applicant acknowledges the HMWPA's position.	ES Appendix 16.1 Mineral Safeguarding Assessment, ~~Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~[APP-183].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2025-SC-0032	Resources and waste management - assessment	The HMWPA supports the Applicant's approach to the Mineral Safeguarding Assessment.	The Applicant acknowledges the HMWPA's position.	ES Chapter 16 Resources and waste management, ~~Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~[APP-095].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2024-0194	Resources and waste management - mitigation	The HMWPA is satisfied that the issue has been addressed, subject to securing in the DCO a suitable mechanism for the submission and approval, by the HMWPA, prior to commencement of the relevant phase of the proposed development, of a minerals plan (as part of the CMTP) of the incidental extraction of mineral deposits that sets out appropriate management, quantification, and re-use of any encountered material.	The Applicant acknowledges the HMWPA's position.	Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1 for document 1 of 3, [APP-413] and [APP-414] for documents 2 and 3).	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2025-0004	Resources and waste management - mitigation	The HMWPA sought assurance that options to avoid mineral sterilisation have been fully explored, including excavation of material beneath the pipeline, appropriate stand-off distances, consideration of extraction along the route (not only at landowner-flagged locations), and inclusion of any associated movements in construction traffic calculations, in line with national policy to safeguard mineral resources.	The Applicant acknowledges the HMWPA's position. The Applicant confirms that, due to the narrow pipeline excavation width, deeper or wider mineral extraction has not been pursued; that all material movements associated with construction are included within traffic assessments; and that the ES Appendix 16.1 Mineral Safeguarding Assessment~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)~~ [APP-183] sets out the assessment of potential effects on mineral resources and the rationale for incidental extraction as the most appropriate approach. The Applicant shared draft text with the explanation, and HMWPA confirms that it is satisfied with this approach.	ES Appendix 16.1 Mineral Safeguarding Assessment~~,~~ ~~Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-183].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2025-SC-0027	Resources and waste management - mitigation	The HMWPA notes that design refinement 24 - From Mortimers Lane (B3037) near Lower Upham to Highbridge Road (B3335), west of Brambridge, will have minimal effect on how much of the pipeline easement is within the Mineral Safeguarding Area. The Mineral Resource Assessment (MRA) will be required to understand the Applicant's assessment of how to deal with extracted minerals.	The Applicant has prepared an Appendix 16.1 Mineral Safeguarding Assessment~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)~~ [APP-183] accompanying the ES Chapter 16 Resources and waste management~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6)~~ [APP-095] in response to the proportion of the land within the Order Limits coinciding with the Mineral Consultation Areas (MCA) as identified by HCC in its adopted Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan. 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) requires the Contractor to develop a Minerals	ES Appendix 16.1 Mineral Safeguarding Assessment~~,~~ ~~Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-183]. ES Chapter 16 Resources and waste management, ~~Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~[APP-095]. Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
			Management Strategy (MMS) as part of the detailed CEMP, prior to the commencement of any excavation activities. To ensure effective management of minerals, a Minerals Management Strategy (MMS) will be developed by the Contractor for inclusion within or to accompany the detailed CEMP(s) and prior to the commencement of excavation activities.	7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1 for document 1 of 3, [APP-413] and [APP-414] for documents 2 and 3).	
HCC-2025-SC-0021	Resources and waste management - safeguarding minerals, waste sites and infrastructure	The HMWPA is satisfied that the issue has been addressed, subject to any site operators' concerns being registered and considered.	The Applicant acknowledges HMWPA's position.		Matter agreed with other party.
Socio-economics, tourism, recreation, and health					
HCC-2024-SC-0036	Socio-economic, tourism, recreation and health - baseline	HCC is not yet satisfied with the rationale for using Lower Super Output Area level (LSOA) only for Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), but not for other health-related data. HCC requested that health data be presented at the smallest data level. The Hampshire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) can be used to help inform this, with health data held at ward, Middle Layer Super Output Area and LSOA. HCC Public Health Authority requires information about the methodology and data used to identify health baseline at the neighbourhood level in their impact assessment. IMD is only one index and there is health data available at LSOA levels (see JSNA). For example, disease prevalence. HCC considered the assessment of potential likely significant effects, proposed mitigation, and monitoring and enhancement measures for the socio-economics, tourism and health through the Community EIA WG Session#10-11 meeting on 1 October 2025. These were not agreed. HCC confirms the following issues have been addressed: • HCC's Public Health Strategy 2023 –2026 is relevant to health assessment and should be included. The strategy focuses on improving health and tackling health inequalities. This has been added according to the Applicant. • HCC requested further clarification to demonstrate the robustness of how population health and health impacts have been considered, and the likely public health effects of the proposals, including wider determinants of health. Baseline evidence is available in the	~~The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position.~~ The Applicant has added the requested references to Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health~~, Volume I, to~~ section 17.2 (Legislation and policy) of the ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1). The Applicant has reviewed the baseline conditions in the ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health~~, Volume I~~ (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1). However, ward data is considered an appropriate scale for the size of the Project. Data from the IMD, which is closely correlated with health outcomes, has been presented at LSOA level. ~~The health assessment presented in Section 17.8 of the ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), is based on the wider determinants of health and considers effects on the health of the population and vulnerable groups in accordance with ISEP (formerly IEMA) guidance on Determining Significance for Human Health in Environmental Impact Assessment (2022).~~ HCC has provided a Relevant Representation [RR-121] dated 21 August 2026, stating that: *'Following previous comments made by the County Council as Public Health Authority on the appropriate scale of assessment to be applied to the Environmental Statement (ES), the assessment appears methodologically sound. Whilst health sensitivities are ultimately assessed at ward level, the ES makes appropriate use of Lower Layer Super Output Area (LSOA) – level deprivation data to identify localised pockets of*	ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health~~, Volume I~~ (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1).	Matters subject to further discussion.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		Hampshire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (to add to Table 17-6 data sources). The Applicant has included data in the ES as appropriate. • HCC requested to include the impacts caused by construction accesses along the pipeline route in addition to the pipeline and AGP construction impacts. This has been addressed. • HCC requested information required to satisfy HCC that construction compound B1-1 within Staunton Country Park would not deter people from accessing it (as asserted in para. 17.8.118 and 17.8.121). The Applicant has confirmed no construction impacts will impact the Country Park.	*vulnerability, and to inform ward sensitivity judgements. The use of ward data to signpost and contextualise more granular LSOA evidence is therefore unlikely to materially affect the conclusions of the assessment.'* The Applicant discussed the health assessment data and mitigation at bilateral meeting on 27 October 2026 and clarified that the assessment of population sensitivity takes account of vulnerable groups, such as users of specific community resources, and deprived communities present within the receptor population. The most deprived communities, based on LSOA data, are assumed to have a high level of sensitivity to health effects, which reflects a reasonable worst case based on the link between social deprivation and poor health. Mitigation of effects on sensitive health receptors includes measures to avoid or reduce effects on sensitive receptors embedded through the design process and measures identified by relevant topics, such as noise. All reasonably practicable mitigation measures have been adopted to avoid or reduce adverse effects on health. The Applicant therefore considers that consideration of LSOA-level health data would not change the conclusions of the health assessment or the mitigation of health effects. HCC confirmed that it will review the additional clarification on the methodology and rationale and consider whether this matter can be agreed.		
HCC-2024-SC-0047	Socio-economic, tourism, recreation and health - methodology	HCC requested that more accurate and detailed assumptions on temporal distribution of health impacts are needed. The proposed approach to assessment of significance for population and human health should reflect the latest IEMA guidance. The significance of forecast health effects has the potential to change in significance over time. HCC Public Health Authority needs to be satisfied that all health impacts have been identified at the appropriate level, but acknowledges that a standalone Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is not the methodology SW wish to utilise which in HCC's opinion risks insufficient assessment. The recommendation to undertake a full HIA rather than a 'Rapid HIA Guidance' (HUDU) was given by HCC in the August 2023 response to EIA Scoping Opinion, and flagged at EIA WG meetings.	The Applicant has included further information on health impacts in ~~the~~ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health~~, Volume I of the ES~~ (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1). The Applicant has provided an overview of the assessment of potential likely significant effects, proposed mitigation, and monitoring and enhancement measures for the socio-economics, tourism and health through the Community EIA WG Session#10-11 meeting on 1 October 2025.	ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health~~, Volume I~~ (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1).	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		Temporal distribution of impacts still unclear. As with health baseline, the extent to which this has been addressed remains unclear until HCC has reviewed the final documents.			
Traffic and transport					
HCC-2022-0146	Construction compound access - Winchester Road/Titchfield Lane	Winchester Road/Titchfield Lane junction – Proposed pipeline route crosses the A334 Winchester Road/Titchfield Lane/Blind Lane junction just outside Wickham. Contributions have been secured as part of application 17/01625 to extend the right-turn lane on Winchester Road southbound. HCC wishes to ensure that the delivery timescales for the consented application works to be delivered by the HA are not precluded or stalled through an overlap of works interactions at this location.	The pipeline will cross under Winchester Road (A334) using trenchless construction. The Project will not directly impact the junction during pipeline construction. Works are proposed at this junction to enable HGV access to/from Blind Lane, including widening of the Blind Lane entry to the junction. These proposed works would not preclude the potential extension of the right-turn lane from coming forward.		Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2025-0048	Construction compound accesses	Notwithstanding the point at HCC-2023-0001 (Other Highway Matters - highway accesses), HCC broadly agrees that safe and suitable access could be achieved at the following locations in the form shown to date, subject to appropriate measures in the Framework CTMP (and appended Framework RoWMP) and TMS: • Construction compound B1-2 and B1-3 (Meyrick Road). • Construction compound D-1 (Gillman Road). • Construction compound E-1 and E-2 (New Down Lane). • Construction compound H-4 and H-5 (Shirell Heath High Street). • Construction compound K-1, K-2, K-3 and K-4 (Winters Hill). • Construction compound L-1 and L-2 (Portsmouth Road (B2177)). • Construction compound L-10 (Highbridge Road (B3335)). In addition, the potential strategy for off-site works at the A334/Botley Road and Bedhampton Road/Brookside Road junctions are broadly agreed.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position and confirms that indicative designs with associated management measures have been included in the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. These demonstrate safe and suitable access could be achieved, subject to the detail that would follow post-DCO consent.	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2025-0047	Construction compound accesses - B1-1	The access route along Mill Lane includes an existing rail bridge and the weight restrictions on the railway bridge need to be established. HCC understands from the Applicant that there are no weight restrictions at the existing rail bridge.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position and confirms that a strategy for managing construction vehicle movements along Brookside Road, Bidbury Lane and Mill Lane is detailed in the	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan)	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
			Framework CTMP ~~(Document Reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	
HCC-2025-0051	Construction compound accesses - E-3, E-4a and E-4b	HCC remains concerned with achievable visibility at these compound locations and whether temporary speed limits will be sufficient or appropriate to ensure safe and suitable access. HCC reserves further comment upon receipt of the referenced information. To resolve this, HCC requests to see visibility splays based on recorded speeds and how the cycle lanes will be managed as part of the access proposal. There are existing on-carriageway cycle lanes which should be considered within any access proposals and the Applicant has not demonstrated how these will be appropriately managed.	The indicative access drawing for construction compounds E-4a and E-4b with Southwick Road has been updated to include recorded road speeds and to note achievable visibility. Vehicle tracking has been provided between both indicative accesses. ~~The suggestion regarding a reduction in the posted speed limit is noted and could be included as part of the final access strategy in the detailed CTMP. The Framework CTMP (Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~The Framework CTMP [APP-415] refers to the existing cycle lanes on Southwick Road and includes measures to safely manage them at the temporary accesses to the construction compounds. Given visibility is achievable based on recorded road speeds, and sufficient measures have been proposed to safely manage the cycle lanes, no further comments are anticipated on this indicative access.	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Matters subject to further discussion.
