



Planning Inspectorate
Environmental Services Operations Group
3 Temple Quay House
2 The Square Bristol,
BS1 6PN

Hampshire 2050
The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UL
Telephone 0300 555 1375
Fax 01962 847055
www.hants.gov.uk

<i>Enquiries to</i>	Neil Massie	<i>My reference</i>	SWDCO Scoping Opinion
<i>Direct Line</i>	0370 779 2113	<i>Your reference</i>	
<i>Date</i>	17 August 2023	<i>Email</i>	Neil.massie@hants.gov.uk

Emailed to: hampshirewaterproject@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Dear Sir,

Re: Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project

Thank you consulting Hampshire County Council on the above EIA Scoping Opinion. The County Council has been actively working with the applicant through a series of pre-application working groups and meetings to understand the scheme as it develops and to provide the necessary technical input that the County Council would expect to form part of the Environmental Statement to support the submission of a Development Consent Order.

It is understood that the proposed project is for a Water Recycling Plant (WRP) and associated Pipelines to transfer water across the network which includes a pipeline connecting to the Havant Thicket Reservoir, a pipeline connecting the Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) and the WRP and one longer pipeline connecting to the Otterbourne Water Supply Works (approximately 40km in length).

The above infrastructure will also be supported by above ground plant in the form of:

- High Lift Pumping Station (HLPS)
- Intermediate Pumping Stations (IPS)
- Break Pressure Tanks (BPT)

Associated works would include temporary development works to support construction, works to support operation and maintenance, site accesses,

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

temporary and permanent utility connections, highway diversions and landscaping, environmental mitigation, enhancement and compensation.

As shown in Figure 1.1 of the EIA Scoping report, the proposed inland infrastructure is within five local authority administrative areas, entirely within the County Council administrative area (the Scoping Area).

Whilst acknowledging that the scheme continues to evolve and the final pipeline routings have not been confirmed, in summary the County Council is broadly satisfied that the Scoping Opinion has been produced to an acceptable standard and has considered most of the areas that would be expected for a proposal of this nature.

The County Council does however reserve the right to comment further in future on the scope and detail of the development proposal through the pre-application process as it continues to develop.

The County Council provides its technical comments in respect of suggested amendments, missing information and suggested issues to scope in, within a series of appendices. Comments are provided in the County Council's capacity as the local highway authority, Highway Authority in respect of Public Rights of Way (PROW) and Commons Registration Authority; local mineral and waste planning authority, and lead local flood authority; alongside comments focussing on archaeology, landscape, and public health issues.

If you have any questions about any of the technical comments in this response please do get in touch with my colleague, Neil Massie who is leading on this project on behalf of the County Council.

Yours faithfully,

Emily Howbrook MRTPI

Strategic Planning Manager

Hampshire 2050

Appendix 1 - Local Highway Authority

The Highway Authority consider that the impacts both during the construction phase and operational phase should be considered by the applicant. The EIA Scoping report suggests that the Highway Authority have agreed this to be the case. Whilst operational use impacts are likely to be significantly less, insufficient information has been provided to confirm the requirements and therefore it cannot be agreed at this stage to exclude operational use impacts from consideration.

This is supported by the requirements set out within NPPF and the National Policy Statement for Water Resources Infrastructure (NPSfWRI). As set out within the NPSfWRI the traffic and transport impacts can vary widely and influence other key stakeholder areas such as noise, air pollution and socio-economic impacts.

In this instance the Highway Authority consider that due to the extent of construction works for both under and overground infrastructure, the populated nature of some areas and the level of interaction with the highway asset that it is likely to have significant transport implications and therefore the ES should include a transport appraisal which is supported by the following documentation:

- Transport Assessment (TA) of construction and operational phases with the scope of the TA work to be agreed with the Highway Authority but considering the impact of these phases of works on all modes walking, cycling, buses and vehicles.
- A Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) setting out the proposed construction methodologies and CTMP parameters.
- A Framework Traffic Management Plan setting out the proposed traffic management working arrangements for works within all areas of the highway including Public Rights of Way.
- Travel plan for the construction and operational phases of development.
- Identification of appropriate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of the construction and operational phases.

