VikingLink

nationalgrid

UK Onshore Scheme

Phase 1 Consultation
Feedback Report Volume 2

VKL-08-06-G500-003

August 2016

Co-financed by the European Union
Connecting Europe Facility

Contents

List of Tables

6 Feedback on Landfall Sites

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 In April and May 2016 NGVL consulted publically on three shortlisted landfall sites, taking into account impacts on the environment and the local community as well as technical and engineering feasibility. The locations of these landfalls are outlined in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report[1].

6.1.2 A total of three landfall consultation events were held which were attended by a total of 215 people. NGVL received 45 pieces of feedback from the local community on the shortlisted landfall site options.

6.1.3 A review of all the feedback received in response to Phase 1 Consultation has taken place and this section highlights the key themes and site specific issues that were raised during the landfall consultation from the local community.

6.1.4 Further details on the ways in which the representations received from the local community during Phase 1 Consultation have influenced the decisions leading to NGVL selecting a preferred landfall site are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Preferred Sites Report (EBD-VIK-ONS-DOC-0004).

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 questions asked by NGVL through the Landfall Consultation feedback form (Appendix 8). Feedback has therefore been summarised under the following headings:

- Feedback received in relation to LF1;
- Feedback received in relation to LF1A;
- Feedback received in relation to LF2;
- General landfall feedback;
- Landfall impacts and mitigation;
- Comments on the converter station (from attendees at the landfall consultation events);
- Feedback from the landfall consultation events; and
- Any other comments received in relation to the landfalls.

[1] UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report available from http://www.viking-link.com/documents/

6.3 Landfall Feedback Summary

LF1

6.3.1 A total of 36 people provided comments in response to Questions 6 and 7 which sought feedback on landfall site LF1.

- Question 6 read "*Based on the information provided on the exhibition panel, do you have any comments on the proposed use of LF1 as a landfall point?*"; and
- Question 7 read "*Do you have any other comments about the site option LF1 that you feel we should take into consideration?*"

6.3.2 The key themes raised in relation to both Questions 6 and 7 and LF1 as an option are summarised below:

Table 6.1 Feedback in relation to Landfall Site LF1 (Questions 6 and 7)

Feedback	NGVL response
Traffic and Transport Local residents have raised a number of concerns in relation to traffic and transport. These include the potential increase in traffic, particularly during construction and the disruption that this could cause to residents and visitors, particularly during the peak summer season. Residents raised concerns over highway safety and the capacity of highway infrastructure to accommodate the development. Residents also have concerns for the potential impacts to Public Rights of Way and Cycle Routes.	NGVL is working closely with Lincolnshire County Council as the highway authority for this area to establish the key highway constraints and will continue dialogue to ensure access to the preferred site can operate safely. The UK Onshore Scheme will result in an increase in traffic for a temporary period during construction. NGVL will produce a Traffic Management Plan which will be agreed with Lincolnshire County Council and the local planning authority to ensure the temporary impacts of construction traffic do not adversely impact on the local road network, particularly during the peak summer season. Where possible, NGVL will try to minimise any disruption to Public Rights of Way and Cycle Routes, however, some temporary impacts are likely to be inevitable.

Table 6.1 Feedback in relation to Landfall Site LF1 (Questions 6 and 7)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Socio-Economic and Tourism Impacts A key concern of the local community relates to the potential impact on tourism. This is with reference to the Lincolnshire Coastal Country Park and Huttoft Car Terrance, which during the summer season is used by a significant amount of visitors.	Tourism is an important consideration and a key source of employment in this part of Lincolnshire. NGVL will take into consideration the tourist season in planning construction works, which will be secured through a Construction Environmental Management Plan agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority. Effects on tourism will be temporary during construction of the UK Onshore Scheme and the timing of works will take into consideration socio-economic impacts. During operation, the scheme is not considered to have a significant effect on tourism.
Ecology / Biodiversity Impacts Residents have concerns for adverse impacts on local wildlife and the submerged ancient forest that can be seen at low tide.	All effects on ecological features will be identified, assessed and mitigated where necessary to ensure no significant effects. Few ecological constraints have been identified following initial surveys, however the feedback received in relation to the potential presence of protected species will be carefully considered. Impacts on the submerged forest off the Lincolnshire Coast will also be considered.
Coordination with other Projects A number of respondents favoured LF1 because of the direct access to the A52 via Sea Lane and because fewer properties would be affected. It was felt that locating the landfall at this site would spread any disruption across the community from Viking Link and Triton Knoll.	NGVL will work to minimise the cumulative effects of the two projects as far as practicable.
Sea Defences Concerns have been raised in relation to breaching / damaging the existing sea defence wall and groynes and the impact this could have on flood risk.	The predominant sea defence at the Lincolnshire coast comprises a flood defence wall. There is some uncertainty with regards to the depth of that structure. NGVL will undertake further assessment of the sea defences once a preferred landfall has been selected to ensure the integrity of the flood defences are not affected during cable installation.

Table 6.1 Feedback in relation to Landfall Site LF1 (Questions 6 and 7)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Construction Impacts It was felt that the works could have a negative impact on the amenity of residents during the construction period, with a particular focus on noise and vibration.	NGVL and their contractors will aim to minimise disturbance to local residents during the construction process through the careful programming of potentially disturbing operations and careful planning of traffic routes and traffic movements. NGVL will look to mitigate noise and vibration during construction in accordance with the recommendations and findings in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

LF1A

6.3.3 A total of 35 people provided comments in response to Questions 10 and 11 which sought feedback on landfall site LF1A.

- Question 10 states "*Based on the information provided on the exhibition panel, do you have any comments on the proposed use of LF1A as a landing point?"*; and
- Question 11 states "*Do you have any other comments about the site option LF1A that you feel we should take into consideration*?"

6.3.4 Key themes raised in relation to both Questions 10 and 11 and LF1A as an option and not already addressed in Table 6.1 above are summarised below:

Table 6.2 Feedback in relation to Landfall Site LF1A (Questions 10 and 11)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Traffic and Transport Local residents raised a number of concerns in relation to traffic and transport. These included the potential increase in traffic, particularly during construction and the disruption that this could cause to residents and visitors in the area, particularly during the peak summer season. A number of responses to LF1A placed an emphasis on using Sea Road for access from the A52 above other options. Other areas of concern include highway safety, poor visibility along some of the local roads and the inability and inadequacy of the local road network to accommodate the	NGVL is working closely with Lincolnshire County Council as the highway authority for this area to establish the key highway constraints and will continue dialogue to ensure access to the preferred landfall site can operate safely. The UK Onshore Scheme will result in an increase in traffic for a temporary period during construction. However, NGVL will produce a Traffic Management Plan which will be agreed with Lincolnshire County Council and the relevant local planning authority to ensure the temporary impacts of construction traffic do not adversely impact on the local road network, particularly during the peak summer season.

