

# VikingLink

nationalgrid

---

## UK Onshore Scheme

## Phase 2 Consultation

## Feedback Report Volume 2

VKL-08-39-G500-007

December 2016



Co-financed by the European Union  
Connecting Europe Facility

*© National Grid Viking Link Limited 2016. The reproduction or transmission of all or part of this report without the written permission of the owner, is prohibited and the commission of any unauthorised act in relation to the report may result in civil or criminal actions. National Grid Viking Link Limited will not be liable for any use which is made of opinions or views expressed within it.*

# Contents

<b>5</b>	<b>FEEDBACK ON CABLE ROUTE CORRIDORS.....</b>	<b>1</b>
5.1	Introduction.....	1
5.2	Feedback Structure.....	2
5.3	Orange and Purple Route Corridor Feedback Summary.....	3
5.4	Orange Route Corridor Feedback Summary.....	10
5.5	Purple Route Corridor Feedback Summary.....	11
<b>6</b>	<b>FEEDBACK ON CONVERTER STATION DESIGN STYLES .....</b>	<b>12</b>
6.1	Introduction.....	12
6.2	Feedback Structure.....	12
6.3	Converter Station Design Styles Summary.....	12
6.4	Feedback to Contextual Design Style.....	12
6.5	Feedback to Functional Green Design Style.....	13
6.6	Feedback to Functional Blue Design Style.....	13
6.7	Other Comments .....	14
6.8	Next Steps.....	15
<b>7</b>	<b>PHASE 2 CONSULTATION FEEDBACK – STAKEHOLDERS.....</b>	<b>16</b>
7.1	Overview .....	16
7.2	East Lindsey District Council.....	17
7.3	North Kesteven District Council.....	17
7.4	South Holland District Council.....	19
7.5	Lincolnshire County Council .....	19
7.6	Natural England.....	23
7.7	The Environment Agency.....	26
7.8	Historic England .....	26
7.9	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust.....	27
7.10	Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Services.....	28
7.11	Lindsey Marsh Drainage Board.....	30
7.12	Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board.....	31
7.13	Witham Fourth Internal Drainage Board.....	33
7.14	The National Farmers Union.....	34
7.15	The National Trust .....	35

## List of Tables

Table 5.1 Feedback in relation to the Public Participation Events.....	2
Table 5.2 Feedback in relation to both Orange and Purple Route Corridors.....	3
Table 5.3 Feedback in relation specifically to the Orange Route Corridor.....	10
Table 5.4 Feedback in relation specifically to the Purple Route Corridor.....	11
Table 6.1 Feedback in relation to contextual design style.....	12
Table 6.2 Feedback in relation to functional green design style.....	13
Table 6.3 Feedback in relation to functional blue design style.....	13
Table 6.4 Feedback in relation to converter station; other issues raised.....	14
Table 7.1 Feedback received from East Lindsey District Council – General comments.....	17
Table 7.2 Feedback received from North Kesteven District Council – General comments.....	18
Table 7.3 Feedback received from South Holland District Council – converter station design styles.....	19
Table 7.4 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – Orange Route Corridor.....	19
Table 7.5 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – Purple Route Corridor.....	20
Table 7.6 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – General comments.....	21
Table 7.7 Feedback received from Natural England – Orange Route Corridor.....	23
Table 7.8 Feedback received from Natural England – Purple Route Corridor.....	24
Table 7.9 Feedback received from Natural England – converter station design styles.....	26
Table 7.10 Feedback received from the Environment Agency – General comments.....	26
Table 7.11 Feedback received from Historic England – both Orange and Purple Route Corridors.....	26
Table 7.12 Feedback received from The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust – Orange Route Corridor.....	27
Table 7.13 Feedback received from The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust – Purple Route Corridor.....	28
Table 7.14 Feedback received from The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust – General comments.....	28
Table 7.15 Feedback received from Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Services – Orange Route Corridor ..	28
Table 7.16 Feedback received from Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Services – Purple Route Corridor....	29
Table 7.17 Feedback received from Lindsey Marsh Drainage Board – both Orange and Purple Route Corridors.....	30
Table 7.18 Feedback received from Lindsey Marsh Drainage Board – Purple Route Corridors.....	30
Table 7.19 Feedback received from Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board – both Orange and Purple Route Corridors.....	31
Table 7.20 Feedback received from Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board – Purple Route Corridors.....	32
Table 7.21 Feedback received from Witham Fourth Internal Drainage Board – both Orange and Purple Route Corridors.....	33
Table 7.22 Feedback received from the National Farmers Union – General comments.....	34
Table 7.23 Feedback received from The National Trust – Orange Route Corridor.....	35
Table 7.24 Feedback received from The National Trust – Purple Route Corridor.....	36
Table 7.25 Feedback received from The National Trust – General comments.....	36

## 5 Feedback on Cable Route Corridors

### 5.1 Introduction

- 5.1.1 This report presents a detailed account of the stakeholder engagement and public consultation which has been undertaken following the Phase 1 Consultation. It includes details of the Public Participation Events which were held in July and August 2016 and the Phase 2 Consultation held from Monday, 5 September 2016 to Friday, 14 October 2016. Chapters 1 to 4 of this report can be found in UK Onshore Scheme; Phase 2 Consultation Feedback Report Volume 1 (VKL-08-39-G500-006); which outline the approach to and delivery of the Phase 2 consultation as well as a summary of the feedback provided. This volume, 2, contains chapters 5 to 7 which provides NGVL responses to the key themes raised from specific feedback received on the cable route corridors and converter station from all stakeholders.
- 5.1.2 In July and August 2016, NGVL held 8 Public Participation Events, meeting the public consultation requirements for a Project of Common Interest in accordance with the European Union's Trans-European Energy Regulation (the TEN-E Regulations). National Grid Viking Link (NGVL) received 15 pieces of feedback in relation to these PPEs.
- 5.1.3 In September and October 2016 NGVL consulted publically on two shortlisted underground Direct Current (DC) cable route corridor options, taking into account impacts on the environment and the local community as well as technical and engineering feasibility. The two cable route corridor options, identified as the Purple and Orange Route Corridors, are outlined in the UK Onshore Scheme; Route Corridor Selection Report (VKL-08-06-G500-001), see Figure 3.1 Orange Route Corridor and Figure 3.2 Purple Route Corridor in UK Onshore Scheme; Phase 2 Consultation Feedback Report Volume 1 (VKL-08-39-G500-006)
- 5.1.4 A total of 10 Phase 2 Public Consultation events were held and attended by a total of 647 people. A review of the feedback received in response to Phase 2 Consultation has taken place and this section highlights the key themes that were raised during the cable route corridor consultation.
- 5.1.5 Further details on the way in which the representations received from stakeholders and the local community during Phase 2 Consultation have influenced NGVL selection of a Preferred Cable Route Corridor are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme; Preferred Route Corridor Report (VKL-08-39-G500-005).

## 5.2 Feedback Structure

5.2.1 The feedback received from the 8 PPEs held in July and August 2016 is summarised and represented in tabular form below, Table 5.1. The 15 pieces of feedback can also be found in Appendix 1 of UK Onshore Scheme; Phase 2 Consultation Feedback Report Volume 3 (VKL-08-39-G500-008).