It is noted that a significantly sized construction hub will be necessary to support the construction of the proposal and it is considered that this will not be covered within the scope of the EIA work. The assumption is that an existing suitable site with appropriate planning will be utilised, but these have not been identified. There appears significant risk that a large element of work is being omitted from the EIA which impacts the wider transport impacts and fails to fully consider the application requirements as a whole. The temporary construction hub should therefore be considered within the EIA as it will

generate significant traffic movements which should be duly considered within the project, rather than as a result of a stand-alone application.

It is understood that the construction phase will be for 6 years with the proposals being operational for 100 years before decommissioning would be necessary there is some discrepancy on whether the assessment year is 5 or 6 years throughout the EIA Scoping Report, clarity is sought on that point.

Section 17.3.1 of the Scoping Report Volume 1 lists key stakeholders and those who have responsibility for traffic and transport aspects. National Highways are excluded from this list and should be included.

Paragraph 17.5.2 describes Harts Farm Way as a short street. The Highway Authority do not agree with the designation of Harts Farm Way as a street. It is subject to a 30mph limit but has no residential frontage, is wide and serves as a key local distributor road from Havant to the strategic road network. Due to its industrial nature, it is also subject to a significant amount of HGV movements. The function of Harts Farm Way is therefore considered to be as a local distributor road.

National Cycle Network (NCN) 22 along Harts Farm Way and is not noted within the EIA scoping. This should be acknowledged and considered appropriately when looking at the impacts of the development proposals and accessibility of the site.

The A3023 is appropriately identified as the only road linking Hayling Island to the mainland. It is highly traffic sensitive along with the Langstone Roundabout at the north of the route.

Penner Road is identified as providing a connection between the A3023 and Southmoor Lane which is not correct. Any access is gated and controlled, and this is not a route open to all traffic.

Section 17.5.13 refers to the B2149 running through the Kingley Green residential area, it is questioned if this is an error in referencing. The B2149 is also not recognised as a key access route for all modes within the Havant area and for wider journeys further north to join the A3(M). Middle Park Way is described similar in its community function which is not agreed. Middle Park Way is a residential primary street and directly serves residential properties with frontages, traffic calming, shopping areas and access to schools and a 20mph speed limit. This will have an impact on the effects of any construction traffic.

Section 17.7 sets out that data that is less than 4 years old will be considered appropriate for base data, whilst it also notes that data used will be agreed by the Emissions and Transport EIA Working Group any data collected between March 2020 – March 2022 is unlikely to be considered appropriate base data due to the impacts of the Covid 19-pandemic. Any data for the remainder of 2022 would need to be considered on its own merits depending on the location and ability to demonstrate that travel patterns were settled or back to

2019 levels. The Highway Authority would consider the use of 2019/2020 pre covid survey data.

Section 17.7.18 whilst agreed to be relevant for the purpose of the EIA work does not apply to the TA work. Thresholds set by the IEA Guidelines relate solely to EIA impacts, these thresholds however do not translate to a classification for non-significant highway impacts, these must be assessed on a case-by-case basis and whilst for example the EIA assessment may not deem the impact to be severe the Highway Authority may still consider the impact to be significant and therefore require appropriate mitigation. The difference between the EIA assessment criteria and that of Transport Assessments is reflected within the IEA Guidelines and should be referenced appropriately.

Driver and Bus Delay should also consider the impact of the traffic management measures on links themselves and the cumulative impacts this may have resulting in increased journey times or reductions in the reliability of the journey times for both drivers and bus services.

Accident and safety assessments should also consider the impact in the change of vehicle composition utilising a route such as a significant increase in HGV movements which in turn can impact the safe operation of the particular road or street.

The EIA scoping note does not acknowledge the direct cumulative impacts of the Portsmouth Water pipeline associated with Havant Thicket approved within application APP/20/00990. Given the direct connectivity between the two schemes the interaction between the construction works and the reservoir operation they should be duly considered when seeking to minimise the EIA and wider transport impacts and consideration of suitable alternative construction methods.