HCC-2025-0052	Construction compound accesses - E-5, E-6a, E-6b and F-1- accessed from Boarhunt Road	Visibility splays cannot be achieved on Boarhunt Road, and more information is needed around how active traffic management can be used noting the speed of the road. Active traffic management in the form of temporary signals are unlikely to be acceptable for this length of time without causing considerable harm to traffic operations. They are also likely to be difficult to safely locate on the carriageway to be used on a non-permanent basis. HCC has responded on the technical note provided and raised concerns around the deliverability of a safe and suitable access as proposed and the reliance on temporary traffic management measures. It has been suggested a suitable access arrangement can be achieved but would require relocation of the proposed works and amendment to the redline area. The Framework CTMP states a temporary junction arrangement will be shown in Appendix C but HCC still need to be satisfied that a safe and suitable access can be delivered.	The Applicant has engaged with HCC regarding the proposed access strategy for the construction compounds E-6a and E-6b, both accessed from Boarhunt Road. A technical note has been prepared and issued to HCC for these accesses and presents the potential management measures that could be considered for the accesses. This includes traffic signals or reducing the posted speed limit. These options are also presented in the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. Whilst the Applicant is satisfied that these options demonstrate a safe and suitable access could be delivered, further revisions to these schemes will be explored with HCC. The Applicant has informed HCC that an indicative Traffic Management scheme is being developed for this location and this will be submitted during Examination.	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Matters subject to further discussion.
HCC-2025-0053	Construction compound accesses - F2, F-3 IPS-F	The construction phase of the DCO works has the potential to overlap with works to the A32 Welborne Garden Village (WGV) Programme. For Intermediate Pumping Station F (IPS-F), the requirement for operational vehicles to access the pumping station within the WGV development	Given the temporary access is located over 100m from the roundabout and the forecast construction traffic demand and the measures proposed to manage construction traffic in the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume~~	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan)	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		should be co-ordinated with the WGV developer to ensure that the requirements for accessing IPS-F can be accommodated within the street layout. HCC requests that the suitability of temporary construction accesses, and the suitability of the permanent access for the IPS-F, be considered (in terms of highway issues and coordination of traffic management with WGV developer) separately by the Applicant. HCC welcomes further discussion on how programme and works coordination will be managed between the two construction projects.	~~7),~~[APP-415], it is highly unlikely that queuing would back up to the A32. Significant flexibility has been provided in the Order Limits to allow for an alternative access arrangement should the streets associated with the WGV come forward. The Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] provides flexibility regarding access, should there be works on the A32, but it is agreed that access should ultimately be via Junction 10 of the M27.	~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	
HCC-2025-0054	Construction compound accesses - G-1, G-2 and G-3	The number of Light Goods Vehicles (LGV) movements required to U-turn on the A32 roundabout should be set out for consideration and resulting safety consideration on the operation of the roundabout should be set out in the TMS (e.g. traffic signage). A Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) and/or physical Traffic Management (TM) measures may be required to prevent right turn movements into the accesses for all vehicles. The access arrangements also need to be shown alongside the WGV works to this road which may be in place prior to construction. The requirement for coordination of works should they overlap with WGV is welcomed however the commitment on this and the priority of the committed WGV consent is very light, and great consideration needs to be given to these requirements alongside the WGV team and HCC. HCC wishes this matter to be considered twofold- both in terms of construction access and operational access. HCC considers that the additional information requested is necessary to inform whether a safe and suitable access can be achieved in this location including details on how vehicle movements will be enforced to undertake a left in and left out manoeuvre. HCC wants reassurance that this access arrangement requirement is secured.	In agreement with HCC, both temporary accesses for construction compounds G-1 and G-2 with the A32 are proposed to be left-in/left-out. The Framework CTMP [APP-415] notes physical traffic management may be required to enforce the left-in/left-out and this would be considered as part of the detailed design. Visibility splays and recorded road speeds are included on the access drawings and are documented in the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. The number of LGV forecast to be undertaking a U-turn at the A32 with the A334 is detailed in para 5.6.58-59 of the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] alongside a commitment to provide sufficient warning signage. The detailed signage strategy will be confirmed by the Contractor, once appointed, and agreed as part of the detailed CTMP. ~~The potential requirement for further measures to enforce the left-in/left-out would also be considered at this stage.~~ As noted in the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7),~~[APP-415], coordination with the WGV developers is proposed to manage the cumulative impacts associated with the traffic management of both schemes, where practicable.	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Matters subject to further discussion.
HCC-2025-0055	Construction compound accesses - G-4, G-5, G-6, G-7 and IPS G	The proposed access (Titchfield Lane) has a significant reduction on the achievable visibility. The visibility constraints are more likely to be manageable via more light touch Traffic Management (TM) arrangements, such as extended speed limit controls and construction access signage, but HCC would need recorded speeds and a drawn-up scheme to confirm. There	The achievable visibility at the temporary access with Titchfield Lane is not sufficient based on roads speeds and it is agreed temporary signals would not be the preferred management measures to control access. As such, it is proposed to reduce the posted speed limit in the vicinity of the access, as detailed in the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2,~~	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan)	Matters subject to further discussion.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		are restrictions on construction worker trips to these compounds with vehicles coming from the construction worker hub and this measure needs to be secured through the Framework CWTP. HCC has not had sight of the proposed measures and therefore reserves further comment until this additional information on vehicle tracking is presented.	~~DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. Vehicle tracking has been provided to HCC, which shows that two HGV (10m rigid lorries) can pass on Titchfield Lane and at the junction with the A334. Larger 16.5m articulated lorries would not be able to pass in places on Titchfield Lane, so these infrequent trips would be scheduled to avoid passing on Titchfield Lane. Some restrictions have been placed on construction worker trips to construction compounds G-4 and G-5, given that they are accessed from the haul road, and these are committed through the Framework CTMP and the appended Framework CWTP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. Additional restrictions on construction worker trips are proposed during the PM peak hour (between 16:00 and 18:00) and are also secured through the Framework CTMP and the appended Framework CWTP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	
HCC-2025-0056	Construction compound accesses - H-1, H-2 and H-3 – Blind Lane access constraints	Tracking demonstrates that the Applicant cannot access Blind Lane from the A334 junction. There are two proposals to address the matter, both requiring HGV to first route to the compound on Titchfield Lane. This enables HGV to travel straight across the A334 between Titchfield Lane. HCC does not support the setting back of the stop line as the existing constraints on the intervisibility whether permanent or temporary should not be exacerbated for all users to facilitate the Applicant's traffic. HCC considers this to create a highway safety risk. Therefore, the option to widen Blind Lane at the junction needs to be explored further which is likely to require, at a minimum, the crown lifting of the existing tree. The trees in question are highway trees and therefore it is within HCC's jurisdiction to allow them to be felled. HCC will require a CAVAT payment for the loss and arb reports in accordance with TG15. On Blind Lane, HCC is concerned there are not sufficient passing places for a car and HGV to pass based on actual working width. If passing places are not feasible, widening works are required to provide formal passing places. It is noted that the Applicant intends to present two options. HCC raises significant safety concerns with the setting back of the stop line and considers that this is not a feasible option and should be removed from the Framework CTMP proposals. HCC has ~~not~~now had sight of the referenced site visit information relating to the road widths and suitable passing provision along Blind Lane and	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's comments with regard to construction access from Blind Lane. ~~As detailed in~~The Applicant has informed HCC that the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7), two options are presented for~~[APP-415] will be updated to remove the ~~A334/Blind Lane junction, including HCC's favoured~~ option of ~~widening the road at~~setting back the stop line ~~on Blind Lane. Flexibility has however been retained at~~ and this ~~early stage, and the final solution will be agreed with HCC as part of the detailed CTMP post-DCO consent.~~ will be submitted during the Examination. Should any felling be required, the process is noted, however alternative powers may be sought through the Draft DCO ~~(Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3).~~ [APP-023]. There have been further discussions with HCC regarding the vehicle tracking on Blind Lane, a site visit has been undertaken to confirm road widths, and updated vehicle tracking ~~will be~~is included in the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] to demonstrate there are sufficient passing places for HGV and cars. An approach has been agreed with HCC for Blind Lane, including a requirement for the Contractor to undertake a survey of the road widths prior to construction to confirm if there have been any changes.	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. Draft Development Consent Order ~~(PDF Version) (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3).~~[APP-023].	Matters subject to further discussion.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		~~reserves further comment until this is presented.~~agreed an approach to be included in the Framework CTMP, including future surveys.	Once HCC has had sight of the updated Framework CTMP [APP-415], no further comments are anticipated on this access. Article 25 of the Draft DCO [APP-023] provides the necessary powers to fell or lop trees and hedgerows for the authorised development. Where those powers affect highway trees or hedgerows, the relevant highway authority controls secured through the DCO, including the protective provisions and applicable approvals for highway works, will apply. The Applicant will continue to engage with HCC on the treatment of affected highway trees, including the application of HCC's CAVAT methodology and Technical Guidance Note 15 where appropriate. The parties will seek to agree any remaining matters through the Examination.		
