
Site Address: Pipeline from Proposed Reservoir Site, Middle Park Way to land adjacent to, West Street, Havant

Proposal: Outline application for (matters to be considered outlined in Table 2.2 in the submitted Development Specification) development of a new pipeline to transfer water from Bedhampton Springs to fill the reservoir in the winter and draw it off to treat and supply when needed in the summer comprising: Construction of an underground, bi-directional pipeline linking the reservoir with the existing pumping station at Bedhampton; Emergency drawdown discharge structure at Hermitage Stream; Upgrades to existing culverts; Washout and air valve chambers (typically below ground).

Application No: APP/20/00991

Expiry Date: 19/03/2021

Applicant: Portsmouth Water

Agent: Atkins Global

Case Officer: Lewis Oliver

Ward: Battins, Barncroft, Bedhampton and St Faiths

Reason for Committee Consideration: This is an application of wider public interest and is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

Density: Not applicable for this scheme.

HDS Recommendation: **GRANT OUTLINE CONSENT**

Executive Summary

The Site

The 'Scheme' includes the reservoir at Havant Thicket and the pipeline connecting to Bedhampton Springs and is wholly within the administrative area of Havant Borough Council. The pipeline corridor extends from the Portsmouth Water pumping station at Bedhampton, northwards through the Leigh Park estate, including being alongside the Hermitage Stream and residential roads to the proposed control house within the reservoir site. The length of the pipeline is approximately 4.8km, of which 210m is within the reservoir site and included in application APP/20/00990.

The Scheme

The proposal is for the construction of an underground, bi-directional pipeline linking the reservoir with the existing pumping station at Bedhampton; Emergency drawdown discharge structure at Hermitage Stream; Upgrades to existing culverts; Washout and air valve chambers (typically below ground). The new inlet / outlet pipeline would typically be installed in an open trench, typically 3.5m deep depending on location. The pipe would have a varying diameter (1.2m to 0.7m) depending on location. The crossing of the pipeline under the railway line would be installed using trenchless techniques. Most of the pipe would be installed using an 'open cut' method, digging down from the road or land, laying the pipe and then filling in the ground above it. Some places would involve tunnelling underground using a 'pipejacking' method to push the pipe into place underground from one open- cut hole, for example, under the railway line. Where the Riders Lane and Hermitage Streams are crossed, the opportunity has been taken to improve these watercourses.

The Need for the Scheme

The increased water supply, available to Portsmouth Water on completion, would enable water to be supplied to Southern Water. Southern Water has a forecast deficit

in water resources in the Hampshire area - created by the reduction of its abstraction licences on the internationally designated River Itchen imposed by the Environment Agency. Southern Water has an agreement under Section 20 of the Water Resources Act 1991 that requires them to address their forecast deficit. Additional water made available by the Scheme would form at least 14% of the resources required to meet the forecast deficit. In addition, Portsmouth Water have outlined that they would utilise supplies from the reservoir, to have a secure water supply, particularly in the peak summer period.

This proposed scheme forms a key part of Water Resources in the South East group's regional strategy and Portsmouth Water and Southern Water's 25-year and 50-year Water Resources Management Plans, which gained approval from the Secretary of State for the Environment, and Ofwat, in 2019.

Alternatives considered

The Havant Thicket site has been identified as the preferred location for a reservoir following numerous studies undertaken over the past 53 years.

Detailed ground investigations were commissioned by the Southern Water Authority in the 1960's and 1970's to identify potential reservoir sites with suitable geological conditions – i.e. its natural clay base.

The Havant Thicket Site Alternatives Assessment (April 2020) summarises the site selection work that had been undertaken previously. The assessment methodology utilises a three-stage appraisal process in order to identify specifically the optimal location and design of a reservoir. Seventy-two potential sites were assessed across the Portsmouth Water and south Hampshire area in stage one. Sixty-seven of the 72 sites were rejected at this stage, primarily because the proposed source of abstraction was protected under an Abstraction Licensing Strategy and/or the Habitat Directive. Only sites that could be supplied by the Havant and Bedhampton Springs were feasible. Five sites were taken forward to stage two and Havant Thicket was assessed as providing the best option as it has the largest capacity, allows for the development of areas for recreational activity that would benefit the local community, together with the potential for nature and biodiversity enhancement, requires the shortest pipeline and would result in the least impact on the protected Chichester and Langstone Harbour.

At stage three, eight conceptual reservoir designs on the Havant Thicket site were assessed and discussed with stakeholders. This led to the development of two new refined concepts which contained a combination of the best features of the favoured appraised options. These were subject to public consultation in 2008 and refined further to form the 2009 Outline Masterplan. This Scheme is a refinement of the 2009 scheme, it further reduces the impact on ancient woodland and the RPG, increases the area of retained wetland, minimises potential traffic impacts, enhances landscaping and optimises opportunities for recreation and biodiversity.

Public consultation

Community engagement has been carried out starting in 2004, including public exhibitions and the establishment of a Stakeholder Group; which included Government Agencies, local government, including Rowlands Parish Council and community and environmental groups.

The work undertaken to prepare the Outline Plan in 2009 was informed by a series of public exhibitions in 2008. Information boards were installed across the site in key locations explaining the scheme and how to get involved.

In 2020, due to Covid-19 situation, it wasn't possible to hold face-to-face exhibitions, so, instead Portsmouth Water ran a series of public webinars that included interviews with scheme experts as well as live Q&A sessions. A large promotional campaign was also launched, to reach as many people as possible, including 50,000 leaflets posted to local households with details on how to get involved and find out more.

The proposal has been subject to extensive review and consultation. Extended negotiations have taken place, resulting in the plans being significantly amended to address concerns raised; revising the design, layout and improving landscaping, which has improved the impact of the development on neighbouring residential properties. The application is supported by an Environmental Statement (ES) together with specialist reports in respect to the key issues, including landscape impact, ecology, highways and drainage. Full extended publicity has been undertaken on the initial and amended plans including consultation, notification of neighbours, site notices and adverts in the press.

Planning considerations

The safeguarding and allocation of a reservoir and associated pipeline at Havant Thicket in the Local Plans recognises that the supply of water needed from the reservoir is critical to meet future population and housing demands.

Any harmful visual impact of the development would be localised during the construction period. The additional landscaping that is proposed would reduce, and mitigate to a degree, the landscape impact of the development and overall, the development would not unduly affect the character and appearance of the wider area. It has also been concluded that the development would not have an adverse impact on highway safety, both in terms of its impact on the surrounding highway network and providing safe access to the site.

Whilst it is recognised that the site is in flood zones 1, 2 and 3; significant flood mitigation measures have been included. The proposal additionally meets the requirements of the sequential test as it would provide a robust and reliable water supply.

The proposed mitigation plans, which include both on-site and off-site ecological improvements to waterbodies, are considered to provide an appropriate balance of measures to satisfy both Article 4.7 Water Framework Directive and Biodiversity Net Gain requirements.

In terms of flood risk, the detailed flood risk assessment, including emergency drawdown strategy, have been considered acceptable by the Environment Agency (EA) and Local Lead Flood Authority.

Following extensive review and consultation to address concerns over vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access. It is now considered that the development would provide safe access to the site would not have a severe impact on the safety and free flow of the highway network.

The Councils have conducted a joint Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the proposed development under Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, this includes an Appropriate Assessment under Regulation 63. The screening under Regulation 63(1)(a) found overall, the Scheme would result in reductions in nutrients loads (particularly nitrates) to the internationally protected Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA) from the

Hermitage Stream catchment (including the flows from the Bedhampton and Havant Springs), and from Habitat loss. The subsequent Appropriate Assessment included a package of measures based on the suggested scale of mitigation in the Position Statement on Nutrient Neutral Development, where this development would result in reduction of nutrients, and the Implementation Plan for Off Site Biodiversity Mitigation and Compensation (Atkins, April 2021). The Appropriate Assessment concluded that this is sufficient to remove the significant effect on the SPAs which would otherwise have been likely to occur.

To conclude, it is considered that the development demonstrates that there is an overriding public need for the Scheme which would help meet the deficit resulting from the restriction on abstraction from the internationally designated River Itchen and the nationally designated River Test and would help to conserve and enhance the biodiversity of these rivers. There is a lack of suitable alternative sites, or design solutions within the application site, which avoids loss of ancient woodland or harm to the Grade II* RGP and Sir George Staunton Conservation Area. Furthermore, a 'suitable compensation strategy' comprising extensive mitigation and compensation measures has been developed in discussion with Natural England, the Environment Agency, and Hampshire County Council. This provides the 'wholly exceptional reasons' and 'clear and convincing justification' in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, and as such planning permission is recommended to be granted subject to conditions and legal agreement.

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The scheme includes the reservoir at Havant Thicket and the pipeline connecting to Bedhampton Springs and is wholly within the administrative area of Havant Borough Council. The pipeline corridor extends from the Portsmouth Water pumping station at Bedhampton, northwards through the Leigh Park estate, to the proposed control house within the reservoir site. The length of the pipeline is approximately 4.8km of which 210m is within the reservoir site and included in application APP/20/00990. A detailed description of the site is provided below.
- 1.2 The route extends from the Portsmouth Water pumping station at Bedhampton through Havant before finishing up at the proposed Control House near the southern edge of the reservoir site. Generally, the route runs north along Hermitage stream before turning north-east through residential areas, broadly following Riders Lane Stream towards the reservoir site. To aid description in this assessment the route has been split into sections (1-8) these are described below:
 - Section 1 - Bedhampton Pumping Station to Chadswell Meadow:
From the southernmost point at the pumping station the route heads north west across the open grassland area surrounding the pumping station before crossing the railway line just south-west of Bedhampton Train Station. Once past the rail line, the route passes through a small area of buffer planting along the railway edge before meeting Chadswell Meadow.
 - Section 2 – Chadswell Meadow to Bidbury School:
At Chadswell Meadow the route turns north-east running within the road until it meets Brunswick Gardens. At this point the pipeline corridor passes through the car park of the Bedhampton Community Centre to meet the B2149 Bedhampton Road, which it crosses to connect to North Street. It then runs the full length of North Street until it meets the southern boundary of the Bidbury School Grounds.
 - Section 3 - Bidbury School to Fraser Road:

The route heads north crossing the school playing fields, then continues to head north through an area of school car parking until it meets Fraser Road at the School gates. Once past the gates, the route turns to head east along the full length of Fraser Road until it meets the public open space /green corridor that runs alongside Hermitage Stream.

- Section 4 – Fraser Road to Highclere Avenue:

At the end of Fraser Road, the route then turns north to follow the route of Hermitage Stream, running alongside the western edge within the public open space following the route of the E9 long distance route footpath. The route follows the footpath crossing Purbrook Way, just north of this it turns north east to cross Hermitage Stream and connecting to the western end of Highclere Avenue. Parts of the site are in flood zones 2 and 3.

- Section 5 – Highclere Avenue to Ellisfield Road:

Once on Highclere Avenue the route continues east within the road until it reaches Riders Lane junction. It then crosses Riders Lane changing its course south-east crossing Riders Lane Stream and associated public open space before joining Ellisfield Road. Parts of the site are in flood zones 2 and 3.

- Section 6 – Ellisfield Road to High Lawn Way:

At Ellisfield Road the route turns to run north within the road before meeting Dunsbury Way, which it follows for a short distance before turning east onto High Lawn Way.

- Section 7 – High Lawn Way to Middle Park Way:

The pipeline corridor now runs within High Lawn Way travelling north-east, then curving towards the north just past Front Lawn School. Nearing the road junction with Middle Park Way the route turns north west to cross an area of public open space adjacent the Great Copse woodland, which is an area of Ancient Woodland, and is within the Staunton Conservation Area and Registered Park and Gardens. Within the public open space, the route follows an existing footpath until it is dissected by Middle Park Way.

- Section 8 – Middle Park Way to proposed Control House:

In the final section of the pipeline corridor, it crosses Middle Park Way northwards entering Staunton Country Park. Here it runs north-west along the western side of High Lawn and Thicket Lawn before entering the southern boundary of the reservoir site where it meets the northern most point of the route at the connecting with the Proposed Control House. This part of the site is designated within the Staunton Conservation Area and Registered Park and Gardens, and High Lawns Site of Importance Nature Conservation (SINC).

- 1.3 The pipeline crosses Havant Footpaths 506a which runs west from Ellisfield Road, Havant Footpath 33 which runs north from Barncroft Way, Havant Footpaths 507 and 41b connect Fraser Road and North Street by Bidbury Junior School.

2 Planning History

Linked reservoir application:

Havant – APP/20/00990 and East Hampshire 51680/001:

Hybrid application seeking: 1) Full Planning permission for Development of a reservoir for raw water storage, A pumped storage reservoir, with the minimum required total storage capacity of 8,700 million litres (MI), to support the planned bulk supply transfer

of at least 21M/d in extreme (currently defined as 1:200 year) drought conditions; Construction of an earth embankment adjacent to Staunton Country Park ; Construction of an overflow discharge/spillway at the south-western side of the reservoir and associated works; Construction of a new junction on the B2149 Manor Lodge Road and a new junction on Swanmore Road. Provision of viewing areas on the southern embankment and western edge of the reservoir.

2) Outline application for (matters to be considered outlined in Table 2.2 in the submitted Development Specification) control house partially incorporated within landscaped earth mounding adjacent to the south west embankment; together with provision of other earth embankments. Construction of a visitor centre / cafe, with storage areas and welfare facilities to the northwest of the reservoir to be used for recreational and education purposes; Provision of picnic area(s) and children's play area(s). Access routes from both junctions to the visitor car park; visitor car park comprising 193 car parking spaces and between 70 and 75 overflow spaces plus spaces for staff, coach/minibus and disabled drivers sited to the north west of the reservoir. Creation of a permanent wetland on the northern side of the reservoir and construction of bird watching hide/screen(s); recreational facilities for public amenity. Provision of perimeter tracks and a network of bridleways, cycle paths and footpaths; Construction of a slipway on the western bank of the reservoir for operational use only and a small section of the proposed pipeline (210m).

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The proposal is for an Outline application for (matters to be considered outlined in Table 2.2 in the submitted Development Specification) development of a new pipeline to transfer water from Bedhampton Springs to fill the reservoir in the winter and draw it off to treat and supply when needed in the summer comprising: Construction of an underground, bi-directional pipeline linking the reservoir with the existing pumping station at Bedhampton; emergency drawdown discharge structure at Hermitage Stream; upgrades to existing culverts; washout and air valve chambers (typically below ground).
- 3.2 The new inlet / outlet pipeline would typically be installed in an open trench, typically 3.5m deep depending on location. The pipe would have a varying diameter (1.2m to 0.7m) depending on location. The crossing of the pipeline under the railway line would be installed using trenchless techniques. Most of the pipe would be installed using an 'open cut' method, digging down from the road or land, laying the pipe and then filling in the ground above it. Some places would involve tunnelling underground using a 'pipejacking' method to push the pipe into place underground from one open- cut hole, for example, under the railway line. Where the Riders Lane and Hermitage Streams are crossed, the opportunity has been taken to improve these watercourses.
- 3.3 This outline application for the pipeline is being submitted with some details reserved for approval at a later stage in the form of reserved matters applications. Detail which is covered in the Pipeline planning application includes general location, appearance and scale of the pipe and associated structures. The application outlines that the parameters for the emergency drawdown structure kiosk, the sizes would be as follows:
- Maximum envelope for above ground kiosk (associated with discharge structure):
 - H3m x W6.5m x L10.5m is the size of above ground kiosk at Hermitage Stream
 - Overall height: 3.5m above ground level.
- 3.4 Details which would be reserved for approval at a later stage include confirmation of the exact pipeline route (within the red line boundary) and detailed design of the

associated structures. Detailed traffic and construction management plans would be the subject of planning conditions.