The Highway Authority note information is included on geology and ground water levels within appendices of the EIA scoping note. The Highway Authority have not been involved in this matter to date and welcome further direct engagement when determining the details of this area of the scheme and involvement in the relevant working group to ensure that the highway asset is suitably protected.

Appendix 2 - Minerals and Waste Planning Authority

Chapter 15 (Resource & Waste Management) is of most relevance to the County Council in its capacity as the local minerals and waste planning authority (MWPA). The County Council generally agrees with the reported information and the scope set out, but identifies a number of areas where Southern Water need to clarify the information that is included and / or where Hampshire County Council can provide additional information at this stage of the scheme development process.

Paragraph 15.4.6 – The MWPA would be interested in seeing the methodology used for calculating the percentages of waste managed arising from the South East, as reported in Paragraph 15.4.6. Based upon the County Council’s own calculations from the Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator 2021, information in the Hampshire County Council table 1 (see below), shows a more accurate representation of waste managed arising in the South East:

Table 1 – Hampshire County Council estimate for South East waste arisings management (comparison with figures in table 15.4.6 of Scoping Main Report)

		Waste Management Area									
		South East	South West	North East	North West	East of England	East Midlands	West Midlands	Yorks & Humber	London	Unknown
Inert Waste	Para 15.4.6	81%	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	HCC estimate	86.8%	0.6%	-	0.1%	3.7%	1.6%	0.2%	0.5%	5.6%	1.0%
Non-haz / HIC Waste	Para 15.4.6	45%	53%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-
	HCC estimate	77.3%	2.0%	0.1%	1.0%	5.0%	1.5%	1.3%	0.3%	10.0%	1.3%
Haz Waste	Para 15.4.6	20%	70%	-	-	2%	1%	2%	-	-	-
	HCC estimate	43.9%	6.3%	0.3%	2.2%	16.4%	10.6%	9.7%	3.0%	7.3%	0.2%

Table 15-2: Source of baseline data – Table 15-2 does not highlight Hampshire’s Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA) as a source for baseline data. However, the LAA is noted in the References Section and data within Table 15-4 appears to have been taken from the LAA.

Table 15-4: Availability of construction resources in Hampshire, South East England and UK – The data underneath the South East England (2021) heading is noted as being shown in million tonnes (Mt), however the data shown is taken directly from the South East England Aggregate Working Party Annual Report which reports all figures in thousand tonnes. The unit in brackets under this section of Table 15-4 needs correcting.

Additionally, the South East England (2021) sand and gravel Reserve figure (67,000) in Table 15-4 is incorrect. The South East had sand and gravel reserves of 54,349 thousand tonnes in 2021. This figure is shown correctly in Table 15-6.

Paragraph 15.5.24 – 15.5.35 – A recent update to the HMWP Safeguarded Sites has added the following sites, the proposed pipeline easement lies within the buffer zone of these sites.

- Highbridge Wastewater Pumping Station;
- Bishop’s Waltham WTW and,
- Wickham WTW.

Paragraph 15.6.9 – reports no data is available on the consumption of recycled and secondary aggregates. Recycled and secondary aggregates annual production data is contained within Hampshire’s Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA) which, as previously mentioned, appears to have been used in Table 15-4 and is noted in the References Section.

Although the Southern Water project is not being taken forward for consent as a series of cross boundary wastewater management planning applications, there are local planning policies in the *Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan* (2013) (HMWP) relevant to several EIA Chapters. These plan policies should therefore be referenced alongside other policy and strategy documents. Relevant policies of the HMWP that should be referenced and considered within the relevant chapters of the EIA are set out with commentary (see table 2):

Table 2 – Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan Policy references

EIA Chapter	HMWP Policy	Comments
Chapter 6 – Air quality and odour	Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity)	
Chapter 7 – Archaeology and cultural heritage	Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets)	