HCC-2025-0058	Construction compound accesses - J-1	Due to the vegetation and raised banking in close proximity to the carriageway there are concerns with regards to achievable visibility. Visibility splay assessment should consider visibility for southbound vehicles beyond the junction extents where reasonable. ~~Tracking demonstrates that two light vans are unable to pass at the access or at the B2177/St Anne's Lane junction and this needs to be addressed given the vehicle numbers. Reference is made to the need for 1 HGV to enter from this compound access. Tracking has been provided for the access itself however not at the junction B2177/St Anne's Lane junction. In addition, no impact consideration in relation to the vertical clearance has been provided, and there are concerns around the tree impacts~~From the updated tracking provided, vehicle passing provision does appear to be acceptable however HCC havs requested a cleaner version of the tracking drawing so this can be confirmed. The Applicant's response to this concern is noted by HCC and shall seek to agree matters on this when the updated Framework CTMP measures proposed have been shared.	The indicative access drawing is being updated with Manual for Streets visibility splays and now shows there is ~~not~~ sufficient visibility at the temporary access with St Anne's Lane ~~and therefore the~~with vegetation clearance. The Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] also notes a traffic marshal would manage the access. There is ~~however~~also sufficient visibility at the existing St Anne's Lane junction with Winchester Road based on recorded road speeds. Whilst the tracking shows that St Anne's Lane is not wide enough for two vans to pass, there is sufficient space for two vehicles to pass at the bell mouth. At the request of HCC a cleaner version of the tracking drawing will be included in the updated Framework CTMP will be submitted during Examination. Given the LGV movements would be very tidal, there would be a peak demand of one LGV every two minutes in the development peak periods, and outbound movement would be managed by a traffic marshal, the measures included in the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] are considered sufficient to safely manage traffic at this junction. There is, however, an opportunity to review these measures as part of the detailed CTMP. ~~The Winchester Road/St Annes Lane has been tracked with a 16.5m HGV and can turn right in/left-out of the junction. The vertical clearance along this route associated with the adjacent trees is noted and any works to the canopy would be~~	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. Draft Development Consent Order ~~(PDF version) (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3).~~[APP-023].	Matters subject to further discussion.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
			~~confirmed by the Contractor in the detailed CTMP. Powers for tree work have been included in the Draft DCO (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3), if required.~~		
HCC-2025-0059	Construction compound accesses - J-2	The crest of the hill to the north and the existing hedge boundary of the field are likely to restrict the achievable visibility from the access. It is unclear what a traffic marshal will be able to do to ensure construction traffic does not impact school service provision. This should be clarified. No tracking of the B2177/Curdridge Lane junction has been provided and this should be shown given that Curdridge Lane is subject to a weight restriction if this route is to be used as suggested in the narrative. Equally, the junction with B3035/The Plantation has not been tracked and there is concern that this junction won't be able to accommodate the HGV movements. HCC notes the response to these access concerns in relation to its safe operation. The proposed temporary speed limit and signing measures have not been presented and there is a concern the measures will not be sufficient to create the reduction in vehicle speeds required to accommodate safe and suitable access. The road is not of a suitable arrangement to be safely managed by a banksman and management of LGV movements by a banksman is not considered a reasonable control measure. HCC remains concerned that the proposals do not address the highway safety concerns that have been identified by the Applicant in the substandard visibility provision for the construction access.	Based on recorded road speeds, sufficient visibility at this junction would not be achievable given the alignment of the road and the crest of the hill. It is therefore proposed to reduce the posted speed limit to ensure the achievable visibility is sufficient, as outlined in the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. Warning signage would also be installed, and this would be confirmed in the detailed CTMP post-DCO consent. As detailed in the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7),~~[APP-415], it is recognised that Curdridge Lane is used by school bus services and impacts on these should be minimised where practicable. This would include restrictions on HGV movements in network peak hours and the use of traffic marshals to manage construction vehicles travelling in and out of the construction compound access. Combined, this would avoid any material impacts of construction traffic on the school bus services. HGV would be routed via Junction 7 of the M27 via Botley Road and Hedge End. Traffic would therefore travel west from the construction compound rather than via the B2177/Curdridge Lane junction. The B3035/The Plantation junction has been reviewed and considered sufficiently sized to accommodate HGV. The Applicant has informed HCC that an indicative Traffic Management scheme is being developed for this location and will be submitted during Examination.	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Matters subject to further discussion.
HCC-2025-0060	Construction compound accesses - J-3	Visibility cannot be achieved at this temporary access with Botley Road and a significant departure from the standards would be required. Recorded speeds should be provided to understand the extent of the departure required against actual speeds and to ascertain whether a traffic marshal can operate the access safely. HCC, following a site visit in February 2026, has highway safety concerns around the operation and location of this access arrangement, given the onsite constraints and historic accident record.	As noted by HCC, visibility based on the posted speed limit is not achievable at this temporary access point with Botley Road. As suggested by HCC, it is therefore proposed to temporarily reduce the posted speed limit. As detailed in the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7),~~[APP-415], the access would also be managed by a traffic marshal. Warning signage would also be installed, and this would be confirmed in the detailed CTMP post-DCO consent. The Applicant has informed HCC that an indicative Traffic Management scheme is being developed for this location and will be submitted	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Matters subject to further discussion.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		HCC is not currently satisfied that the measures proposed are sufficient to address the concerns raised.	during Examination. The Applicant has also informed HCC that additional speed survey data has been collected at this location which indicates that visibility may be achievable at this location without Traffic Management.		
HCC-2025-0062	Construction compound accesses - K-5, K-6 and BPT-K	Speed surveys will be necessary to inform the visibility requirements. It would appear that with some vegetation removal and modest repositioning of the access visibility could be achieved. HCC needs to see the speed surveys and the visibility splays based on the speed surveys before confirming whether the access in the location is suitable or not.	The recorded road speeds have been reviewed, and the required visibility splays are not achievable at this location. As detailed in the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7),~~[APP-415], a temporary reduction in the posted speed limit is proposed. The Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] has also been updated to note that the stagger is a risk for the access arrangement; however, as the HCC notes, there would be no vehicles travelling between the two junctions. Only construction workers at construction compound K-5 would be expected to park at the construction worker hub and travel to the site by mini-bus, given that this compound is accessed via two haul roads. As detailed in the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7),~~[APP-415], construction workers can drive directly to construction compounds K-6 and Break Pressure Tank K (BPT-K). The Applicant has informed HCC that an indicative Traffic Management scheme is being developed for this location and will be submitted during Examination.	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Matters subject to further discussion.
HCC-2025-0064	Construction compound accesses - L-3, L-4, L-5, L-6 and L-7	A bridge abutment is noted as a minimal obstruction to the visibility splay but further narrative is requested. The impacts for pedestrians need to be set out alongside how long and justification is needed as to why an uncontrolled crossing is appropriate. Construction compound L7 requires workers to be transported via minibus from the Otterbourne site which is agreed. HCC notes the Applicant's comments and reserves further comment until the referenced measures within the Framework CTMP are shared.	There is a low bridge abutment within the visibility splay, but, as noted on the drawing, it would have minimal impact on visibility at the access. The Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] has been updated to confirm that a traffic marshal would control the pedestrian crossing at the temporary construction compound access when construction vehicles are accessing the site. This crossing would be required for 17 months. All accesses have been designed to be wide enough for a single HGV and therefore HGV arrivals and departures would need to be managed for all accesses. The Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] has been updated to note that the Contractor would need to manage the arrivals and departures at all accesses.	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
HCC-2025-0065	Construction compound accesses - L-8 and L-9	HCC is concerned with the tracking and turning movements at this access. Concerns have also been raised on the existing carriageway alignment of Church Lane which restricts visibility to the left. There is an existing telegraph pole which will require relocation and confirmation should be provided to ensure that the telegraph pole can be relocated. Footway disruption is noted however no measures have been set out on how this is to be managed. HCC seeks confirmation on the duration of this access and whether a temporary crossing provision compliant with ES Chapter 18 on traffic and transport would be required. The Framework CTMP does not pick up the interaction with the PRoW and there are no measures in the Framework RoWMP. HCC requested clarification on the impacted PRoW given there are several within the vicinity of this access arrangement.	The access location has been amended which resolves many of the concerns identified by HCC. Vehicle tracking shows ~~ana~~ HGV can turn in and out of the temporary haul road access. ~~The Contractor will be responsible for seeking agreement to relocate the telegraph pole, which will be done post DCO consent~~Visibility is achievable at this location. ~~The access drawing has been updated to note that the tree would need to be removed.~~ The Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] has been updated to confirm that a traffic marshal would control the pedestrian crossing at the temporary construction compound access when construction vehicles are accessing the site. The Framework RoWMP appended to the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] includes any necessary management measures associated with construction compounds L-8 and L-9. Once HCC has had sight of the updated Framework CTMP, no further comments are anticipated on this access.	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Matters subject to further discussion.
HCC-2025-0067	Construction compound accesses - M-1 and M-2	Vehicle tracking has not been provided between the access and Otterbourne Road. The access tracking shows an HGV needing to be in the centre of the carriageway which is not acceptable. Should an HGV and LGV not be able to pass, this section of Kiln Lane is going to require traffic management control. The forecast numbers of HGV are not excessive and therefore active management of these movements are not unreasonable (e.g. temporary rolling road closure). This would require a holding area, but this could be the Otterbourne site. HCC notes that the Applicant has undertaken additional assessment work which will be reviewed when submitted.	Vehicle tracking for the full length of Kiln Lane between Otterbourne Road and the temporary accesses has been undertaken and demonstrates that an HGV and an LGV could pass at several places along Kiln Lane. A site visit was undertaken to confirm the road width in places given the tracking is based on OS mapping. It is therefore assumed that further traffic management (e.g. rolling road closures) would not be required, but these could be explored further post-DCO consent, should they be required. The management measures for PRoW are included in the Framework RoWMP appended to the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2025-0082	Construction compound accesses - Otterbourne/Kiln Lane mitigation measures	HCC has raised concerns around the tracking requirements at the Otterbourne Road/Kiln Lane junction and considers that temporary traffic management measures along this corridor to facilitate these movements would not be acceptable. This route also forms part of the formal diversion route for the M3.	Vehicle tracking of the Otterbourne Main Road/Kiln Lane mini-roundabout indicates that works would likely be required at this junction to facilitate HGV access to construction compounds M-1 and M-2. ~~The extent of works required will be confirmed once topographical survey data has been collected.~~	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan)	Matters subject to further discussion.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		HCC agrees with the scope of the physical measures being proposed by the Applicant to alter the entry and exit lanes to Kiln Lane to accommodate a left in and left out movement. However, reserves further comment on the matter on receipt of the topographical survey and more information on the proposals to manage the junction for articulated HGVs. Offsite works are also planned at this location as part of an active planning application (ref: 26/00197/OUT), including a controlled crossing for pedestrians and cycles on Kiln Lane. HCC would prefer to see this design implemented at the junction over the indicative design included in the Framework CTMP.	Based on ~~OS mapping~~topographical survey data, physical works ~~are likely to~~will be required to widen the entry/exit lanes to the roundabout from Kiln Lane. Traffic management would also be required to facilitate the small number of 16.5m articulated lorry movements in and out of Kiln Lane. This temporary traffic management would be undertaken by the Contractor and would only be required in the inter-peak period, and is therefore not anticipated to have a perceptible impact on journey times in the network peak hours. The alternative mitigation scheme identified at the mini-roundabout as part of the planning application 26/00197/OUT has been tested using vehicle tracking. As presented to HCC, minor alterations to the design would be required to enable access for a 10m rigid vehicle, however this could be addressed as part of the detailed design. As such, it is confirmed that neither scheme would preclude the other from coming forward.	~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	
HCC-2025-0046	Construction compound accesses – WRP (width of access)	HCC has questioned the proposed width of the WRP access and is seeking confirmation that it will be designed in accordance with the vehicle tracking requirements.	An indicative access drawing has been prepared by the Applicant with visibility splays based on recorded road speeds and this is included in the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] and will inform the detailed design to be provided post-DCO consent. This demonstrates that sufficient visibility could be achieved at this location. The width of the access shown on the indicative design is not secured through the DCO, noting this would be subject to detailed design, and agreement with HCC as per the protective provisions set out in the Draft DCO [APP-023].	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. Draft Development Consent Order [APP-023].	Matters subject to further discussion.