Table 6.2 Feedback in relation to Landfall Site LF1A (Questions 10 and 11)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
development of the UK Onshore Scheme. In addition, residents noted a number of Public Rights of Way and Cycle Routes which could be affected by the proposed works.	NGVL will work with the Local Highways Authority in respect of any project impact to the local road network or consider a dedicated haul road depending on the site to be taken forward. Such arrangements will be agreed with Lincolnshire County Council and the local planning authority. Where possible, NGVL will try to minimise any disruption to Public Rights of Way and Cycle Routes, however, some temporary impacts are likely to be inevitable.
Coordination with other projects Residents have queried the extent to which dialogue has taken place with Triton Knoll. A number of residents are unclear as to why the project could not be aligned with this project in a bid to minimise disruption.	NGVL has been in dialogue with Triton Knoll. Triton Knoll is a separate project and has progressed further along the consenting process. It is to be consented under a different planning regime (Development Consent Order under the Planning Act 2008) and their consent application does not include for the Viking Link requirements. Viking Link will be consented under the local planning process. Viking Link and Triton Knoll are using two different technologies which are not compatible. There are also practical considerations which need to be taken into account including the timing and programme of the two projects, contract management, traffic management and the land that would be required to accommodate both projects together.
Construction Impacts The community are concerned that construction works could have a negative impact on the amenity of residents during the construction period, with a particular focus on noise and vibration. Concern is also raised in respect of physical damage to property and the liability associated with this.	A Construction Management Plan will be developed which will set out how construction works will be undertaken and managed to address concerns of noise and vibration. It is not envisaged that the UK Onshore Scheme will result in any physical damage to private property during construction or operation. In the unlikely event that such an issue arises and where liable, NGVL will work with the landowner concerned to resolve the matter.
Cable Routeing	Comments noted. The location of shortlisted landfall sites does not have a direct bearing on

Table 6.2 Feedback in relation to Landfall Site LF1A (Questions 10 and 11)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
If LF1A is taken forward residents are concerned that this is more likely to result in an onshore cable route towards the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the settlement of Alford.	the cable route between the two terminal points. A separate consultation on cable routes between the preferred landfall site and converter station site will be held in September 2016.

LF2

6.3.5 A total of 31 people provided comments in response to Questions 8 and 9 which sought feedback on landfall site LF2.

- Question 8 reads "*Based on the information provided on the exhibition panel, do you have any comments on the proposed use of LF2 as a landfall point?*"; and
- Question 9 reads *"Do you have any other comments about the site option LF2 that you feel we should take into consideration?*"

6.3.6 The key themes raised in relation to both Questions 8 and 9 and LF2 as an option and not already addressed in Table 6.1 above are summarised below:

Table 6.3 Feedback in relation to Landfall Site LF2 (Questions 8 and 9)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Traffic and Transport A key concern of the local community relates to the increase in traffic and the capacity of the local road network to cope with this. Residents are also concerned with the effect of vibration from HGV's on houses along the road. The local community are also concerned about the state and capacity of Roman Road to take heavy machinery and plant.	The UK Onshore Scheme will result in an increase in traffic for a temporary period during the construction works. NGVL will produce a Traffic Management Plan (which will be agreed with Lincolnshire County Council as the highways authority) to ensure the temporary impacts of construction traffic do not adversely impact on the local road network. NGVL will work with the Local Highways Authority in respect of any project impact to the local road network or consider a dedicated haul road depending on the site to be taken forward. Such arrangements will be agreed with Lincolnshire County Council and the local planning authority and are required to mitigate impacts on the local community.
Noise and Vibration Residents are keen to understand the noise impacts at this location and how this would be mitigated.	A Construction Management Plan will be developed which will set out how construction works will be undertaken and managed to address concerns of noise and vibration.

Table 6.3 Feedback in relation to Landfall Site LF2 (Questions 8 and 9)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Socio-economic and Tourism A number of residents note that there are no sea defences at this site and that there are less beach users to be impacted by the development. A number or people also consider LF2 to have potentially fewer impacts on residential properties as this area is less populated than some of the other landfall options. However, other members of the community are of the opinion that works would cause disruption to users of the golf course, dog walkers and result in negative impacts on tourism. Residents also queried whether or not works could be timed to have less of an impact on the tourist season.	NGVL understand the importance of tourism and the part it plays in the local economy. NGVL will take into consideration the tourist season in planning construction works, which will be secured through a Construction Environmental Management Plan agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority. Effects on tourism will be temporary during construction of the UK Onshore Scheme. NGVL will seek to minimise any disruption to people using facilities in the surrounding area and will consider this also through a Construction Environmental Management Plan.
Hydrology and Land Drainage In relation to technical feasibility, the local community highlighted a number of drains in the vicinity of LF2.	Drainage is a key consideration in the site selection process and development of the UK Onshore Scheme. The impacts on drainage will be considered in consultation with the Environment Agency and the appropriate Internal Drainage Boards.
Archaeology and Cultural Heritage The local community state that archaeological and heritage orientated considerations should be accounted for at LF2.	The impact on archaeology and cultural heritage will be carefully considered as the UK Onshore Scheme develops. NGVL are proactively engaged with Historic England and Lincolnshire County Council to identify, assess and evaluate sources of known archaeology and cultural heritage. These features will be considered further in the Environmental Statement.
Project Funding Residents have sought clarity as to how Viking Link is being funded.	The development and construction of Viking Link is a jointly funded project by National Grid and Energinet.dk.

Table 6.3 Feedback in relation to Landfall Site LF2 (Questions 8 and 9)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Coordination with other projects Residents have queried the extent to which dialogue has taken place with Triton Knoll. A number of residents are unclear as to why the project could not be aligned with this project in a bid to minimise disruption.	NGVL has been in dialogue with Triton Knoll. Triton Knoll is a separate project and has progressed further along the consenting process. It is to be consented under a different planning regime (Development Consent Order under the Planning Act 2008) and their consent application does not include for Viking Link. Viking Link will be consented under the local planning process. Viking Link and Triton Knoll are using two different technologies which are not compatible. There are also practical considerations which need to be taken into account including the timing and programme of the two projects, contract management, traffic management and the land that would be required to accommodate both projects together. NGVL will work to minimise the cumulative effects of the two projects as far as practicable.
Sea Defences The local community note that there are no sea defences at LF2, which could be seen as positive, however, a number of residents have similarly raised concerns that this would need to be looked at as part of the UK Onshore Scheme.	The predominant sea defence at the Lincolnshire Coast comprises a flood defence wall. There is some uncertainty with regards to the depth of that structure. NGVL will undertake further assessments of the sea defences once a chosen landfall has been selected to ensure the integrity of the flood defences are not affected during cable installation.
Property Value and Compensation The local community have raised questions regarding the impact on property prices and compensation to traders.	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 the value of a property not material planning considerations. Land Agents have been engaged by NGVL to work with affected landowners.