Table 5.1 Feedback in relation to the Public Participation Events	
Feedback	NGVL response
<p><b>Construction Impact</b></p> <p>Concern was raised regarding;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Distance from properties in which the installed cable will be laid</li> </ul>	<p>NGVL will not be installing cables through residential properties or domestic gardens. NGVL will avoid impact on local residents through detailed routeing design where possible.</p>
<p><b>Traffic and transport</b></p> <p>Concerns raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- heavy traffic on unclassified roads</li> </ul>	<p>A traffic assessment will be carried out to inform the Environmental Statement, and a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will also be produced.</p>
<p><b>Coordination with other projects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- cooperation with other projects</li> </ul>	<p>NGVL will undertake an assessment of cumulative impacts with other approved projects as part of the Environmental Statement.</p>
<p><b>Health impacts</b></p> <p>Concern was raised regarding;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- health issues from the cable</li> </ul>	<p>NGVL has a responsibility to ensure safe operation of assets. As far as health issues are concerned, such as Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMFs), NGVL discharge that responsibility by ensuring that the underground cable will comply with all appropriate independent safety standards (i.e. the exposure guidelines recommended by the European Union and adopted by UK Government). The guidelines are based on a thorough analysis of the scientific evidence, including epidemiological studies and biological research. NGVL can confirm that no electric fields emanate from the underground DC cables.</p> <p>A Construction Management Plan will be submitted with any Planning Application.</p>

Table 5.1 Feedback in relation to the Public Participation Events	
Feedback	NGVL response
<p><b>Hydrology and land drainage</b></p> <p>Concern was raised regarding;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- existing land drainage schemes</li> </ul>	<p>Once a preferred route corridor has been identified work will be carried out to identify a route alignment for the cables within that corridor. Further work will be undertaken with land owners, Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs) and the Environment Agency to understand and assess impacts on land and field drainage, crossing of water courses and flood defences.</p>
<p><b>Communication/Consultation approach</b></p> <p>Comments raised regarding communications with;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Government</li> <li>- Local Town Councils</li> </ul> <p>Comments received stated positive feedback regarding the Public Participation Event.</p>	<p>NGVL have been in and will continue dialogue with all relevant Local Authorities, Town and Parish Councils as it develops its plans further.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

5.2.2 Phase 2 Consultation feedback has been summarised and presented in tabular form. This has allowed the key issues raised to be considered in context of the questions asked by NGVL through the Phase 2 Consultation feedback form (Appendix 13). Feedback has therefore been summarised under the following headings:

- Feedback received in relation to both Orange and Purple Route Corridors
- Feedback received in relation specifically to the Orange Route Corridor
- Feedback received in relation specifically to the Purple Route Corridor
- Feedback received in relation to the converter station design style

### 5.3 Orange and Purple Route Corridor Feedback Summary

5.3.1 A total of 114 responses were received. Key themes raised in relation to both Orange and Purple Route Corridors are summarised below:

Table 5.2 Feedback in relation to both Orange and Purple Route Corridors	
Feedback	NGVL response

**Table 5.2 Feedback in relation to both Orange and Purple Route Corridors**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p><b>Socio-Economic and tourism impact</b></p> <p>Concern was raised over the impact on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local residents</li> <li>- Visitors to the area</li> <li>- Local attractions</li> </ul> <p>Specific impacts on farming and local businesses and Public Rights of Way (PRoW) were raised.</p>	<p>Concerns are noted – socio impacts will be assessed and form part of the Environmental Statement submitted along with NGVL’s Planning Applications.</p>
<p><b>Impact on agriculture land and soils</b></p> <p>Concerns raised regarding loss and disturbance of high grade agricultural land. Other concerns included impact on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ancient field boundaries</li> <li>- Ditches</li> <li>- Unstable ground</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NGVL have engaged Dalcour Maclaren as land agents and have engaged the services of a dedicated agricultural liaison officer. Liaison is taking place and continuing to take place with land owners to understand specific issues. NGVL are aware of the importance of agriculture to the area and this will form a separate technical chapter in NGVL’s Environmental Statement which will be submitted with its planning application.</p>
<p><b>Traffic and transport</b></p> <p>Concerns raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased traffic volumes and highways safety</li> <li>- Poor condition of some local roads</li> <li>- Post construction restoration</li> </ul>	<p>A traffic assessment will be carried out to inform the Environmental Statement, and a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will also be produced. NGVL will explore the use of temporary haul roads within the construction working width where appropriate.</p>



**Table 5.2 Feedback in relation to both Orange and Purple Route Corridors**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p><b>Property value</b></p> <p>Concerns raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Property devaluation</li> </ul>	<p>The effect of the scheme on property prices is not a matter that requires assessment under the 2009 Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations. NGVL recognises the concerns raised by the community regarding the impact on property prices. It is well established in planning law that the planning process is concerned with land use in the public interest and the protection of purely private interests such as the impact of development on property values are not material planning considerations.</p>
<p><b>Compensation</b></p> <p>Concerns raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land owner compensation</li> </ul>	<p>Where applicable, our land agents will be contacting landowners and tenants to discuss a potential route alignment through their land and to gather information about farm accesses, land drainage, farm practices etc. that might influence the route alignment. We aim to work with the landowners to minimise disruption to farm operations where possible. NGVL will propose a range of compensation payments in recognition of any potential land damage and disturbances that may be caused. Crop loss compensation and disturbance will be payable on a proven loss basis in line with the relevant statutory provisions such as Land Compensation Act and Compulsory Purchase Act.</p>
<p><b>Coordination with other projects</b></p> <p>The public highlighted awareness that an exploration licence was granted in the area at Boygrift (landfall site). Cumulative impacts with other projects, including Triton Knoll, Anglian Water assets and development at Bicker Fen substation were raised.</p>	<p>Investigations have been carried out to understand the nature of the exploration licence.</p> <p>NGVL will undertake an assessment of cumulative impacts with other approved projects as part of the Environmental Statement.</p>

**Table 5.2 Feedback in relation to both Orange and Purple Route Corridors**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p><b>Sea defences</b></p> <p>Concerns were raised regarding the extent/depth of the sea defences that NGVL propose to install the cable underneath.</p>	<p>These concerns were raised in the Phase 1 Consultation process and have been addressed in UK Onshore Scheme; Preferred Sites Report (VKL-08-06-G500-002)</p>
<p><b>Ecology/Biodiversity impact</b></p> <p>Concerns raised regarding impact on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Nature reserves</li> <li>- Protected species</li> <li>- Watercourse ecology and habitats</li> <li>- Local Wildlife Site</li> <li>- Stewardship areas</li> <li>- Management of soils during construction</li> </ul>	<p>Careful consideration has been given to the cable route corridors that were brought forward to consultation. We have sought to avoid designated sites, nature reserves and habitats of principal importance, where possible. Detailed ecological surveys will further inform the Environmental Statement. NGVL will put in place a Soil Management Plan which will form part of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).</p>
<p><b>Landscape and visual impact</b></p> <p>Concerns raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Visual impacts at Boygrift</li> <li>- Landscape reinstatement</li> <li>- Visual impacts at the AONB</li> </ul> <p>The suggestion was made to consult further with Natural England and Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Services on landscape and visual impacts as well as reinstatement.</p>	<p>There will be no permanent above ground structures that will have a visual impact at the landfall at Boygrift.</p> <p>Careful consideration has been given to the cable route corridors that were brought forward to consultation. NGVL have sought to avoid designated sites, nature reserves and habitats of principal importance, where possible.</p> <p>Further routeing and detailed surveys will help inform the requirement, if any, for visual impact mitigation.</p> <p>NGVL are consulting and will continue to consult with Natural England, Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Services.</p> <p>NGVL note particularly the NPPF planning policy tests as set out in paragraphs 115 and 116 should a route through the AONB be pursued.</p>

**Table 5.2 Feedback in relation to both Orange and Purple Route Corridors**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p><b>Electric and Magnetic Fields</b></p> <p>Concern raised regarding Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMFs).</p>	<p>NGVL takes the issue of Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMFs) very seriously and has a responsibility to ensure safe operation of assets. As far as EMFs are concerned, NGVL discharge that responsibility by ensuring that the underground cable will comply with all appropriate independent safety standards (i.e. the exposure guidelines recommended by the European Union and adopted by UK Government). The guidelines are based on a thorough analysis of the scientific evidence, including epidemiological studies and biological research. NGVL can confirm that no electric fields emanate from the underground DC cables.</p>
<p><b>Construction Impact</b></p> <p>Concerns raised over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Timing of construction works</li> <li>- Cable trench depth</li> <li>- Flood defence damage due to construction</li> <li>- Coastline and beach level concerns at Boygrift</li> <li>- The seabed, submerged shipwreck and submerged forest</li> </ul>	<p>The timing of construction activities will be considered in our Environmental Statement and will form part of a Construction Management Plan, which will be developed in conjunction with the relevant planning authority.</p> <p>NGVL will work with Landowners and asset owners to establish an agreed cable trench depth.</p> <p>Similar concerns were raised during the Phase 1 Consultation and have been addressed in the UK Onshore Scheme; Phase 1 Consultation Feedback Report Volume 2 (VKL-08-06-G500-003)</p>