HCC-2024-0092	Environmental Assessment - access to rail	The TA Scoping Report should note more strategic stations such as Eastleigh, Fareham and Winchester. It is noted that there are a number of stations along the corridor which provide opportunity to workers through additional support measures within the Travel Plan to reduce the traffic impacts from the site. Such support could be through funded rail travel and shuttle bus provision for employees.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position and confirms that these stations have been considered in the ES Appendix 18.1 TA~~, Volume II~~ (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) baseline, as discussed and agreed through engagement with HCC. The Framework CWTP, appended to the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7),~~[APP-415], has been discussed with HCC and potential shuttle bus services to local railway stations have been considered.	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. ES Appendix 18.1 Transport Assessment~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188]	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
HCC-2024-0083	Environmental Assessment - accident analysis	The extent of the personal injury accident data (PIA) assessment presented in the TA Scoping Report is not agreed. This should also cover the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and the junctions between the SRN and the Local Highway Network. At the next stage of works the accident and safety assessments should also consider the impact in the change of vehicle composition utilising a route such as a significant increase in HGV movements which in turn can impact the safe operation of the particular road or street. Generally, the assessment work of the accident data is appropriate.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position and confirms that the study area includes all junctions between SRN and the construction compound accesses. The SRN has been excluded due to minimal traffic impacts, and this position has been discussed and agreed with NH. The Applicant confirms that the impact in the change of vehicle composition utilising a route has been assessed within the TA. The Applicant confirms that a detailed assessment of accident data has been undertaken within the ES Appendix 18.1 TA~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188].	ES Appendix 18.1 Transport Assessment~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2024-SC-0017	Environmental Assessment - assessment of local impacts	Based on the principles of the IEMA Guidance HCC is not convinced about the methodology's approach to local impacts, which are deemed as negligible due to the short-term impact. The impact of the access arrangements needs to be considered in the EIA work to understand if this results in a significant cumulative harm as a result of presumed 'lower order impacts'. It is noted that the Applicant has sought to address HCC concerns from the early consultation stages and has yet to have sight of the TA to support the application. HCC therefore is unable to comment any further on this matter until these core assessment pieces have been sighted.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's comment and confirms that the number of accesses have been reduced, limiting the potential impacts. Very short-term impacts are likely more relevant to the ES Appendix 18.1 TA~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188] than the ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6),~~ [APP-097], unless there are considerable cumulative impacts, which are not anticipated. This position has been discussed and agreed through ongoing engagement with HCC within the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7) and TMS (Document reference 7.3, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415] and TMS [APP-416]. All roads with medium or high sensitivity to driver delay are subject to restrictions, including nighttime works, under the TMS ~~(Document reference 7.3, DCO Volume 7),~~[APP-416], however some locations are subject to further discussions with WCC. Any links where the magnitude of impact would be moderate or high would have a link sensitivity of low, very low or negligible. Therefore, the ES concluded no significant effects with regard to driver delay as a result of works in the public highway. To consider the cumulative harm, the structure of ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) of the ES~~ [APP-097] has been amended to consider the impacts on each section of the pipeline.	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. Traffic Management Strategy ~~(Document reference 7.3, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-416]. ES Appendix 18.1 Transport Assessment~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188]. ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6)~~ [APP-097].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2024-0090	Environmental Assessment - bus service impacts	Consideration from any particular section of road works should be given to the impacts to Home to School transport services particularly Swanmore College, Kings School and Barton Peveril services. Consideration to whether any particular services would be impacted can be identified when more detail is understood regarding the highway impacts	The assessment of effects with regard to driver and bus passenger delay is based on roads used by any motor vehicles, including cars and public bus services. The link sensitivity is based on the characteristics of a road and, therefore, would not be influenced by a college bus service. The impacts of road closures have been qualitatively	ES Appendix 18.1 Transport Assessment, ~~Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~[APP-186] - [APP-188].	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		of the traffic management requirements for the development through the TMS. Within the scoping Driver and Bus Delay should also consider the impact of the traffic management measures on links themselves and the cumulative impacts this may have resulting in increased journey times or reductions in the reliability of the journey times for both drivers and bus services. HCC requests that the impact on known school buses be reflected in the TMS and measures be provided as appropriate. HCC agrees that the assessment of passenger delay does not need to get into the granularity of user types (e.g. students).	assessed in the ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6),~~ [APP-097], based on the traffic data included in the ES Appendix 18.1 TA~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188]. This includes Average Annual Traffic Data, including the impacts of road closures and diversions, for roads where traffic data is available.	ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-097].	
HCC-2024-SC-0014	Environmental Assessment - construction on access impacts on pedestrian and cyclists	HCC requested to include the impacts of the permanent and temporary access arrangements beyond the pipeline route and not be isolated to consideration of the pipeline route itself. Additionally, HCC noted specifically compound access point locations raise some concerns in relation to the impacts on people walking, wheeling or riding. HCC notes that reference is made to this matter being considered with the assessment work which has yet to be shared with HCC and therefore further consideration will be given to this point when this information is made available.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position and confirms that the impacts of the permanent and temporary access arrangements beyond the pipeline route have been considered within the Framework CTMP and appended Framework RoWMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. The Applicant reviewed the assessment to determine if construction traffic would have noticeable environmental effects related to delays at the accessed locations, but such effects are unlikely to be significant at most or all accesses.	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2024-0078	Environmental Assessment - Kiln Lane access	HCC and the Applicant agree that the routing via the B3335 and Kiln Lane are not suitable for construction traffic due to physical constraints, including the railway bridge on the B3335, road geometry, limited width and visibility, and weight restricted bridges on Kiln Lane. The Applicant confirms that construction traffic will not be routed via the B3335 railway bridge or Kiln Lane east of compound accesses, and that no closures of Kiln Lane are proposed.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position and the alternative routing for construction traffic is being sought through the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] noting ongoing discussions around the requirements for the alternative route.	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2024-SC-0015	Environmental Assessment - severance of highways users	HCC noted that the impact of severance at the local level was not adequately assessed in the Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) Report and it needs to include consideration of the more minor road network and the impacts of the creation of new access points onto the highway for vehicular traffic. There is a need to consider whether these impacts are most effectively managed through the TMS.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's comment and confirms that the assessment has been included within the ES Appendix 18.1 TA~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188] and ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport~~, Volume I of the ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-097].	ES Appendix 18.1 Transport Assessment~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188]. ES Chapter 18 Traffic and transport~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-097].	Matter agreed with other Party.
HCC-2024-0008	Environmental Assessment -	HCC and the Applicant agree that the M27 Junction 10 improvements and the Botley Bypass are committed highway schemes. The Applicant	The Applicant acknowledges that these schemes are in the ES Appendix 18.1 TA~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)~~ [APP-	ES Appendix 20.1 List of 'other developments' – longlist and shortlist~~,~~	Matter agreed with other party

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
	cumulative effects assessment	confirms that the M27 Junction 10 improvements are included within the Cumulative Effects Assessment (ES Appendix 20.1 List of 'other developments' – longlist and shortlist~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6),~~ [APP-208], reference FBC PC001) and that the proposed alignment does not conflict with these works. The Applicant also confirms that there are no overlapping construction programmes with the Botley Bypass, currently planned to be completed in 2027, and will continue to consider the local context during detailed design and construction, including measures to minimise potential impacts.	186] - [APP-188] and are utilised accordingly on the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	~~Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-208] ES Appendix 18.1 Transport Assessment~~,~~ ~~Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188]. Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	
HCC-2025-0068	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan	HCC has reviewed multiple drafts of the Framework CTMP. Those items that remain open for further discussion include: • Identify any large loads and any necessary highway alterations necessary to safely facilitate these movements. • A standalone Communication Strategy to ensure that all affected users are notified of delays and disruption ahead of time and provide a means for affected residents to liaise with the identified contractor. • Reserve the right for the LHA to request further condition surveys and confirm any damage to the highway. • Set out hours under which construction traffic routing will be restricted to. Measures should also be considered to reduce unnecessary HGV movements. • PRoW safety should be added to the scope of the Framework CTMP alongside proposed road safety. • No contractor parking will be permitted outside of the construction compounds. HCC reserves comment on the submitted Framework CTMP on all matters, although it acknowledges that there have been positive discussions and amendments to date through the engagement process.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position. The Applicant confirms that: • The Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] has included vehicle tracking for the route between these compounds and the SRN. The vehicle tracking also identified where potential temporary works may be required to facilitate access, although this would need to be confirmed by the contractor post-DCO consent once the vehicle specifications for the large loads are confirmed. • The Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] cross-references to a communication strategy which is detailed in and 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) through the 'Stakeholder and Customer Communications Plan'. • The Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] includes a commitment to undertake condition surveys before and after construction. The scope of these surveys will be agreed as part of the detailed CTMP, to be prepared post-DCO consent. The Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] includes a commitment that any damage to the highway network arising from use by construction vehicles identified by the	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. ES Appendix 18.1 Transport Assessment~~,~~ ~~Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188]. Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1 for document 1 of 3, [APP-413] and [APP-414] for documents 2 and 3).	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
			condition surveys would be rectified at the Applicant's expense. • The hours under which construction traffic routing will be restricted have been considered within the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] and reflected in the analysis included in the ES Appendix 18.1 TA~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188]. • PRoW safety has been considered within the Framework RoWMP appended to Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] which has been discussed and agreed with HCC. HCC agreed that the Framework RoWMP appended to Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] is the document to address PRoW safety.		