General Landfall Feedback

6.3.7 A total of 25 people provided general comments in relation to all shortlisted landfall options. The key themes are summarised below:

Table 6.4 General Landfall feedback	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Socio-economic and Tourism Local residents are concerned about the potential impact on Huttoft Car Terrance, which during the summer season can be very busy. Consultation feedback indicates that residents are concerned that there will be negative impacts to users of the beach and those enjoying the waters at this location.	NGVL will take into consideration the tourist season in planning construction works, which will be secured through a Construction Environmental Management Plan agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority. Effects on tourism will be temporary during construction of the UK Onshore Scheme and the timing of works will take into consideration socio-economic impacts. During operation, the scheme is not considered to have a significant effect on tourism. NGVL will seek to minimise any disruption to people using facilities in the surrounding area and will consider this also through a Construction Environmental Management Plan.
Project Need Residents are unsure why projects like Viking Link are required.	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 http://www.viking-link.com/
Project Funding Residents would like to understand the cost benefit analysis of securing alternative sources of supply.	National Grid and its partner, Energinet.dk, believe there is a strong business case for Viking Link. The project, which will be jointly funded by National Grid and Energinet.dk, has demonstrated to the electricity regulator, Ofgem, that the benefits to consumers in Great Britain and producers are sufficiently strong to warrant the granting of a Cap & Floor regulatory treatment to the project. Ofgem will be scrutinizing the costs and benefits for consumers in Great Britain as part of its ongoing regulatory oversight of the project.

Table 6.4 General Landfall feedback	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Project Development and Site Selection Residents are unsure why the project needs to be located in Lincolnshire and the process of site selection leading up to Phase 1 Consultation.	A number of different options were considered along the east of England. Bicker Fen 400 kV substation was identified as the most appropriate connection point to the electricity transmission system. Details of all the options identified and the assessments are included in a Connection Point Selection Report provided by NGET and a Strategic Options Report produced by NGVL. NGVL have carried out a comprehensive site selection process to identify a shortlist of site options for a converter station and a landfall point. This involved technical and feasibility studies as well as engagement with statutory consultees, local authorities, parish councils and local residents. The full details of the converter station and landfall siting assessment are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report (April 2016).
Coordination with other Projects Residents have queried why a joint venture with Triton Knoll is not possible.	NGVL has been in dialogue with Triton Knoll. Triton Knoll is a separate project and has progressed further along the consenting process. It is to be consented under a different planning regime (Development Consent Order) and their consent application does not include for Viking Link. Viking Link will be consented under the local planning process. Viking Link and Triton Knoll are using two different technologies which are not compatible. There are also practical considerations which need to be taken into account including the timing and programme of the two projects, contract management, traffic management and the land that would be required to accommodate both projects together.
Construction Impact Residents also have concerns that certain areas are being discounted from site selection as residents in those areas are perhaps more vocal than those which are less populated.	All feedback received from Phase 1 Consultation will be considered by NGVL and will feed into the selection of a preferred landfall and converter station site. The assessment of responses is based on the nature of the feedback rather than the quantity of feedback.

Landfall Impacts and Mitigation

6.3.8 A total of 34 people provided feedback in relation to the potential impacts and mitigation for all shortlisted landfall sites. This specifically concerned Questions 4 and 5 of the landfall feedback form.

- Question 4 states "*Based on the information provided at the public information event and the information on our project website, www.viking-link.com, do you have any comments on the following: The potential impacts, environmental or otherwise, of the project?*"

6.3.9 The key themes from Question 4 are summarised below:

Table 6.5 Landfall Impacts (Question 4)

Feedback	NGVL response
Traffic and Transport Local residents raised a number of concerns in relation to traffic and transport. These include the potential increase in traffic, particularly during construction, and the disruption and added congestion that this could cause in the area, particularly during the peak summer season. A number of residents raised concerns regarding the existing condition of the local road network and that this was unsuitable for construction vehicles. Other areas of concern include highway safety, including poor visibility along some of the local roads, and that a variety of people use the local roads including walkers, horse riders cars and farm vehicles. Sea Road in particular has been singled out as a road which should not be used.	The feedback received in relation to the local highway network in terms of its use, capacity and safe operation is important to the project. NGVL is working closely with Lincolnshire County Council as the highway authority for this area to establish the key highway constraints and will continue dialogue to ensure access to the preferred site can operate safely. The UK Onshore Scheme will result in an increase in traffic for a temporary period during construction. NGVL will produce a Traffic Management Plan (which will be agreed with Lincolnshire County Council as highway authority) to ensure the temporary impacts of construction traffic do not adversely impact on the local road network particularly during the peak summer season.
Impact on Agricultural Land Residents have raised concerns regarding the impact on agricultural land and that the project could put at risk crop production in Lincolnshire.	Agricultural land affected at the landfall will be appropriately reinstated following construction. NGVL and their contractors will aim to minimise disturbance to agricultural land and practices through liaison with affected landowners and careful programming of installation works.

Table 6.5 Landfall Impacts (Question 4)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Socio-economic and Tourism A key concern of the local community relates to the potential socio-economic impacts in the area. This is with reference to visitors and residents using a variety of features including the Lincolnshire Coastal Country Park and Sandilands Golf Club. Feedback also indicates that residents are concerned that there will be negative impacts on local businesses and disruption during construction in an otherwise quiet area.	NGVL will take into consideration the tourist season in planning construction works, which will be secured through a Construction Environmental Management Plan agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority. Effects on tourism will be temporary during construction of the UK Onshore Scheme and the timing of works will take into consideration socio-economic impacts. During operation, the scheme is not considered to have a significant effect on tourism. NGVL will seek to minimise any disruption to people using facilities in the surrounding area and will consider this also through a Construction Environmental Management Plan.
Coordination with other Projects Concern has also been shown for how the project will affect the Lincshore Scheme running along the Lincolnshire Coast.	NGVL is aware of the Lincshore beach re-nourishment scheme which is currently in operation and this is referred to in the Site Selection Report. NGVL are proposing the use of trenchless cable installation techniques and the works will be designed to not impact on the Lincshore scheme if it is still in operation at the time of the cable installation works.
Project Security Residents have raised security concerns because it will be located in a rural area. Residents feel that it will be challenging to manage/monitor security given the remoteness of the scheme.	NGVL will take necessary steps to ensure the project is secure. The majority of the UK Onshore Scheme will result in a buried cable, which once installed and the land reinstated, will be very difficult to identify.

