

Havant Thicket Reservoir

‘You Said, We Did’ Report

Main Embankment, Culvert & Valve Tower

April 2024

The Havant Thicket Reservoir (HTR) scheme has outline planning permission, subject to discharge of reserved matters. As part of discharging these conditions for the main embankment, culvert and valve tower), stakeholders have been provided with information relating to the required reserved matters application and a separate Section 73 application for changes to the outline planning permission. A combined approach was taken to the pre-submission consultation for both applications and this feedback is detailed below.

The stakeholders involved in this consultation were the HTR scheme’s Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG). These stakeholders include local community representatives, environmental groups, Local Councillors and several Statutory Consultees, including East Hampshire District Council, Havant Borough Council, South Downs National Park, Portsmouth City Council, the Environment Agency, Forestry England and Natural England.

This consultation was a two-way communications process by which we offered information and invited the consultees to provide their opinion and feedback (both in writing and via online meetings and in-person workshops). We have subsequently reviewed and incorporated this feedback where it is appropriate, with this document designed to summarise back to the community which proposals have been taken forward, and why it has not been possible in some instances.

The report details responses received during the consultation exercise and the way in which this feedback was considered and/or incorporated into what is being presented within the documentation for discharging of the main embankment and culvert reserved matters. Each section of the report can be broadly explained as the following:

- Feedback – comment(s) provided in relation to the matters covered by this report during the consultation process
- Response – the actions taken following review of the feedback and summary of any incorporations into this submission as a result (where it has been appropriate to do so)

Comments from Local Councillors and Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG)

Feedback	Response
Explanation needs to be provided as to why such significant changes to the embankment slope angle are required.	The reference design was based on surveys including ground investigations, which were carried out over several years. It was recognised that the contractor appointed to construct the reservoir would carry out further investigations to inform the detailed design and this would likely result in some refinement of the design. Over the last few years we have completed extensive ground investigations and have completed a trial embankment using clay which was excavated from the reservoir site. This work has given us a more detailed view of the ground conditions, and a greater understanding of how clay from this site behaves during and after construction. We have used this information to inform the design of the reservoir and have concluded that these changes to the slope angles of the main reservoir embankment are necessary to ensure its long-term structural strength and integrity.
The embankment slope angle changes to the western embankment appear to show that the embankment will move closer to the Western boundary. Concerns were raised specifically regarding the remaining space being sufficient for planned infrastructure.	There has been a minor realignment of the western embankment toe, however the area will continue to accommodate the Southern Access Road in the same way as before – this will be subject to a separate Reserved Matters application.
Visual and historic environment impacts of the embankment slope angle changes should be considered.	Assessments have been made regarding both the visual impact and historical environment impact of the proposed changes. These are included within Chapters 7 (Historic Environment) and 10 (Landscape and Visual) of the Environmental Statement (ES) Addendum. The conclusion in respect of heritage impacts (Chapter 7) is that, while the proposed changes in design will result in limited changes in respect of heritage impacts, overall these are not significant and there would be no change to the magnitude of effect previously assessed. The same broad conclusion is reached in respect of landscape and visual impacts (Chapter 10). While there are some minor localised adverse effects, there is also a beneficial effect of moving the reservoir away from sensitive receptors; overall the significance of the effects remain as previously recorded in the 2020 ES. <u>Document reference:</u> HTR-RHD-ZZ-ZZ-RP-Z-0001

Consideration needs to be given to the following as a result of changes to the construction of the embankment: <table border="0"> <tr> <td><u>Impacts of:</u></td> <td><u>Effects on:</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>- Noise</td> <td>- Transport</td> </tr> <tr> <td>- Vibration</td> <td>- Energy</td> </tr> <tr> <td>- Air pollution</td> <td>- Carbon impacts</td> </tr> </table>	<u>Impacts of:</u>	<u>Effects on:</u>	- Noise	- Transport	- Vibration	- Energy	- Air pollution	- Carbon impacts	Reviews have been undertaken regarding each of these topics and the outcomes of these are summarised within the Environmental Statement (ES) Addendum. In terms of noise and vibration, the conclusion of the ES Addendum (Chapter 11) is that the proposed amendments to the Project results in effects that are no greater than those reported in the 2020 ES and that the mitigation agreed for the consented scheme remain appropriate in the light of the revisions. In terms of air quality the conclusion of the ES Addendum (Chapter 7) is that there will be no changes to the significance of the air quality previously assessed in the 2020 version of the ES and, in all likelihood, the magnitude of effects will be lower than those originally assessed. This is because it is proposed that the embankment is to be moved a further 80m north of the location in the consented scheme and so further away from potentially sensitive receptors. <u>Document reference:</u> HTR-RHD-ZZ-ZZ-RP-Z-0001
<u>Impacts of:</u>	<u>Effects on:</u>								
- Noise	- Transport								
- Vibration	- Energy								
- Air pollution	- Carbon impacts								
Changes to the visibility of the Control House and staircase as a result of embankment slope angle changes need to be reviewed.	The ES Addendum has considered the potential visual effects of the changes to the embankment slopes and concluded that the changes are not significant in landscape and visual terms. Details of the Control House will be covered in a separate Reserved Matter application and as a result they are not detailed in full as part of the present application.								
Visibility of the valve tower and embankment should be assessed from key vantage points.	Visualisations prepared as part of the outline planning application have been revisited and revised in line with the present application. These are appended to the Environmental Statement Addendum. <u>Document reference:</u> HTR-RHD-ZZ-ZZ-RP-Z-0001								
Sufficient room needs to be allowed within the downstream culvert for maintenance, including replacement of sections of pipe should this be required.	As part of the design, adequate space for the removal of pipes has been allowed for within the downstream culvert design. This area can be accessed for maintenance via the Control House building.								
Justification for an offshore valve tower needs to be explained, balancing the safety concerns relating to the valve tower with its safe construction and operational requirements.	The detailed design phase aims to reduce and mitigate all potential risks from the embankment structure. As part of this detailed design, it proposed that the reservoir valve tower is relocated outside the inner core of the main embankment in order to maintain an uninterrupted homogenous core along the full length of the main embankment.								

	Concerns regarding public access to the valve tower are understood, however, the primary access is via the control house and culvert. The top of the valve tower can be accessed by boat, pontoon or other non-permanent method as secondary means of access in the case of an emergency, however, other options may be considered in the future, and if necessary, will be the subject of a future planning application. The local community will receive an opportunity to provide feedback on any proposed measures for a secondary means of access.
--	--