HCC-2025-SC-0022	Framework Rights of Way Management Plan	HCC has reviewed multiple drafts of the Framework RoWMP. Those items that remain open for further discussion include: • HCC has an established position that increases in motorised vehicle movements along PRoW from development is typically unacceptable; • Confirmation there will be no impacts on Bishops Waltham 502. • PRoW are unobstructed and clear to allow priority public access at all times. • Curdridge 4 would not be impacted by the proposed ecological mitigation. • The diverted Footpath 103 should be in a green corridor that is a minimum of 12m wide providing 5m wide offset to hard boundaries greater than 1m in height. • The Applicant should find ways to adopt permissive rights on PRoW through the development of the scheme. • Scope of the Framework RoWMP should include risk assessments to identify and mitigate or avoid safety hazards to the public. • Suitable mitigations is identified where construction traffic routes along PRoW. • For the diversion via Widley Walk, HCC requests that a crossing at the Widley Walk junction with Portsdown Hill Road is provided.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position. The Applicant confirms that: • There would be no impacts to Bishops Waltham 502 adjacent to the River Hamble as part of the revised amendments to the Order Limits. • PRoW would remain unobstructed unless formal temporary closures and/or diversions are implemented, as per the Framework RoWMP appended to the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. • Footpath Curdridge 4 is not impacted by the Project and this is confirmed in the Framework RoWMP appended to the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. • As per design principle IPS-F_3 PRoW diversion and enhancements of the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5, Version 1), the diverted PRoW (Footpath 103) will have accessible, multi-functional gates and surfaces and native hedgerows will be established between the PRoW and AGP, where practicable, having regard to LHA's maintenance requirements. Where the PRoW passes adjacent to and through proposed woodland and hedgerow planting, meadow strips will be established on both sides of the diverted path to improve	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5, Version 1).	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		• Worst case closure durations should be identified prior to DCO submission. • Suitable fencing shall be installed to provide reasonable path corridor width of a minimum of 3 metres for a Footpath and 4 metres for a bridleway. The fencing shall not be for excessive continuous lengths of enclosure, and provide an acceptable level of sense of security and safety for PRoW users.	amenity for local residents of Welborne and habitat connectivity (see environmental principles for IPS-F of the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5, Version 1). • No permissive paths have been identified that would benefit from being adopted as a PRoW. Whilst there may have been some opportunities adjacent to Havant Thicket Reservoir, no works are now proposed in this area. • Risk assessments have been included in the Framework RoWMP (appended to the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7))~~[APP-415]) at those locations agreed with HCC. • Construction traffic is not proposed to travel along any operational PRoW aside from Havant 30 that follows Mill Lane (which is also an adopted highway). As detailed in the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7),~~[APP-415], all PRoW interactions/crossings with the construction works would be managed by a bondsperson. • A crossing on Portsdown Hill has been considered as part of the Project and the Order Limits have been updated to include this improvement. • PRoW closure durations identified in the Framework RoWMP appended to the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] are based on worst case assumptions. • These corridor widths have been incorporated into the Framework RoWMP, appended to the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].		
HCC-2024-0165	Framework Rights of Way Management Plan - communication strategy	HCC suggested that the Applicant explores a Communication Strategy with the public, such as the 'one network' website, which communicates permits for closures on the highway and queried whether something similar could be done for closures on the PRoW network.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position and confirms that a potential tool could be explored as part of the detailed Rights of Way Management Plan (RoWMP) and CEMP. The wider communication strategy for the scheme would be 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) through the 'Stakeholder and Customer Communications Plan'. Appropriate reference for such provision will be provided within the Outline CEMP (Document reference	Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1 for document 1 of 3, [APP-413] and [APP-414] for documents 2 and 3).	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
			7.1, DCO Volume 7~~).~~, Version 1 for document 1 of 3, [APP-413] and [APP-414] for documents 2 and 3).		
HCC-2025-SC-0034	Legacy and enhancements - Harts Farm Way	Planning permission was granted for generic E class use under application APP/21/00189 and secures the provision of shared use facilities on the northern side of Harts Farm Way along the site boundary and a toucan crossing on Harts Farm Way. The infrastructure has previously been secured to enable sustainable access to the site as well as offset the impact of the development in traffic terms by securing wider sustainable benefit. There is strategic desire (see Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)) to improve permeability of movements around the teardrop junction. The crossing of Harts Farm Way forms part of this strategy along with the delivery of a shared use path across the site frontage which is reliant on land within the development site and has previously been secured through the extant consent. The Applicant has suggested that the crossing scheme is not justified, deliverable or feasible, and will not try and provide the land needed for the scheme. HCC requests that this case is set out clearly, in order to evidence the rationale for not endeavouring to safeguard the opportunity for improved sustainable transport in this location.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position and has updated the indicative design for the WRP site access to include a controlled crossing for the construction period and this is secured through the Framework CTMP and appended Framework CWTP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. The Applicant will not provide a footway or cycleway to the west of the existing site access as this is neither practicable nor necessary. Physical constraints, including drainage and established landscaping, would require disproportionate intervention and result in the loss of valuable developable area, undermining the efficient use of the site. Furthermore, given the very limited number of staff expected to access the site, the absence of a western pedestrian/cycle link does not prejudice sustainable travel objectives, which can be adequately supported through existing and proposed access arrangements.	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Matters subject to further discussion.
HCC-2025-0043	Legacy and enhancements - PRoW	HCC requested upgrades are considered for PRoW Havant 34 as well as a crossing on Portsdown Hill Road and Highbridge Road. HCC would also seek to see improvements to PRoW Havant 30 including for dedication to allow for cyclists. Emissions and Transport WG Session#12 meeting on 12 April 2026 lists Portsdown Hill PRoW enhancements as a project specific benefit (legacy and benefits). HCC supports this.	The Applicant confirms that the crossing on Portsdown Hill has been considered as part of the Project commitments (ES Appendix 5.5 Commitments Register~~, Volume II~~ (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6, Version 1)). The Applicant has also committed to funding further PRoW enhancements on Portsdown Hill through the Portsdown Hill Improvement Fund as identified in the Case for the Project (Document reference 5.6, DCO Volume 5, Version 1).	ES Appendix 5.5 Commitments Register~~,~~ ~~Volume II~~ (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6, Version 1). Case for the Project (Document reference 5.6, DCO Volume 5, Version 1).	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2022-0158	Other Highway Matters - Harts Farm Way trenching	The Applicant should also be aware of the construction make up of Harts Farm Way within their considerations with the route being on reclaimed land. It is noted already by the Applicant that this route would also require crossing the Harts Farm Way bridge over the hermitage stream which would require wider consideration. HCC notes that there is no open cut construction and the depth of the pipe here. However it remains unclear if the depth of the pipe falls within the	The current proposal is to utilise trenchless techniques between Budds Farm Waste Water Treatment Works (WTW) and the proposed WRP site under Hermitage Stream and Harts Farm Way within the underlying chalk bedrock, therefore no open-cut construction/trench will be required within Harts Farm Way or other roads in the proximity of the proposed WRP site. The preferred route of the pipelines between Budds Farm WTW and the WRP site has moved to the		Matters subject to further discussion.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		reclaimed land and HCC considers in this location additional information needs to be presented to provide some surety that the road construction and highway assets will not be detrimentally impacted by the works and that suitable flexibility exists within the DCO to accommodate sufficient depth of the pipe to protect the HA's interests. HCC notes the previous reference to the provision of additional information relating to geotechnical matters and welcomes that provision.	west and no longer runs beneath the Harts Farm Way bridge. The pipeline must pass beneath the sheet piled walls present on both sides of Hermitage Stream, these piles are founded in the underlying chalk and consequently force the pipeline to be within the chalk in order to clear these obstructions. The Strategy for Technical Approval of Trenchless Crossings beneath Highway Assets document defines the locations of highway assets crossed and which are addressed by compliance with DMRB standards CD 622 for managing geotechnical risk and CG 300 technical approval of highway structures. This document was previously shared with NHA/LHA in draft with comments received.		
HCC-2024-SC-0038	Other Highway Matters - HCC owned structures	HCC ~~is~~was seeking clarity on whether the assessment work and supporting control documents has given due consideration to the impacts on existing utility services that may be affected by the works and the impacts of any diversion works that may be required. This assessment is set out in the ES Appendix 20.2 Cumulative Effects Assessment [APP-209] and the traffic and transport impacts set out. HCC notes that only a limited number of diversions have been identified. The Applicant's position on this is noted and HCC reserves its position on this matter until the information has been made available for review. The need to divert other utilities could add considerably time delays and additional highway impacts to the scheme, whilst noted to be temporary ~~this will impact the Environmental Impact Assessment work and therefore should be considered and evidenced further.~~. Clarity is needed on what powers the Applicant has or is seeking to obtain to divert existing services within the DCO.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position and confirms that due consideration has been given to the potential impacts of the Project on existing utility services and the need for diversion works. Known required diversions are being progressed directly with the relevant Statutory Undertakers and will be undertaken using the Statutory Undertakers' own powers, with associated works captured within the cumulative assessment in ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects~~, Volume I (Document Reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-099]. Diversions are limited and include the undergrounding of a 33kV overhead power line at the permanent access to the WRP site and the lowering of shallow statutory undertaker ~~assets~~apparatus beneath permanent highway accesses at the four AGP sites. The majority of ~~assets~~apparatus crossed by the pipeline, temporary accesses, compounds and haul roads are proposed to remain in situ with appropriate construction mitigation, which has been discussed with the relevant Statutory Undertakers and will be secured through protective provisions. The relevant utility undertakers have been consulted on the proposed approach. In respect of retained apparatus, Schedule 10, Part 1, paragraph 8 of the Draft DCO [APP-023] requires the Applicant to provide the relevant utility undertaker with details of works that may affect its apparatus and to comply with reasonable requirements for its protection or continued access. The utility undertaker is also entitled to watch and inspect the execution of those works.	Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 7).~~ [APP-099] Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. Traffic Management Strategy ~~(Document reference 7.3, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-416]. Draft Development Consent Order [APP-023].	Matters subject to further discussion.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
			The Applicant has discussed and agreed the potential highway impacts requiring further design development with HCC, as set out within the Framework CTMP and TMS ~~(Document References 7.2 and 7.3, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-416]. The Applicant confirms that most bridges are outside the Order Limits and that no structural assessments have been undertaken, with the exception of B2150 Ditcham Crescent bridge within the Order Limits but is not subject to works.		