- Question 5 reads "*Based on the information provided at the public information event and the information on our project website, www.viking-link.com, do you have any comments on the following: Are there any additional measures you think we could take to further mitigate these impacts?*"

6.3.10 The key themes from Question 5 that have not already been addressed are summarised below:

Table 6.6 Landfall Mitigation (Question 5)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Traffic and Transport Residents would like to see grass verges and road surfaces made good after the project and in some instances, roads improved or new haul roads built to facilitate access.	NGVL will look to make improvements to the local road network or consider a haul road depending on the site to be taken forward. Such arrangements will be agreed with Lincolnshire County Council as the local highway authority.
Sea Defences Residents would like assurances that sea defences will not be affected by the UK Onshore scheme and have suggested that cables could be transported via boats from the sea.	The predominant sea defence at the Lincolnshire Coast comprises a flood defence wall. There is some uncertainty with regards to the depth of that structure. NGVL will undertake further assessment of the sea defences once a preferred landfall has been selected to ensure the integrity of the flood defences are not affected during cable installation. A transition joint pit will be required at the landfall to join the Onshore and Offshore cables. This will necessitate cables being transported by a variety of means.
Construction Impact Residents have suggested that working hours should be restricted and that noise should be regularly monitored. Residents would also like to be kept up-to-date as the project develops.	NGVL will also prepare and implement a Construction Environmental Management Plan and a Traffic Management Plan which will be agreed with the relevant consenting bodies. Residents who have registered an interest during Phase 1 Consultation will be kept abreast of developments as the UK Onshore Scheme progresses. Dialogue will also continue with key stakeholders including local authorities and Parish Councils.

Comments on the Converter Station

6.3.11 A total of 18 people who attended the consultation events at the landfall, provided comments in relation to the shortlisted converter station site options. This was covered by Question 12 of the landfall feedback form.

- Question 12 reads "*Based on the information provided on the exhibition panel, is there anything you would like us to take into consideration when identifying a preferred converter station site?*"

6.3.12 The key themes from Question 12 are summarised below:

Table 6.7 Comments on the Converter Station (Question12)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
General Comments The majority of residents attending the Landfall Consultation events chose not to comment on the converter station, citing a lack of local knowledge for the converter station options and noting the distance from the Lincolnshire Coast.	Noted
Project Development and Site Selection Some residents sought assurances that the converter station would not be located at the coast and that it would be underground. Residents also thought that wider consideration should be had to alternative siting options and that a landfall should be selected before a converter station site.	There will be no above ground installations at the landfall. The converter station will be sited within a 5km radius of Bicker Fen 400 kV substation. In terms of site selection, NGVL have carried out a comprehensive site selection process to identify a shortlist of site options for a converter station and a landfall point. This involved technical and feasibility studies as well as engagement with statutory Consultees, local authorities, parish councils and local residents. The full details of the converter station and landfall siting assessment are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report (April 2016). The preferred converter station and landfall site will be selected following an assessment of the feedback received in relation to Phase 1 consultation, together with technical, environmental and engineering factors.

Feedback from the Landfall Consultation Events

6.3.13 The following tables provide an overview of the consultation events held at the Landfall. A total of 41 people provided comments which relate to Questions 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 of the landfall feedback form.

- Question 14 reads "*What was your main reason for attending the public information event?*"

6.3.14 The key themes for Question 14 are summarised in the table below:

Table 6.8 Feedback from the consultation events at the Landfall (Question 14)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Communication / Consultation Approach A number of residents attended the consultation events to gain further information on various aspects of the project which were important to them and to make a judgement as to how they could be affected. Some residents use facilities in proximity of the landfalls for recreational purposes which could be affected, such as the golf course or coastal walking routes. Other residents attended events to voice their concerns / objections to the project or seek specific information on certain issues such as road usage or energy policy. One resident attended the event to find out more about the proposed cable route.	The reasons for attendance at the landfall consultation events were varied and have been noted for Phase 2 Consultation.

- Question 15 states "*Do you feel this consultation event has provided you with all the information you needed?*"

The key figures for Question 15 are summarised in the table below:

Table 6.9 Feedback from the consultation events at the Landfall (Question 15)	
Feedback	**Numbers of Respondents**
Yes	20
No	18
No Comment	3

- Question 16 states "*If no, please let us know what additional information we could have provided?*"

6.3.15 The key themes for Question 16 that have not already been addressed previously are summarised in the table below:

Table 6.10 Feedback from the consultation events at the Landfall (Question 16)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Noise and Vibration Some residents would have liked more detailed information on noise mitigation.	Noise impacts at the landfall will be temporary during construction. Noise will be considered as part of the Environmental Statement and detailed noise assessments will be undertaken as part of that process. Once this information has been compiled, appropriate mitigation measures will be agreed with the relevant local planning authority and will be conditioned with any consent.
Communication / Consultation Approach Some residents would have preferred to see more information at the consultation events, including more detail on the proposed cable route and the timescales involved.	NGVL acknowledge that different people require varied levels of information, which is why the event boards provided the key points emanating from the site selection process and more detailed documents were available if required. NGVL are confident that the level and range of information provided at each event was sufficient to gain meaningful feedback from the community during Phase 1 consultation. Further information on the cable route(s) will be presented at Phase 2 Consultation, together with more detailed design options for the converter station.
Project Development and Site Selection Some residents would have liked greater certainty rather than potential options. Other residents would have liked to have felt more transparency rather than a feeling that decisions had already been taken and more detailed answers to the questions they asked.	NGVL have carried out a comprehensive site selection process to identify a shortlist of site options for a converter station and a landfall point. This involved technical and feasibility studies as well as engagement with statutory Consultees, local authorities, parish councils and local residents. The full details of the converter station and landfall siting assessment are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report (April 2016). At the time of consultation, no decisions had been taken on the shortlisted landfall and converter station sites. All feedback received from Phase 1 Consultation will be considered by NGVL and will feed into the selection of a preferred landfall and converter station site.