Construction phasing

- 3.5 The reservoir and pipeline would be constructed in phases, to reduce the amount of traffic travelling to and from the reservoir site at any one time. It is likely that the pipeline would be broken down into sections to allow multiple teams to operate at the same time. As the pipeline would be routed through residential areas, there is insufficient space for a dedicated construction compound and laydown area to support these activities. Therefore, the main construction support site and laydown areas at the reservoir site would be used throughout the construction of the pipeline. Small scale, portable welfare facilities would be provided for the pipeline workforce along the pipeline corridor at appropriate locations. Each section of the pipeline that is being worked on would require fencing to secure the site and protect the health and safety of the public.
- 3.6 Any outline planning approval would be subject to detailed Traffic Management and Construction Environmental Management Plans which would include measures to reduce disruption from construction activities. The reservoir and pipeline would be constructed in phases, to reduce the amount of traffic travelling to and from the reservoir site at any one time. Whilst it is expected that both the northern and southern access points would be available, HGV construction traffic would be required to use the northern access as the main access point, with the southern access only being used for construction of the top third of the pipeline. Construction traffic for the lower two thirds of the pipeline would access the pipeline corridor directly from junctions 2 and 3 of the A3(M). The application documentation outlines that construction during school term times would be avoided, for the elements of the pipeline runs close to schools.
- 3.7 The chosen route for the pipeline corridor utilises existing road corridors where possible, allowing the pipeline to be laid within existing highway carriageway, avoiding impact to soft landscape areas and street trees. Where the pipeline corridor must run through soft landscape areas, such as public open space, a route has been chosen to minimise impact to existing trees and vegetation, wherever possible. This includes following routes of existing pathways or open areas of grassland as much as possible, thus reducing the amount of existing vegetation that would need to be cleared for excavation.

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

- 3.8 By virtue of the scale and likely significant effects of the development on the environment the proposed new reservoir and associated infrastructure and works constitutes EIA development under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 ('EIA Regulations'). The scope of the EIA was agreed with the relevant authorities and statutory consultees and the ES reports the findings of that assessment. This outline planning application for the pipeline, together with the Reservoir application being considered are a 'single project' (i.e. inextricably linked), as such they are supported by one Environmental Statement (ES) which assesses both the reservoir and pipeline as one scheme. The following topics were identified as having likely significant effects:
- Air Quality
 - Historic Environment
 - Biodiversity
 - Ground Conditions

- Landscape and Visual Impact
- Noise and Vibration
- Traffic and Transport – including a Transport Assessment
- Material Resources and Waste
- Water (including Flood Risk Assessment outlining flows, quality and groundwater)
- Effect on Climate
- Vulnerability to Major Accidents and Disasters
- Population and Human Health
- Cumulative and In-Combination Effects

3.9 The Environmental Statement includes a Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) which would be implemented during the construction and operation of the reservoir site and access routes, and pipeline. The REAC would also inform the reserved matters applications, legal agreement and planning conditions for the Scheme. The relevant actions are summarised below to enable a full understanding of the phasing and associated requirements of this development at outline and reserved matter stages. The actions and commitments are relevant to both parts of the Scheme (reservoir and pipeline) unless indicated otherwise:

	Detailed commitments
1	Reserved matters applications to be submitted within 5 years of outline consent granted.
2	Reserved matters (details) applications for reservoir to be prepared and submitted for approval in relation to the following components of the reservoir: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The buildings - Visitor centre and bird hide and control house; b. Layout of the north west corner including visitor centre, car park and bird hide; c. Viewing area; d. Embankment profile/toe (apart from where the embankment joins Staunton Country Park which is fixed) e. Wetland; and f. Children's play areas.
3	Reserved matters (details) applications for pipeline to be prepared and submitted for approval in relation to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Confirmation of pipeline route within red line boundary; and b. Design of associated structures e.g. culverts (appearance, scale, layout).
4	Scheme to be constructed in accordance with the submitted design and approved planning drawings.
5	Preparation of an Archaeological Management Plan (Reservoir).
6	During detailed design, explore options for enhancement and interpretation of the historic environment as part of public realm amenities (Reservoir).
7	Preparation of detailed Biodiversity Mitigation and Compensation Strategy.
8	Preparation of a detailed long-term landscape and ecological management plan including management measures, monitoring and plan review requirements (post five-year aftercare period) (Reservoir).
9	A strategy for advance and phased mitigation planting / landscape reinstatement (Reservoir).
10	Preparation and implementation of a Watercourse Mitigation and Compensation Strategy (including fish management plan).

11	Preparation of an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS), Tree Protection Strategy (Pipeline).
12	A Soil Management Plan including separate management of ancient woodland soils for restoration (Reservoir).
13	Preparation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) informed by the Outline CEMP and REAC.
14	Preparation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan to manage the impact of HGV traffic on the highway network (including construction sequencing plan).
15	Preparation of a construction travel plan to maximise opportunities for staff travel to and from the site using modes other than the private car.
16	Preparation of an operational travel plan to maximise opportunities for staff and visitors to travel to and from the site using modes other than the private car (Reservoir).
17	Preparation of a Site Waste Management Plan
18	Preparation of a Materials Management Plan in accordance with CL:AIRE Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice.
19	Preparation of a Drainage Management Plan.
20	Preparation of a Renewable Energy Strategy (Reservoir).
21	A strategy for offsite woodland and wood pasture creation (Reservoir).
22	Preparation of a strategy for capital grants scheme and / or biodiversity net gain strategy.
23	Preparation of a visitor management plan.
24	All permits, consents and licences to be in place prior to commencement of construction.

3.10 The Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) as part of the Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) comprises the following mitigation measures:

- During construction, an environmental clerk of works (ECoW) would monitor compliance with all environmental management requirements, plans and restoration;
- Retention and protection of identified trees, shrubs and hedges that are considered to be significant (by reason of landscape or visual importance), would be carried out in accordance with British Standards Institute (2005): BS 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Construction;
- All other existing vegetation to be retained (e.g. grasslands and wetlands) as part of the Scheme would be protected in accordance with measures REAC as part of the OEMP.
- Where the pipeline corridor crosses an existing hedge, area of scrub or tree belt, existing gaps would be used where possible so that vegetation removal is minimised. No unnecessary tree or shrub removal would be undertaken, and vegetation which is to be removed would be marked and agreed on site with the ECoW prior to any felling. Where removal of sections of scrub, hedgerows and trees are unavoidable, appropriate hedge species would be replanted along the line of the existing hedge or within the area of scrub, and managed to restore the existing hedgerow or area of scrub;
- No construction related vehicular access would be permitted outside the defined working width and agreed access points;
- Materials and machinery would be stored tidily during the works;
- Operations would be designed so that progressive restoration of finished areas can

occur where appropriate, and so that stored topsoil can be replaced on graded areas as these are finished;

- There would be an end aim to create naturalistic and sympathetically designed landscape profiles, once the works are complete. Slopes in the area are very gentle and this would be reflected in any grading of soils associated with restoration. Visible manmade slope reinforcement such as gabions, concrete, geotextiles and mesh would not be used;
- Topsoil and subsoil would be replaced (using existing topsoil and subsoil removed and stored during excavation) and evenly spread. Areas of disturbed earth would be re-graded to blend with the surrounding landform, cultivated and seeded or replanted; and
- A restoration plan would form part of the REAC as part of the OEMP as described above. It would be implemented to restore landscape earthworks, soils and surface vegetation including trees and alongside tracks and along the pipeline corridor.

4 Policy Considerations

4.1 National Planning Policy Framework

At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a presumption in favour of sustainable development based upon a number of core principles and themes. Those most relevant to this Scheme relate to:

- Promoting healthy and safe communities
- Promoting sustainable transport
- Making effective use of land
- Achieving well-designed places
- Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- Conserving and enhancing the historic environment
- Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals

4.2 NPPF paragraph 20 requires local authorities to have strategic policies setting out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development and make sufficient provision for inter alia, infrastructure for water supply. Broad locations for infrastructure required should be indicated on a key diagram, and land-use designations and allocations identified on a policies map. Strategic policies should provide a clear strategy for bringing sufficient land forward, and at a sufficient rate, to address objectively assessed needs over the plan period, in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This should include planning for and allocating sufficient sites to deliver the strategic priorities.

4.3 The NPPF advises Local Authorities to have strategic policies for infrastructure in their Local Plans, which would include a reservoir, to ensure the strategic needs of the area are discussed. To identify what is required in terms of the area's infrastructure needs, Local Authorities must have an effective dialogue with the relevant bodies. The NPPF states a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure is needed. The NPPF states that water supply and quality is a cross-boundary issue and that there is a duty to cooperate.

Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

4.4 The NPPF advises the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change, in line with the objectives of the Climate Change Act 2008. NPPF Paragraph 149 states "Policies should support appropriate measures to ensure the future resilience of communities and infrastructure to climate change impacts, such as providing space for

physical protection measures, or making provision for the possible future relocation of vulnerable development and infrastructure”.

- 4.5 The NPPF provides advice in terms of flood risk. It states that when determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere, and the development is safe for its lifetime. In Flood Zone 1, a site-specific flood risk assessment should accompany all proposals involving sites of 1 hectare or more. Due to climate change, increases in flood risk need to be assessed to understand the long-term implications of flood risk. Paragraph 149 encourages infrastructure to be resilient.

Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

- 4.6 Paragraph 170 advises that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity value, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services and minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.

- 4.7 Paragraph 172 considers great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in for example, National Parks which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas and should be given great weight in National Parks.

Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

- 4.8 Paragraph 189 requires proposals affecting heritage assets to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.
- 4.9 Paragraph 193 outlines that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
- 4.10 Paragraph 194 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of grade II registered parks or gardens should be exceptional, assets of the highest significance including grade I and II* registered parks should be wholly exceptional.
- 4.11 Paragraph 195 continues and states where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) consent should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:
- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
 - b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
 - c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
 - d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

- 4.12 Paragraph 196 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Promoting healthy and safe communities

- 4.13 Paragraph 91 supports the achievement of healthy, inclusive and safe places which enable and support healthy lifestyles, for example through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure and layouts that encourage walking and cycling.
- 4.14 Paragraph 92 supports the provision of recreational facilities and services the community that plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces and community facilities to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments and that support the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well-being for all sections of the community;
- 4.15 Paragraph 96 supports access to a network of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities and paragraph 98 seeks to protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails.

Draft National Policy Statement (NPS) for Water Resources

- 4.16 The draft National Policy Statement for Water Resources Infrastructure (NPS) sets out the need and government's policies for the development of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) relevant to water resources in England. It will help to ensure that where nationally significant water resources infrastructure is needed, it can be delivered in a timely manner to a high standard. Consultation on the draft National Policy Statement for Water Resources Infrastructure published by DEFRA commenced on 29 November 2018 and ended on 31 Jan 2019. Whilst the Scheme is not an NSIP, and therefore does not need to adhere explicitly to the NPS, it remains a material consideration.
- 4.17 Section 3 of the draft NPS sets out the general criteria for the assessment of NSIPs principles namely relating to the design, environmental, health, safety and security aspects of a scheme. Section 4 focuses on the potential construction and operational impacts of water resources infrastructure, the assessments that an applicant will need to carry out, and the specific planning requirements that the applicant will need to meet, in order to gain development consent. Of relevance to the Scheme, the following should be considered:
- Environmental net gain - Water resource infrastructure projects have the potential to deliver significant benefits and enhancements, resulting in environmental net gains.
 - Criteria for 'good design' for water resources infrastructure - good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places and helps make infrastructure projects acceptable to communities. Applicants should provide sufficient information in its application to demonstrate how the design process was conducted (including stakeholder engagement) and how the proposed design evolved.
 - Climate change adaption – regard should be had to the desirability of mitigating, and adapting to, climate change. New water resources infrastructure will typically be a long-term investment which will need to remain operational over many decades. Consequently, the applicant must consider the impacts of climate change at design, build and operational stages.
 - Health - The construction and use of water resources infrastructure has the potential to

affect people's health, wellbeing and quality of life. New or enhanced water resources infrastructure may also have indirect health impacts through improvements in access, opportunities for cycling and walking, or the use of open space for recreation and physical activity.

- 4.18 Paragraph 2.6.5 highlights that Reservoirs can have benefits other than helping to secure a more resilient water supply and protect the environment. They can enhance the environment and the wildlife that exist in it by providing new habitats and nesting and breeding grounds for birds. Recreational and wellbeing benefits can also be achieved and in some cases, they can also provide resilience to downstream flood events and can play a potential role in water trading by supporting water transfer schemes.

Local Plans

- 4.19 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) require a local planning authority determining a planning application to do so in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 4.20 The Development Plan for Havant Borough consists of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations Plan) and the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan. The Development Plan for East Hampshire District Council consists of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014) and the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan. The proposed development is supported in principle by the Development Plans.

Site specific policies

- 4.21 The reservoir and pipeline route are safeguarded in the adopted development plans by the following policies:

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS18 (Strategic Site Delivery) and
CS19 (Effective Provision of Infrastructure)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL6 (Havant Thicket Reservoir Pipeline Route)
AL7 (Hermitage Stream)

Policy CS18 (HBC) outlines that Havant Thicket Reservoir is a Strategic Site. The Scheme is key infrastructure to ensure water supply in South Hampshire and will require a code of construction practice to mitigate its impacts as part of a formal planning application. The policy notes there is major leisure and recreation potential that will complement Staunton Country Park and have health and well-being benefits. The policy includes construction of a new junction on the B2149 to provide the main access and parking for 125 cars plus cycle and pedestrian paths and renewable energy infrastructure. The policies outline specific requirements as follows:

- a) The development must be sustainable, fully-maintained and cost-effective and deliver environmental and community benefits
- b) The use of the reservoir for recreation should complement existing provision in the borough and become an attraction for local communities
- c) The use of the water should be limited to supervised, water-based activities such as canoeing and kayaking
- d) The reservoir should provide additional leisure opportunities which complement existing provision in the borough and help attract more day visitors to Staunton

- Country Park
- e) Recreational provision should be appropriate to the countryside location and should not include any motorised activities
 - f) Green infrastructure links between the rest of Leigh Park and Dunsbury Hill Farm will be enhanced
 - g) Construction traffic should be minimised in Leigh Park, Rowlands Castle and other residential areas
 - h) Public vehicular traffic should be restricted within the site and confined to the vicinity of the main access
 - i) Vehicular access is expected from the B2149 outside the borough
 - j) Recreation provision should include a network of paths for walking, cycling and horse-riding and the potential for links with the Riders Lane and Hermitage Stream Corridors should be considered
 - k) Access and the surfacing of paths should take account of the needs of all
 - l) Natural and rural character should be conserved in particular by limiting impacts on biodiversity including the creation of additional habitats; compensating for the loss of, and effects on, sites of importance for nature conservation, the listed park and conservation area; enhancing adjacent sites of importance for nature conservation; ensuring that the pipeline avoids Great Copse, which should be protected during construction; integrating the reservoir and the new landscape with the historic landscape of the Sir George Staunton Conservation Area and existing woodland; minimising the loss of ancient woodland and trees
 - m) The potential impacts on the Langstone and Chichester Harbours as well as the Hermitage Stream should be minimised in terms of ecology, water quality and flow effects
 - n) Opportunities for biodiversity enhancements associated with the reservoir and the Hermitage Stream should be realised wherever possible
 - o) The risk of flooding during storm events should be fully assessed in a flood risk assessment and mitigation put in place to minimise all risks
 - p) The proposal should realise the potential for renewable energy dependent on nature conservation and other site constraints
 - q) Regeneration opportunities arising from the new pipe works between the reservoir and the water works must enhance the habitats, recreation opportunities and cycle and pedestrian accessibility along the stream corridors.

4.22 Policy AL6 (Havant Thicket Reservoir Pipeline Route) supports the inclusion of a new pipeline in association with the reservoir scheme. Policy AL7 (Hermitage Stream) is directly relevant to this application, and outlines that planning permission will be granted for development proposals that positively contribute to the improvement of the Hermitage Stream.