HCC-2022-0159	Other Highway Matters - Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) specifications	HCC has adopted policy requirements for HDD works under a highway or highway structure, these are a reduced scope of the NH requirements set out in CD622 Rev 1 due to the scope of most HDD work undertaken. However, HCC as standard reserves the right to require full compliance with CD622 in particular Section 7. Due to the scale of the proposed construction route HCC therefore requires full compliance with CD622 to ensure the construction of the highway is not unduly impacted and the safe operation of the highway can be maintained.	The Applicant is currently engaging with the HCC and other HA on the Strategy for Technical Approval of Trenchless Crossings.		Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-nsc-036	Other Highway Matters - infrastructure in the highway	Supporting infrastructure, such as break pressure tanks and intermediate pumping stations, should not be located within the highway. Location details of such infrastructure need to be clearly identified. Highway boundary searches should be undertaken for the route to ensure the full extent of the highway is understood by the Applicant.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position and confirms that the Project does not propose to locate infrastructure within the highway. Zones for AGP were identified in consultation material and sites were later presented through engagement and refined through scheme development. The locations of the AGP are secured through the Order Limits and Limits of Deviation for AGP.		Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2022-0077	Other Highway Matters - lagoon location	Lagoons must be located at least 15m from any highway to ensure no adverse impact on the structure of the highway or raise any concerns in relation to highway safety.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's comment and confirms that all temporary commissioning lagoons shall be located a minimum of 15 m from the nearest highway boundary unless otherwise agreed with the relevant LHA as set out in 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) environmental measure WE19.	Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1 for document 1 of 3, [APP-413] and [APP-414] for documents 2 and 3).	Matters subject to further discussion.
HCC-2023-0059	Other Highway Matters - Mayles Lane weight restriction	There is a three-tonne weight restriction on Mayles Lane in relation to the proposed construction compound on Mayles Lane which would prevent safe and suitable access to the site.	The Project is no longer proposing to use Mayles Lane as a construction access for HGV. Construction vehicles would instead access construction compounds from the A32. The Applicant has confirmed this position following engagement with HCC.		Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2023-0006	Other Highway Matters - permanent accesses	All permanent access points will need to be suitably tied into the existing carriageway and the presence	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position, and the permanent access for the proposed WRP site and other AGP sites have been discussed at	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		of an existing access will not assume that no further works will be needed.	workshops with HCC. The indicative access design for the WRP access is included in the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7)~~[APP-415] and submitted as part of the DCO application documents. No physical works are planned at the other permanent accesses on to the public highway. The detailed design for the permanent access to the WRP site will be developed in accordance with the HCC Technical Design Standards.	Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	
HCC-2025-SC-0015	Other Highway Matters - Wickham Park Golf Club	An additional access has been added to the Order Limits, being that of the existing access to Wickham Park Golf Club. HCC will need greater understanding of its intended use, and levels of construction traffic usage, before the principle of this access use can be agreed. This should be provided with the Framework CTMP submitted for consideration.	The new entrance to the Wickham Golf Course is intended to provide greater flexibility in accessing the area. The main construction access will be from a newly created temporary site entrance on Titchfield Lane. However, adding this entrance to the Order Limits will allow for more options, potentially reducing the impact on the junction of Titchfield Lane and Winchester Road, which is located close to the temporary site entrance. It can be confirmed that this access would not be used for HGV~~.~~ and this is secured through the Framework CTMP [APP-415].	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Matters subject to further discussion.
HCC-2023-0009	Permanent site accesses - access design	HCC in its capacity as the LHA will need to be satisfied that the accesses can be suitably tracked by both the largest vehicles needing access and for the most frequent. This may differ for the purposes of construction and operation.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position and can confirm vehicle tracking of all permanent accesses has been undertaken. The indicative design of the WRP site access with vehicle tracking is in the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. Vehicle tracking for all permanent accesses are appended to the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2023-0004	Permanent site accesses - permanent accesses	Visibility splays for all permanent accesses will need to be dedicated as highway and be free from obstructions; this is likely to involve significant vegetation clearance, which should be properly set out for consideration by other stakeholders. HCC provided feedback on the Generic Design Principle 'visibility splays' and confirmed that is not able to agree on a generic design principle in the absence of site specific information. It would be inappropriate for HCC to be bound by this design principle in relation to all site accesses. With indicative designs for the temporary and permanent accesses being submitted with the DCO, it is unclear how visibility requirements will be secured. To date, there is some general confusion in the documents received in draft form, and HCC reserves further comment on this matter on receipt of the full submission pack and draft DCO.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position. Former GDP_44 has been removed from the Generic Design Principles to avoid duplication. Indicative designs will be referenced but not fixed in the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. The protective provisions in the Draft DCO ~~(Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3)~~[APP-023] will afford HCC a reviewing role on the detailed designs.	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. Draft Development Consent Order ~~(PDF Version) (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3).~~[APP-023].	Matters subject to further discussion.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
HCC-2023-0054	PRoW impacts	HCC will seek agreements to secure contributions to mitigate impacts and provide improvements to PRoW. Commuted sums for the public maintenance of those improvements may be sought. These are based on standardised HCS costings and local construction requirements. They will also require triggers that suit the phasing of the works. Any temporary diversions and/or closures require specific prior permission via authority order. A phased approach to plans and documentation is required as part of the DCO application to secure approval mechanisms to submit, notify, update, gain permission, and signpost, closures and/or diversions. HCC therefore request the use of the HCC standardised Public Path Orders (PPO) process, with a 42-day notice period. HCC will review the protective provisions as this relates to mitigating PRoW impacts.	Engagement on the protective provisions of the Draft DCO ~~(Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3)~~[APP-023] will take place as required. The Applicant intends to utilise the important benefits of the 'one stop shop' approach provided by the Planning Act 2008 for significant infrastructure projects. The Applicant does not intend to abandon this for a multiplicity of separate agreements and procedures where the DCO is capable of addressing these in an integrated fashion in a single consent, supporting timely delivery of infrastructure and certainty of consenting. The Applicant understands HCC's concerns and will work with HCC to address them through protective provisions.	Draft Development Consent Order ~~(PDF Version) (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3).~~[APP-023].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2023-0065	Transport Assessment - scope	The IEMA guidance works to different parameters than standard modelling work undertaken within TA. Applying a percentage increase as a means of identifying whether there is a severe impact on a junction or link does not take account of the existing capacity constraints at certain locations. As a result, the use of the IEMA guidance for identifying which parts of the network will need to be modelled within the TA is not considered robust nor applicable. Whilst general percentage increases can be used to inform decisions, this should be per junction and by each arm of the junction. A site-specific assessment will need to be undertaken to identify which areas are potentially severely impacted by the works. On the Cumulative Effects Assessment, the general point that impacts in transport terms identified in the ES against those EIA assessment criteria do not match the severity test of impacts within a TA work as set out under National Planning Policy Framework.	The Institute of Sustainability and Environmental Professionals (previously IEMA) 2023 Guidelines have informed the assessment presented in the ES. An alternative assessment methodology is used for the ES Appendix 18.1 TA~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6),~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188], and this has been agreed with HCC, PCC and NH as the local and strategic highway authorities. It is recognised that key criteria used in the ES, such as discounting links with less than a 30% increase in traffic, is not appropriate for a TA Scoping Report and this approach was discussed with HCC, PCC and NH. The resulting traffic impacts have been discussed with HCC in workshops, and the agreed mitigation has been secured through the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	ES Appendix 18.1 Transport Assessment~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188]. Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2024-0096	Transport Assessment - TEMPro assumptions	The base year should accord with the forecast year of application with future year scenarios appropriately forecasting to a final year of construction. Interim scenarios may be needed, and it is unclear if the 2026 timeframe is realistic given the timescales for a DCO approval and in the absence of any build programme information or parameters around how the development proposals will be built out.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position and confirms that the use of current Trip End Model Presentation Program (TEMPro) has been agreed through ongoing consultation with highways authorities, including the submission of a Technical Note which has been reviewed by HCC and the traffic growth factors have been approved.		Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-2024-0127	Transport Assessment -	The construction access routes for HGV were assigned based on the shortest route to the SRN.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position and confirms that all construction access routes for	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
	construction, distribution and assessment	Whilst HCC acknowledges the rationale behind this approach, some of the routes identified are not suitable for frequent HGV movements. The access route for each compound should be supported by a full routing plan to identify each route to be utilised to reach the SRN. Whilst some routes may be considered the most direct to the SRN, they may be considered unsuitable when considering their constraints.	HGV to each construction compound have been agreed with HCC through ongoing engagement and secured through the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	(including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	
HCC-2025-0002	Transport Assessment	HCC has not had sight of the draft TA, however the following items were identified at the scoping stage: • Consideration of the impact on public transport, including road and lane closures, and the potential need for quantitative assessment. • Collision analysis, including evidence it would not exacerbate existing patterns and the impacts of new accesses. • Full assessment of construction traffic demand and distribution has not been approved. • Confirm phasing of construction and how many compounds would be operational at one time. • The number of visits and operational traffic generation should however still be set out to all permanent features along the corridor. • Specific chapter added to consider PRoW impacts. • A peak hour assessment is undertaken alongside an assessment of AADT traffic data. HCC reserves full comment on the assessment work undertaken on sight of the full document.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position. The Applicant confirms that the impact on public transport has been included within the ES Appendix 18.1 TA~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188]. A detailed assessment of the highway impacts of the scheme has been presented to HCC in workshops and is included in the ES Appendix 18.1 TA~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6):~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188]: • Road traffic collision data has been obtained from the local constabulary, and a detailed review of the data is provided in the TA. • The Applicant confirmed that key aspects such as the construction traffic trip generation calculations and HGV routing have been agreed through previous workshops, technical notes and Excel files. • The Applicant acknowledges HCC's comment and confirms that the number of visits and operational traffic generation has been addressed in the ES Appendix 18.1 TA~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188]. • The impacts on the PRoW network are clearly set out in the Framework RoWMP appended to the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. Appendix 18.1 of the ES TA~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188] also details the impacts of the Project on the PRoW network. • The peak hour assessment has been addressed within the TA. The findings of this assessment have been presented to HCC and the mitigation has been secured through the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	ES Appendix 18.1 Transport Assessment~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188]. Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415].	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
HCC-2025-SC-0001	Traffic Management Strategy	HCC has reviewed multiple drafts of the TMS. Those items that remain open for further discussion include: • Scope to include how impact on pedestrians, cyclists and public transport routes will be addressed and mitigated where appropriate. • The A3, A32, A334, Botley Road and Titchfield Lane are strategic routes and road closures would not be acceptable. HCC would also not accept road closure of Portsmouth Road or Winchester Road at/near Fishers Pond for planned works. • Consideration of management of construction risks which may require road closures during trenchless and tunnelling activities. • Any proposed temporary diversions and closures are submitted to and approved by HCC prior to commencement of any works. HCC notes the comments provided and reserves further comments on review of the submitted document. Through discussions it is unclear the weight to be applied to the TMS within the application and HCC considers that this document should form part of the core control documents to ensure the expectations around works timing and restrictions the HA would apply through the permitting process and duly understood at the contracting and detailed design stage. It is understood that the TMS will not form part of the DCO documents.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position. • The details of how any interactions with sustainable modes, including walking, cycling and bus should be managed are considered within the Framework RoWMP appended to the Framework CTMP ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. This position has been discussed and agreed through ongoing engagement with HCC. • The pipeline will cross under Winchester Road (A334) and the A32 using trenchless construction. The pipeline is also no longer located within Titchfield Lane. No road closure of Botley Road, A3, Portsmouth Road or Winchester Road is proposed. • The Applicant has considered the management of construction risks in 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) land quality and ground conditions mitigation measures. Section 4.2 Construction methodologies describe the use of trenchless techniques where appropriate to reduce potential environmental and community impacts. • The approach to notifications of road closures will be discussed with HCC as part of the Draft DCO ~~(Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3).~~[APP-023].	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. Traffic Management Strategy ~~(Document reference 7.3, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-416]. Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1 for document 1 of 3, [APP-413] and [APP-414] for documents 2 and 3). Draft Development Consent Order ~~(PDF Version) (Document reference 3.1, DCO Volume 3).~~[APP-023].	Matter agreed with other party.