- Question 17 reads "*Do you have any other comments about this consultation event?*"

6.3.16 The key themes for Question 17 are summarised in the table below:

Table 6.11 Feedback from the consultation events at the Landfall (Question 17)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Communication / Consultation Approach Residents felt there were enough people on hand to discuss the project and that staff were professional, knowledgeable, friendly and informative. Residents also felt that the event was accessible and well laid-out. Some residents felt that the consultation had not alleviated their concerns Some residents felt that more people from Sutton-on-Sea should have been given the opportunity to attend the event and that in some instances letters were not received.	NGVL representatives (covering a range of technical specialisms) were on hand at all consultation events to answer questions and engage with the community. NGVL is committed to community and stakeholder engagement. NGVL would encourage anyone with unanswered questions to contact the Project Team for further information. The extent of public consultation and advertisement was carefully considered and agreed with the relevant local planning authorities. NGVL consider the scope and extent of public consultation to be proportionate to the scale of the project and the matters considered at Phase 1 Consultation.
Project Need Some residents felt that the project is not required; bringing only limited benefits to the UK.	The benefits of the project and interconnection in general are set out in the Site Selection Report.

- Question 18 reads "*Do you have any other comments about the Viking Link project?*"

6.3.17 The key themes for Question 18 are summarised in the table below:

Table 6.12 Feedback from the consultation events at the Landfall (Question 18)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Communication / Consultation Approach Some residents felt that consultation was futile and that decisions on the project have already been made. Some residents would like to be kept informed as the project develops.	At the time of consultation, no decisions had been taken on the shortlisted landfall and converter station sites. All feedback received from Phase 1 Consultation will be considered by NGVL and will feed into the selection of a preferred landfall and converter station site. Residents who have registered during Phase 1 Consultation will be kept abreast as the project progresses.

Table 6.12 Feedback from the consultation events at the Landfall (Question 18)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Project Need Some residents feel strongly that electricity used in the UK should be produced in the UK and should not be imported. Residents also question how often the UK is likely to trade electricity.	Comments noted regarding home production of electricity. Government Policy acknowledges that interconnectors will play a vital role in the UK's energy mix. National Grid already operates two electricity interconnectors connecting to France and the Netherlands respectively. Electricity is traded over these interconnectors on a half hour by half hour basis playing an important role in meeting Great Britain's electricity requirements every day of the year.
Project Benefits Some residents feel that there will be no benefit to the local community and that benefits of the scheme would only be commercial.	Electricity interconnection enables countries to import power when there is a shortfall and export when they are generating surplus electricity. It also provides another source of power for British homes and businesses, helping us to meet our need for electricity. Interconnectors give us access to cheaper power from other countries, reducing wholesale electricity prices and they can assist in the move towards lower carbon energy electricity supply.
Project Development and Site Selection Residents feel that the project is unnecessary to a rural area when other industrialised options exist. Some residents had no issue with the principle of the project, but felt further information should be provided around the construction period and that safety should be considered for local residents and their properties.	NGVL have carried out a comprehensive site selection process to identify a shortlist of site options for a converter station and a landfall point. This involved technical and feasibility studies as well as engagement with statutory Consultees, local authorities, parish councils and local residents. The full details of the converter station and landfall siting assessment are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report (April 2016). NGVL takes safety extremely seriously and will ensure full compliance with the relevant health and safety regulations during construction.

Table 6.12 Feedback from the consultation events at the Landfall (Question 18)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Property Value and Compensation Residents are concerned over the lack of certainty as to whether or not their land will be affected by the project and have queried whether or not compulsory purchase could be used.	NGVL Land Agents have already begun to speak to landowners in respect of shortlisted landfall and converter station sites. Further environmental, technical and engineering work is required before landowners are contacted in respect of the cable route option(s). This will be formally consulted on in September 2016. NGVL is licenced under the Electricity Act and has the benefit of compulsory acquisition powers. A Compulsory Purchase Order will be sought to acquire rights to install the cables over the cable route from Landfall to Converter Station however NGVL will seek to enter into voluntary negotiated land agreements.
Cable Routeing Some residents would prefer the cable route to remain under the sea to Killingholme rather than connecting at Bicker. Positive feedback was received that the UK Onshore scheme will result in buried cables rather than the use of overhead lines.	A number of different options were considered along the east of England including connecting at Killingholme. Bicker Fen 400 kV substation was identified as the most appropriate connection point to the electricity transmission system. Details of all the options identified and the assessments are included in a Connection Point Selection Report provided by NGET and a Strategic Options Report produced by NGVL. Cable routing to connect the two terminal points will be consulted on in September 2016.

6.4 Other Comments

Other feedback received in relation to the Landfall

6.4.1 A total of 6 people provided feedback on the shortlisted landfall sites by means other than the landfall consultation feedback form (i.e. by letter or email etc). The key themes that have not already been addressed previously are summarised below:

Table 6.13 Other feedback received in relation to the Landfall	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Socio-economic and Tourism Residents are concerned that the proposed works at the landfall will conflict with other activity in this area, including users of the beach. This is with particular reference to surfers who use the sea all year round at the site of LF1A. It has also been suggested that an artificial reef could be created with excavated material to benefit surfers using the area.	NGVL will take into consideration impacts on people using facilities or features in the area for recreational purposes in planning construction works. This will be secured through a Construction Environmental Management Plan, to be agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority. Effects on these users will be temporary during construction of the UK Onshore Scheme and the timing of works will take into consideration socio-economic impacts. During operation, the scheme is not considered to have a significant effect on leisure activates in the area. NGVL will not be looking to create an artificial reef off the Lincolnshire Coast and the majority of excavated material will be reinstated once cable installation is complete.
Electric and Magnetic Fields Residents would like clarification as to whether or not the cables emit EMF and what the works will entail landwards.	NGVL takes the issue of Electric and Magnetic Fields 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. Cable routing to connect the two terminal points will be consulted on in September 2016.
EU Referendum Residents would like to understand how leaving the European Union affects the project.	The result of the EU Referendum has no bearing on the decision to develop the project.

Table 6.13 Other feedback received in relation to the Landfall	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Sea Defences Some residents feel that the extent of the existing sea defences have been underestimated and that there is significantly more concrete, granite boulders and groynes present than may first appear. Residents note that groynes might not be visible and that they may have been removed by Lincshore, however, there is a real risk that they exist and are buried under sand.	The predominant sea defence at the Lincolnshire Coast comprises a flood defence wall; however there is some uncertainty with regards to the depth of that structure. NGVL will undertake further assessment of the sea defences once a chosen landfall has been selected to ensure the integrity of the flood defences are not affected during cable installation.

7 Feedback on Converter Station sites

7.1 Overview

7.1.1 In April and May 2016 NGVL consulted publically on four shortlisted options for a converter station site, taking into account impacts on the environment and the local community as well as technical and engineering feasibility. The locations of the converter station sites are outlined in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report.

7.1.2 A total of three converter station consultation events were held which were attended by a total of 290 people. NGVL received 578 pieces of feedback from the local community on the shortlisted converter station site options.

7.1.3 A review of all the feedback received in response to Phase 1 Consultation has taken place and this section highlights the key themes and site specific issues that were raised during the converter station consultation from the local community.