4.23 The following other policies are particularly pertinent to the determination of this application:

- CS1 (Health and Wellbeing)
- CS5 (Tourism)
- CS6 (Regeneration of the Borough)
- CS11 (Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
- CS13 (Green Infrastructure)
- CS15 (Flood and Coastal Erosion)
- CS16 (High Quality Design)
- CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
- CS18 (Strategic Site Delivery)
- CS19 (Effective Provision of Infrastructure)
- CS20 (Transport and Access Strategy)

DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)
DM10	(Pollution)
DM12	(Mitigating the Impacts of Travel)
DM14	(Car and Cycle Parking on Development (excluding residential))

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)
AL6	(Havant Thicket Reservoir Pipeline)
AL7	(Hermitage Stream)
DM20	(Historic Assets)

Havant Borough Local Plan – submission version February 2021

In 2019, the Council consulted on a Pre-Submission Local Plan under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended). However, there has been a near 18-month delay to submitting the Plan due to the need to respond to the Dutch Case and ensure that all new development can be nutrient neutral.

The Council subsequently consulted on the proposed changes to the Pre-Submission Plan under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) for public consultation between 3 November 2020 to 17 December 2020. The proposed changes include a strategic mitigation solution for addressing nutrient neutrality.

The Havant Borough Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State for Housing Communities and Local Government for examination on 12 February 2021. An inspector will now be appointed on behalf of the Secretary of State to undertake an examination of the plan.

Until that time, the emerging Local Plan is a material consideration in the assessment of this planning application in accordance with paragraph 48 of the NPPF. This confirms that weight may be given to policies in emerging plans depending on a number of factors. Based on the current stage of preparation, along with the fact that the policies are compliant with the NPPF, the policies within the emerging Local Plan referenced below are currently afforded limited weight, dependent on the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies.

The relevant planning policies of the emerging Local Plan are:

KP9 – Havant Thicket Reservoir. This strategic site allocation is carried forward into Policy KP9 of the Local Plan, with associated developer requirements largely transposed from the adopted plan policy for this site, with a number of key additional/expanded developer requirements (emphasis added) as follows:

'j. Changes to the natural and rural character are mitigated in particular by:
i. Limiting impacts on biodiversity including the creation of additional habitats to ensure biodiversity net gain is secured....

....v. Minimising the loss of ancient woodland and trees and compensating for the loss of irreplaceable habitat within a costed management strategy;

vi. A comprehensive mitigation strategy is secured for impacts to protected and notable species, including appropriate mitigation measures for Bechstein's bats in line

with Policy E15.'

'm. Opportunities have been explored for the prior mitigation of minerals to the satisfaction of Hampshire County Council;

n. The potential impact of the development on the setting of the South Downs National Park has been assessed any necessary avoidance and mitigation measures are included in the scheme design.'

Other relevant policies:

DR1 – Delivery of Sustainable Development

DR2 - Regeneration

IN1 - Effective Provision of Infrastructure

IN2 – Improving Transport Infrastructure

IN3 – Transport and Parking in new development

IN5 – Future management and management plans

E1 – High Quality Design

E2 - Health and wellbeing

E3 – Landscape and settlement boundaries

E6 – Best and most versatile agricultural land

E9 - Provision of public open space in new development

E12 – Low Carbon Design

E13 – Historic Environment and heritage assets

E14 – The Local Ecological Network

E15 – Protected Species

E16 – Solent Special Protection Areas

EX1 – Water Quality impact on the Solent European sites

E17 – Solent wader and Brent Goose feeding and roosting sites

E18 – Trees, hedgerows and woodland

E19 – Managing flood risk in new development

E20 – Drainage infrastructure in new development

E22 – Amenity and pollution

Supplementary Planning Documents

The following Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) are also relevant:

Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011

Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Sir George Staunton and Grade II* Registered Park and Garden (RPG) at Leigh Park (Staunton Country Park)

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist

The applicant is however ensuring that major mitigation planting will be achieved on site, if the planning application is accepted then it is vital that replanting and restocking on site are undertaken and that a full maintenance programme is set up and actioned

Building Control, Havant Borough Council

This work appears to be exempt from Building Control involvement, therefore no comment

Chichester Harbour Conservancy, The Harbour Office

No response received

Community Infrastructure, Planning Policy & Urban Design

Community Infrastructure Levy is not applicable for this proposal.

Conservation Officer

No Objection

Councillor Beryl Francis

No response received

Councillor D Guest

No response received

Councillor Gary Robinson

No response received

Councillor J Branson

No response received

Councillor Jo Lowe

No response received

Councillor John Davis

No response received

Councillor Kenneth Smith

No response received

Councillor Malc Carpenter

No response received

Councillor Mark Inkster

No response received

Councillor Pamela Crellin

No response received

Councillor T Pike

No response received

Councillor Yvonne Weeks

No response received

Countryside Access Team, HCC, Countryside Access Team, Countryside Service

No Objection subject to condition:

Site Context:

The pipeline crosses Havant Footpaths 506a which runs west from Ellisfield Road, Havant Footpath 33 which runs north from Barncroft Way, Havant Footpaths 507 and 41b connect Fraser Road and North Steet by Bidbury Junior School.

The pipeline also runs through Staunton County Park (Hampshire County Council Countryside Service Site), High Lawn Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and Thicket Lawn SINC.

The pipeline will require works to the surface of a number of public footpaths and permissive paths within Staunton Country Park. Any works to the surface of the public Right of Way will be required to be restored to the satisfaction of the Countryside Area Access Manager. There is likely to be an effect on the footpath in terms of dust, noise, or other obstruction during the period of the works and there could be a risk to users of the footpaths.

The applicant should contact Hampshire Countryside Service directly to discuss the Temporary Closure of the footpaths. Temporary Closure Orders should be applied for at least 6 weeks prior to the commencement of works.

The applicant is also reminded that the granting of a planning permission is separate from any consents that may be required in relation to access and rights of way and that nothing should be done to stop up or divert the public right of way without following the due legal process.

The Environmental Statement 13.71 states that a full construction methodology will be the subject of on-going discussion with the relevant authorities including Hampshire County Council and Highways England and will be agreed through the appointed contractor's detailed Construction Management Plan (CMP). The CMP will need to include full details of material and spoil storage and vehicle parking. The County Council Countryside Service request that it is formally included in these discussions via the wording of the planning condition.

County Archaeologist, Strategic Environmental Delivery Group, HCC

The archaeological watching brief that is proposed will be set out within the Archaeological Management Plan (AMP) and secured therefore by archaeological condition attached to the planning permission. I am happy to endorse the principle of an AMP to describe appropriate archaeological monitoring of the pipeline construction and to secure the protection of Chad's Well by fencing and boring.

County Ecologist – Full response in appendix A – 1.1

No Objection subject to conditions and legal agreement:

Additional information is provided within the Habitats Regulations Assessment completed by Havant Borough Council and East Hampshire District Council.

In summary, I am now confident that my previous queries have been addressed satisfactorily and that there is sufficient reassurance that proposed mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures can be delivered.

County Planning, Economy, Transport & Environment Department

No response received

County Waste Management

No response received

Highways England

No Objection subject to condition:

We request that construction trips are, where practicable, minimised during the weekday peak periods to reduce their impact on the Strategic Road Network and its

junction. Careful consideration should also be given the construction phasing of the pipeline, including any required road closures, to ensure that it does not add to any construction impacts from other developments or schemes in vicinity of the proposed pipeline, such as for example the proposed AQUIND Interconnector scheme that is currently progressing through its DCO examination. Therefore, we propose a Construction Traffic Management Plan be conditioned.

Southern Water

In order to protect public sewers, Southern Water requests that if consent is granted, the following condition is attached to the planning permission; The developer must agree with Southern Water, prior to commencement of the development, the measures to be taken to protect the public sewers.

Environment Agency - Full response in appendix A – 1.2

No objection subject to condition and obligations in a legal agreement (response summarised):

In the absence of suitable mitigation measure the development would have an impact in terms of flooding and loss of biodiversity. However, the proposed mitigation plans, which includes both on-site and off-site ecological improvements to waterbodies addition, are considered to provide an appropriate balance of measures to satisfy both the Article 4.7 requirements and also Biodiversity Net Gain commitments. In terms of flood risk the detailed flood risk assessment, including emergency drawdown strategy, have been considered acceptable.

Environmental Health Manager, Community Group

Documents submitted against this application generally concern both the Reservoir (APP/20/00990 1) & 2)) and the Water Transfer Pipeline (APP/20/00991). I have reviewed these applications concurrently, and respond here with specific comments relating to construction works for all of the applications but with special concern relating to the pipeline construction works as in the Outline application for the Water Transfer Pipeline. I have no adverse comments to make with respect to the Reservoir operation.

Observations / Comments:

I continue to have some concerns with respect to the noise and vibration assessment conclusions with respect to noise from pipeline construction because they rely on a number of assumptions. In order to provide greater certainty regarding predicted noise and vibration impacts for all the applications I would like to recommend the following conditions be applied to any consents granted :

The applicant commits to the following which I would like to require as conditions :

Condition 1 “A noise and vibration management plan, including a targeted scheme wide construction noise and vibration monitoring and reporting programme, to be submitted by the appointed contractors, to the Local Planning Authority for approval prior to the commencement of construction works on any approved phase “

Reason

To ensure that construction noise and vibration is managed effectively so that levels do not regularly exceed the threshold for significant impacts.

Also I note that the applicant commits to the following :

The Potential impacts section (paragraphs 12.65 to 12.111) notes that there are

potentially significant impacts where night time works are required. For the reservoir site, if night time working is required, these impacts will be mitigated using acoustic screens in some locations. 12.124. The locations where it is unlikely to be able to fully mitigate night time working impacts are at receptors along Swanmore Road, Havant. As impacts from night time works cannot be fully mitigated in this area, night time earthworks will be avoided around the south west side of the site.

I would like to recommend a suite relevant conditions to control these impacts. Given that this application is for outline consent, it may be more appropriate to secure the CEMP as a reserved matter. Environmental Health has no preference – the aim is to ensure that the proposed mitigation measures are secured and are made enforceable matters.

Forestry Commission, Planning Consultations - South East & London

No response received

Hampshire Constabulary

No response received

Hampshire County Council, Property Management, Property Records, Business Information Team

No response received

Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service

Outline that the development would need to comply with Building Regulations, if applicable.

Langstone Harbour Board

No objection

Havant Borough Council Regeneration

Support

Hampshire Highways - Full response in appendix A – 1.3

Original response

Summary

Additional information is sought from the applicant on both matters relating to the construction and operational phases before the impacts of the development can be fully understood and appropriate measures can be agreed with the applicant to minimise the impacts of the construction phase and ensure appropriate access, integration and operation of the site in the operational phase.

Response to further information

No objection subject to conditions and obligations.

The further information submitted by the applicant has considered and responded to the original concerns raised by the Highway Authority. The development subject to the conditions and obligations would not have a significant adverse impact on the safety and free flow of the highway network. In addition, the proposal would make adequate provision and mitigation towards enhancements to pedestrian and cycle provision in the wider area.

Historic England, South East

On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any

comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

Landscape Team, Havant Borough Council

No objection subject to condition

We have concerns with the loss of trees and vegetation and the potential impact on the landscape character as a result of this application. We require greater clarity on any potential planting easement zone for the pipeline and what impacts this could have on existing mature trees. For example tree G807D is a large Oak with a high water demand and falls in close proximity to the pipe line. Will a standard 3.0 easement area be applied and if so will there be a subsequent impact on existing trees? The reduction in tree numbers could be detrimental to the existing green infrastructure and landscape character and we would look to seek replacement trees to mitigate against any loss.

Local Lead Flood Authority HCC, Hampshire County Council

No objection subject to conditions:

The submitted model result maps within the Flood Risk Assessment show the flood depths and extents of the existing baseline conditions, and for the expected operational and emergency situations including the breach scenario. Therefore, the Environment Agency (EA) should be consulted considering that they are responsible for the flood risk management associated with artificial sources.

The applicant has not submitted any information on how surface water runoff from the infrastructure that supports the new reservoir (access roads, new car park, visitor centre, etc) will be managed. Bearing in mind that this is an outline planning application, at this stage we would expect an outline drainage strategy which includes sufficient information to cover each points of our surface water checklist. Additionally, the applicant should submit a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to show how surface water will be managed during construction phase of both planning applications.

Nevertheless, considering that this is an Outline Planning Application and the nature of the development, the County Council is content that these matters can be addressed through the use of suitable worded planning conditions

Natural England

It is noted that further detailed design will be undertaken in relation to the pipeline route. A number of SINC's will potentially be affected during construction. All development proposals should follow the mitigation hierarchy to avoid impacts in the first instance, then ensure impacts are adequately mitigated for or, as a last resort, compensation should be considered. Natural England recommends that the detailed design is supported by a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP), or equivalent, that has been agreed by your retained ecologist.

Given that there is a risk that even with mitigation and restoration works, potential impacts to habitats within the SINC's may not be fully addressed following construction. We recommend that the applicant ensures that the biodiversity value of the SINC's are enhanced following the project through supporting habitat improvement projects at the SINC, or associated funds for improved management in consultation with the County Ecologist.

Further details on these mitigation and compensation measures are requested to ensure the impacts from the pipeline route have been appropriately addressed.

Nitrogen neutrality

It is noted that Portsmouth Water has undertaken a separate report to examine whether the reservoir will deliver a nitrogen reduction to the Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area and Ramsar site and the Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation. Natural England agrees with the principle of this nitrogen reduction proposal. It is understood that Portsmouth Water has commissioned consultants to peer review the assessment. Natural England's specialists will also review the reports in due course and provide further advice on nitrogen credit capacity in due course.

Network Rail

Due to the nature of the works (i.e. digging under the railway) the applicant will be required to contact Network Rail's Asset Protection and Optimisation (ASPRO) team via AssetProtectionWessex@networkrail.co.uk. Our Asset Protection will ensure that the proposed development can be completed without any risk to the operational railway. The applicant / developer may be required to enter into an Asset Protection Agreement to get the required resource and expertise on-board to enable approval of detailed works.

The applicant will be required to:

- Adopt ASPRO guidance and requirements and a list of NR deliverables that will be provided to the developer in kick-off meeting;
- Confirm if any covenants are applied to the land and if so comply with them
- Submit for ASPRO acceptance design-if needed, risk assessment & method statement (RAMS) for any work -within Network (NR) zone of influence such as, but not limited to:
 - Ground Investigation Report
 - Detailed ground investigation to be carried out which should include the risk of ground stability of NR ground movement
 - Track monitoring plan

As well as contacting Network Rail's ASPRO Team, the applicant / developer must also follow the attached Asset Protection informatives (compliance with the informatives does not remove the need to contact ASPRO).

As the proposed works include the construction of a new pipeline under the railway, the applicant will be required to gain an easement.

The depth of the pipe may have to be increased to accommodate existing NR apparatus requirements.

Proposer to apply for buried services report prior to any works on site.

Open Space Society

No response received

Planning Casework Unit

No response received

Planning Policy

The pipeline route

ALP Policy AL6 and emerging HBLP Policy KP9 do not specifically refer to this element of the development, but generally seek to safeguard the pipeline route's buffer zone so as not to prejudice its delivery.

Summary

The application proposals are supported in policy terms, subject to relevant environmental considerations (as set out above) being appropriately addressed. In addition, it will also be of importance to ensure that the scheme delivers appropriate community benefits which mitigate the loss of the recreation opportunities currently offered by the site.

Portsmouth Water Company

No response received

Public Health Team, Hampshire County Council

No response received

Ramblers Association, South East Hants Group

The Ramblers Association recognizes the disruption inevitably to be caused with the construction of the pipeline serving the Havant Thicket Reservoir. However, while the accompanying document (Environmental Statement Volume 2 - Main Report Chapters 11 and 13) refers to the need to divert a PRoW in the proximity of the reservoir, the PRoW affected by the pipeline are not considered.