**Table 5.2 Feedback in relation to both Orange and Purple Route Corridors**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p><b>Hydrology and land drainage</b></p> <p>Concerns raised regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and field drainage</li> <li>- The number of watercourses to be crossed</li> <li>- Flooding and impact on flood defences</li> </ul>	<p>Concerns noted.</p> <p>Once a preferred route corridor has been identified work will be carried out to identify a route alignment for the cables within that corridor. Further work will be undertaken with land owners, Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs) and the Environment Agency to understand and assess impacts on land and field drainage, crossing of water courses and flood defences.</p> <p>A flood risk assessment will form part of the Environmental Statement and Planning Application submissions.</p>
<p><b>Communication/Consultation approach</b></p> <p>Concern raised regarding the absence of a marine representative at the consultation.</p>	<p>The Phase 2 Consultation related to the onshore cable route corridors. Marine representatives were available at the events supporting the Phase 1 Consultation period where a further standalone event was held on 11<sup>th</sup> August 2016 at Grimsby as part of the Public Participation Events, this event was specific to Offshore and maritime.</p>
<p><b>Archaeology and cultural heritage</b></p> <p>Concerns were raised regarding the effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Heritage assets, archaeology features/monuments</li> </ul>	<p>NGVL have noted the comments and will be undertaking further surveys to assess any impacts on the local archaeology. Close consultation is taking place with the Local Authorities and Historic England regarding archaeology and cultural heritage. Impacts on archaeology will be assessed and form part of the Environmental Statement.</p>
<p><b>Cable routing</b></p> <p>Questions received regarding Cable Routing through The Wash.</p> <p>Concerns raised in relation to routing of cables in close proximity to paddocks, gardens and residential properties.</p>	<p>Routeing through The Wash has been addressed during Phase 1 Consultation and is referred to in section 2.3.1 of the UK Onshore Scheme; Site Selection Report (April 2016).</p> <p>NGVL will not be installing cables through residential properties or domestic gardens, and NGVL aims to avoid areas such as paddocks through detailed routeing design.</p>

**Table 5.2 Feedback in relation to both Orange and Purple Route Corridors**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <p>Concerns raised regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construction noise and vibration</li> <li>- Increased traffic noise during construction</li> <li>- Noise during construction of the converter station</li> </ul>	<p>NGVL will seek to minimise noise from construction activities as far as reasonably practicable.</p> <p>Construction traffic on main roads will form only a small fraction of the existing vehicle flows. A full assessment will quantify any associated noise increase. Construction activities will primarily be undertaken during the daytime period, but for some activities, such as HDD, 24-hour working will be required.</p> <p>Potential impacts of construction noise are being assessed and will form part of our Environmental Statement that will support the planning application.</p> <p>The timing of construction activities will be considered in our Environmental Statement and will form part of a Construction Management Plan, which will be developed in conjunction with the relevant Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Concerns regarding noise during construction of the converter station have been addressed as part of the Phase 1 Consultation process.</p>
<p><b>Project Need</b></p> <p>Concerns raised regarding the need for the Project</p>	<p>There are many benefits that electricity Interconnectors such as Viking Link can bring. The benefits include access to cheaper sources of electricity, improved ability to import or export electricity depending upon supply and demand, improved security of electricity supply and improved integration of renewable electricity. More detailed information on these benefits can be found in the “Getting More Connected” report which can be found at <a href="http://www.viking-link.com/">http://www.viking-link.com/</a></p>

**Table 5.2 Feedback in relation to both Orange and Purple Route Corridors**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p><b>General comments</b></p> <p>Concerns raised regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The amount of electrical infrastructure in the area</li> <li>- Potential of buried UXO</li> </ul> <p>General preference for Cable Routeing to the western corridor at the southern end of the cable route corridor.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NGVL have undertaken initial desk studies with a view to identifying key UXO risk areas.</p>

## 5.4 Orange Route Corridor Feedback Summary

- 5.4.1 A total of 86 people provided comments in response to the Orange Route Corridor. Key themes raised in relation to the Orange Route Corridor as an option and not already addressed in table 5.2 above are summarised below:

**Table 5.3 Feedback in relation specifically to the Orange Route Corridor**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p><b>Socio-Economic and tourism impact</b></p> <p>Comments stated that the Orange Route Corridor will impact residents and businesses more than the Purple Route Corridor.</p>	<p>Noted. Socio-Economic User Surveys are being undertaken to establish Peak Season and Off Peak Season Visitor and Recreation Use at various locations, particularly at the coast.</p>
<p><b>Ecology/Biodiversity impact</b></p> <p>Concern raised regarding the impacts on Lincolnshire Coastal Grazing Marshes (LCGM)</p>	<p>Careful consideration has been given to the cable route corridors that were brought forward to consultation. We have sought to avoid designated and non-designated sites where possible. NGVL is aware of the significance of the Grazing Marshes and the challenges of routeing a cable through.</p>
<p><b>Impact on agriculture land and soils</b></p> <p>Feedback suggested that higher graded land within the Orange Route Corridor should be avoided, therefore the Orange Route Corridor should be avoided.</p>	<p>Noted. An assessment of Best Most Versatile (BMV) land has influenced the routes taken forward to consultation, more detailed investigation will inform the route alignment with in the preferred route corridor.</p>

Table 5.3 Feedback in relation specifically to the Orange Route Corridor	
Feedback	NGVL response
<p><b>Archaeology and cultural heritage</b></p> <p>Feedback suggested that a natural burial ground and unknown burial at Monksthorpe airfield should be avoided.</p>	<p>NGVL have noted the comments and will be undertaking further surveys to assess any impacts on the local archaeology. Close consultation is taking place with the Local Authorities regarding archaeology and cultural heritage.</p>
<p><b>Landscape and visual impact</b></p> <p>Concern raised regarding the impact on Gunby Hall, park and gardens.</p>	<p>During the routeing selection process NGVL has avoided designated sites where possible and will continue to assess and propose mitigation where appropriate, following detailed surveys, assessments and routeing and construction design.</p>

## 5.5 Purple Route Corridor Feedback Summary

- 5.5.1 A total of 85 people provided comments in response to the Purple Route Corridor. Key themes raised in relation to the Purple Route Corridor as an option and not already addressed in table 5.2 above are summarised below:

Table 5.4 Feedback in relation specifically to the Purple Route Corridor	
Feedback	NGVL response
<p><b>Impact on agriculture land and soils</b></p> <p>Concerns raised regarding the chalky nature of soil within the Purple Route Corridor.</p>	<p>Noted. Ground investigation surveys will take place on the cable corridor should this Route Corridor be preferred. NGVL recognise the importance of chalk streams and the chalky nature of the soil within this corridor and will continue to engage with landowners and the Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Service should this corridor be taken forward.</p>
<p><b>Coordination with other projects</b></p> <p>Concern raised regarding repeated impacts to landowners over the recent Anglian Water Pipeline works.</p>	<p>NGVL remains in dialogue with Anglian Water. NGVL will undertake an assessment of cumulative impacts as part of the Environmental Statement if the Purple Route Corridor is preferred.</p>

## 6 Feedback on Converter Station Design Styles

### 6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 A review of all the feedback received in response to Phase 2 Consultation has taken place and this section highlights the key themes that were raised in relation to converter station design styles presented. The preferred converter station location and detail on how this site was arrived at, is outlined in the UK Onshore Scheme; Preferred Sites Report (VKL-08-06-G500-002).

