

- and 10km from the site. No information is provided on the likely route or how the rights to install an electric line and any related equipment will be acquired given that the grid connection does not form part of the proposal for which a DCO is sought, nor is any information included on the likely environmental effects of the connection.
- 2.6 It is noted that a plan showing a potential route for the grid connection along the A303 was included at the consultation events. Notwithstanding the fact that this information should have been included in the published material available online, further explanation is required as to how this route was arrived at and whether discussions have been held with Highways England on the likely effects on traffic on the A303 during construction. The grid connection is an intrinsic part of a waste to energy proposal. Consequently, there needs to be an assessment of the likely significant effects of the connection as well as of the generator. As indicated by paragraph 4.9.3 of NPS EN-1, this assessment should include both the direct and indirect effects, short-term and long-term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects of the connection; and should not be confined simply to cumulative effects.
- 2.7 In order to carry out an assessment of likely effects, information is required on how the connection to the grid will be made. A connection via underground cables has the potential for significant landscape, archaeological, biodiversity and socio-economic effects. If the route is to be alongside the A303, this is likely to cause severe traffic disruption which must also be assessed. Information is required on the working width, the width of the trenches, the number and width of joint bays, the need and extent of any vegetation removal and any proposals for mitigation.
- 2.8 The connection to the grid is an essential part of the project, without that connection the proposal is simply for an incinerator. There is no justification for consenting incinerator proposals through the 2008 Act's DCO procedure. Section 15(2)(c) of the Planning Act 2008 requires a generating station to have a capacity of more than 50 megawatts to be considered an NSIP. Further explanation is required as to how the capacity of the facility is measured without a connection to the grid or any battery storage on site.

## CHP

- 2.9 The National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1, makes it clear that any application to develop a thermal generating station must either include CHP or contain evidence that the possibilities for CHP have been fully explored. It further states at paragraph 4.6.7 that developers should consider the opportunities for CHP from the very earliest point and it should be adopted as a criterion when considering locations for a project.
- 2.10 The PEIR makes it clear that no viable heat offtake has been identified to date and therefore CHP is not included within the scope of the development. Further evidence is required to demonstrate that opportunities have been fully explored and that the potential for CHP was taken into account when considering locations for the facility.

## Scoping Opinion

- 2.11 Paragraph 2.10 of the PEIR refers to points raised during the scoping discussions with Test Valley Borough Council (TVBC) following receipt of the EIA Scoping Opinion. It is not clear why there were continuing discussions on the scope of the EIA following receipt

- of the Scoping Opinion or why these have been considered separately from the Scoping Opinion issued by the Planning Inspectorate. Further explanation is required.
- 2.12 It is noted that the boundary of the proposed DCO has increased significantly since the Scoping Request was submitted in February 2019 (at scoping stage the area of the site was 5.7ha whereas now it has been increased to 8.76 ha – a more than 50% increase in site area). Given that a number of the assessment areas are based on a specified radius from the boundary of the site, the fact that this has changed significantly indicates that there are, at least, elements in respect of which the scoping opinion was given on assumptions that are no longer correct. In order to obtain a scoping opinion, the applicant must supply, inter alia, “a plan sufficient to identify the land”. The plan submitted with the request for a scoping opinion identified clearly that land now included in the proposal was excluded. So, the scoping opinion which followed was based on a plan that is now incorrect. KTVB would like confirmation that the Environmental Statement will include an assessment area based on the site area as proposed to be submitted in the draft Development Consent Order (DCO).
- 2.13 Notwithstanding the issues with the assessment boundary referred to above, the EIA Regulations require at Regulation 14(3) for the Environmental Statement (ES) to be based on the most recent scoping opinion adopted (so far as the proposed development remains materially the same as the proposed development which was subject to that opinion).
- 2.14 Table 2-3 of the PEIR includes a summary of the general comments raised in the Scoping Opinion. In respect of alternatives, it states that *‘a comprehensive analysis of alternative sites should be presented, with particular focus on the number and location of alternative sites with proximity to power and heat offtake locations that have been considered and reasons for their unsuitability. A detailed justification for selection of a development site in the countryside away from sources of waste and market for heat offtake should be presented. It should be demonstrated how analysis of the existing IBA and hazardous waste processing capacity on the adjacent site and the current and future levels of congestion of the A303/A34 network have been taken into consideration when selecting the current site.’*
- 2.15 The information provided in the text on alternatives in Chapter 5 of the PEIR is woefully inadequate and limited to design. No information is provided on alternative sites, rather the PEIR refers to a high-level search exercise being undertaken within Hampshire and the wider area for potentially suitable sites. The EIA Regulations requires the ES to include *‘a description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the applicant, which are relevant to the proposed development and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for the option chosen, taking into account the effects of the development on the environment’* (regulation 14(2)). Clearly the applicant has looked at alternative sites and should make this information available. This has not yet been done.
- 2.16 The reasons given in the PEIR for the selection of the site do not include environmental considerations and are largely unsubstantiated. The location of the site relative to available waste/fuel supply within Hampshire and the region is given as a key reason for the choice of the site, yet no information is provided on the source or amount of any residual waste/fuel. It is noted that Wheelabrator’s proposal for Kemsley North relies on waste from East London, Essex, Sussex and Kent. It would therefore appear that the Harewood site is intended to service locations predominantly to the west and therefore it

- begs the question as to whether the site is the most appropriate location given the likely traffic movements involved.
- 2.17 The potential for CHP is identified as a key locational factor in NPS EN-1, yet this has not been taken into account in the reasons for site selection set out in paragraph 5.2.1 of the PEIR.
- 2.18 It is unclear why the availability of the land and the ability to agree commercial terms is identified as a reason for site selection given that compulsory purchase powers may be sought as part of an application for a Development Consent Order. It would appear that this has been the driving factor for site selection rather than any consideration of likely environmental effects.
- 2.19 No information is provided on the scale of operational, environmental or transportation benefits of co-locating the facility with the existing Raymond Brown MRF and IBA operations in the context of those associated with the proposed incinerator.
- 2.20 Further information is required on the capacity of the Fortis IBA plant to process the additional bottom ash from the proposed incinerator. It is noted that the current planning consent for the IBA facility is conditioned to limit the amount of material delivered to the site to no more than 120,000 tonnes per annum. It is understood that the facility currently processes 108,000 tonnes from the three existing Energy Recovery Facilities in Hampshire. If it is intended that the Wheelabrator facility will ultimately displace the material currently processed at the site or will require an extension to the existing facility, then this should be made clear and the impacts properly assessed.
- 2.21 Whilst the PEIR does include some information on design options, this is inadequate. One of the key design objectives included in paragraph 5.25 is stated as *'ensuring that the overall massing, scale and architectural design of the Proposed Development was developed such that it best mitigates its visual impact'*. No evidence is provided to demonstrate that visual impact has been minimised through the consideration of best available technology.

## Details of the Proposed Development

- 2.22 It is noted that as part of the design evolution, the overall height of the building above ground level has been reduced by 9m. It is not clear whether this measurement is from the top of the slab or whether it includes sufficient depth to allow for appropriate foundations. This is an important issue bearing in mind that groundwater has been found at 6.3m bgl.
- 2.23 The Ground Conditions chapter makes it clear that the laydown area will be used to accommodate approximately 50,000m<sup>3</sup> of excavated material to accommodate the bunker. This will raise the ground level and potentially form landscape features. This information should have been included in the Proposals chapter; as it stands it is not clear whether this impact has been assessed in the specific assessment chapters in the PEIR. There is no mention of it in the landscape chapter. That is a major omission. Further information is required on likely future levels and use of this part of the site.