EIA Chapter	HMWP Policy	Comments
Chapter 8 – Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity	Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species)	
Chapter 9 – Marine biodiversity	Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species)	
Chapter 10 – Carbon and climate change	Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adaptation)	
Chapter 11 – Land quality and ground conditions	Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity)	
Chapter 12 – Land use and agriculture	Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity)	Additionally, the title of Policy 19 in Table 12-1 is incorrect. This should be corrected to 'Aggregate wharves and rail <u>depots</u> '.
Chapter 13 – Landscape and visual impact	Policy 4 (Protection of the designated landscape)	
Chapter 14 – Noise and vibration	Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity)	Policy 14 (Community benefits) of the HMWP should be removed from Table 16-1 in this chapter.
Chapter 15 – Resource and waste management	Policy 31 (Liquid waste and wastewater management)	
Chapter 16 – Socio-economics, tourism, recreation and health		Policy 14 (Community benefits) of the HMWP should be removed from Table 16-1 in this chapter.
Chapter 17 – Traffic and transport	Policy 12 (Managing traffic)	
Chapter 18 – Water environment	Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention)	
Chapter 19 – Cumulative Effects Assessment	Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of	

Section 23 – Abbreviations: The acronym HMWP, for Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan, appears twice on Page 543 of the Abbreviations Section.

Section 24 – References and throughout: The References numbered throughout the document with square brackets, [xxx], do not appear to match up correctly to the same number in Section 24. For example, reference [300] in the text of Chapter 15 is supposed to be for the Marine Aggregates: Capability and portfolio 2021 produced by the Crown Estate, but in Section 24 reference [300] is for the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan: Partial Update - Draft Plan.

Further information on Hampshire County Council's approach to safeguarding is available in the adopted [Minerals and Waste Safeguarding in Hampshire Supplementary Planning Document](#) (SPD), which can be found on our [website](#).

Appendix 3 - Lead Local Flood Authority

The County Council in its capacity as the Lead Local Flood Authority is satisfied that the water environment has been scoped into the EIA and that a detailed Flood Risk Assessment will be included within the Environmental Statement to support the Development Consent Order application.

The scoping report highlights the points raised in previous meetings with the County Council, and how they will be incorporated into the relevant documents. The County Council is satisfied with the proposed scope as it currently stands.

Appendix 4 - Archaeology and Historic Environment

Chapter 7 of the main report addresses archaeological matters, which the County Council endorses. It is acknowledged within the report that there will be archaeological impacts associated with this project that will need to be reviewed, assessed, accommodated, and mitigated, and as a consequence archaeological matters have been scoped in which is welcome.

The County Archaeologist is aware that the applicant has already taken steps to secure preliminary archaeological advice from their own archaeological advisors and from the EIA Working Group (Historic Environment and Landscape Working Group) which has already met (para 5.3.4 and 7.3.1 and 2). The County Archaeologist has attended these meetings on behalf of the County Council and their scope, discussion and progress is properly reflected in Chapter 7.

Appendix 5 - Landscape

The County Council will be considering the holistic landscape impacts of this project along the geography of the proposed pipeline route and are keen to ensure that any impacts on Hampshire's landscape are managed and mitigated in an appropriate way. In respect of landscape, the County Council is satisfied that it is a through document setting out the approach to the production of the Environmental Statement.

However, the County Council take this opportunity to state that the assessment of landscape character, should not just assess the effects against the published Landscape Character assessments. It also needs to assess the effects on landscape elements i.e., topography & vegetation loss.

Table 13-17 sets out the criteria for judging the value of the visual impacts. There is no mention of the value local people may put on a view. In the recently published National Policy Statement for Water Infrastructure it states in 4.9.15 "*Outside nationally designated areas, there are local landscapes and townscapes that are highly valued locally*". Whilst this statement relates to landscape character assessments, it applies equally to visual assessments.

Finally, within the Environmental Constraints Plans, there are a lot of areas marked up with 'pink / brown dots', which do not appear in the key. It is assumed that these areas are part of the water source protection zones, but it would be helpful to have accurate Keys on the plans that can be interpreted easily.

Appendix 6 – Public Health

Hampshire County Council has statutory duties for Public Health, and as such has responsibility for promoting and protecting the public's health. The comments provided below refer to Chapter 16 - Socio-economics, tourism, recreation and health.

Hampshire Public Health has also considered the related elements of the sections on: Air quality and odour; Terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity; Land use and agriculture; Landscape and visual; Noise and vibration and Traffic and transport.