### 6.2 Feedback Structure

6.2.1 Feedback has been summarised and presented in tabular form. This has allowed the key issues raised to be considered in context of the question asked by NGVL through the Phase 2 Consultation feedback form (Appendix 13). Feedback has therefore been summarised under the following headings:

- Responses to contextual style design
- Responses to functional green style design
- Responses to functional blue style design

### 6.3 Converter Station Design Styles Summary

6.3.1 A total of 68 people provided feedback in relation to the converter station design style options. The design style images can be found in the UK Onshore Scheme; Phase 2 Consultation Feedback Report Volume 1 (VKL-08-39-G500-006) Figure 3.3 Converter station contextual design, Figure 3.4 Converter station functional blue design and Figure 3.5 Converter station functional green design. The key themes are summarised within each design style option below.

### 6.4 Feedback to Contextual Design Style

6.4.1 Key themes raised in relation to the contextual design style as an option are summarised below:

**Table 6.1 Feedback in relation to contextual design style**

Feedback
----------



**Table 6.1 Feedback in relation to contextual design style**

Feedback
<p><b>Contextual design style</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The contextual ‘barn’ style was preferred by a majority of those who responded</li> <li>• Height concerns were raised regarding the converter station, in particular to the contextual ‘barn’ style design being higher than other farm buildings.</li> <li>• The design and screening idea was welcomed to help blend the structure in with the surroundings.</li> <li>• Concerns were raised that the artists’ impressions imagery were not representative.</li> </ul>

**6.5 Feedback to Functional Green Design Style**

6.5.1 Key themes raised in relation to the functional green design style as an option are summarised below:

**Table 6.2 Feedback in relation to functional green design style**

Feedback
<p><b>Functional green design style</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Functional green design style was mainly preferred in relation to long distance views.</li> <li>• It was suggested that this design style could become a statement piece within the area.</li> <li>• It was also highlighted that this type of design could look like a distribution centre.</li> <li>• Height concerns were raised regarding the converter station.</li> <li>• The design and screening idea was welcomed to help blend the structure in with the surroundings.</li> <li>• Concerns were raised that the artists’ impressions imagery were not representative.</li> </ul>

**6.6 Feedback to Functional Blue Design Style**

6.6.1 Key themes raised in relation to the functional blue design style as an option are summarised below:

**Table 6.3 Feedback in relation to functional blue design style**

Feedback
----------

**Table 6.3 Feedback in relation to functional blue design style**

Feedback
<p><b>Functional blue design style</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Functional blue design style was mainly preferred in relation to long distance views.</li> <li>• It was suggested that this design style could become a statement piece within the area.</li> <li>• It was also highlighted that this type of design could look like a distribution centre.</li> <li>• Height concerns were raised regarding the converter station.</li> <li>• The design and screening idea was welcomed to help blend the structure in with the surroundings.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the artists' impressions imagery were not representative.</li> </ul>

**6.7 Other Comments**

6.7.1 Many comments that did not specify a preference stated that the decision should be made in consultation with the surrounding communities of the converter station and people who will view the structure daily. Key themes raised regarding the converter station, other than the design related comments above, are summarised below:

**Table 6.4 Feedback in relation to converter station; other issues raised**

Feedback	NGVL response
----------	---------------

**Table 6.4 Feedback in relation to converter station; other issues raised**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p><b>Converter station; other issues</b></p> <p>Other issues unrelated to the converter station design style were raised such as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Site security</li> <li>- Traffic and transport</li> <li>- Noise</li> <li>- Community investment</li> <li>- Cost, materials and supply chain</li> <li>- Ecology/biodiversity impacts</li> <li>- Agricultural land</li> <li>- Cumulative impact with other projects</li> <li>- Construction impact</li> <li>- Property value and compensation</li> <li>- Operational lighting</li> <li>- Radio telemetry</li> <li>- Hydrology and drainage</li> </ul>	<p>The Phase 2 Consultation related to the onshore cable route corridors and converter station design style only. The issues raised regarding the converter station outside of the design style subject was covered in Phase 1 Consultation period. NGVL response to these can be found in UK Onshore Scheme; Phase 1 Consultation Feedback Report Volume 2 (VKL-08-06-G500-003).</p>

## 6.8 Next Steps

6.8.1 Feedback received in respect of the converter station design styles will now be discussed with the affected local planning authority (SHDC), and Elected Members, in order to ensure local views form part of the decision making process when agreeing the Design Code for the site. The Design Code and Design and Access Statement will be available to view as part of the pre-submission information events that will be held, prior to a formal planning application submission being made.

## 7 Phase 2 Consultation Feedback – Stakeholders

### 7.1 Overview

7.1.1 NGVL has developed relationships with a number of key stakeholder groups and has an ongoing and iterative programme of engagement with these stakeholders, outside of the defined phases of public consultation. This engagement can take many forms from meetings, briefings and group workshops to discuss detailed aspects of project development, through to email updates and newsletters.

7.1.2 Some stakeholders have provided written responses to Phase 2 Consultation. This section highlights the key themes and site specific issues that were raised for both the cable route corridors and the converter station design style options, and seeks to draw out and respond to some key issues raised.

7.1.3 Further detail on how representations received from stakeholders during Phase 2 Consultation will influence the decision for a preferred cable route corridor and converter station design style are set out in the UK Onshore Preferred Route Corridor Report (VKL-08-39-G500-005).

7.1.4 The following stakeholders have provided written responses to Phase 2 Consultation. The feedback received has been summarised and is presented in tabular form to reflect the issues raised:

- East Lindsey District Council;
- North Kesteven District Council;
- South Holland District Council;
- Lincolnshire County Council;
- Natural England;
- The Environment Agency;
- Historic England;
- Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust;
- Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Services;
- Lindsey Marsh Drainage Board;
- Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board;
- Witham Fourth District Internal Drainage Board;
- The National Farmers Union; and
- National Trust

The following stakeholders were contacted by NGVL requesting a written response for the Phase 2 Consultation, but did not reply:

- Boston Borough Council;
- The Crown Estate;
- Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership;
- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds;
- Heritage Trust for Lincolnshire;
- Marine Management Organisation;
- Lincolnshire Association of Agricultural Valuers; and
- Country Land and Business Association

## 7.2 East Lindsey District Council

7.2.1 The following comments relating to both cable route corridors have been received from East Lindsey District Council (ELDC) and are summarised in the table below. It is noted that comments on converter station design style were specified as being more appropriate from the relevant District Authority.

Table 7.1 Feedback received from East Lindsey District Council – general comments	
Feedback	NGVL response
As both Purple and Orange Route Corridor pass through the AONB, it is suggested that the possibility of being able to route the cable within the AONB without substantially altering the character of the designated landscape in the long term could be achieved by locating temporary construction facilities outside the AONB. A key characteristic of the AONB is that of long distance views. Careful consideration should be given to the visual and character impacts arising from potential works outside of the designated landscape area itself.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Following detailed surveys, assessments and, routing and construction design, all efforts will be made to mitigate the potential visual impact of any construction facilities.</p> <p>When operational the DC cable will be buried and there will be only a small number of above ground marker posts. The size and scale of these posts would be proportionate and sympathetic to the area so as not to detract from the features that comprise the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB should the Purple Route Corridor be preferred.</p> <p>NGVL note particularly the NPPF planning policy tests as set out in paragraphs 115 and 116 should a route through the AONB be pursued.</p>

## 7.3 North Kesteven District Council

7.3.1 The following comments have been received from North Kesteven District Council (NKDC) relating to that section of cable route corridor passing through the jurisdiction of NKDC and are summarised in Table 7.2 below.