For the pipeline, the focus of the application is on the impact on the roads directly affected and the need for road closures as construction proceeds. But a number of footpaths will be affected directly also - FP 41b, FP 507, FP 33, FP 505 and FP 506a - either by the pipeline construction itself or associated culvert improvement work. Specifically: FP 41b will need to be temporarily closed since it leads off North Street; FP 33 is crossed by the pipeline opposite Hooks Farm Way; FP 505 is affected by the culvert improvement work; and 506a is affected by the culvert improvement work at Eversley Crescent and the pipeline crossing it at Highclere Avenue.

It is also noted that Engineering and Design report (page 52 paragraph 3.1.34) suggests that an alternative route for the pipeline could be the 'other side of the stream to avoid the pinch points altogether. FP 506b is on the east side of Hermitage Stream. Therefore, taking such action as suggested needs to be avoided.

Where a temporary closure of a PRoW or other walking route is required, this must be for as short a period of time as possible. Also, a temporary diversion must be provided that minimizes the extra distance that pedestrians need to walk and ensures that traffic and pedestrian segregation is maintained. It is assumed that, once completed, the sites will be restored to a standard that allows the footpath to be reinstated and used as before the works started.

South Eastern Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group

No response received

South Downs National Park Authority

Comments received relate solely to the reservoir application, and are outlined in that report

Southern Electric

No response received

Southern Gas Network

No response received

Sport England, The Planning Administration Team, Sport Park

The proposed development does not fall within either our statutory remit (Statutory Instrument 2015/595), or non-statutory remit therefore Sport England has not provided a detailed response in this case

The Gardens Trust

No response received

Traffic Management, East Hampshire District Council

The Traffic Team have no adverse comment to make.

6 Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications, as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken both at the time of the original submission and following the receipt of amendments:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 745

Number of site notices: 15.

Statutory advertisement: 20/11/2020

Number of representations received: 11

Comprising 9 objections, 2 in support and 1 neutral comment on the scheme

Summary of issues raised by objection letters:

- Disruption to areas of Leigh Park, during the construction of the pipeline
- The proposal will adversely impact on the foundation of garages in Chadswell Meadow. **Officer Comment:** This is a civil matter and not a material planning Consideration.
- Laying the pipeline will involve more destruction of wildlife habitat and removal of trees and cause disruption to residents of Leigh Park as the plans involve it being laid through busy roads in the town.
- The proposal will create a flood risk
- It will harm the environment and decimate the green spaces adjacent to Hermitage Stream and the fields close to the proposed reservoir site.

Summary of issues raised by support letters:

- Fully support the proposal for a reservoir on the Portsmouth Water land at Havant Thicket. I would encourage the LPA to support the application as a sustainable way of addressing water resource shortfalls in the area.

7 Planning Considerations

Appropriate Assessment

7.1 The Council has conducted a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), including Appropriate Assessment (AA), of the proposed development, for both planning applications, under Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (hereafter referred to as the Habitats Regulations). The application is accompanied by a suite of ecological reports comprising the following:

- Habitats Regulations Assessment (Atkins/Portsmouth Water, September 2020)

- Implementation Plan for Off Site Biodiversity Mitigation and Compensation (Atkins, April 2021).
- Havant Thicket Reservoir Project – Environmental Statement Volume 4 – Appendix A15, Water Framework Directive Assessment.
- Outline Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Strategy (ECOSA, September 2020).
- Technical Note – Article 4.7 WFD Short-listing methodology (Atkins, March 2021).
- Letter to Portsmouth Water - Havant Thicket Winter Storage Reservoir – Water Framework Directive (WFD) Article 4.7 (Environment Agency, 18 February 2021).

7.2 The Council's assessment as competent Authority under the Habitats Regulations is included in the case file. The screening under Regulation 63(1)(a) considered whether there was likely to be a significant effect on several European Sites due to habitat loss and water quality impacts. The planning application was then subject to Appropriate Assessment under Regulation 63.

7.3 Chapter 9 of the submitted Habitats Regulation Assessment includes details of mitigating measures designed to address the potential impacts identified during the screening assessment. These measures are summarised below:

Habitat loss

SPA/Ramsar supporting habitat.

7.4 There is potential for construction-related noise to result in functional habitat loss at two Solent Wader & Brent Goose Strategy (SWBGS) sites in proximity to the Bedhampton & Havant Springs pumping station. These sites are within c.300m of the pumping station.

7.5 Proposed construction at the pumping station has potential to result in novel noise levels of c.87 decibels (dB) at a distance of 10m from the noise source. Given the distance between the noise source, and the presence of dense residential and commercial development and road and rail infrastructure between the application site and SWBGS sites, it is considered highly unlikely that construction noise disturbance would occur.

Singleton & Cocking Tunnels Special Area of Conservation (SAC) supporting habitat.

7.6 The reservoir proposal would result in the loss of substantial areas of suitable Bechstein's and Western barbastelle bat habitat. This can be summarised as:

- c.13 Ha of semi-natural woodland to be removed.
- c.18 mature veteran trees to be removed.
- c. 29 scattered broadleaved trees to be removed.
- At least four Bechstein's bat tree day roosts and one night roost removed.
- c.139 Ha of grassland removed.
- Impacts to c.3.7km of ephemeral stream habitat.

7.7 The proposals would therefore result in the permanent loss of Bechstein's bat roosting sites and extensive areas of habitat used for foraging, commuting and other behaviours. These impacts are considered to affect supporting habitat for the Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC.

Proposed mitigation, compensation, and enhancement

7.8 A number of measures are proposed for mitigating the identified impacts to bat habitat. These are summarised below:

- Obtain European Protected Species mitigation licence from Natural England.

- Timing of tree removal works to avoid periods of highest sensitivity.
- Supervised tree removal by licensed ecologist.
- Protection of retained habitat during construction.
- Updating bat surveys during 2021 in advance of any works.

7.9 The mitigation measures listed above are considered acceptable and would ensure that all activities are carried out under Natural England licence.

7.10 In order to compensate for the extensive loss of bat habitat and broad package of on-site and off-site habitat enhancement and creation measures are proposed. These are summarised as follows:

- On-site woodland enhancements within Havant Thicket (Forestry England (FE) owned),
- Bell's Copse (FE owned) and Staunton Country Park (Hampshire County Council owned).
- Off-site woodland and grassland enhancements within land north of Havant Thicket (East Hampshire District Council owned), Southleigh Forest (Portsmouth Water owned) and the Stansted Estate.
- Enhancements to watercourses in proximity to the proposed pipeline route.
- Capital Grants Scheme funded by PW to deliver off-site ecological enhancement projects, prioritising local initiatives to restore, create or enhance habitat connectivity in accordance with local planning policy priorities.

7.11 Between them these on-site and off-site measures aim to provide:

- New woodland linkages at Gipsies Plain and Deerslaughter Plain.
- Creation of 60 Ha of pasture woodland and 20 Ha of neutral grassland.
- 72 Ha of woodland enhancement within Southleigh Forest.
- Roosting habitat for Bechstein's bats, with measures to be agreed.
- 5.5km of watercourse enhancement.
- £40,000 per annum for 30 years from 2029 towards Capital Grants Scheme.

7.12 Whilst acknowledging the extensive impacts arising from the proposals, it is considered that the above mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures provide for a substantial package of works that would provide a long-term benefit at the landscape scale for bat species associated with the Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC. Targeted woodland and grassland creation and enhancement works would improve the condition of habitat for bat species across a large area of the landscape. Combined with the Capital Grants Scheme focussing on enhancing the local landscape in terms of habitat connectivity.

Delivery mechanism

7.13 Details of the delivery mechanism for the overall mitigation package have been provided through the submission of an Implementation Plan (Atkins, April 2021). This provides details of:

- Memorandum of Understanding signed between Portsmouth Water, Forestry England and Hampshire County Council.
- Outline Biodiversity and Compensation Strategy submitted with current application to form basis for future submissions.
- Detailed Biodiversity Mitigation and Compensation Strategy submitted for each phase of works and to be agreed by the LPA and other key consultees.
- Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan for all pipeline works, submitted as part of

detailed design and subject to agreement from key consultees.

- Full details of Capital Grants Scheme to be provided alongside detailed submissions and agreed by key consultees.
- All agreed measures to be subject to Section 106 agreement – ensuring that measures are enforceable and that monitoring systems (to agreed indicators) are included.

7.14 The Implementation Plan includes four Action Plans for the main elements of the overall mitigation package: Woodland Creation, Southleigh Forest, Ephemeral Streams, and Capital Grants Scheme. The Action Plans contain further details of the proposed location, baseline conditions, roles and responsibilities, site planning/preparation, delivery, and monitoring.

7.15 It is the view of Havant Borough Council and East Hampshire District Council that the submitted Implementation Plan provides for an appropriate mechanism for the delivery of an overall package of ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures. The Implementation Plan and its four Action Plans provide a sufficient level of detail appropriate to the hybrid status of the applications.

7.16 It is acknowledged that further details of off-site compensatory measures would be provided at agreed stages. This is a logical approach and recognises the complex nature of the proposed development and the need for further investigations on the precise location and nature of mitigation.

Summary

7.17 It is concluded that the identified impacts from habitat loss on the Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC can be effectively compensated through the comprehensive package of mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures as detailed within the Outline Biodiversity and Compensation Strategy and Implementation Plan. These outline measures would form the basis of a detailed Section 106 agreement, enabling the Local Planning Authorities to have reassurance that all measures would be delivered and compliance monitored.

Local Plan Policy

7.18 The proposed developments are addressed through specific local plan policy.

Policy KP9 of the Submission Havant Borough Local Plan and Policy CP26 of East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014) details the conditions of any planning permission for the Havant Thicket reservoir. Planning permission would be granted where:

j. Changes to the natural and rural character are mitigated in particular by:

- i. Limiting impacts on biodiversity including the creation of additional habitats to ensure biodiversity net gain is secured;
- ii. Avoiding, mitigating and then compensating for the loss of, and effects on, Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs);
- iii. Ensuring that the pipeline has no significant impact on Great Copse, protecting it during construction;
- iv. Integrating the reservoir into the existing landscape of the area;
- v. Minimising the loss of ancient woodland and trees and compensating for the loss of irreplaceable habitat within a costed management strategy;
- vi. A comprehensive mitigation strategy is secured for impacts to protected and notable species, including appropriate mitigation measures for Bechstein's bats in line with Policy E15.

k. The potential impacts on the Langstone and Chichester Harbours as well as the

Hermitage Stream have been assessed under the appropriate regulations and any necessary avoidance and mitigation measures included in the scheme design;

I. Opportunities for biodiversity enhancements associated with the reservoir and the Hermitage Stream are realised wherever possible;

7.19 East Hampshire District Council Policies in the East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy (2014) Policies CP20 (Landscape), CP21 (Biodiversity) and CP28 (Green Infrastructure) and the Havant Borough Local Plan policies E14 The Local Ecological Network, E15 Protected Species, EX1 Water Quality impact on the Solent European Sites, and E17 Solent Wader and Brent Goose feeding and roosting sites also provide details of the expectations for planning submissions. These policies provide a policy framework that ensures that planning permission would only be granted subject to specific conditions being met.

Water Quality

7.20 There is potential for proposed development to result in water quality impacts affecting the following European sites:

- Chichester & Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA).
- Chichester & Langstone Harbours Ramsar site.
- Solent & Dorset Coasts SPA.
- Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

7.21 The proposed development would result in the loss and modification of watercourses that are hydrologically linked to Langstone Harbour and the above European sites.

Proposed mitigation, compensation, and enhancement

7.22 A number of measures are proposed for mitigating the identified impacts to these European sites. These are summarised below:

- Environment Agency (EA) consents would be obtained for the discharge of water from the development site. This would control the discharge of silt within surface or accumulated water during construction.
- Use of standard construction methods to control silt e.g. CIRIA guidelines.
- Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) would be produced.
- Drainage Management Plan (DMP) would be produced.
- EA licences for the outflow of water from the reservoir in order to maintain flows in local watercourses.
- Filtration (of silt, nitrates and phosphorous) via the created wetland habitat at the northern edge of the proposed reservoir.
- Compressed air mixing of water within reservoir control house to prevent phosphorous concentrations within reservoir.
- Decrease in nitrate loading to linked watercourses due to use of water from Bedhampton & Havant Springs.

7.23 These measures would ensure that surface and accumulated water leaving the site during construction and operation would be subject to EA permit and that no such activities could occur until such permits are in place. The use of standard pollution prevention guidance, the CEMP and the DMP would be secured through planning condition and subject to enforcement as necessary.

7.24 In addition, the applicant (Portsmouth Water) has undertaken an assessment in accordance with Article 4.7 of the Water Framework Directive (WFD). The

Environment Agency (EA) has provided detailed response, following consultation, to the submitted Article 4.7 WFD assessment. In summary, the WFD assessment includes details of:

- Long list of potential watercourse mitigation and compensation measures.
- Agreed short list of watercourse mitigation and compensation measures.
- Three mitigation and compensation packages.
- Confirmation that Package 2 was chosen as the most suitable option, delivering 5.5km of mitigation and compensation to local watercourses.

7.25 The EA have subsequently provided a detailed commentary on the Article 4.7 WFD assessment (EA, letter dated 30 March 2021). In summary, the EA state that they are content with Package 2 and recommend that this is secured by legal agreement. The mechanism for this would be via Section 106 agreement.

7.26 Whilst not linked to HRA, the parallel WFD assessment and subsequent EA comments provide an additional level of reassurance that there is an agreed package of measures that would provide appropriate mitigation, compensation and enhancement for ephemeral watercourses. The measures would ensure that the works would not result in degradation of the quality of freshwater inputs into Langstone Harbour.

Appropriate Assessment conclusion

7.27 The Appropriate Assessment concluded that the avoidance and mitigation packages proposed are sufficient to remove the significant effect on the SPAs which would otherwise have been likely to occur. The HRA was subject to consultation with Natural England as the appropriate nature conservation body under Regulation 63(3). The applicant has indicated a willingness to enter into a legal agreement and appropriate conditions to secure the mitigation packages.

7.28 In other respects, and having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development, including need and proposed location
- (ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the landscape
- (iii) Impact of the development on ecology
- (iv) Impact of the development on the local and strategic highway network
- (v) Impact on flood risk, hydrology and hydro-geology
- (vi) Impact on residential amenity (noise and vibration, air quality)
- (vii) Other Environmental Impacts, Geology, Soils, Contamination and minerals
- (viii) Impact on climate change and sustainable design
- (ix) Contribution requirements and legal agreement

(i) Principle of development

7.29 The reservoir and pipeline route are safeguarded in the adopted local plan through HBC Policy CS18, CS19 and AL6, and in the emerging Local Plan through HBC Policy KP9 Policy S31. Policy CS18 - Strategic Site Delivery identifies Havant Thicket Reservoir as a Strategic Site. The Scheme would ensure water supply in South Hampshire and therefore embedded in local policy as strategic infrastructure required for the plan period. As such, the principle of a new reservoir at Havant Thicket and a pipeline route from the reservoir to Bedhampton Springs has been established and accepted, subject to certain requirements. Further detailed reasoning and justification for the location of the reservoir are provided within the linked planning application APP/20/00990.