Hampshire Public Health welcome what appears to be a generally comprehensive scoping document; however, it is noted that links to the section regarding climate change are not referred to in chapter 16. The links here are felt to be important and this should be included as the public health and climate issues very often have related impacts/benefits.

Health considerations and references.

Hampshire Public Health would expect a full Health Impact Assessment (HIA) to be carried out as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment to better inform the Environmental Statement. The guidance being used within the scoping document refers to 'Rapid HIA Guidance' (HUDU) which would not be sufficient for this scale of infrastructure project.

Hampshire Public Health would also like to raise the issue that some of the guidance cited within the document, while useful, is dated ranging from 2011 – 2015, this also predates changes to EIA legislation in 2017. More up to date document guidance should be looked at such as ARUP 'Exploring and Health Led Approach to Infrastructure' (2018) [Exploring a health led approach to infrastructure - Arup](#) and the Governments own 'Health Impact Assessment in Spatial Planning (2020) [Health Impact Assessment in spatial planning - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#).

It is noted that the JSNA is being used for Air Quality Data but the Hampshire County Council Power BI has recently been updated and should be used as a helpful tool for assessing other fields set out in Table 16-3 on page 399 - [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\) | Health and social care | Hampshire County Council \(hants.gov.uk\)](#). This JNSA data works at a more granular level and should also help reduce limitations and assumptions set out at 16.8. of the scoping document.

The health impacts of major development projects need to be considered to capture issues such as air and noise pollution, residents' mental health, active travel access, poor site/building design and impact on children's health, especially as elements of the scheme will be in close proximity to some urban areas and could also impact public access to the PROW network and open spaces along the pipeline route.

Construction effects and Operational effects - Areas Scoped Out

There are two sections under construction effects and operational effects (16.6.13 and 16.6.16) which have areas scoped out and it is the view of the County Council that these sections require further review.

Internal environments close to the project for example could easily be impacted upon by construction noise, dust, air pollution and other factors and as such should not be scoped out.

Public health issues such as social cohesion, social exclusion, lifestyle choices could also be hampered by elements of poor design, diverted PROW routes (see Appendix 7 of this consultation response) or hard-edged built elements of the scheme which create poorer environments for access and safety.

New vehicular access routes and entrances for industrial facilities / infrastructure for example can influence the walking and cycling environment and as such need considering. There is limited detail at this stage on the built form element of the project, so for example a large fenced off industrial building alongside a PROW which was previously open and overlooked will impact on the PROW users experience of that PROW. As such Public Health suggest these areas that are scoped out should be scoped in so that the full health impacts of the proposal are considered. This should also be amended in the table set out at 16.10.

Assessment Scenarios

At paragraph 16.7.20 the assessment scenario allows for a year of operation. This should be expanded to allow for known areas of regular maintenance which could be ongoing and typical for this kind of facility beyond the first year of operation especially where these activities have a possibility of impacting on the health and wellbeing of the local population.

The scoping statement narrowly defines health impacts as those arising directly from the construction and operational phases of the project which then potentially omits the longer-term effects of noise, odour and exhaust pollution associated with the scheme and how these issues can interact with community wellbeing and mental health.

Population and Health

The County Council welcomes an EIA which informs the protection of the health of residents, visitors, and workers within the proposed scoping red line of the project during construction as well as during the future operation of the plant and pipelines.

Whilst the scheme offers potential opportunity to create new and enhance the wider PROW network and access to open spaces alongside the pipeline route which would be a positive public health outcome, public health impacts and

outcomes from the project should also be considered across a wider geographic area beyond just the red line of the proposed DCO application.

Air Quality

No level of air pollution is a safe level of air pollution, and Hampshire Public Health recommends stringent prevention and management measures as part of this project. Hampshire Public Health therefore support the principle of scoping in air pollution in and around this geographic area as a public health priority.

The County Council would seek to ensure that the appropriate levels of air quality assessment work are carried out for the scheme itself and for the construction phases when issues of dust and disturbance will add to the impact on air quality. Climatic factors of wind and weather and in particular micro climate impacts on air particulate movement around the scheme and large excavation requirements also need to be factored in.