**Table 7.2 Feedback received from North Kesteven District Council – general comments**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p>Observation that the area within the boundary of NKDC and immediately adjacent to the cable route corridor is relatively sparsely populated, although there is a small hamlet of East Heckington adjacent to the west along the A17.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Access to the section of cable route corridor which lies within North Kesteven via the road network is generally very poor with majority of routes being single track drove roads running down the South Forty Foot and serving adjacent farmland, from the B1394 which links the A17 and A52. The road passes through the centre of villages and, careful consideration should be given to the potential impacts of construction traffic upon residential amenity and highway safety.</p>	<p>Noted. A Construction Management Plan will be submitted with any Planning Application.</p>
<p>The Carterplot Road does provide direct access from Great Hale Drove (avoiding Great Hale and Heckington) to the A17 but is single track with limited passing opportunities.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>NKDC require clarification if it were proposed to use/upgrade the existing road network or to provide a haul road to enable direct access to avoid passing through villages. If the latter is proposed, the question of sole use for construction traffic or retained long term for maintenance access is raised.</p>	<p>A Construction Management Plan will be submitted with any Planning Application.</p>
<p>The Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs) have previously indicated that to ensure the integrity of drainage channels the cable would need to be bored beneath and that trenching through the watercourses would not be acceptable.</p>	<p>NGVL remains in dialogue with IDB's regarding crossing techniques.</p>
<p>Consideration should be given to any existing hedgerows or small copses.</p>	<p>NGVL will seek to avoid routeing through hedgerows and appropriate mitigation will be provided following detailed ecological surveys and, routeing and construction design, considered as part of the ecological assessment.</p>

**Table 7.2 Feedback received from North Kesteven District Council – general comments**

Feedback	NGVL response
There is a scheduled ancient monument (AM303 – roman saltern) on Helpringham Fen in the south west corner of the corridor.	Noted.
Consideration regarding impacts on noise and dust as well as any temporary construction compounds (siting, size, visual impact, lighting, security) during the construction phase.	The potential impacts of construction noise are being assessed for both ecological and residential sensitive receptors. NGVL will take into account technical and other environmental considerations when deciding on the positioning of any access tracks and compound areas within fields where practicable to minimise disturbance.

## 7.4 South Holland District Council

- 7.4.1 The following comments have been received from South Holland District Council (SHDC) and are summarised in Table 7.3 below; SHDC had no comments regarding the cable route corridors and confined their comments to the converter station design style only.

**Table 7.3 Feedback received from South Holland District Council – converter station design styles**

Feedback	NGVL response
As the converter station would be much larger than any traditional agricultural building, a functional style would be preferable. No strong preference of the colour approach or either of the layout options.	Noted.

## 7.5 Lincolnshire County Council

- 7.5.1 The following comments have been received from Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) and are summarised in the tables below; one for the Orange Route Corridor, one for the Purple Route Corridor and the final table on general comments.

**Table 7.4 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – Orange Route Corridor**

Feedback	NGVL response
----------	---------------

**Table 7.4 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – Orange Route Corridor**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p>The Orange Route Corridor crosses the southern tip of the AONB, resulting in less impact than the Purple Route Corridor, and runs close to the Gunby Hall. Careful consideration is required so that there is minimal impact upon the listed hall, park and gardens, and surrounding hinterland. National Trust indicates that HDD could be used around Gunby Hall.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The Orange Route Corridor at Boygriff shows more alluvial soils, typically flat land soils which require land drainage. Concern over interference to these soils and the disturbance of the soils drainage and characteristics. Soil types more vulnerable to damage by disturbance should be avoided in the event that alternatives are available.</p>	<p>NGVL are conducting assessments of land quality and ground conditions with intrusive surveys. After review of the findings, mitigation will then be considered where appropriate to ensure that any works are conducted safely and without any legacy problems being created.</p>
<p>LCC’s ownership of 9 blocks of County Farm estate land are potentially intersected by the Orange Route Corridor.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>If the Orange Route Corridor is to be selected as preferred, LCC sees the cumulative impacts of the Triton Knoll Offshore Wind Farm development and NGVL as a significant factor against using the Orange Route Corridor. LCC would wish to avoid any one settlement being subject to disturbance from two cable Projects passing through it.</p>	<p>Noted. NGVL will undertake an assessment of cumulative impacts with other approved projects as part of the Environmental Statement.</p>

**Table 7.5 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – Purple Route Corridor**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p>As the Purple Route Corridor passes through the AONB, attention is brought to the national level NPPF, Paragraphs 115 and 116. At the local level, ELDC Local plan 1999, Policy C11 and the new developing plan seek to protect the AONB in a similar way to the NPPF.</p>	<p>NGVL are aware of the National Policy tests should a route through the AONB be pursued. These will be considered in full in the Planning Statement submitted with any application should the Purple Route Corridor be taken forward.</p>



<b>Table 7.5 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – Purple Route Corridor</b>	
<b>Feedback</b>	<b>NGVL response</b>
Consideration of the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB Management Plan 2013-18 will also be required for the Purple Route Corridor.	NGVL acknowledge the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB Management Plan against which the UK Onshore Scheme will be considered.
The Purple Route Corridor crosses land classified as best and most versatile by the Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales. It is preferable that the chosen route minimises the area of best and most versatile agricultural land affected by the development.	Any disruption as a result of underground DC cable works would be temporary and appropriate mitigation measures would be in place to ensure that the soils are correctly handled and stored to minimise loss of soil function. Works would be undertaken by a specialist team.
The Purple Route Corridor passes through more chalky soils which by nature are more free draining and potentially easier to restore post cable installation. Damage can be caused to agricultural land under land drainage schemes. Although it is possible to minimise impact, it is preferable if the route avoids areas likely to require such drainage in favour of free draining soils. Chalky soils of the Purple Route Corridor provide the advantage of more free draining soils.	NGVL are conducting assessments of land quality and ground conditions with intrusive surveys. After review of the findings, mitigation will then be considered as appropriate to ensure that any works are conducted safely and without any legacy problems being created.
LCC's ownership of 4 blocks of County Farm land are potentially intersected by the Purple Route Corridor.	Noted.

<b>Table 7.6 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – general comments</b>	
<b>Feedback</b>	<b>NGVL response</b>
Archaeological work will need to form part of any mitigation strategy. There is currently insufficient site specific information on archaeological potential. Detailed archaeological desk top assessment combined with archaeological field walking and geophysical survey would be required to support the Environmental Statement.	Noted.  Assessment, techniques and scope on the preferred route corridor will be discussed with the county archaeologist and Historic England.

**Table 7.6 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – general comments**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p>Highways and transport junction layout proposals for temporary and final design to Design Manual of Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards; Swept paths of access proposals and along designated routes at key junctions; and estimate of construction traffic, routeings, duration, time of year (note seasonal traffic flows in this area-peak in summer)</p>	<p>Noted. Assessment, techniques and scope on the preferred route corridor will be discussed with the local Highways Authority, including any junction layout proposal.</p>
<p>Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) – detailed ALC survey in accordance with Natural England Technical Note TIN049.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Soils and Soil Management Plan showing impact on the localised soils which will be disturbed, mitigation and protection of soils and how land will be restored following construction, with particular reference to any temporary working areas which are to be restored to agricultural use.</p>	<p>The soils temporarily disturbed as a result of cable installation and associated works will be fully restored following construction, as per the guidance contained in Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs’ (DEFRA) “Construction Code of Practice for Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites”, with more detailed site specific mitigation designation for any soils identified as being of highly sensitivity, where required.</p>
<p>Detailed assessment of existing land drainage schemes should be documented with proposals agreed for mitigation both temporary during construction and permanent post construction, considering the appropriate cable depth.</p>	<p>NGVL will assess potential impacts of the Project on agricultural land drainage. Surveying, mitigation, construction and post construction design will be undertaken by a specialist team.</p>
<p>As detailed design is brought forward, the location of any permanent surface structures should consider impact on normal agricultural operations.</p>	<p>NGVL will be using joint bays which will sit underground resulting in no above ground infrastructure until the converter station, with the exception of some cable marker posts along the Cable Route. Detailed surveys carried out at the converter station will be used to microsite the development works into areas of lower ALC grading or non-agricultural land as far as is practicable.</p>
<p>Detailed information should be provided of any temporary compound areas and the routes of any site access including both permanent and temporary requirements for land take.</p>	<p>It is envisaged that the planning applications will include the necessary information suggested by the County Council.</p>

**Table 7.6 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – general comments**

Feedback	NGVL response
The County Council recommend that the Purple Route Corridor is selected for further consideration and the Orange Route Corridor is dismissed.	Noted.