7.1.4 Further details on how the representations received from the local community during Phase 1 Consultation have influenced the decisions leading to NGVL selecting a preferred converter station site are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Preferred Sites Report.

7.2 Feedback Structure

7.2.1 Feedback has been summarised and presented in tabular form. This has allowed the key issues raised to be considered in context of the questions asked by NGVL through the Converter Station Consultation feedback form (Appendix 9). Feedback has therefore been summarised under the following headings:

- Feedback received in relation to CS1;
- Feedback received in relation to CS3;
- Feedback received in relation to CS5;
- Feedback received in relation to CS9;
- General converter station feedback;
- Converter station impacts and mitigation;
- Comments on the landfall (from attendees at the converter station consultation events);
- Feedback from the converter station consultation events; and
- Any other comments received in relation to the converter station site options.

7.3 Converter Station Specific

Converter Station site CS1

7.3.1 A total of 51 people provided comments in response to Questions 6 and 7 which sought feedback on converter station site CS1. Questions 6 and 7 read:

- Question 6 states "*Based on the information provided on the exhibition panel, do you have any comments on the use of CS1 as a site for the proposed converter station?*"; and
- Question 7 states "*Do you have any other comments about the site option CS1 that you feel we should take into consideration?*"

7.3.2 The key themes raised in relation to both Questions and converter station site CS1 as an option are summarised below:

Table 7.1 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS1 (Questions 6 and 7)

Feedback	NGVL response
Traffic and Transport Some residents feel that several access options are available for CS1 and that a new haul road would be a good option which could incorporate a cycle route for use by the local community. Other residents were less clear as to how CS1 would be accessed. Residents are keen for site access to avoid local villages and particularly Northorpe in the case of CS1.	NGVL will look to make improvements to the local road network or consider a haul road depending on the site to be taken forward. Such arrangements will be agreed with Lincolnshire County Council as the local highway authority and are being investigated to minimise the potential impact on the local road network. NGVL will look to ensure construction traffic avoids the local highway network and particularly roads running through nearby settlements, including Northorpe.
Noise and Vibration A number of residents raised concerns regarding noise and vibration from the proposed converter station, stating that they felt this could be particularly significant in Northorpe. Residents also had concerns for droning and ozone emissions from the converter station. Some residents were less concerned about noise at this location, given the distance to residential properties.	Noise from the proposed converter station will be assessed against current guidance and standards and noise thresholds will be agreed with the relevant local planning authority. Low frequency noise will also be considered to ensure there are no significant adverse effects on surrounding residential receptors. Noise mitigation measures will be implemented as part of the UK Onshore Scheme and will be agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority.

Table 7.1 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS1 (Questions 6 and 7)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Agricultural Land A number of residents have concerns regarding the permanent loss of high grade agricultural land. Some residents recognise the merit in CS1 as the agricultural land quality is lower than at some other sites.	As identified on the most currently available Agricultural Land Classification mapping, all the land within a 5 km radius of Bicker Fen 400 kV substation is Best and Most Versatile (BMV) quality and hence the development of the converter station on BMV land is unavoidable. Although the land taken by the converter station would be permanently lost to agricultural use, the area of loss in relation to the amount of BMV land within the locale is very small. Additionally, appropriate mitigation measures would be in place to ensure that the soils were correctly handled and stored to minimise loss of soil function. Agricultural land will be taken out of production for the cable on a temporary basis.
Landscape and Visual Impact A number of local residents cited visual impact as a key concern when considering CS1, which mainly concerned the settlements of Northorpe and Donington as well as scattered properties in the surrounding area. Others felt that CS1 was a more appropriate site visually, given the remoteness from nearby settlements and the proximity to existing infrastructure, including the wind farm and Bicker Fen substation. Some residents felt that CS1 allowed for more flexible design options including tree screening which would help to reduce the visual impact.	Comments in relation to CS1 are noted. Visual impact is an important consideration in the site selection process and will inform the identification of the preferred converter station site option. All efforts will be made to reduce the potential visual impact of the converter station, the design of which is likely to include screening planting, earth bunds, or a combination of both as part of an overall mitigation strategy. Landscape and Visual Impact will be a key consideration in the Environmental Statement.
Ecology / Biodiversity Impacts Residents have concerns regarding the impact of pollution on local wildlife and the proximity of the site to the South Forty Foot Drain.	All effects on ecological features will be identified, assessed and mitigated where necessary to ensure no significant effects. Few ecological constraints have been identified following initial surveys, however the feedback received in relation to the potential presence of protected species will be carefully considered.

Table 7.1 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS1 (Questions 6 and 7)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Hydrology and Land Drainage A number of residents note that CS1 is in an area of greater flood risk than some of the other shortlisted sites.	Drainage and Flood Risk is a key consideration in the site selection process and development of the UK Onshore Scheme and will be considered in consultation with the Environment Agency and Internal Drainage Boards. NGVL will adopt a sequential, risk-based approach to locating development in areas of flood risk.
Health Effects Residents are concerned regarding potential health impacts from the converter station.	The UK Onshore Scheme will not result in any significant adverse health effects to the local community. NGVL will ensure the equipment used and installation methods comply with all appropriate independent safety standards.
Project Development and Site Selection Some residents felt that the converter station should be sited in the context of other industrial development in the area. Other residents felt that out of the four converter station site options presented, a number of residents favour CS1 over many of the other sites, stating that whilst there will be impacts from the development, many of these will be felt less than at some of the other converter station site options. A number of residents raised the issue that certain Parishes in the area had little energy infrastructure and that the Parish at CS1 could share some of the local burden.	NGVL have carried out a comprehensive site selection process to identify a shortlist of site options for a converter station and a landfall point. This involved technical and feasibility studies as well as engagement with statutory Consultees, local authorities, parish councils and local residents. The full details of the converter station and landfall siting assessment are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report (April 2016). The preferred converter station site will be selected following an assessment of the feedback received in relation to Phase 1 consultation, together with technical, environmental and engineering factors. The location of a converter station site will not be determined on the basis distributing development evenly across Parish boundaries.

Table 7.1 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS1 (Questions 6 and 7)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Cable Routeing A number of residents questioned the location of CS1 in relation to the Bicker Fen 400 kV substation and that the DC cable would need to go past the substation, only for AC cables to run back in the same direction. Residents felt that this would result in additional cost and a greater impact on agricultural land.	CS1will result in a longer section of AC cable which could potentially result in greater disruption to agricultural land when compared with some of the other shortlisted converter station site options. NGVL has carried out a comprehensive site selection process to identify a shortlist of site options for a converter station and a landfall point. This involved technical and feasibility studies as well as engagement with statutory consultees, local authorities, parish councils and local residents. The full details of the converter station and landfall siting assessment are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report (April 2016).
Property Value and Compensation Residents are concerned about the impact of views from their property and the impact on the resale value of their homes.	NGVL understands 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 the value of a property are not material planning considerations. Whilst the visual impact of the converter station site in landscape terms will be a key consideration as part of the Environmental Statement, the impact on a view from an existing residential property in itself is not a material planning consideration.