Particulates modelling should include PM10, PM2.5, Fine Particulates and those created from tyre abrasions should be included. The County council would also wish to ensure that the impact of construction and road management changes on the mental health, connectedness and wellbeing of nearby communities and vulnerable groups is included in any EIA assessment.

Noise, Odour and Vibration

Noise and vibration control measures during construction should be assessed, as set out in the Scoping Report. Hampshire Public Health encourage the applicant to mitigate this, and the operational noise of the completed scheme as far as is possible due to the effects on nearby residents, schools, places of worship as well as healthcare and other facilities. The impacts of prolonged exposure to noise and odour have been evidenced by the World Health Organisation and the local environmental health teams will need to be satisfied that the impacts of the scheme during construction and in its operational phase are at an acceptable level based on the evidence and modelling carried out.

Design Impacts of WTP and Pipeline Routes

At this stage, the full impacts of the buildings, above ground plant, pipelines, maintenance facilities, and security and access requirements for this proposal are not clear. Water treatment and recycling plants within an urban context are not synonymous with creating inclusive and accessible built form and are often designed to turn their back on spaces, footpaths and public access. Hampshire Public Health would therefore recommend that a section of the scoping document should seek to assess the built form design element of the scheme at an early stage.

Appendix 7- Public Rights of Way (PROW)

The PROW network and the impacts to users (pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians), in regards to delay and safety, are scoped into the proposed EIA. These are identified in sections 16 (Socio-economics, tourism, recreation and health) and 17 (Traffic and transport).

- Safety issues are scoped in for construction and scoped out for operation.
- Delay issues are scoped in for construction and operation phases.

There is notable scope for the project to positively impact the PROW network and public access to the countryside. The route of the pipeline runs across a significant part of green Hampshire, and particularly where trench cut installation is proposed, the ground and surface will need to be restored. This gives scope for the route to incorporate new public rights of way running along the length of the restored route. For example, establishing an entirely new route; a collection of new short routes; or enhancements and/or diversions for existing PROW.

The scheme could also provide benefits with enhancements to the existing local network, with surface repairs, improving access and signage, as well as improving crossing points at roads to enhance public safety.

There are a number of proposed compounds for the project that impact on the existing PROW network. Numerous compounds are proposed to locate directly over a PROW, others have site access that would share the route of public access to PROW. Each of these cases needs careful consideration – to ensure public safety and manage suitable diversions of the PROW route around compounds, consideration of alternative access routes, and similar mitigation and obligations. This includes carrying out the expected notification to the highways Regulation for any works, closures, or diversions, including temporary ones, with the Highways Authority, in regards to the PROW network, to ensure correct public notification and allow for the Definitive map to be maintained.

All the above will need to be in collaboration with the relevant landowners, Hampshire Countryside Service [the Highways Authority, in regards to the PROW network, PROW interest groups, Parish Councils, and other relevant stakeholders. Any impacts to PROW, such as temporary closures and diversions must be done in a phased manner to minimise inconvenience to the public.

The applicant should work with authorities to create a single document, and/or location, of all information relating to the PROW network to aid public communication. This would allow users of the network to understand the location and duration of works to be able to plan routes in advance of using

the network to achieve successful and enjoyable navigation of the PROW network.

The County Council supports scoping in impacts on the PROW network, and consideration of cyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians on the PROW and road networks. To summarise:

- Safety aspects regarding PROW and their users are an issue for the construction phase and can be scoped out for the operational phase.
- Diversion/delay impacts should be scoped in for both construction and operation phases;
- Environmental topics, such as air quality, dust, ground conditions, land use, drainage, and noise, should all consider the PROW network as a sensitive receptor for assessment. The PROW network is not mentioned in many of these topics and yet these are public infrastructure upon which the public will be in close proximity to works. This is particularly notable for the construction period. The cumulative impact on PROW users could be significant to their safety, convenience, as well as their amenity, when using the network.
- Staunton County Park (Middle Park Way in Havant) is the sole Hampshire Countryside Service managed site within the corridor for the pipeline. Suitable consideration for this site, its biodiversity, landscape, management, business, tourism/leisure, onsite PROW, and other infrastructure, will be included within the Scoped in topics of the report.