## 7.6 Natural England

7.6.1 The following comments have been received from Natural England and are summarised in the tables below; one for the Orange Route Corridor, one for the Purple Route Corridor and the final table on the converter station design styles.

**Table 7.7 Feedback received from Natural England – Orange Route Corridor**

Feedback	NGVL response
The western option of the Orange Route Corridor, where it divides around Gunby Hall, traverses the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB for approximately 3km. However as a much smaller distance is covered it may be more preferable than the Purple Route Corridor and we understand that mitigation measures including HDD may be an option along this route removing any significant impacts.	Noted.  NGVL have considered AONB impact within the Preferred Route Corridor Report. Detailed consideration will be given in the Environmental Statement and Planning Statement, should the Orange Route Corridor be taken forward. Trenchless crossing techniques are being considered and will help inform a detailed alignment once a preferred route corridor is chosen.
There may also be other non-landscape constraints in this area and there would be the need to reinstate and mitigate any significant impacts to the landscape.	Further assessments of constraints will feed into the Environmental Statement that will be submitted with the Planning Application to the respective Local Planning Authorities.
NE advises that the route avoids both the SSSI and the woodland and is given an appropriate buffer to avoid any potential impacts. HDD should be considered to reduce the impacts to sensitive receptors.	During the routing selection process NGVL has avoided all SSSI's and will continue to assess determine what if any mitigation will be required. Trenchless crossing techniques will be considered where appropriate.
The cable route could skirt to the east and south of the large block of woodland that Willoughby Wood forms part of and which should be avoided.	Noted.

**Table 7.7 Feedback received from Natural England – Orange Route Corridor**

Feedback	NGVL response
Candlesby Hill SSSI appears that the route would include this SSSI, therefore advise that the cable route should avoid this site.	During the routeing selection process NGVL has avoided all SSSI's and will continue to assess and mitigate to ensure no significant effects.
The eastern route option should avoid disruption of the water table at the Grazing Marshes. An assessment on the impact of the cable installation activities and long term effects would need to be made on the hydrology of the area to assess the likely impact on the SSSI.	NGVL is aware of the significance of the Grazing Marshes and the challenges of routeing a cable through.
NE advises considering previous advice relating to European Protected Species and Discretionary Advice relating to soils and agriculture.	Noted.

**Table 7.8 Feedback received from Natural England – Purple Route Corridor**

Feedback	NGVL response
Both Purple and Orange Route Corridors traverse fields which fall within Higher Level Stewardship (HLS) agreements.	Noted.
Serious concerns with the Purple Route Corridor as it traverses 8km through the width of the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which is a nationally designated landscape. Cable installation would cause significant disturbance both visually and to the tranquillity of the area. Maintenance of the route could result in a legacy of impact and disruption over the years.	Noted. NGVL have considered AONB impact within the Preferred Route Corridor Report. Detailed consideration will be given in the Environmental Statement and Planning Statement, should the Purple Route Corridor be taken forward.

**Table 7.8 Feedback received from Natural England – Purple Route Corridor**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p>Concerned with the number of junction boxes that would be necessary within the AONB section, and how they would be accessed and how often maintenance activities (including repairs) will occur.</p>	<p>NGVL confirm that junction boxes will <u>not</u> be required on the DC cable; underground cable joint bays will be required and once installed will not be visible. With the exception of marker posts along the route of the underground cables no above ground infrastructure will be required. Routine access for maintenance of the cables is not required. Access will only be required in the event of a cable failure. Land disturbed by construction will be restored to a pre-construction state.</p>
<p>If the Purple Route Corridor is chosen, NE would need to see convincing and specific reason for choosing this route over the alternative option. Clear evidence for the reasons for discounting the alternative option if the Purple Route Corridor is selected.</p>	<p>NGVL will choose the preferred cable route corridor with careful consideration given to all the information currently held, providing clear evidence for the reasons behind the choice.</p>
<p>NGVL would need to address how they would meet the tests set out in the NPPF.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) showing the specific landscape impact of the cabling proposal. Plans for reinstatement and mitigation of the landscape.</p>	<p>NGVL plan to produce and submit an LVIA showing specific landscape impact and plans for reinstatement and mitigation of the landscape.</p>
<p>Seek the advice of Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Service for more detailed advice on the impact of the landscape along this route.</p>	<p>NGVL remains in dialogue with the Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Services. Feedback from them has been received in the Phase 2 Consultation and is listed in chapter 7.10 of this report.</p>
<p>The Purple Route Corridor passes in close proximity to a number of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The proposed cable route corridor should not cause any significant impact both directly and indirectly on these nationally designated sites. It should be ensured that the cabling would not result in any hydrological impact to any SSSI's.</p>	<p>During the routeing process NGVL has avoided all SSSI's and will continue to assess and mitigate as appropriate to ensure no significant effects.</p>

**Table 7.9 Feedback received from Natural England – converter station design styles**

Feedback	NGVL response
NE has no nature conservation and landscape concerns to raise in relation to the design style of the converter station photomontage and fly around.	Noted.

## 7.7 The Environment Agency

7.7.1 The following comments have been received from The Environment Agency and are summarised in Table 7.10 below as general comments.

**Table 7.10 Feedback received from the Environment Agency – general comments**

Feedback	NGVL response
Environment Agency (EA) note that NGVL are using the relevant environmental data to inform its options decision. EA advise that they are likely to specify some requirements in respect of installation techniques to ensure appropriate environmental protection in place (for example, a requirement to pass under main rivers using HDD etc)	NGVL will continue its dialogue with the EA as it develops its plans further.
EA will be pleased to assist NGVL again when the preferred route corridor is announced and NGVL begin work on the detailed alignment.	Noted.

## 7.8 Historic England

7.8.1 The following comments have been received from Historic England (HE) and are summarised in Table 7.11 below; on both Orange and Purple Route Corridors.

**Table 7.11 Feedback received from Historic England – both Orange and Purple Route Corridors**

Feedback	NGVL response
Advise to include all heritage assets, regardless of period, for assessment.	Assessment, techniques and scope on the preferred route corridor will be discussed with the county archaeologist and Historic England.

<b>Table 7.11 Feedback received from Historic England – both Orange and Purple Route Corridors</b>	
<b>Feedback</b>	<b>NGVL response</b>
It is recognised that the advice provided by HE in relation to the density of designated and no-designated heritage assets within Lincolnshire Wolds AONB including particular prehistoric sites, is reflected in the assessment.	Noted.
It is recognised that the advice provided by HE in relation to the sensitivity of the historic landscape surrounding Gunby Hall, is reflected in the assessment.	Noted.
It is recognised that NGVL aim to avoid clusters of associated/broadly contemporaneous assets.	Noted.
Recommendation to produce detailed corridor maps for the refined Purple and Orange Route Corridors to assist in assessing the historic environment impacts of these two alternatives in detail.	Detailed assessment of the historic environment within the preferred route corridor, to inform the Environmental Statement, will be provided.
HE advice to choose the least harmful cable route corridor in relation to the historic environment impacts.	Noted.

## 7.9 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

7.9.1 The following comments have been received from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (LWT) and are summarised in the tables below; one for the Orange Route Corridor, one for the Purple Route Corridor and the final table reflecting general comments.

<b>Table 7.12 Feedback received from The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust – Orange Route Corridor</b>	
<b>Feedback</b>	<b>NGVL response</b>
LWT has concerns regarding the eastern Orange Route Corridor which passes through the area of the LCGMP. Assessing the value of the existing grassland habitats, potential impacts on those existing habitats and how impacts could be avoided. Suitable mitigation measures would be required if avoidance is not feasible.	During the routeing selection process NGVL has avoided LCGM land where possible. These areas of ecological value would be highlighted during surveys to see if re-routeing would be possible. If we are unable to re-route, proposals would need to be developed in conjunction with LWT.