Flood risk and water environment					
HCC-2024-0196	Watercourse crossings and methodologies	HCC emphasises two key requirements: Overland flow routes must not be obstructed during construction, and any temporary crossings of ordinary watercourses require consent under the Land Drainage Act, noting that many watercourses are unmapped and may need additional consents. The CEMP must include clear methodologies to maintain flow routes, manage flood risk, and reference updated surface water maps. Ordinary watercourse crossings (e.g., cut and cover) require Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA) consent, with details on flow management to be addressed post-DCO consent via the consent process. The LLFA requests amendments to the CEMP to clarify flood risk controls, ensure temporary drainage strategies manage flow routes, and provide details for features subject to watercourse consent. For the	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position. Additional surveys will be undertaken as part of the post-DCO consent detailed design process to identify the location of additional unmapped ordinary watercourses. The Applicant is discussing with the relevant LLFA to agree the approach to consenting crossings of ordinary watercourses. The Applicant has discussed the construction methodology and any technical agreements that can be made at joint meetings. The watercourse crossings proposals are set out in detail in ES Appendix ~~9~~19.4 Watercourse crossing schedule~~, Volume II (Document Reference 6.2, Volume 6).~~ [APP-199]. The Applicant is preparing the third-party agreements for the watercourse crossings with relevant LPA. Old Mill Dam above ground pipeline crossing is	Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7, Version 1 for document 1 of 3, [APP-413] and [APP-414] for documents 2 and 3). ES Appendix ~~9~~19.4 Watercourse crossing schedule~~, Volume II (Document Reference 6.2, Volume 6).~~ [APP-199].	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		Old Mill Dam crossing, further information is needed to demonstrate flow management and prevent blockages. Overland flow routes must be managed during and after construction. Feedback was provided by HCC in December 2025 on the draft of the Watercourse Crossings and Connections Technical Approval Strategy. In order to agree this matter, HCC will need to review the Outline CEMP with mapping of previously unmapped ordinary watercourses, watercourse crossing/connection schedule (managed through protective provisions), the flow statistics for open cut construction and likely flows expected on ordinary watercourses.	currently under investigation. Possible high flow scenarios being investigated to ensure pipeline does not form a blockage during high flow conditions. An 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) will be submitted with the DCO application and secured via a DCO Requirement. Crossings of Watercourses are defined within the Summary of Technical approval of Crossing and Connections to Watercourse Assets, within which the construction of the crossings are referred to 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). Where open-cut construction methods are being applied at watercourse crossings, flow statistics for the ordinary watercourses have been produced to help inform 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) of the likely flows expected on the ordinary watercourses so adequate overpumping/flume can be provided.		
HCC-2025-0041	Flood Risk Assessment	HCC is satisfied with the submitted documents for the BPT-K and Break Pressure Tank and Intermediate Pumping Station E (BPT/IPS-E), provided that the appended Integrated Catchment Modelling (ICM) demonstrates there will be no adverse impacts. The approach for Pressure Tank K is considered acceptable, as runoff is being restricted to the lowest practical minimum in relation to blockages. For Pressure Tank K, while it is noted that the flow control is set to 6.3 l/s for the 1:100 event and that there would be no increase in flows leaving the site, further clarification is required on how the Qbar and Q30 discharge rates will be mimicked. If this matter is resolved through the ICM modelling, then HCC is content with the documents as they stand. Given the current stage of the project, HCC is comfortable with any additional detail - such as detailed drainage plans, calculations, and maintenance arrangements being secured via specific requirements in the DCO. The standard surface water drainage provision used in previous DCOs is provided below, and HCC would be happy for a similar approach to be adopted in this DCO.13. (1) No part of the authorised development is to commence until written details of the surface water drainage system for that part, in	The Applicant acknowledges the comments from HCC and has confirmed that the Qbar and Q30 discharge rates will be addressed using the ICM modelling for both Qbar and Q30. Flood Risk is addressed within the BPT/IPS-E and BPT-K site specific ES Appendix 19.1 FRA~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-189] - [APP-196]. The description of the Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) detention basin and other features are covered within the SuDS Drainage Strategy within the ES Appendix 19.1 FRA~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-189] - [APP-196]).	ES Appendix 19.1 Flood Risk Assessment~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-189] - [APP-196].	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and drainage strategy, reflecting the mitigation measures in Chapter 19 of the ES and including means of pollution control, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State following consultation with the relevant planning authority on matters related to their functions, the LLFA, the Environment Agency (EA), and the LHA where that the surface water drainage system interacts with a highway maintainable at the expense of LHA. (2) The drainage system must be constructed and maintained in accordance with the approved details referred to in sub-paragraph (1) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Secretary of State following consultation with the relevant planning authority, the LLFA and the EA.			
HCC-2025-0085	Watercourse crossings and connections technical approval strategy	HCC has no objection in principle to the proposed permanent outfalls and temporary watercourse crossings, subject to site-specific consent. Permanent outfalls will require a single, coordinated submission per outfall including location plans, detailed drawings, ownership and maintenance arrangements, and a construction method statement. Temporary watercourse crossings using flume or cut-and-cover methods are considered appropriate, with trenchless techniques proposed for more significant watercourses. Any permanent crossings or access points must be clearly identified, supported by appropriate permanent design details, and submitted with confirmation of ownership, maintenance and construction methodology. HCC recommends grouping submissions by construction phase where practicable.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position.		Matter agreed with other party.
HCC-nsc-006	Water environment - impacts of recycled water	Further information is needed to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on water quality; both potable water and the wastewater proposed to be discharged into the Solent. The major water bodies - the reservoir and Langstone Harbour/The Solent are managed by other authorities. Therefore, these are not a direct consideration for HCC. Consideration of ordinary water courses, including Riders Lane Stream and Hermitage Stream are the concern of the LLFA HCC. HCC, as the LLFA, states that the Project should have regard to the Land Drainage Act. The Project needs to address legislation/regulation in addition to those concerned with planning. The discharge of water falls within the statutory role of others. Therefore, this issue can be closed, subject	The recycled water input to the reservoir will be assessed as part of a water safety plan which is regulated by the Drinking Water Inspectorate, as well as having regulated discharge consents from the EA. The obligations on SW to comply with EA regulations, and the drinking water safety plan, will ensure the Applicant's adherence to strict water quality standards. As part of our Summer 2024 Consultation, the Applicant published a PEI Report which reported preliminary information about the environmental impacts of the Project including on water quality and the release of reject water from the existing Eastney Long Sea Outfall (LSO). Further information on water quality modelling was presented at the Applicant's Spring 2025 Consultation. The focus of the water quality	ES Chapter 19 Water environment~~, Volume I~~ (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1).	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		to the scheme being satisfactory to the relevant bodies.	modelling has been to understand the impact of blending recycled and spring water on water quality and aquatic ecology in Havant Thicket Reservoir, as well as potential water quality effects on downstream water bodies receiving flows from the reservoir (Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream, Langstone Harbour), and the Solent (releases of reject water from the water recycling process from Eastney LSO). Outputs from the detailed water quality modelling and assessment of effects are fully reported in the ES Chapter 19 Water environment~~, Volume I~~ (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1) submitted with the DCO application. The results of the water quality modelling predict that operation of the Project would not result in a deterioration in the chemistry or physico-chemistry status of the reservoir. Similarly, there would be no deterioration in water quality in downstream water bodies, and the addition of reject water to the existing discharge at Eastney LSO would not result in any significant changes to consented water quality parameters. Modelling has also predicted no significant changes to salinity in the Hermitage Stream associated with releases of surface water from a new outfall at the WRP site. Consequently, no significant effects on aquatic ecology are anticipated.		
HCC-2024-SC-0046	Flood Risk Assessment	The Hampshire LLFA requires further assessment work for IPS-F south of Crockerhill (edge of WGV development area) - the identified surface water flooding risk needs to be assessed in more detail. Site specific FRA will be expected to address the points within the HCC checklist (drainage design) - demonstrating a viable drainage option for the site, specifying key parameters with further detail to be provided under DCO provisions. The Hampshire LLFA requires a detailed FRA for Intermediate Pumping Station G (IPS-G) Meon Valley (Titchfield Lane). IPS-G has been noted to have extremely high groundwater levels. While this is unlikely to affect the proposed Sustainable Drainage Systems features, buoyancy impacts will need to be assessed. Site specific FRA will be expected to address the points within the HCC checklist (drainage design) - demonstrating a viable drainage option for the site, specifying key parameters with further detail to be provided under DCO provisions. The Hampshire LLFA requires site	National Planning Statement Water Resources Infrastructure paragraphs 4.7.1 to 4.7.15 set out detailed requirements for flood risk, including the need to undertake a FRA, ensure that climate change is accounted for and ensure that the development's design takes into account flood risk, and should put forward measures to mitigate the impact of flooding, for the Project's lifetime, taking into account climate change. Flood modelling has been conducted to quantify the flood risk at IPS-F, modelling results indicate that proposed plant will not be within the modelled flood extent. The Applicant consulted the Hampshire LLFA on SuDS, and Hampshire LLFA confirmed these were suitable on assumption of receiving further details. Measures to deal with high groundwater levels at IPS-G will be addressed at detailed design, after DCO consent. The Applicant consulted the LLFA on SuDS and it	ES Appendix 19.1 Flood Risk Assessment~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-189] - [APP-196].	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		specific plans/FRA for each of the relevant AGP locations to reflect specific site conditions. Details, including discharge rates, specific Sustainable Drainage Systems features, layout etc will need to be confirmed as the design progresses. In April 2026, HCC still wants to review the site-specific FRA for IPS-F and IPS-G that will address points within the HCC checklist (drainage design) - demonstrating a viable drainage option for the site, specifying key parameters with further detail to be provided under DCO provisions. The Applicant confirms that the details on measures to deal with high ground water levels at IPS-G will be addressed through design and that modelling results indicate that IPS-F will not be within the modelled flood extent. Areas where more detailed information would be required were identified, however given the nature of the works, this is expected to be addressed during or following the DCO process when construction details are available. There are no objections in principle to the proposals, just a requirement for details to be provided before final consent is granted.	confirmed these were suitable on assumption of receiving further details. Draft FRA which included description of SuDS measures were shared with the LLFA. SuDS measures were extracted from the FRA and included within a specific document, SuDS Drainage Strategy. The FRA and SuDS Drainage Strategy are appended to the ES in Appendix 19.1 FRA~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-189] - [APP-196].		