Pipeline route optioneering

- 7.30 During the 2008 consultation, and subsequent Stakeholder Group meetings undertaken by Portsmouth Water there was support for a pipeline route that followed the Riders Lane and Hermitage Stream corridors. As such since then Portsmouth Water has been looking in more detail at how to build along this route and the disruption that might be caused during construction. In addition, the opportunity was also taken to consider new construction techniques that were not in common use in 2008.
- 7.31 The optioneering included different routes and construction techniques and carefully considering each one in relation to:
- The engineering and how difficult it would be to build;
 - Disruption to the local community and traffic;
 - The health, safety and wellbeing of people;
 - Building the pipeline and maintaining it in the future;
 - Environmental effects and sustainability; and
 - Overall cost.
- 7.32 The proposed route has sought to minimise the impact on communities and avoid environmentally sensitive areas, notably Great Copse (north of High Lawn Way), which is a Site of Nature Conservation Importance and an area of Ancient woodland.
- 7.33 Most of the pipe would be installed using an 'open cut' method, digging down from the road or land, laying the pipe and then filling in the ground above it. Some places would involve tunnelling underground using a 'pipejacking' method to push the pipe into place underground from one open- cut hole, for example, under the railway line. Where the Riders Lane and Hermitage Streams are crossed, the opportunity has been taken to improve these watercourses. The improvements are as follows:
- 250m compensation flow channel - This is a new channel that would connect the reservoir to Riders Lane Stream downstream. The existing channel would be filled in under the embankment footprint but, where feasible, the remainder of the channel upstream of the confluence of the compensation channel and Riders Lane Stream would be left as a backwater to improve habitat value;
 - opportunity to improve around 20m of channel around these crossing points in terms of biodiversity enhancements;
 - improvements to culverts for passage should they need upgrading; should any of the culverts on Riders Lane Stream need upgrading to account for any discharges then the opportunity to enhance them for fish passage;
 - mitigation of habitat around opening outfall from emergency discharge;
 - there would be an outfall from the emergency discharge into the main Hermitage Stream.
- When this work is undertaken there would be an opportunity to ensure that the habitat around the opening is maximised and this would be taken forward as part of the detailed design.
- 7.34 In conclusion, on the principle of development, it is considered that there is an overriding public need for the scheme and a lack of suitable alternative sites. The majority of the South East is classed as 'seriously water-stressed' with Portsmouth Water currently sharing supplies with Southern Water in West Sussex and Hampshire of up to 30 million litres of water each day. Southern Water supplies water to an area that is officially identified as an area of significant population and economic growth. Following the restriction imposed by the Environment Agency on abstraction from the

internationally designated River Itchen and nationally designated River Test options for making up the subsequent water resources deficit were considered by the WRSE group. In addition, Portsmouth Water have outlined that they would utilise supplies from the reservoir, to have a secure water supply, particularly in the peak summer period. The pipeline is an integral part of the reservoir works and is, therefore, necessary to meet the overriding public need for the scheme.

(ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the landscape

- 7.35 The chosen route for the pipeline corridor utilises existing road corridors where possible, allowing the pipeline to be laid within existing highway carriageway, avoiding impact to soft landscape areas and street trees. Using this approach as much as possible, would ensure effects on landscape character and visual amenity are limited to the construction period. Once the hard surfacing is reinstated, no further mitigation is required, and the effect would be neutral at the completion stage.
- 7.36 Where the pipeline corridor must run through soft landscape areas, such as public open space, a route has been chosen to minimise impact to existing trees and vegetation wherever possible. This includes following routes of existing pathways or open areas of grassland as much as possible, therefore reducing the amount of existing vegetation that would need to be cleared for excavation. In this way effects post construction can be reduced, without the need to wait for replacement mitigation planting to establish.
- 7.37 The proposal does include a discharge structure, at the point where the pipeline first meets the Hermitage Stream, which is to the west of Ewhurst Close. As this application is outline in nature, the full details of this structure would be considered in a Reserved Matters application. However, broad parameters have been provided, which outlines that the maximum envelope for the above ground kiosk (associated with discharge structure) would be: H3m x W6.5m x L10.5m is the size of above ground kiosk at Hermitage Stream (excluding slab H0.5m x W6.5m x L11.6m). The overall height: 3.5m above ground level. Given its sensitive location within the open space, the visual impact and an associated mitigation measures comprising landscaping and built form would be considered in detail at the Reserved Matters stage.
- 7.38 The Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) as part of the Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) in Appendix A2.1 in ES Volume 4 includes measures to help mitigate local impacts and effects during construction. This sets out a number of areas of mitigation, which are as follows:

1.	During construction, an environmental clerk of works (ECoW) would monitor compliance with all environmental management requirements, plans and restoration procedures including requirements relating to the landscape and visual environment. This would include monitoring the implementation of committed mitigation measures as set out in the ES and REAC as part of the OEMP.
2.	Where the pipeline corridor crosses an existing hedge, area of scrub or tree belt, existing gaps would be used where possible so that vegetation removal is minimised. No unnecessary tree or shrub removal would be undertaken, and vegetation which is to be removed would be marked and agreed on site with the ECoW prior to any felling. Where removal of sections of scrub, hedgerows and trees are unavoidable, appropriate species would be replanted along the line of the existing hedge or within the area of scrub, and managed so as to restore the existing hedgerow or area of scrub

3.	Operations would be designed so that progressive restoration of finished areas can occur where appropriate, and so that stored topsoil can be replaced on graded areas as these are finished;
4.	Topsoil and subsoil would be replaced (using existing topsoil and subsoil removed and stored during excavation) and evenly spread. Areas of disturbed earth would be re-graded to blend with the surrounding landform, cultivated and seeded or replanted; and
5.	A restoration plan would form part of the REAC as part of the OEMP in Appendix A2.1 in ES Volume 4 described above. It would be implemented to restore landscape earthworks, soils and surface vegetation including alongside tracks and along the pipeline corridor.

7.39 During construction of the pipeline, there would be disturbance to the local landscape arising from construction activity along the pipeline corridor, resulting in some adverse effects to landscape and visual receptors, none of which, however, are considered significant in EIA terms. These would be localised and temporary or short to medium-term, occurring during construction works, and for a short period post construction, whilst the disturbed land is returned to its original condition, and replacement vegetation which is planted post-construction becomes established. Once the proposed mitigation measures mature, this would reduce the initial adverse effects to Neutral.

7.40 Overall, no significant long-term effects are considered likely to the landscape character or to views and visual amenity. This is due to the nature of the pipeline being located below ground, meaning that once the works are complete any effect remaining short to medium term would be due to vegetation removal and excavation works. Further conditions are proposed that in the subsequent Reserved Matters application, additional detailed Arboricultural information would be provided once the route of the pipeline has been fixed. This would include details in relation to demolition, design, and construction. Tree survey data should be provided including the trees growing on highway land. Tree constraint plans should be provided showing how trees have been considered in all design proposals to minimise the impact on important trees. Furthermore, tree protection plans would be provided to demonstrate how they would be safeguarded through the proposal and construction phase. All areas of vegetation would be mitigated by reinstatement, including planting and seeding, which once established in the medium term would neutralise any effects on the landscape post construction.

(iii) Impact of the development on ecology

7.41 The application is accompanied by detailed ecological information, which comprises Environmental Statement Chapter 2 Biodiversity (Atkins/Portsmouth Water, September 2020) and each of the habitat and species-specific technical reports with supporting appendices (ECOSA, various dates). Together with the Outline Biodiversity Mitigation and Compensation Strategy and the Habitats Regulations Assessment. Further details have been provided for proposed off-site mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures. These details are contained within the Implementation Plan for Off Site Biodiversity Mitigation and Compensation (Atkins, April 2021) as well as the Technical Note – Article 4.7 WFD Short-listing methodology (Atkins, March 2021) and accompanying letter to Portsmouth Water - Havant Thicket Winter Storage Reservoir – Water Framework Directive (WFD) Article 4.7 (Environment Agency, 18 February 2021).

7.42 Detailed ecological assessments at the site have taken place over a considerable period of time. The scope, scale and standard of ecological assessments are considered appropriate in assessing the ecological baseline over many years using

expert technical advice. The robust baseline allows a greater level of certainty with respect to predicted impacts and is used to shape the overall ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement package. The application has been further supported by an Implementation Plan, which has been produced following comments from the Ecologist consultant, Natural England and the Environment Agency.

- 7.43 As the pipeline is underground, the main impacts of the development would arise during the construction period. The site would run closely to High Lawns Site of Importance Nature Conservation (SINC), amongst other. All development proposals should follow the mitigation hierarchy to avoid impacts in the first instance, then ensure impacts are adequately mitigated for or, as a last resort, compensation should be considered. As this is an outline application, with the exact route, within the red-edge, would be confirmed at Reserved Matters stage.
- 7.44 The proposed outline mitigation and compensation strategy relies of several strands: the removal of certain protected/notable species from within the construction footprint; the use of habitat manipulation techniques to render habitat less suitable prior to construction; a commitment to long-term habitat management works in surrounding land; the use of artificial nesting and roost boxes; a commitment to substantial new grassland and pasture-woodland habitats off-site; the creation of new habitats within the developed site; enhancements to retained watercourses and waterbodies; and the establishment of a fund for ecological improvements.
- 7.45 The large scope and scale of the proposed mitigation and compensation measures and the efforts employed to date in ensuring that key stakeholders have been involved in their scope and design are acknowledged. Within the reservoir site itself the proposed land-use changes are so profound that it is essentially impossible to make meaningful comparative judgements between losses and gains that take full account of impacts to habitats, species and the local ecological network.
- 7.46 Overall, the submission of the Implementation Plan and Action Plans, provides a useful level of further detail to demonstrate the scope of the proposed works and methods of delivery. It is acknowledged that there is uncertainty over the exact location and nature of some aspects, but consider that these further details would provide adequate protection and enhancement of the local ecology along the pipeline route. The details would be secured through future planning submissions and appropriate legal agreements.
- 7.47 There are various conditions which are relevant to biodiversity. The Site Wide Framework includes the requirement for the submission of a Site Wide Ecological Mitigation and Management Strategy and the Key Phase condition also requires the submission of a Key Phase Ecological Management Plan setting out how the development would secure ecological enhancements and mitigation. This together with a 'running total' of mitigation, compensation and enhancement delivery in order that the applicant, LPA and other stakeholders understand what is being delivered, where and by whom, and that net biodiversity gain is achieved.

(iv) Impact of the development on the local and strategic highway network

- 7.48 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at Paragraphs 108 and 109 states that, in relation to development proposals, decisions should take account of whether safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. Paragraph 110 of the NPPF also states that developments should be located and designed where practical to give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements; and create safe and secure layouts which

minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians.

- 7.49 The pipeline route includes sections, circa 2km of the 4.5km length, which are proposed to be laid below public highway. The following roads are subject to infrastructure being laid beneath the highway.
- Middle Park Way
 - High Lawn Way
 - Dunsbury Way
 - Willisfield Road
 - Riders Lane
 - Highclere Avenue
 - Ewhurst Close
 - Purbrook Way
 - Barncroft Way
 - Fraser Road
 - North Street
 - Bedhampton Road
 - Bruswick Gardens
- 7.50 It is forecast that works to complete the pipeline would be undertaken within 2023 and 2026. Construction of the pipeline would be undertaken in 3 periods so construction on the highway may not be continuous across the 3 years
- 7.51 Extensive discussions have taken place between the applicant, Havant Borough Council, and Hampshire Highways. The Highway Authority requested the following further information from the applicant:
- A high-level programme of works and timetable should be submitted;
 - Key junctions on the local road network to be assessed for the worst-case scenario of traffic impact;
 - Assessment of diversion of traffic during road closures/traffic management;
 - Framework Traffic Management Strategy showing, but not limited to, the following;
 - Proposed diversion routes, traffic management plans, indicative programme of works, appropriate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of the works on the highway
 - Personal Injury Accident data to be reviewed based on the proposed road closures and diversions;
 - Restricting the use of road space near existing schools;
 - Diversion plans for cyclists where appropriate when road closures are required;
 - Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan;
 - Highway reinstatement proposals;
 - Highway tree impact assessment;
 - Updated construction detail plan.
- 7.52 The applicant and the Highway Authority have been engaging in discussion over the above and a Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan has been provided for both the construction of the reservoir and the construction of the pipeline. The applicant has stated that due to the current work undertaken to date, some of the requested information cannot be provided until further detailed work is undertaken and a design and build contractor is on board, which would be appointed if planning permission is approved.
- 7.53 The applicant has set out in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan for the pipeline element that the full CTMP would include the following;
- A Full CTMP for any phase of works area;

- Detailed programme and duration of construction;
- Restrictions of the number construction personnel per a day to a maximum of 125 workers. The CTMP secured restricting travel arrangements to be outside of peak hours and further mitigation where necessary;
- Details of any alterations to the highway, including temporary and / or permanent, to enable construction and to obtain the necessary highway approvals for any changes;
- Details of the number of construction and delivery vehicles permitted to utilise the southern access fixed at up to 30 HGV movements per day and six per hour;
- Traffic management details of the pipeline installation;
- Details of any additional compounds and laydown area which are not located within the reservoir site;
- Highway condition surveys of all construction traffic routes;
- Wheel washing facilities for managing the site to prevent mud onto the highway and road sweepers to be utilised if required;
- Details of onsite contractor parking;
- Commitment to avoid school term times where the pipeline runs close to a school.

Traffic Management Plan

- 7.54 The Highway Authority are satisfied that through securing the Framework CTMP and the obligation for the applicant to provide a Full CTMP for every phase, which would be aligned to the overarching framework that the impact on the local road network can be suitably mitigated against. This would complement the formal highway licences and permits the applicant would need to apply for when constructing the pipeline under the highway. Traffic Management plans would need to be provided, which should include pedestrian, cycling and vehicular diversions for every phase of works undertaken. The details of the CTMP are further covered in the Highway section of the reservoir application.
- 7.55 The applicant has included in Appendix A of the Framework CTMP, a table of proposed road closures and diversion routes. The Highway Authority has undertaken a high-level review and only has a concern over the Dunsbury Way closure and the diversion on to Riders Lane. Whilst this is not a matter to consider at this stage, it is the applicant would need to revisit the diversion routing in dialogue with the Highway Authority to ensure traffic management and diversions are suitable and agreed in a timely manner.
- 7.56 The Framework Traffic Management Strategy should also include a commitment to providing a high level of public engagement and communication over the road closures and diversion routes to ensure that disruption to journeys are minimised when Traffic Management is in place.

Highway Reinstatement

- 7.57 Due to the increase in HGV's there may be a detrimental impact to the existing carriageway and ongoing maintenance. A pre-condition survey should be undertaken by the applicant prior to any commencement on site to assess the condition of the construction route. At the end of the construction period, the applicant would need to make good any defects caused by HGV traffic, in agreement with the Highway Authority.
- 7.58 It is not known what impact the construction period would have on existing highway infrastructure, including trees, street lighting/signage and drainage, the applicant should provide an overview of infrastructure which may be impacted as a result and commit to reinstating all highway infrastructure and assets to their original state.

Public Rights of Way

- 7.59 The pipeline crosses Havant Footpaths 506a which runs west from Ellisfield Road, Havant Footpath 33 which runs north from Barncroft Way, Havant Footpaths 507 and 41b connect Fraser Road and North Steet by Bidbury Junior School. The pipeline also runs through Staunton County Park (Hampshire County Council Countryside Service Site), High Lawn Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and Thicket Lawn SINC.
- 7.60 The pipeline would require works to the surface of a number of public footpaths and permissive paths within Staunton Country Park. Any works to the surface of the public Right of Way would be required to be restored to the satisfaction of Hampshire County Council Countryside Area Access Manager. There is likely to be an effect on the footpath in terms of dust, noise, or other obstruction during the period of the works and there could be a risk to users of the footpaths. These matters can be controlled through the submission of a construction environment management plan (CEMP), to ensure the safety of users of the Rights of Way during the construction period.
- 7.61 The Highways Authority in respect of Rights of Way, have advised that Temporary Closure Orders would need to be applied for separately to stop up or divert the public right of way without following the due legal process. The applicant would be advised of this by way of an informative to any decision made.
- 7.62 Taking all these highway factors together it is considered that the site is sustainable in transport terms, subject to the mitigation measures proposed, and secured via the S106 and conditions. Overall, the impacts on the highway network are not considered to be severely harmful to the safety or free flow of the highway network and as such the development should not be refused. It is clear in paragraph 109 of the NPPF that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. Following the implementation of the agreed mitigation proposals required by legal agreement and conditions, these are considered to mitigate the impact of the development on the highway network.