Converter Station site CS3

7.3.3 A total of 57 people provided comments in response to Questions 8 and 9 which sought feedback on converter station site CS3. Questions 8 and 9 read:

- Question 8 stated "*Based on the information provided on the exhibition panel, do you have any comments on the proposed use of CS3 as a site for a converter station?*"; and
- Question 9 stated "*Do you have any other comments about the site option CS3 that you feel we should take into consideration?*"

7.3.4 The key themes raised in relation to both Questions and converter station site CS3 as an option which have not already been addressed are summarised below:

Table 7.2 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS3 (Questions 8 and 9)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Traffic and Transport With regard to transport and access, residents felt that a shared access with Triton Knoll would make sense, however, residents also stated that traffic management would need to be carefully coordinated with Triton Knoll. A number of residents felt that Timm's Drove was unsuitable for construction vehicles and that a new route from the A17 would be more preferable. Residents felt that a number of country lanes would need rebuilding if this option were to be taken forward. Residents also recognised that there were several potential access options for CS3. Residents are keen for access to avoid local villages in particular the village of Bicker. Some residents feel that CS3 is too close to the existing railway line and others suggested that NGVL should consider making use of rail and waterway links for delivery of materials to avoid impacts on the local road network.	Should Triton Knoll be consented and come to fruition and CS3 result in being the preferred converter station site, then NGVL will look to engage with Triton Knoll to progress a single haul road from the A17. NGVL will work with the Local Highways Authority in respect of any project impact on the local road network and consider a dedicated haul road depending on the site to be taken forward. Such arrangements will be agreed with Lincolnshire County Council as the local highway authority and are being investigated to minimise the potential impact on the local road network. NGVL will look to ensure construction traffic avoids the local highway network and particularly roads running through nearby settlements, including Bicker. NGVL do not consider it feasible or financially viable to utilise the nearby railway line for the delivery of materials.
Noise and Vibration A number of residents raised concerns regarding noise from the converter station.	Noise from the proposed converter station will be assessed against current guidance and standards and noise thresholds will be agreed with the relevant local planning authority. Low frequency noise will also be considered in the Environmental Statement to ensure there are no significant adverse effects on surrounding residential receptors. Noise mitigation measures will be implemented as part of the UK Onshore Scheme and will be agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority.

Table 7.2 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS3 (Questions 8 and 9)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Landscape and Visual Impact A number of local residents cited visual impact as a concern when considering CS3 and in particular the visual impact from the A17 and a number of properties in the area. Some residents feel that South Forty Foot Drain provides a degree of screening which weighs in favour of the site.	Visual impact is an important consideration in the site selection process and will inform the identification of the preferred option. All efforts will be made to reduce the potential visual impact of the converter station, the design of which is likely to include screening planting, earth bunds, or a combination of both as part of an overall mitigation strategy. It is noted that South Forty Foot Drain provides a degree of screening in context of CS3.
Socio-economic and Tourism A number of residents have identified South Forty Foot Drain as an area frequently used by dog walkers, cyclists and hikers. Residents also state that the area is popular with tourists and have raised concerns that the enjoyment of the area by visitors would be diminished if CS3 were to be taken forward, which would have a negative impact on the local economy.	NGVL will take into consideration the tourist season in planning construction works, which will be secured through a Construction Environmental Management Plan agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority. Effects on tourism will be temporary during construction of the UK Onshore Scheme and the timing of works will take into consideration socio-economic impacts. Comments regarding the lasting impact on tourism have been noted.
Ecology / Biodiversity Impacts Residents have concerns regarding the impact of pollution on local wildlife and the proximity of the site to South Forty Foot Drain. Residents have also shown specific concern for badgers in vicinity of CS3.	All effects on ecological features (including badgers) will be identified, assessed and mitigated where necessary to ensure no significant effects. Few ecological constraints have been identified following initial surveys, however the feedback received in relation to the potential presence of protected species will be carefully considered.
Hydrology and Land Drainage A number of residents are concerned regarding the proximity of CS3 to the South Forty Foot Drain.	Flood Risk is a key consideration in the site selection process and development of the UK Onshore Scheme and will be considered in consultation with the Environment Agency and Internal Drainage Boards. NGVL will adopt a sequential, risk-based approach to locating development in areas of flood risk.

Table 7.2 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS3 (Questions 8 and 9)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Project Development and Site Selection Out of the four converter station site options presented, a significant number of residents favour CS3 over many of the other sites, stating that whilst there will be impacts from the development, many of these will be felt less locally at Bicker and Swineshead than at some of the other converter station site options. Other residents feel that CS3 is located too far from Bicker Fen substation and the existing wind farm, and that a site closer to existing industrial development would be more suitable.	The preferred converter station site will be selected following an assessment of the feedback received in relation to Phase 1 consultation, together with technical, environmental and engineering factors.
Coordination with other Projects A number of residents have queried the extent to which dialogue has taken place with Triton Knoll, and a number of residents are unclear as to why the projects could not be aligned in a bid to save time and money and minimise disruption to the environment and communities along to the route.	NGVL has engaged with Triton Knoll. Triton Knoll is a separate project and has progressed further along the consenting process. It is to be consented under a different planning regime (Development Consent Order) and their consent application does not include for Viking Link. Viking Link will be consented under the local planning process. Viking Link and Triton Knoll are using two different technologies which are not compatible. There are also practical considerations which need to be taken into account including the timing and programme of the two projects, contract management, traffic management and the land that would be required to accommodate both projects together.

Table 7.2 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS3 (Questions 8 and 9)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Property Value and Compensation Residents are concerned about the impact of views from their property and the impact on property prices.	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 the value of a property or loss of private rights to light are not material planning considerations. Whilst the visual impact of the converter station site in landscape terms will be a key consideration as part of the Environmental Statement, the impact on a view from an existing residential property in itself is not a material planning consideration.