HCC-2025-0084	Flood Risk Assessment	HCC commented on the WRP site draft FRA. The discharge rate has been provided as a betterment figure in comparison to the post development unmanaged runoff rate. HCC wishes to understand the comparison as there may be other considerations, such as what the greenfield rate would be. It is also not clear what the impermeable area is that fed into these calculations. There appears to be a lot of siltation of the river channel and also paths at a low level adjacent to it. Has any comment been received from the EA in relation to the proposed discharge rate? HCC would like some assurance from them that the watercourse is suitable to receive the level of flows identified. The overall drainage strategy is high level and it is difficult to see all the features and understand the connectivity. There is an area to the east which does not appear to be positively drained and clarification on its use would be appreciated. It is not clear whether the gravel layer is lined. It is stated that there is 200mm of storage before water runs into the road and into the rest of the drainage network. If there is an element of infiltration then this water would not have sufficient treatment, if not, will it just be sat in the gravel layer for an	Further details of the indicative SuDS designs are provided in the SuDS Drainage Strategy within Appendix 19.1 FRA~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-189] - [APP-196]. The proposed discharge from the SuDS for the WRP site has been compared to normal and flood flows in the Hermitage Stream to show that the watercourse is capable of receiving the discharge. This has been provided to assure the LLFA that the watercourse is suitable to receive the level of flows identified. The solar panels (area to the east) have been removed from the SuDS layout plan. Further clarity has been provided in the latest revision of the draft SuDS Drainage Strategy to state that the WRP site SuDS will be lined and that no long-term storage is provided at the WRP site, as such, runoff will be able to convey to the downstream SuDS features without pooling and infiltrating. Further clarity has been provided in the latest revision of the SuDS Drainage Strategy as to the mitigation for the high-risk areas of the site for water quality, this will include the foul and chemical delivery areas being bunded and drained to a separate foul system.	ES Appendix 19.1 Flood Risk Assessment~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-189] - [APP-196].	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		extended period, potentially taking up the storage area? Modelling identifies that surface water should be appropriately managed within the site (subject to the control rate identified). The pollution indices identify that the site is at high risk which usually requires a risk assessment process as opposed to the simple index approach. It is not clear whether the high rating applies to all areas of the site and it is noted that specific arrangements are proposed for chemical delivery. There is also a section of the site which bypasses the SuDS features so would not receive any treatment. In April 2026, HCC requires a better understanding of the discharge rate provided- specifically whether the Hermitage Stream can take on the flow from the SuDS (for the WRP design). It is understood that the proposed discharge from the SuDS for the WRP has been compared to normal and flood flows in the Hermitage Stream, in order to show that the watercourse can receive the discharge. HCC will review the final ES Appendix 19.1 FRA. HCC also needs to provide further feedback to the Applicant on the updated design of the SuDS. The indicative SuDS designs have been outlined in the SuDS Strategy Report within ES Appendix 19.1. FRA.			
Cumulative and in-combination effects					
HCC-2024-SC-0022	Environmental Assessment - cumulative effects assessment	In HCC's view, an understanding the in-combination effects is not possible without a TMS and finalisation of the compound locations and access points etc informing the TA. These fixed points must then inform the study area (zone of influence) and HCC can respond on the study area (zone of influence) for the traffic and transport topic used in the cumulative effects assessment (CEA). Given the proximity of other major projects (including some along the Strategic Road Network routes) there is potential for the in-combination effects to have impacts outside of the direct construction routes of the Project and therefore HCC questions the zone of influence as assumed in the PEI Report. These in-combination effects would be significant and therefore would require management and the identification of appropriate restrictions within the TMS. HCC agrees that the Applicant has engaged with HCC regarding the ZOI through Highways Workshops. Through revisions to the CEA work the applicant has taken account of	The Applicant has engaged with HCC regarding the ZOI through Highways Workshops. Technical note regarding TEMPro growth factors and committed developments has been discussed and agreed with HCC. Alternative to explore more committed development sites is in the ES Appendix 18.1 TA~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188]. ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6)~~ [APP-099] considers common receptors that would receive effects as a result of the Project and other developments (inter-project effects) and those receiving more than one type of effect from the Project (intra-project effects). The cumulative assessment did not identify any common receptors for inter-project cumulative effects. Intra-project cumulative effects have been considered in the neighbourhood amenity assessment, which forms part of the health	ES Appendix 18.1 Transport Assessment~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-186] - [APP-188]. Traffic Management Strategy ~~(Document reference 7.3, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-416]. Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (including Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan and Framework Rights of Way Management Plan) ~~(Document reference 7.2, DCO Volume 7).~~[APP-415]. ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects~~, Volume I (Document~~	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		HCC's local knowledge of the land supply data (planning permission pipeline) in the relevant buffer of the order limits. More information is needed to inform the in-combination effects assessment which will be undertaken and reported in the ES. This should consider the in-combination effects on public health from different sources such as air quality, land quality, land use, visual impacts, noise and vibration and traffic. The Public Health Authority need to be satisfied that health impacts have been fully assessed and at a scale that accounts for the health impacts where smaller impacts combine to potentially create more significant health effects. HCC acknowledges that a standalone HIA is not the methodology the Applicant wishes to utilise, which in HCC's opinion risks insufficient assessment. The recommendation to undertake a full Health Impact Assessment (HIA) rather than a 'Rapid HIA Guidance' (HUDU) was given by HCC in the August 2023 response to EIA Scoping Opinion, and flagged at EIA WG meetings by HCC.	assessment in ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health~~, Volume I~~ (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1). This considers the combined air quality, noise and vibration, visual and traffic effects of the Project on communities. A significant intra-project cumulative effect on neighbourhood amenity was identified for residential neighbourhoods in Widley during the construction phase.	~~reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-099]. ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics, tourism and health~~, Volume I~~ (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6, Version 1~~, DCO Volume 6~~).	
HCC-2025-0086	Planning Policy - Longlist and shortlist	HCC agrees that the longlist of developments considered as of May 2025 was appropriate and confirms that sufficient engagement has taken place. HCC also agrees with the shortlist of sites and schemes taken forward for the Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA). The approach of including a figure in the ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects showing only shortlisted developments, with full details provided in ES Appendix 20.1, is considered acceptable.	The Applicant acknowledges HCC's position. The Applicant confirms that the ES Figure 20.1 Projects considered as part of the cumulative effects assessment – shortlist~~, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6)~~ [APP-410] is included in the ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-099]. The Applicant confirms that the full details are provided in ES Appendix 20.1 List of 'other developments' – longlist and shortlist~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-208]. The Applicant updated the ES Appendix 20.1 List of 'other developments' – longlist and shortlist~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)~~ [APP-208] to reflect a new cut-off date of February 2026 and engaged with HCC.	ES Appendix 20.1 List of 'other developments' – longlist and shortlist~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-208] ES Figure 20.1 Projects considered as part of the cumulative effects assessment – shortlist~~, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-410] ES Appendix 20.1 List of 'other developments' – longlist and shortlist~~, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-208].	Matter agreed with other party.
Multiple issues					
HCC-2024-SC-0011	Environmental Assessment - approach	Chapter 5 explains the contractor flexibility sought for the Project to address uncertainty, and that the PEI Report assessment is undertaken on a worst case basis. The requirement and rationale for the DCO to deliver an appropriate level of flexibility,	In ES Chapter 5 EIA approach and methodology, ~~Volume I of the ES (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6),~~[APP-084], the Applicant explained the parameter approach, the principle of the 'Rochdale Envelope' is applied to the	ES Chapter 5 EIA approach and methodology~~, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-084]	Matter agreed with other party.

Row ID	Topic	Summary of HCC issue	Latest position in resolving the issue	Application document reference	Status
		and how this will be assessed and controlled, requires further explanation for statutory consultees. In submitting the DCO, the Applicant will be expected to explain which elements of the proposal have yet to be finalised, and the reasons why this is the case. HCC is concerned that there is uncertainty regarding the mitigation requirements, and unknowns which risk failure to demonstrate compliance with other regulatory regimes (notably highway safety). HCC does not contest the principle within the DCO to allow for flexibility of detailed design post-DCO consent, provided the protective provisions are in place as have been stated.	Project, in accordance with Planning Inspectorate (2018) Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope (Version 3). This approach involves establishing a maximum design envelope within which the final detailed design of the Project will sit. These parameters are defined in ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development~~,~~ ~~Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6)~~ [APP-082] and are secured by the Works Plans ~~(Document reference 2.3, DCO Volume 2)~~[APP-012] - [APP-014] and the Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5, Version 1) and by other management plans that have been submitted with the DCO application. These provide clear parameters for environmental assessment, whilst allowing for flexibility of detailed design post-DCO consent. Each topic assessment therefore establishes those parameters likely to result in the maximum adverse effect (the worst case scenario) and an assessment is undertaken on this basis.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development~~,~~ ~~Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).~~ [APP-082] Works Plans ~~(Document reference 2.3, DCO Volume 2).~~[APP-012] - [APP-014] Design Principles Document (Document reference 5.11, DCO Volume 5, Version 1).	

4 Signatories

4.1.1 This SoCG is agreed between Southern Water Services Limited (the Applicant) and HCC on the date below.

Signed for HCC
Name
Position
Date
Duly authorised for and on behalf of HCC

Signed for Southern Water Services Limited
Name
Position
Date
Duly authorised for and on behalf of Southern Water Services Limited


WATER
for LIFE®
from
Southern
Water®