(v) Impact on flood risk, hydrology and hydro-geology

- 7.63 The NPPF advises the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change, in line with the objectives of the Climate Change Act 2008 (paragraph 149). At a local level, policy on flood risk is outlined in HBC Policy CS15, draft Policy E19, In addition, HBC Policy CS18 and draft Policy KP9 seek a flood risk assessment of the scheme and mitigation put in place to minimise risks.
- 7.64 The assessment of the scheme on the water environment is provided in Chapter 15 of the ES, which includes a detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). This section firstly considers whether the location of the development is appropriate, in accordance with guidance relating to the flood sequential and exception tests. This report then considers the impact on the water environment, including flood risk from the development, in terms of impacts during construction and the operation of the reservoir and pipeline.

Sequential and exception test

- 7.65 The application boundary of the is approximately 21 hectares. Whilst the majority of the site in flood zone 1, which has the lowest probability of flooding, parts of both the and pipeline are in flood zones 2 and 3, located adjacent to the Heritage and Riders Streams, which have a high risk of flooding.

7.66 As parts of the site are at high risk of flooding, being located in flood zones 2 and 3. The NPPF assigns vulnerability type to land use. The vulnerability types range from water-compatible to essential infrastructure. The land use changes across the site. The main developments are classed as the following:

- reservoir embankment = essential infrastructure
- pipeline = essential infrastructure
- control house = essential infrastructure
- visitor centre = less vulnerable
- educational hides = less vulnerable.

7.67 A development is always classified based on the most vulnerable element/s. Havant Thicket reservoir is classed as essential infrastructure and can be compatible with a high risk of flooding (flood zone 3), subject to appropriate mitigation. However, the proposals must satisfy both the sequential and exception tests, as set out in the NPPF, for development to be permitted. These tests are considered below.

7.68 In this case, the requirements of the sequential test should be considered alongside the wider available and suitable land for a reservoir, as outlined in the principle of development including need and proposed location section of this report. In addition, this site is allocated in the development plans for a reservoir. As such the proposal complies with the sequential test.

7.69 As the site is allocated for a reservoir and pipeline in the adopted plans, government guidance outlines that an exception test is not required both due to the nature of the development and that it complies with adopted policy.

Impact on water environment

7.70 This development needs to be read in context of the water environment, the whole purpose of the scheme is to reduce abstraction from the nearby River Itchen, designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the River Test (SSSI) - whilst maintaining a resilient water supply to the area.

7.71 The proposal is supported by an Outline Biodiversity Mitigation and Compensation Plan, which is been produced following detailed negotiations with both Natural England and the Environment Agency. As part of this proposal the reservoir would result in the creation of new habitats of ecological value - particularly the wetland along the northern edge of the reservoir as well as approximately 100m additional stream length to the east of the reservoir.

7.72 In addition, there would be further benefits to the Riders Lane Stream and Hermitage Stream as a result of a more consistent compensation flow regime from the reservoir, which would improve the current intermittent flows within these water bodies. In addition, the reservoir and associated pipeline would have benefits downstream, in terms of flood risk, by reducing the volume and frequency of peak water flows during flooding events.

7.73 Furthermore the water quality discharged from the reservoir into the Riders and Hermitage Streams would be of more consistent quality. Improvements, and associated reductions, in nutrient levels which would be of significant benefit downstream where it enters into Langstone Harbour - a sensitive designated site, which is a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA), Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI), and Ramsar.

7.74 However, the scheme would result in the loss of 3.7 km of headwater stream habitats, from the reservoir site and would result in a permanent effect on aquatic habitat connectivity and geomorphology in the river system. There would also be permanent change to the outline of superficial aquifers as a result of the presence of the reservoir.

Water Framework Directive (WFD)

7.75 The environmental objectives of the WFD are set out in Article 4 of the directive and relate to... *ensuring the continued protection of the condition of all waterbodies and the development of plans to deliver measures to improve failing water bodies to a good condition (or better).*

7.76 The two key objectives against which new developments or schemes should be assessed are:

- no deterioration of status (or potential) for surface and groundwaters
- achievement of good status (or potential) by 2021 or 2027, for waterbodies currently failing to achieve this status or potential.

7.77 WFD compliance assessments for new developments and schemes must demonstrate that the proposals would not result in the deterioration in status (or potential) of any water body. Where a waterbody is at a status less than good (or potential), it must be demonstrated that the implementation of the proposals would not prevent the water body from meeting good status (or potential) in the future.

7.78 Following the completion of a WFD compliance assessment, Havant Thicket reservoir was deemed to have the potential to cause deterioration of the impacted water body of Riders Lane Stream which is part of the Hermitage Stream. The main area of concern relates to the construction of the embankment and reservoir footprint. The resulting loss of habitat is significant with the direct loss of 3.7km of headwater habitat within Riders Lane Stream. The length of watercourse lost would account for approximately 42% of headwaters and 18% of the entire length of watercourse within the water body.

7.79 The WFD uses the term "quality elements" to refer to the different indicators of ecological quality comprising its ecological status classification schemes. The quality elements used to assess ecological status are biological, chemical and physicochemical, and hydromorphological quality elements.

7.80 The assessment identified that both biological and hydromorphological WFD quality elements were at risk of deterioration. Specifically, invertebrates, macrophytes phytobenthos and hydromorphology. A deterioration of any one, or more quality elements can cause an overall deterioration and lowering of class status at the water body scale, this is contrary to the objectives of WFD.

7.81 The WFD precludes the authorisation of individual projects which may cause the deterioration of the status of a body of water, unless a derogation under article 4.7 of the WFD is justified. As such, whilst the identified compensation and mitigation measures would be undertaken, there does remain potential for deterioration of the water downstream, which is a Water Framework Directive (WFD) qualifying waterbody.

7.82 The four WFD derogation tests that must be satisfied are:

- test (a): All practicable steps are to be taken to mitigate the adverse impacts on the water body concerned
- test (b): The reasons for modifications or alterations are specifically set out and

- explained in the RBMP (River Basin Management Plan);
- test (c)(1): There is an overriding public interest in the Proposed Development and/or test (c)(2): Its benefits outweigh the benefits of the WFD objectives
- test (d): The benefits of the project cannot be achieved by a significantly better environmental option.

7.83 The WFD Article 4.7 assessment (document reference - HTR-ATK-XX-XX-RP-2-0067) describes the outcome of this process. A framework approach demonstrating how the scheme would meet the four tests has been discussed between the Environment Agency (EA) and the applicant and accompanies the planning applications. These discussions identified a long list of practicable measures that would be appropriate to fulfil article 4.7 test (a). The EA have agreed that these measures are sufficient for the purposes of fulfilling the Article 4.7 derogation.

7.84 Following the above process, a shortlisting exercise has been undertaken to identify the deliverable options and the appropriate level of mitigation and compensation required for the watercourses impacted by the scheme. The agreed package, for the water environment includes both on-site and off-site mitigation, and compensation totalling up to 5.5km of watercourse improvement.

The on-site mitigation and compensation plan (approximately 1.57km) concentrates efforts in the headwater streams upstream of the reservoir.

7.85 The off-site mitigation and compensation are spread across the wider catchment and includes the following measures:

- Riders Lane Stream (part of the Lake Stream) (approximately 0.45km)
- Hermitage Stream (approximately 2.99km)
- Park Lane Stream (approximately 0.47km)
- improvements along Lake Stream would provide mitigation for distinct species lost under the scheme's footprint.

7.86 The package of measures includes restoration of the Hermitage Stream. The measures proposed are based upon feasibility and design work undertaken jointly by Havant Borough Council and Environment Agency in 2013. The EA have shared this information that was compiled at the time with Portsmouth Water, including drawings and costings. The mitigation and compensation measures agreed as part of the water environment package would be in keeping with the design work previously undertaken, including the removal of concrete bed and banks, which would enable the naturalisation of the waterbody again, and allowing the flow of the to be slowed through ecological enhancements, thus naturally reducing flood risk.

7.87 The EA in agreeing the package of mitigation and compensation with Portsmouth Water, have identified measures that are both environmentally sound and appropriate for the scale of loss that would result from the development. The impacts that have been identified cannot be readily mitigated or compensated for, due to the distinctiveness of the habitat. Meaning the habitat to be lost cannot be recreated. Therefore, it is considered that the package of measures, once implemented, would provide a joined-up network of quality habitat improvements that would mitigate and compensate against the high value conservation habitat lost from the scheme.

7.88 In summary the EA have advised that this package provides sufficient length of watercourse improvement (5.5km) and an appropriate balance of measures to satisfy both the article 4.7 requirements and Biodiversity Net Gain commitments. The proposal would only be acceptable and compliant under the Water Framework

Directive once the mitigation and compensation package of measures has been secured - these measures would be secured by a legal agreement.

Flood risk

- 7.89 The application is accompanied by a comprehensive Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), which considered the impact of the development from construction through to operation. The FRA considers the impacts of fluvial, tidal and surface water flooding. In addition, it considers the impact of artificial flood risk, which is that created by the reservoir and pipeline itself, and the proposed mitigation measures. This element of the report would outline:
- the permanent and construction elements of the scheme
 - operational and construction flood risk impacts
 - managing associated flood risk.
- 7.90 Whilst this is the subject of the parallel application APP/20/00990, and within Havant Borough, as these two applications are inextricably linked details have been provided within this report. The reservoir would operate as a pumped storage reservoir utilising surplus water from the Havant & Bedhampton Spring source. A bi-directional pipeline (4.4 km) is, therefore, required to allow for the transfer and discharge of water between the Bedhampton Springs and the reservoir.
- 7.91 The same pipeline would also provide a conduit to convey part of the drawdown flow that is not discharged into the Riders Lane Stream. This flow is to be conveyed over halfway along the route, into the Hermitage Stream near its confluence with the Riders Lane Stream. This discharge facility can reduce the water level in the reservoir in line with the requirements of the Environment Agency Guide to Drawdown Capacity for Reservoir Safety and Emergency Planning.
- 7.92 The sizing of the conduit has been analysed, in relation to the flow rate passed down it, within a study on the Emergency Drawdown scenario. The maximum emergency drawdown rate from the reservoir in accordance with Environment Agency guidance has been calculated as 10.9m³/s, which would allow the reservoir top water level to be drained down by 900mm in depth over a 24-hour period, allowing the reservoir to be lowered by a third of its water depth in six days.
- 7.93 The total discharge rate from the reservoir is then split to allow a 7.05m³/s to the Riders Lane Stream directly downstream of the reservoir embankment, and 3.85m³/s to the Hermitage Stream approximately 2km downstream from the reservoir. In order for the Riders Lane Stream to receive these emergency drawdown flows without increasing flood risk, three culverts are proposed, to replace the existing culverts in the river system, in order to be able to accommodate the Emergency Drawdown.
- 7.94 The pipeline includes a 700mm diameter pipe (1,650m in length) for normal pump-and-return flows with this increased to 1,200mm diameter (2,750m in length) for the section where it is to accommodate the emergency drawdown flow from the reservoir site to the Emergency Drawdown Valve. The location of the Emergency Drawdown Valve is not fixed at this point, as this would be considered at Reserved Matters stage, however they would be located on the Hermitage Stream, upstream of the Riders Lane Stream confluence and Purbrook Way. The locations would be selected considering geomorphology modelling, flood modelling and aquatic/ecological assessment. It is expected that the valve would be housed in a concrete structure adjacent to the watercourse.

Drainage management plan

- 7.95 A drainage management plan would be prepared for the scheme as part of the Detailed Reserved Matters application. This would include details such as design standards, pollution control/interception, outfall locations, earthworks, access roads and haulage routes and surface water drains. It would also include details of how increased surface water runoff from new areas of hardstanding, such as from access roads, visitor centre and car parks, and how these would be managed to ensure no increase in flood risk. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) would be included in the drainage design. It would also include details of how the construction compounds would safely manage surface water flows in line with Environment Agency guidance.

Construction Environmental Management Plan

- 7.96 A construction environment management plan (CEMP) would be prepared for the scheme. This would include a process for managing the volume and quality of discharge of water for the construction compound, areas used for construction use, other areas of hard standing and haulage roads, which would discharge into the site water management systems via shut-off sluice valves. This document would also make provision for attenuating surface water runoff generated as part of the reservoir and pipeline construction, which has additional benefits of better management of water quality, and the associated nutrient input into Langstone Harbour.

- 7.97 The proposed mitigation in line with best practicable measures and construction environmental management procedures are set out in the Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP), which would form the basis for the production of the CEMP. In addition, the Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) identifies the commitments to address potential flood risk effects of the construction of the scheme.

Environmental Permits

- 7.98 In addition to the above requirements, permits would be required, as required under other legislation. These include:
- an Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency would also be required to allow any controlled discharges to the Riders Lane Stream, Hermitage Stream and Lavant Stream
 - a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP), from the Environment Agency, as the application sites designated main rivers, such as the Hermitage and Riders Streams, and areas that are in Flood Zones 2 and 3. As such the construction of the pipeline corridor, culvert engineering works and construction compound would require a FRAP
 - works within 8m of an Ordinary Watercourse, for example, the pipeline construction crossing the Lake Stream and/or the culvert improvements under the construction access road for the headwaters to the Riders Lane Stream, would require an Ordinary Watercourse consent from the LLFA.

Operational maintenance

- 7.99 Havant Thicket reservoir would be regulated under the Reservoirs Act 1975 as amended by the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, which was set to promote the safety of large raised reservoirs. As required by the legislation, the reservoir is being designed and would be constructed under the supervision of an All Reservoirs Panel Engineer (as the Construction Engineer) and during operation a Supervising Engineer would do regular visits (twice a year typically) and prepare an annual statement. An Inspection Engineer would inspect the reservoir at least every 10 years, or when requested by the Supervising Engineer. Following the inspection, the Inspection Engineer in their report can identify "measures in the interests of safety" which must be addressed by Portsmouth Water.

- 7.100 The testing of the emergency discharge valves would be undertaken twice per year, in line with the requirements of the Reservoirs Act (1975), and the Environment Agency Guidance for Drawdown Capacity (Environment Agency, 2017). The configuration of the control and submerged valves permits testing of each under full head, without a discharge at design capacity. This regular maintenance and testing is required to ensure the continued safe operation of the reservoir and Emergency Drawdown Strategy. Full testing of the 'emergency drawdown' system, up to the capacity of the watercourses, would be tested on commissioning of the reservoir. Further details of this emergency drawdown scenario are considered further below.
- 7.101 The Reservoirs Act 1975 ensures that reservoir operators are legally responsible for ensuring that the stringent safety measures are met through regular maintenance of the reservoir assets, such as the embankment, spillway, control system and drawdown infrastructure. With these measures in place, the risk of embankment failure and reservoir beach are highly unlikely.
- 7.102 However, the consequence of a breach has been modelled to understand the flood risk associated with a failure of the reservoir embankment. A single breach location has been considered on the southern face of the embankment, approximately at the natural/existing path of the Riders Lane Stream. This location is selected at the lowest section in the surrounding topography (the valley for the stream), and thus at this location the embankment is at its highest. This provides the worst-case scenario by releasing the entire volume of the reservoir, excluding the volume retained in the wetland. This is also considered the most likely point of failure, since it is the location of the control structure/outfall.
- 7.103 The results show that if a breach were to occur then there would be a wide-ranging flood extent that covers most of the urban centre of Havant, Leigh Park and Langstone. However as outlined above, this scenario is never anticipated as the reservoir is designed and maintained never to breach, and this is the worst case-scenario without appropriate mitigation and emergency plans. Following a reservoir inspection by a Panel Engineer, if a breach is considered likely, an 'Emergency Drawdown Strategy' would be implemented to avoid a breach of the embankment and significantly reduce the volume held in the reservoir.