**Table 7.12 Feedback received from The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust – Orange Route Corridor**

Feedback	NGVL response
Proposals for habitat enhancements to ensure there is net gain for biodiversity would need to be seen.	NGVL will consider habitat enhancements as proportionate and appropriate to the Project impact.

**Table 7.13 Feedback received from The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust – Purple Route Corridor**

Feedback	NGVL response
Part of Keal Carr Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Trust Nature Reserve sits within the Purple Route Corridor which could be impacted upon by the cable installation.	During the routeing selection process NGVL has avoided all SSSI's and will continue to assess and mitigate where necessary to ensure no significant effects.

**Table 7.14 Feedback received from The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust – general comments**

Feedback	NGVL response
LWT strongly recommend that every effort is made to avoid statutory or non-statutory designated sites, including sites meeting the LWS criteria but not yet designated, and priority habitats during the detailed routeing of the cable corridor. Where avoidance is not possible, LWT support the use of less intrusive installation methods such as HDD.	During the routeing selection process NGVL has avoided designated sites where possible and will continue to assess and mitigate where appropriate to ensure no significant effects, following detailed surveys, assessments, and routeing and construction design. Trenchless crossing techniques will be considered where appropriate.

## 7.10 Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Services

- 7.10.1 The following comments have been received from The Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Services and are summarised in the tables below; one for the Purple Route Corridor, one for the Orange Route Corridor.

**Table 7.15 Feedback received from Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Services – Orange Route Corridor**

Feedback	NGVL response
----------	---------------



**Table 7.15 Feedback received from Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Services – Orange Route Corridor**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p>This route needs further consideration and discussion with partners. A route that avoids the AONB would be preferred but the need is recognised to secure an agreed route with minimal impact upon the Listed Gunby Hall Park and Gardens and its more immediate surroundings.</p>	<p>During the routeing selection process NGVL has avoided designated sites where possible and will continue to assess and propose mitigation where appropriate, following detailed surveys, assessments and routeing and construction design.</p>

**Table 7.16 Feedback received from Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Services – Purple Route Corridor**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p>The Purple Route Corridor would be the most undesirable routeing selection from the perspective of the AONB. Paragraph 115 and 116 of the NPPF should be considered.</p>	<p>NGVL note the National Policy tests in particular paragraphs 115 and 116, should a route through the AONB be pursued. These will be considered in full in the Planning Statement submitted with any application should the Purple Route Corridor be taken forward.</p>
<p>Section 89 of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, requires the preparation and publication of a Partnership Management Plan and its periodic review by the appropriate local authorities.</p>	<p>NGVL understand and acknowledge the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000) and National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act (1949). PRoW which are affected will be identified. NGVL are aware of the need for appropriate notification and consultation with regard to any temporary closure/diversions.</p>
<p>East Lindsey District Council (ELDC) Local Plan Alteration 1999; saved Policy C11 A, B, C and D.</p>	<p>NGVL note and acknowledge the ELDC Local Plan against which the UK Onshore Scheme will be considered.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire Wolds AONB Management Plan 2013-18. The current Partnership Management Plan has been formally adopted by all relevant authorities.</p>	<p>NGVL note and acknowledge the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB Management Plan against which the UK Onshore Scheme will be considered.</p>

**7.11 Lindsey Marsh Drainage Board**

7.11.1 The following comments have been received from Lindsey Marsh Drainage Board (LMDB) and are summarised in the tables below; one for both Orange and Purple Route Corridors and the final table specifically for the Purple Route Corridor.

<b>Table 7.17 Feedback received from Lindsey Marsh Drainage Board – both Orange and Purple Route Corridors</b>	
<b>Feedback</b>	<b>NGVL response</b>
Concerns raised regarding the number of watercourse crossings required by each cable route corridor.	Noted.  Once a preferred route corridor has been identified work will be carried out to identify a route for the cables within that corridor. Further work will be undertaken with land owners, Internal Drainage Boards, the Environment Agency amongst others to understand and assess impacts of crossing water courses.  A flood risk assessment will form part of the Environmental Statement.

<b>Table 7.18 Feedback received from Lindsey Marsh Drainage Board – Purple Route Corridors</b>	
<b>Feedback</b>	<b>NGVL response</b>
LMDB has strong preference for the Purple Route Corridor in comparison to the Orange Route Corridor due to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The cable could run parallel to LMDB</li> <li>- Fewer higher risk service crossings</li> <li>- Lower impact on the integrity of the Board</li> <li>- Reduction in the number of private drainage systems impacted</li> <li>- Less disruption to agricultural land drainage systems</li> <li>- Reduced number of riparian drains</li> <li>- Avoids more settlements</li> </ul>	Noted.
The preferred method for crossing LMDB maintained drains is HDD.	Noted.

**Table 7.18 Feedback received from Lindsey Marsh Drainage Board – Purple Route Corridors**

Feedback	NGVL response
LMDB will require a minimum depth of 2 metres below the hard bed level of the watercourse in addition to the protective depth required by NG for the cable. Associated drill pits will need to be 10 metres from the watercourse bank top.	Noted.
Important points for consideration were raised and agreements required prior to the development commencing.	Noted.
Recommendation to undertake field surveys as soon as possible on a wide selection of watercourses to establish depths of watercourses.	Noted.
NGVL will need to fully demonstrate that there are no temporary or permanent negative impacts upon the current and future operation of the Boygrift Pumping Station.	NGVL will remain in dialogue with LMDB on the Boygrift Pumping Station to ensure that Viking Link works do not compromise its operation on a temporary or permanent basis.

## 7.12 Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board

7.12.1 The following comments have been received from Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board (BSIDB) and are summarised in the tables below; one for both Orange and Purple Route Corridors and the final table specifically to the Purple Route Corridor.

**Table 7.19 Feedback received from Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board – both Orange and Purple Route Corridors**

Feedback	NGVL response
HDD crossing of the South Forty Foot Drain would then mean crossing only one main river and potentially only one BSIDB-maintained watercourse. It is BSIDB's preference that all watercourse crossings are carried out by HDD.	Noted. Trenchless crossing techniques will be considered where appropriate.
No part of the converter station site shall be located within 9 meters of the top of the banks of these watercourses. Consent will also be required for any surface water discharges from the site into any watercourse.	Noted.

**Table 7.19 Feedback received from Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board – both Orange and Purple Route Corridors**

Feedback	NGVL response
Prior written consent will be required from BSIDB for the three points stated in the feedback.	Noted.
All watercourse crossings should be no less than 2 metres plus the NGVL standard safety distance beneath the hard bed level of the watercourse.	Noted.
Where a crossing is under an BSIDB-maintained watercourse, the level of the crossing shall be to Ordnance Data Newlyn (ODN). All works, including post-construction, must not preclude BSIDB or landowners from being able to carry out maintenance or improvements on any watercourse. Post-construction wayleaves, easements or any other restrictions present a serious concern for the BSIDB.	Noted.
The BSIDB will not accept any restrictions to its normal working practices. Including, weeding and bank cutting, improvements such as deepening and widening of watercourses, construction works such as sheet piling and installation of culverts.	Noted. NGVL will remain in dialogue with BSIDB.
Existing landowners underground field drainage systems need to be considered to ensure these are not affected by the cable. New or altered outfalls may require BSIDB consent if unavoidable.	NGVL will assess potential impacts of the Project on agricultural land drainage. Surveying, mitigation, construction and post construction design will be undertaken by a specialist team.

**Table 7.20 Feedback received from Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board – Purple Route Corridors**

Feedback	NGVL response
Preference for Cable Routeing to the western corridor at the southern end of the cable route corridor as this would involve fewer water course crossings.	Noted.

**7.13 Witham Fourth Internal Drainage Board**

7.13.1 The following comments have been received from Witham Fourth Internal Drainage Board (WFIDB) and are summarised in Table 7.21 below; on the general comments for both Orange and Purple Route Corridors.