Emergency Drawdown Strategy

- 7.104 As discussed above, the pipeline that pumps surplus water from the Bedhampton spring source, would also be used to provide an Emergency Drawdown facility to safely reduce the water level in the reservoir - in line with the requirements of the Environment Agency Guide to Drawdown Capacity for Reservoir Safety and Emergency Planning.
- 7.105 If early signs of internal erosion are identified, the emergency drawdown system provides a means to lower a reservoir's level quickly. This may be a precautionary measure while the problem is investigated, or an emergency measure. In either case, the primary objective would be to reduce the load on the dam, and thereby arrest the internal erosion which has already initiated, or is at high risk of initiating, and prevent it from developing. If this objective cannot be achieved, then partial drawdown would allow time to make repairs, or evacuate downstream, or employ other techniques to avert failure. In the very worst outcome, the intervention of drawdown would reduce the consequences of failure by reducing the volume of water released in a breach event.
- 7.106 The maximum drawdown rate from the reservoir in accordance with Environment

Agency guidance would allow the reservoir top water level to be drained down by a depth of 900mm over a 24-hour period, this would allow the reservoir capacity to be drained by a third in six days. The Emergency Drawdown would be accommodated through outfall structures into the Riders Lane Stream at the toe of the dam structure and into the Hermitage Stream via a pipe discharging in the vicinity of Purbrook Way, approximately 2km downstream from the reservoir site.

7.107 To determine if the capacity of the downstream channels is sufficient to accommodate the Emergency Drawdown without causing flooding to properties, the proposed flows were simulated in combination with an existing flow condition equivalent to the 10% exceedance flow in each channel, and an extreme tidal flooding event, this approach was agreed with the Environment Agency. In addition to this design test scenario the following sensitivity scenarios were also tested:

- modelling of a range of fluvial event flows to identify the thresholds for property flooding at key locations
- testing of whether the waterbodies have sufficient capacity for an emergency event
- testing of Emergency Drawdown scenario against extreme tidal events, including with an allowance for climate change.

7.108 The model results indicate that the emergency drawdown flows into the Riders Lane Stream potentially resulted in four properties upstream of Middle Park Way being at risk of flooding, as well as causing some inundation of Dunsbury Way and Purbrook Way roads/bridges. To mitigate this, enhancements to culverts along the Riders Lane Stream, as outlined earlier in this section, have been included in the scheme design. In addition, Middle Park Way was identified as being at risk of flooding, and this risk is mitigated by the culvert enhancements. The modelling demonstrates that there are no residential properties/dwellings at risk of flooding in this design scenario, however a small number of gardens/sheds (2-3) and one industrial unit are within the modelled extent, showing depths between 0.1-0.2 m. There is no inundation of roads due to the enhanced capacity at the culvert constrictions.

Access condition, flood warning and evacuation

7.109 As outlined above during the Emergency Drawdown scenario, there are no residential properties at risk. Although a small section of the industrial unit is potentially at risk of shallow flooding, however there is an alternative route for access and egress via Dunsbury Way. In the worst-case scenario, due to the unexpected failure of the embankment, in combination with the inability to invoke the Emergency Drawdown strategy there would be very limited warning and ability for evacuation. The breach modelling demonstrates that the following key roads are likely to be out of the flooding zone and would be available to use for evacuation:

- Petersfield Road (B2149)
- western section of Purbrook Way, leading to the A3(M)
- Park Lane, leading south-west and away from the breach extent
- Bedhampton Lane, leading west and away from the breach extent.
- Safe access and egress to/from the Visitor Centre within the site would be provided by the Southern access road.

7.110 If there is a requirement to activate the Emergency Drawdown strategy, and it is unsafe to do so from the Control House, the valves can be operated remotely. Furthermore, piping failure of the reservoir is known to start slowly, and therefore if the embankment structural integrity was compromised, it is likely that there would be significant warning to the reservoir operator. This would not only allow the Emergency Drawdown strategy to be activated, reducing the hydraulic load on the embankment by drawing down the reservoir level (by a third over 6 days), but also give the reservoir

operator time, if decided necessary, to evacuate areas of Havant at risk if breach occurred.

- 7.111 The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), provides guidance on Reservoir Emergencies, this requires that an off-site plan be developed prior to reservoir operation, which provides a framework of procedures to coordinate a multi-agency response to the off-site consequences of a potential or actual breach. If a dam breach is deemed imminent, the operator is required to raise an alert to the Police, who in turn activate the Plan and instigate the coordination of emergency services, local authorities and other key partners.

Overall summary on water environment and flood risk

- 7.112 In conclusion on this matter, whilst an element of the site is categorised as being within an area of potentially high flood risk, it can be concluded that this proposal meets the requirements of the necessary sequential test through the provision of much needed infrastructure in terms of providing robust and reliable water supply. In the absence of suitable mitigation measures the development would have an impact in terms of flooding and loss of biodiversity. However, the proposed mitigation plans, which includes both on-site and off-site ecological improvements to waterbodies, are considered to provide an appropriate balance of measures to satisfy both the article 4.7 requirements and also Biodiversity Net Gain commitments. In terms of flood risk, the detailed flood risk assessment, including emergency drawdown strategy, have been considered acceptable by the EA and LLFA, subject to further detailed matters being considered at Reserved Matters stage.

(vi) Impact on residential amenity (noise and vibration, air quality)

- 7.113 The principal effect on residential amenity is likely to be from noise and vibration initially associated with construction activities and increased traffic during construction phase. It is also anticipated that there may ongoing impact, albeit lesser so, when operational from visitors. Chapter 8 of the ES considers noise and vibration and provides an appraisal of the likely significant effects at sensitive receptors within 300m of the reservoir and pipeline application sites. These were agreed with the Council's Environmental Health Officer as being representative of the noise sensitive receptors closest to the scheme boundary.
- 7.114 The approach and methods used to predict and assess noise and vibration from the proposed scheme are considered relevant and robust. They reflect good practice and are similar to the approach and methods used for comparable schemes. The choice of approach and methods used generally takes a 'worst case' based approach to predicting and assessing impacts which leads to confidence that the outcomes do not under-estimate the likely noise and vibration effects.
- 7.115 Baseline noise measurements can be regarded as precautionary and the reported data is in the range expected for a mixed rural and edge of settlement location such as this. The limitations and assumptions of the appraisal of the noise and vibration effects are clearly stated and are regarded as making the assessment robust.
- 7.116 The anticipated noise levels from different phases of the construction and operation of the scheme and associated traffic noise, and the resulting change in noise level relative to the baseline, have been predicted using established and ratified methods such as the statutorily approved method for predicting construction noise from BS 5228 and the Department of Transport's Calculation of Road Traffic Noise. Consequently, the predicted impact magnitudes presented within the ES are considered appropriate and subject to minimal uncertainty. The criteria used to assess the significance of impact of construction noise are taken from BS 5228 and generally

linked to the existing baseline noise climate. Where earth-moving works would last more than six months however, the ES adopts the substantially more stringent criteria from minerals planning guidance. These criteria are well established and are considered to represent best practice.

- 7.117 The ES states that none of the noise levels from the construction works are predicted to exceed the significance criteria identified. The effect of the noise from the construction phase is further mitigated by the worst-case nature of the noise predictions i.e. in reality the noise levels are likely to be lower than predicted in the ES. The ES reports the residual significant effect of construction noise as being a minor adverse effect and this is considered to be a precautionary (pessimistic) assessment.
- 7.118 The Environmental Health Officer has noted that the key issue with the pipeline application, is the impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties, particularly alongside the pinch points of the pipeline corridor where it is in close proximity to residential properties, particularly where it would run through the highway, and at points alongside the Hermitage Stream. It is noted that with respect to noise from pipeline construction the ES relies on a number of assumptions, given the outline nature of the scheme.
- 7.119 In order to be able to fully understand and mitigate any associated impacts, conditions are proposed which require a noise and vibration management plan, including details of working hours with night working to be discouraged, except in exceptional circumstances. In addition, a Construction Method Statement (CMS), and a revised and updated noise and vibration assessment, with associated mitigation measures including noise insulation measures for those properties that are in close proximity to the scheme and shown to require mitigation during the construction period.
- 7.120 In conclusion, the ES reports less than minor adverse noise impacts from the construction phase including construction traffic, and minor adverse noise impacts from the operational phase. The ES finds that significant impacts due to vibration in either the construction or operational phase are unlikely. It is considered that these findings are precautionary and pessimistic and effective control of adverse noise and vibration effects from the construction phase can be achieved by implementation of a construction environmental management plan to ensure that, amongst other matters, construction HGV movements only occur at given times as assumed in the ES. Conditions requiring a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and a Construction Method Statement (CMS) to control the associated impacts, are considered appropriate.

Air quality

- 7.121 The air quality assessment and consideration of potential air quality effects during the construction and operation of the proposed development makes appropriate reference to the Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland and the associated local air quality management (LAQM) regime. It also makes relevant reference to the properties of dust in the British Standard document BS6069 and how it is defined as a statutory nuisance in the Environmental Protection Act.
- 7.122 The assessment of construction and operational traffic follows guidance set out in the Highways Agency DMRB, and the approach adopted is considered sound. Based on the predicted number of vehicle movements the ES concludes that the impact on air quality would be negligible. This conclusion is considered reasonable. The use of the assessment of the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) document, Guidance on the Assessment of the Impacts of Construction on Air Quality and the Determination of their Significance for assessing the effects of construction dust are also considered

appropriate.

- 7.123 The proposed mitigation measures set out in the ES are considered extensive and Officers agree that with mitigation the residual construction dust effects would be minor. As such, the constructional effects can be mitigated through implementation of the CEMP.

(vii) Other Environmental Impacts, Geology, Soils and Contamination

- 7.124 The ES considers the main issues relevant to geology and soils, including land potentially affected by contamination. The likely significant effects arising from any existing ground contamination are assessed principally in relation to human health and safety, groundwater and surface waters, designated ecological receptors, plant growth and construction materials.
- 7.125 The general approach to assessment is supported and includes consideration of published and other available documentary sources, intrusive surveys and associated ground contamination assessment reports. Consideration has also given to the site's history, geology, hydrogeology, hydrology and soil quality. Potential risks, where identified, and the likely significant effects associated with the proposed development have been assessed in terms of geological, geomorphological and soil attributes and also water and groundwater resources. Officers are satisfied that the assessment methodology has been developed in accordance with the relevant legislative framework and relevant planning guidance as it relates to the management of contaminated land and the impact of contaminated land on ground and surface water.
- 7.125 The ES identifies the potential for contamination and effect on human health at both the construction and operation phases, although the most significant effect on construction workers is expected to be only minor adverse and reversible. Contaminants included isolated and localised elevated levels of iron and manganese. The iron levels are actually within the normal ranges for this part of southern England. However, these were not at levels considered to be a significant risk to construction workers or the wider population and could be mitigated via the application of health and safety measures. The impacts during the operation of the development are assessed as negligible.
- 7.126 In order to mitigate any impacts, the applicant proposes that during construction measures set out in a CEMP would be followed. These include environmental monitoring of groundwater and surface water quality, and control of the exposure to known contaminants of concern. Those parts of the site yet to be surveyed would be investigated to collect information (e.g. on soil quality) needed to assess potential risks to health and quality of water. This would also take account of the final design of pipelines and other elements of the proposed development. The Council's proposed conditions would ensure that any unexpected contamination encountered during the construction works is appropriately assessed and dealt with, and Officers are satisfied that any likely impacts would be mitigated via conditions as proposed by the Council's Environmental Health Officer.

(viii) Impact on climate change

- 7.127 The UK Climate Change Act set a legal reduction target of 80% against 1990 levels by 2050. It also introduced a series of carbon 'budgets' for five-year periods, to act as stepping-stones to the overall reduction. There are budgets currently set up to 2032. In response to the ambitions of the Paris Agreement, in June 2019 the Climate Change Act was amended to set the overall reduction target by 2050 to at least a 100% reduction in net emissions against 1990 levels, i.e. 'net zero carbon'.

7.128 The assessment of the effects of the Scheme on climate change is provided in Chapter 16 of the ES. Greenhouse gas emissions for the construction and operation of the Scheme have been calculated, based on current design and construction information, and have been considered in the context of the UK's national carbon budgets and overall net zero carbon ambition. The Scheme seeks to promote renewable energy and low carbon design in the buildings. In addition, the design considers the effects of climate change and applies the appropriate climate change factors particularly to flood risk levels to ensure that the infrastructure is resilient to expected climate change and extreme weather events. It is considered achievable for the reservoir to be carbon neutral by 2050. Due to its small contribution to overall emissions, the potential for carbon neutral operation by 2050, and the proposed design factors, it is considered the Scheme is compliant with climate change planning policies.

(ix) Contribution requirements and legal agreement

7.129 As set out above a number of issues need to be secured within the Section 106 legal Agreement, in addition these obligations are similar to the reservoir application, in addition some specific obligations relating solely to the pipeline are included required under APP/20/00990, these are:

1. Off-site Biodiversity Mitigation and Compensation Strategy- to include:
 - a) Creation of 80 hectares of new wood pasture and neutral grassland habitat
 - b) Up to 72 hectares of habitat restoration in Southleigh Forest
 - c) Compensation and enhancement package for the loss of 3.7km of ephemeral stream, which would provide on-site and off-site mitigation and compensation, totalling up to 5.5km of watercourse improvement.
 - d) Capital Grant Scheme to fund biodiversity enhancements to the value of £1.2 million
2. S106 monitoring fee
3. A contribution in relation to traffic management
4. Payment of a Travel Plan Bond, Monitoring Fee and Approval Fee
5. Travel Plan (HCC)
6. Highway County Council Highway Works (HCC) and Site-Specific Transport Improvements (HCC) – including:
 - Commitment to pay to the Highway Authority any required CAVAT payment prior to the loss of any highway trees
 - No pipeline works can start on site until such time as the Northern Access and Southern Access as secured within the reservoir application have been built to Hampshire County Council's satisfaction through application HBC APP/20/00990 and East Hants – 51680/001

8 Conclusion – overall planning balance

8.1 In conclusion on the principle of development it is considered that there is an overriding public need for the scheme and a lack of suitable alternative sites. In that the majority of the South East is classed as 'seriously water-stressed' with Portsmouth Water currently sharing supplies with Southern Water in West Sussex and Hampshire of up to 30 million litres of water each day. Southern Water supplies water to an area that is officially identified as an area of significant population and economic growth. Following the restriction imposed by the Environment Agency on abstraction from the internationally designated River Itchen and nationally designated River Test options for making up the subsequent water resources deficit were considered by the WRSE group. In addition, Portsmouth Water have outlined that they would utilise supplies from the reservoir, to have a secure water supply, particularly in the peak summer period for its customers.

- 8.2 The reservoir was included in WRSE's regional strategy and Portsmouth Water and Southern Water's 25-year and 50-year WRMP's, which gained approval from the Secretary of State for the Environment, and then Ofwat, in 2019. The Scheme would provide over 35% of water supply need over the next 25 years, and would help Portsmouth Water to free up existing supplies in the west of the catchment area to share with Southern Water's customers in order to meet the region's challenges in the future, in particular relating to abstraction licence changes, predicted population growth and climate change which would all place pressure on meeting future water supply demand. The site is identified within the adopted and emerging local plans for both Local Planning Authorities and as such the principle of development is acceptable.
- 8.3 Any harmful visual impact of the pipeline would be localised during the construction period. The works within the highway would be restored as original and within landscaped areas, the site would be restored. Whilst it is recognised that in some places this may take some time to mature, the principle is acceptable and details would be secured as part of a Reserved Matters submission. It has also been concluded that the pipeline would not have an adverse impact on highway safety during the construction phase.
- 8.4 The loss of watercourses within the reservoir site would be compensated for through improvements to the Hermitage Stream. Natural England and the Environment Agency have highlighted that they are satisfied that provided the mitigation and compensation strategy is secured and fully implemented the scheme would have delivered a suitable compensation strategy for the loss of irreplaceable habitats. As such it is considered that wholly exceptional reasons to apply in this application, in that a clear and convincing justification and a suitable compensation strategy have been demonstrated in accordance with paragraph 175 of the NPPF.
- 8.5 The site is in flood zones 1, 2 and 3 and the proposal includes significant flood mitigation measures. It can be concluded that this proposal meets the requirements of the necessary Sequential test through the provision of much needed infrastructure in terms of providing robust and reliable water supply. In the absence of suitable mitigation measure the development would have an impact in terms of flooding and loss of biodiversity. However, the proposed mitigation plans, which includes both onsite and off-site ecological improvements to waterbodies addition, are considered to provide an appropriate balance of measures to satisfy both the Article 4.7 of the WFD requirements and also Biodiversity Net Gain commitments. In terms of flood risk the detailed flood risk assessment, including emergency drawdown strategy, have been considered acceptable by the Environment Agency (EA) and Local Lead Flood Authority. The EA and LLFA raise no objection to the pipeline development and are content with the measures in place to ensure that the development, and the surrounding areas are free from the risk of flooding.
- 8.6 In order to be able to fully understand and mitigate any associated impacts, on the amenities of residential amenities during the construction of the pipeline, conditions are proposed which require a noise and vibration management plan, including details of working hours with night working to be discouraged, except in exceptional circumstances. In addition, a Construction Method Statement (CMS), and a revised an updated noise and vibration assessment, with association mitigation measures including noise insulation measures for those properties that are near the scheme. As such subject to these conditions and the associated mitigation measures it is not considered that the development would have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of residential properties.