<b>Table 7.21 Feedback received from Witham Fourth Internal Drainage Board – both Orange and Purple Route Corridors</b>	
<b>Feedback</b>	<b>NGVL response</b>
The Purple Route Corridor is WFIDB’s preferred option as it has the least impact on WFIDB’s maintained watercourses. This route reduces impact on; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Flood risk</li> <li>- Drainage</li> <li>- Watercourse ecology</li> </ul>	Noted.
Land Drainage or Byelaw consent will be required for any works in, under, over or within 9m of a watercourse.	Noted.
Cables should be buried at a depth that avoids disruption to agricultural drainage systems and at least 2metres below the hard bed of all watercourses or other level to WFIDB’s approval plus NGVLs safe working clearance.	Noted.
The works must not restrict the Boards or landowners ability to maintain or improve watercourses during or after the completion of the Project.	Noted.
WFIDB owns land in connection with some watercourses and will be seeking land owner compensation.	We aim to work with the landowners to minimise disruption to farm operations where possible. NGVL will propose a range of compensation payments in recognition of any potential land damage and disturbances that may be caused.
Temporary compounds, haul roads and other construction phase work sites as well as permanent structures, should be at least 9m from any WFIDB maintained watercourse.	Noted.

**Table 7.21 Feedback received from Witham Fourth Internal Drainage Board – both Orange and Purple Route Corridors**

Feedback	NGVL response
Advise to liaise with WFIDB over the life of the Project.	NGVL will remain in dialogue with WFIDB on announcement of a preferred route corridor.

## 7.14 The National Farmers Union

7.14.1 The following comments have been received from the National Farmers Union and are summarised in Table 7.22 below; table on general comments for both cable route corridors.

**Table 7.22 Feedback received from the National Farmers Union – general comments**

Feedback	NGVL response
Chapter 7 (UK Onshore Scheme; Scoping Report) deals with agriculture and soils. We feel that this chapter is somewhat light on two issues, namely drainage and biosecurity.	NGVL are aware of the importance of land drainage to landowners and tenants. Once the preferred cable route corridor has been identified, work will be carried out to identify a detailed alignment for the cable within that corridor. Land drainage surveys will take place along the proposed route working closely with land owners, land drainage design for construction and post construction phases will then be prepared. NGVL will ensure all land drains that are disturbed during the installation of the cable will be returned to pre development state.
A land drainage expert should be employed who knows the land drainage systems in the area to communicate with landowners and tenants about mitigation works.	NGVL will assess potential impacts of the Project on agricultural land drainage. Surveying, mitigation, construction and post construction design will be undertaken by a specialist team.
The lower the cable in the ground, the less intrusion there should be with land drainage systems and farming operations.	Once the preferred cable route corridor is decided, NGVL will conduct surveys along the route to inform cable depth installation, taking into account all aspects of drainage.

**Table 7.22 Feedback received from the National Farmers Union – general comments**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p>Biosecurity measures are not addressed in the document and we would urge that proper, effective biosecurity measures are undertaken by all contractors on agricultural land during the lifetime of the Project to ensure plant and animal diseases are not spread along the cable route corridor by construction and other staff working on or visiting farms.</p>	<p>NGVL recognise biosecurity as an important factor during the construction phase. The Agricultural Liaison Officer will communicate with landowners and tenants to identify areas of known high risk, and allow for suitable mitigation to be carried out. The use of Best Management Practice (BMP) in line with those already in place on individual farms, where appropriate, will minimise the risk of pathogen transfer. The preparation of a Soil Management Plan (SMP) within the Construction Environmental Management Plan will provide details on how soil will be protected during the construction period and how land will be restored following construction in accordance with Code of Construction Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Site with particular reference to any temporary working areas which are to be restored to agricultural use.</p>

**7.15 The National Trust**

7.15.1 The following comments have been received from The National Trust and are summarised in the tables below; one for the Orange Route Corridor, one for the Purple Route Corridor and the final table on general comments.

**Table 7.23 Feedback received from The National Trust – Orange Route Corridor**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p>The western leg of the Orange Route Corridor appears to pass through an area of the Wolds AONB, Paragraph 115 and 116 of the NPPF would therefore apply to this section of the route.</p>	<p>NGVL note the National Policy tests in the NPPF, and in particular paragraphs 115 and 116, should a route through the AONB be pursued. These will be considered in full in the Planning Statement submitted with any applications should the Purple Route Corridor be taken forward.</p>

**Table 7.23 Feedback received from The National Trust – Orange Route Corridor**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p>A section of the eastern leg of the Orange Route Corridor passes through National Trust land at Gunby Estate. While the National Trust has the power to grant an easement over inalienable land, the Trust cannot part with possession of the surface of the land. Nor would an easement be granted if the associated impacts were not acceptable.</p>	<p>NGVL will continue to engage with the National Trust regarding an easement if this route is taken forward- and notes NT's position in respect of inalienable land.</p>
<p>The eastern leg includes a significant area of National Trust land between Burgh-le-Marsh and Bratoft. Were the route (and associated easements) to pass through this area it would need to consider and avoid or minimise impacts on the 9 listed factors stated in the response. (includes impacts on landscape, heritage, ecology, transport, drainage and local communities)</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Impacts on access to the Monksthorpe Chapel should be minimised and to ensure that the historic approach to the property along the lane from the west is restored and maintained for the future.</p>	<p>Noted. A Construction Management Plan will be provided with any submissions.</p>

**Table 7.24 Feedback received from The National Trust – Purple Route Corridor**

Feedback	NGVL response
<p>As the Purple Route Corridor routes through the AONB, Paragraph 115 of the NPPF would need to be met, requiring that great weight is given to conservation of landscape and scenic beauty. Conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage will also be an important consideration. The 'exceptional circumstances test' in paragraph 116 of the NPPF would also therefore need to be met</p>	<p>NGVL are aware of the National Policy tests should a route through the AONB be pursued. These will be considered in full in the Planning Statement submitted with any application should the Purple Route Corridor be taken forward. Impacts on landscape, ecology and cultural heritage will be assessed in the Environmental Statement.</p>

**Table 7.25 Feedback received from The National Trust – general comments**

Feedback	NGVL response
----------	---------------



**Table 7.25 Feedback received from The National Trust – general comments**

Feedback	NGVL response
National Trust advises NGVL to consider (amongst other things) – Landscape impact – Heritage impact – Ecological impact – Transport impact – Impacts on local communities – Impacts on drainage	Noted
National and Local Planning Policies should also be taken into account.	NGVL acknowledge the requirements of Planning Policy at National and Local level.
Concern regarding impact of construction on the heritage assets, visitor operation and tenanted areas at Gunby arising as a result of noise, dust and road closure etc.	Noted. A Construction Management Plan will be provided with any submissions.
Concern over the size of works areas and associated easements and will need to be clarified as detailed routeing is developed. The location and timing of works at particular locations will also need to be clarified.	NGVL can confirm that the typical working width for the DC cable is up to 30m wide and the easement will be up to 15m wide. A construction programme will be provided with any planning submission.
Archaeology evaluation should inform the final course of the route. Site supervision and recording should also be carried out during construction.	An archaeological assessment will be carried out which will inform the detailed alignment of the cables within the preferred route corridor.
Assessment of impact on the setting of heritage assets will require a more nuanced approach than application of 50m buffers.	Noted. Assessment, techniques and scope on the preferred route corridor will be discussed with the county archaeologist and Historic England.
Disruption to farming practices including any loss of income to landowners and tenants should be carefully considered.	Where appropriate, our land agents will be contacting landowners and tenants to discuss a potential route alignment through their land and to gather information about farm accesses, land drainage, farm practices etc. that might influence the route alignment. We aim to work with the landowners and tenants to minimise disruption to farm operations where possible.



## CONTACT US

---



You can find out more information by:



calling our freephone number:  
**0800 731 0561**



Sending an email to:  
**vikinglink@communityrelations.co.uk**



Writing to our freepost address at:  
**FREEPOST VIKING LINK**



Visiting our website at:  
**www.viking-link.com**

If you, or someone you know, would like information in Braille, audio, large print or another language, please call us on the freephone number above.