- 8.5 Following extensive review and consultation to address concerns over vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access. It is now considered that the development would provide safe access to the pipeline during the construction phase and would not have a severe impact on the safety and free flow of the highway network subject to the mitigation measures proposed and S106 and conditional requirements. Overall, the impacts on the highway network are not considered to be severely harmful to the safety or free flow of the highway network during in construction of the pipeline and as such the development should not be refused. It is clear in paragraph 109 of the NPPF that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.
- 8.6 The pipeline is an integral part of the reservoir works and is, therefore, necessary to facilitate the transfer of water from the Bedhampton Springs to the reservoir, and vice-versa, in order to meet the overriding public need for the scheme. As outlined above, the impacts of the scheme are would largely be temporary in nature during the construction period. These impacts would be mitigated by appropriate conditions to control the impact on the character and appearance of the area, highway network, ecological impacts, and the impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties impacted by the development.
- 8.7 In conclusion, having regard to the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the NPPF, that planning permission should be granted for such development unless any other material considerations indicate otherwise, it is considered that there are public benefits from the environmental, social and economic dimensions that can be captured from this proposal, together with the wider reservoir planning application and as such the proposal does constitute sustainable development and is in accordance with adopted and emerging policy. Accordingly, in what is a challenging balance of sustainable development principles, the application is recommended for permission.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That, subject to a resolution to grant planning permission for applications APP/20/00990 - Havant Borough Council and 51680/001- East Hampshire, then

i) the Head of Legal Services be authorised to enter into a S106 Agreement to secure the Heads of Terms set out in paragraph 7.129 above,

ii) the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT OUTLINE PERMISSION** for application APP/20/00991 - Havant Borough Council, subject to:

(A) completion of the Section 106 Agreement as set out in paragraph 7.129 above; and

(B) the conditions set out below (subject to such changes and/or additions that the Head of Planning considers necessary to impose prior to the issuing of the decision)

1. The development must be begun not later than five years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. No part of the development hereby approved in outline shall be commenced until an application or applications for written approval of the details of the route of the pipeline and the siting, scale and external appearance of the emergency drawdown discharge structure, and landscaping (**hereinafter called "the reserved matters"**) have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Application(s) for approval of the matters reserved by this planning permission must be made not later than the expiration of 5 years from the date of this decision notice; and Development must be begun not later than the expiration of 2 years from the final approval of reserved matters for the relevant phase, or, in the case of approval on different dates, the approval of the last such matter to be approved.

Reason: The application was submitted as part outline part full application in accordance with the provisions of Article 3(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 and in accordance with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed below:

Drawings

HTR-ATK-ZZ-ZZ-GS-Z-0140 Site Location Plan

HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0009 Overall Plan and Route

HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0021 Red Line Boundary Drawing (Ch0-1600)

HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0022 Red Line Boundary Drawing (Ch1600-3200)

HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0023 Red Line Boundary Drawing (Ch3200-4500)

HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0014 Site Plan (Ch0-800)

HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0015 Site Plan (Ch800-1600)

HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0016 Site Plan (Ch1600-2400)

HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0017 Site Plan (Ch2400-3200)

HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0018 Site Plan (Ch3200-4000)

HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0019 Site Plan (Ch4000-4564)

HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0010 Typical Stream Crossing Detail

HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0011 Typical Pipeline Construction Detail

HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0012 Typical Under Track Crossing Detail

HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0013 Hermitage Discharge Structure Detail

HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0020 Typical Culvert Detail

Documents

Engineering and Design Report

Planning Statement

Development Specification

Environmental Statement (Volumes 1 - 4) including Non-Technical Summary.
The Volume 4 Appendices include the following standalone reports:

Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan including Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments or REAC
(ES_Volume_4_Appendix_A2.1_OEMP)

Transport Assessment (ES_Volume_4_Appendix_A13.1_TA)

Flood Risk Assessment (ES_Volume_4_Appendix_A15.2_FRA)

Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment
(ES_Volume_4_Appendix_A15.1_WFD)

Arboricultural Impact Assessment (ES_Volume_4_Appendix_A9.14_AIA)

HTR-ATK-RZ-RE-DR-L-113 Revised Tree Protection Plan Sheet 37 of 40
(revP01.1)

Design and Access Statement

Statement of Community Involvement

Outline Biodiversity Mitigation and Compensation Strategy

Article 4.7 Statement

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUBMITTED FEBRUARY 2021

A Summary of the Benefits of Havant Thicket Reservoir

HTR TNPS02 Traffic Distribution Sensitivity revision_V2.0 dated 25/01/2021

HTR TNPS03 Report on Northern Access Layout dated 29/01/2021

HTR Water Framework Directive Article 4.7 29/01/2021

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUBMITTED APRIL 2021

Access for Non Motorised Users - Technical Note dated 01/04/2021

Access Strategy, Rat Running and Construction Management - Technical Note
dated 01/04/2021

Framework Construction Management Plan dated 31/03/2021

Article 4.7 Shortlisting Methodology dated 01/04/2021

Transport Assessment Addendum - Framework Travel Plan dated 01/04/2021

Implementation Plan for Off Site Biodiversity Mitigation and Compensation dated
01/04/2021

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Phasing

4. Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed phasing plan for the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved phasing plan and no variation shall be made without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Approval will not be given if, in the reasonable opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed variation creates new environmental impacts which exceed the range or scale of those measured and assessed in the Environmental Statement (including the further information) and which the Local Planning Authority considers may require further or additional mitigation measures.

Reason: The Environmental Impact and merits of the proposed development have been assessed on this basis.

Construction Environmental Management Plan

5. No phase of the development approved under Condition 4 shall commence until a phase specific Construction Environmental Management Plan for that parcel has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall be based upon, and be in broad accordance with, Volume 4 Appendix A2.1 of the application Environmental Statement (Outline Environmental Management Plan). It should demonstrate that the risk to controlled waters will be appropriately managed, and include both temporary and permanent construction features and detail information on locations of proposed techniques such as cofferdams, culverting and piping and the associated flood risks and mitigation measures. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the construction process is carried out in a manner which will minimise disturbance, pollution & nuisance to neighbouring properties or within the public realm. To avoid inappropriate parking practices, and turning and manoeuvring of construction vehicles which adversely impact either the use- or safety- of the public highway. This condition is imposed having due regard to policies DM10 & CS15 (Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011), and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Highways and amenity

6. No phase of the development approved under Condition 4 shall commence until a Construction Method Statement (CMS) for that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the construction process is carried out in a manner which will minimise disturbance, pollution & nuisance to neighbouring properties.

Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)

7. A) No development shall take place until a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Hampshire County Council as local highways authority). B) No phase of the development approved under Condition 4 shall commence until a phase specific CTMP for that parcel has been approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CTMP(s) shall include all commitments set out in the Framework CTMP, dated 31/03/2021, submitted with the planning applications and will include a Construction Traffic Management Strategy and Construction Worker Travel Plan. The CTMP shall include the following:

- Vehicle routing plans
- proposed programme and duration
- number of construction personnel including travel arrangements and mitigation where necessary
- alterations to the highway, including temporary and / or permanent, to enable construction
- details of the number of construction and delivery vehicles using the public highway (no abnormal loads are anticipated at this stage)
- traffic management details
- compounds and laydown area details
- highway condition surveys
- methods for managing the site to prevent mud onto the highway
- details of on-site contractor parking.

The CTMP shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the safe and efficient operation of the highway network.

8. No phase of the development approved under Condition 4 shall commence until a phase specific Traffic management and construction measures for that parcel has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. This shall include the following:

- a) Vehicular, pedestrian and cyclist diversion plans
- b) Details of type of traffic management
- c) Details of highway reinstatement
- d) Construction methodology and details
- e) Material and spoil storage

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the safe and efficient operation of the highway network.

9. No construction on the pipeline site shall take place outside the hours of 08:30-

18:00 Monday to Friday, 09:00-13:00 on Saturday and no Sunday working, except works on the adopted highway, where alternative arrangements are to be agreed between the Highway Authority and Local Planning Authority, with the exception of specific works that shall have been agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in advance and shall include details of the task, the date and duration of works. No works shall take place on Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of local residents.

10. No phase of the development approved under Condition 4 shall commence until a revised and updated assessment of potential noise and vibration arising during construction shall be prepared in accordance with BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014. The assessments shall include likely eligibility for noise insulation or temporary re housing and shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and construction carried out in accordance with the agreed recommendations.

Reason: To minimise potential noise impacts on nearby sensitive receptors.

11. Subject to Condition 10 [ABOVE], no night time working shall take place, except works on the adopted highway, where alternative arrangements are to be agreed between the Highway Authority and Local Planning Authority, unless otherwise in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Night-time works to be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To avoid potentially significant impacts of noise and vibration upon residential receptors.

Archaeological Evaluation (Written Scheme)

12. No phase of development approved under Condition 4 hereby approved shall commence until an Archaeological Management Plan (AMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The AMP will provide appropriately for all aspects of archaeological recording and will serve as an over-arching Written Scheme of Investigation for all archaeological works.

Reason: To record important archaeological features.

Archaeological Evaluation (Programme)

13. No development within a Development Phase shall commence until the applicant has submitted, and the Local Planning Authority has approved, a written scheme for the programme of archaeological mitigation within that Development Phase area. The programme for archaeological mitigation shall then be implemented in accordance with the agreed written scheme.

This condition may be discharged on an individual Development Phase basis or on a section by section basis.

Reason - To mitigate the effect of the works associated with the development upon any heritage assets and to ensure that information regarding these heritage assets is preserved by record for future generations. This is a pre-commencement requirement because of the need to secure satisfactory

archaeological protection in advance of each individual Development Phase commencing.

Archaeological Evaluation (Recording)

14. No development within a Development Phase shall commence until the applicant has submitted, and the Local Planning Authority has approved in writing, a Written Scheme for recording all historic assets within that Development Phase area. The recording of all historic assets shall then be implemented in accordance with the agreed scheme.

This condition may be discharged on an individual Development Phase basis or on a section by section basis.

Reason - To mitigate the effect of the works associated with the development upon any heritage assets and to ensure that information regarding these heritage assets is preserved by record for future generations. This is a pre-commencement requirement because of the need to secure satisfactory archaeological protection in advance of each individual Development Phase commencing.

Archaeological Evaluation (Publishing)

15. Following completion of archaeological fieldwork within a Development Phase, a report shall be produced in accordance with an approved programme including, where appropriate, post-excavation assessment, specialist analysis and reports, publication and public engagement related to that Development Phase area and submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

This condition may be discharged on an individual Development Phase basis or on a section by section basis.

Reason - To contribute to the knowledge and understanding of past uses and activities on site by ensuring that opportunities are taken to capture evidence from the historic environment and to make this publicly available.

Landscape

16. Any reserved matters application for layout or landscaping submitted pursuant to Conditions 2 and 4 shall include:
 - a) The submission of a Tree Survey and updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (including a Tree Constraints Plan), Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan showing the tree or group of trees, the Root Protection Area(s) and the crown spread(s) in relation to the proposed development. All tree root protection areas identified, shall be protected by protection fencing in accordance with BS 5837:2012.
 - b) The approved tree protection measures shall be implemented before any equipment, machinery, or materials are brought on to the site in connection with the works. They shall be retained intact for the duration of the construction works and shall only be removed or altered following completion of that phase.

- c) A landscaping reinstatement scheme for all open parts of the site, where loss occurs due the development, which shall include the planting and maintenance of a number of semi-mature native broad leaf trees (UK grown and sourced in line with current biosecurity guidelines) to be planted in a sustainable location as per the British Standard guidelines. The information shall include:

- i) Written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment,
- ii) Planting methods, tree pits & guying methods,
- iii) Schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate,
- iv) Retained areas of grassland cover, scrub, hedgerow, trees and woodland,
- v) A timetable for implementation of the soft and hard landscaping works.

The scheme of Landscaping Works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable. Any plant which dies, becomes diseased or is removed, within 10 years shall be replaced with another of similar type and size, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason: To preserve the amenity visual amenity of the locality.

Flood risk and drainage

Contamination

17. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site. In line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Flood risk

18. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment (ref HTR-ATK-XX-XX-RP-Z-0042, titled A15.2 Flood Risk Assessment Report, compiled by Atkins on behalf of Portsmouth Water Ltd dated 01/09/20) and the mitigation measures it details. These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to operation and subsequently in accordance with the scheme's timing/phasing arrangements. The measures detailed throughout the FRA shall be retained and maintained thereafter

throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: • To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants

- To ensure flood risk off site is not increased as a result of the proposed development in line with paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

19. No phase of the pipeline development approved under Condition 4 shall commence until a detailed scheme, to ensure the development will not increase the risk of flooding, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Specifically, further details should be provided where relevant to that phase including:

- Detailed information on the proposed emergency drawdown discharge structure.
- Detailed information surrounding the proposed upgrading of the culverts, in order to not increase flood risk associated with the Emergency discharge and as detailed in table 4.2 and section 4.17 of the FRA
- Detailed information including the long term maintenance scheduled for the proposed development, including but not limited to the proposed pipeline and culverts.
- Detailed information for the crossing of watercourses where these are proposed.

The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the scheme's timing/phasing arrangements, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and its future users. This is in line with paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

20. Prior to construction of the development approved under Condition 4 above, an On-site Emergency Flood Plan shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details approved.

Reason: To ensure that residual flood risks on site are safely managed in accordance with the NPPF.

Ecology

21. No phase of the development approved under Condition 4 shall commence until full details of all ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures (to be informed as necessary by up-to-date survey and assessment) and on-going monitoring of mitigation measures required for each reserved matters application (including both ecological works directly related to that Development Phase reserved matters area and any works associated with that area but lying outside of the boundary of that area) shall be submitted for approval to the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall be in accordance

with the ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures detailed within the Outline Biodiversity Mitigation and Compensation Strategy (ECOSA, September 2020), the Habitats Regulations Assessment (Atkins/Portsmouth Water, September 2020) and the Implementation Plan for Off Site Biodiversity Mitigation and Compensation (Atkins, April 2021). Any such approved measures shall thereafter be implemented in strict accordance with the agreed details and with all measures maintained in perpetuity, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect and enhance biodiversity in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019, NERC Act 2006, NPPF and Policy CS 11 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011.

22. An Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) shall be appointed, to be full time on site during site preparation and clearance and during any works in sensitive areas, and to undertake regular monitoring visits throughout the construction programme.

Reason: To protect and enhance biodiversity in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019, NERC Act 2006, NPPF and Policy CS 11 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Appendices:

- (a) Full consultation responses
- (b) Site location plan
- (c) Pipeline location and environmental constraints

- (A) Full consultation responses
- (B) Site location plan
- (C) Pipeline location and Environmental constraints
- (D) Pipeline trench section
- (E) Detailed location plan – northern section
- (F) Discharge location and indicative layout of discharge structures by Riders and Hermitage Streams
- (G) Detailed location plan – southern section
- (H) Pipeline railway track section