Converter Station site CS5

7.3.5 A total of 80 people provided comments in response to Questions 10 and 11 which sought feedback on converter station site CS5. Questions 10 and 11 read:

- Question 10 stated "*Based on the information provided on the exhibition panel, do you have any comments on the proposed use of CS5 as a site for a converter station?*"; and
- Question 11 stated "*Do you have any other comments about the site option CS5 that you feel we should take into consideration?*"

7.3.6 The key themes raised in relation to both Questions and converter station site CS5 as an option which have not already been addressed are summarised below:

Table 7.3 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS5 (Questions 10 and 11)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Traffic and Transport Significant feedback has been received in relation to the role and function of the A17 in context of the local road network. A number of residents have raised concerns over the traffic impacts of selecting CS5 and that the A17 is a hazardous and dangerous road. Residents state that the A17 carries significant amounts of traffic, including commercial traffic from local food production as well as the main seasonal traffic flow between Norfolk and Lincolnshire. Residents are concerned that a building the size of the converter station will act as a distraction to road users. Residents are also concerned that if the A17 is closed, this will result in significant impacts to the village and would cause disruption to users of the local road network.	The feedback received in relation to the local highway network in terms of its use, capacity and safety issues is important to the project. NGVL is working closely with Lincolnshire County Council as the highway authority to establish the key highway constraints and will continue dialogue to ensure access to the preferred site is safe. Whilst the converter station building will be substantial in size and could be noticeable in the landscape, it is not considered that it will result in an unsafe distraction to road users. The UK Onshore Scheme will result in an increase in traffic for a temporary period during construction. NGVL will produce a Traffic Management Plan which will be agreed with Lincolnshire County Council and the local planning authority to ensure the temporary impacts of construction traffic do not adversely impact on the local road network. NGVL will look to ensure construction traffic avoids the local highway network and particularly roads running through nearby settlements, including Swineshead.
Noise and Vibration Concern for noise has not only been identified in the construction phases, but once the site is operational and the potential complaints which will need to be dealt with. A significant number of residents have cited noise from the converter station and in particular, the humming from equipment as a concern. Residents are concerned that the prevailing winds are from the west and will carry noise to Swineshead.	Noise from the proposed converter station will be assessed against current guidance, and standards and noise thresholds will be agreed with the relevant local planning authority. Noise will be fully considered as part of the Environmental Statement and more detailed assessments will be undertaken in due course. Low frequency noise will also be considered to ensure there are no significant adverse effects on surrounding residential receptors. Noise mitigation measures will be implemented as part of the UK Onshore Scheme and will be agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority.

Table 7.3 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS5 (Questions 10 and 11)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Agricultural Land A significant number of residents have concerns regarding the permanent loss of high grade agricultural land and that in the case of CS5, this could undermine the existing agricultural business in operation in the area, rendering it unviable. Concern is also been raised that during the construction process, topsoil will be mixed with heavier subsoil and compaction will take place meaning it will be impossible to reinstate the land to its former condition. Local residents are concerned about the impacts on land drainage and the general inconvenience the development will cause to regular farming practices. Residents suggest that an alternative site should be taken forward which involves lower grade agricultural land. Concern has also be raised in relation to the wider implications of selecting CS5 and the suggestion that people will no longer want to farm the surrounding land.	As identified on the most currently available Agricultural Land Classification mapping, all the land within a 5km radius of Bicker Fen Substation is Best and Most Versatile (BMV) quality and hence the development of the converter station on BMV land is unavoidable. Although the land taken by the converter station would be permanently lost to agricultural use, the area of loss in relation to the amount of BMV land within the locale is very small. Additionally, appropriate mitigation measures would be in place to ensure that the soils were correctly handled and stored to minimise loss of soil function. Agricultural land will be taken out of production for the cable on a temporary basis. Drainage is a key consideration in the site selection process and will be considered in consultation with landowners, the Environment Agency and Internal Drainage Boards. NGVL will seek to minimise any disruption to the local drainage network and where this is unavoidable, drains will be fully reinstated using recognised best practice. NGVL have carried out a comprehensive site selection process to identify a shortlist of site options for a converter station and a landfall point. This involved technical and feasibility studies as well as engagement with statutory Consultees, local authorities, parish councils and local residents. The full details of the converter station and landfall siting assessment are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report (April 2016).

Table 7.3 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS5 (Questions 10 and 11)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Landscape and Visual Impact A key concern from a number of local residents relates to the visual impact associated with developing the converter station at CS5. Residents feel that the converter station would appear as an eyesore from the A17 as well as a significant number of properties located in the settlement of Swineshead. Residents are also of the opinion that there is currently no landscape structure in the area and not enough space to plant trees between the converter station and the village of Swineshead. There is a general consensus that a significant amount of tree planting will be required, but this will not screen the converter station. It has been suggested that the building should be sunk to reduce the visual impact.	Visual impact is an important consideration in the site selection process and will inform the identification of the preferred option. All efforts will be made to reduce the potential visual impact of the converter station, the design of which is likely to include screening planting, earth bunds, or a combination of both as part of an overall mitigation strategy. The dimensions of the converter station are partly constrained by technical requirements, but the form of the structure will be designed to take into account the character and scale of the landscape. All efforts will be made to reduce the potential visual impact of the converter station. The low-lying and level nature of this landscape does not permit the siting of the proposal in a location entirely 'out of sight'. It is not technically feasible to sink the building in this location.
Socio-Economic and Tourism Feedback indicates that Park Lane and Mill Hill are regularly used by people walking, cycling, running or dog walking. Residents feel that this will no longer be possible during the construction phase. Residents are also concerned that siting a converter station at CS5 will have an impact on the footfall at Swineshead Village, impacting negatively on tourism, local businesses and the local economy.	NGVL will take into consideration impacts on people using facilities or features in the area for recreational purposes when planning construction works, which will be secured through a Construction Environmental Management Plan, to be agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority. Effects on these users will be temporary during construction of the UK Onshore Scheme and the timing of works will take into consideration socio-economic impacts. During operation, the scheme is not considered to have a significant effect on leisure activities in the area. CS5 is located on the west side of the A17 whilst the main settlement of Swineshead is located on the east side of the A17. With the proposed increase in housing stock within the village this concern would be difficult to assess and quantify.

Table 7.3 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS5 (Questions 10 and 11)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Ecology / Biodiversity Impacts Residents have raised concerns regarding the impact on local wildlife and the environment should CS5 be taken forward.	All effects on ecological features will be identified, assessed and mitigated where necessary to ensure no significant effects. Few ecological constraints have been identified following initial surveys, however the feedback received in relation to the potential presence of protected species will be carefully considered.
Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Local residents have stated that the development could result in damage to listed and scheduled structures and that the centre of Swineshead is designated as a Conservation Area.	The impact on archaeology and cultural heritage will be carefully considered as the UK Onshore Scheme develops, and NGVL are proactively engaged with Historic England and Lincolnshire County Council to identify, assess and evaluate sources of known archaeology and cultural heritage. These features will be considered in the Environmental Statement.
Hydrology and Land Drainage A number of residents are concerned about potential flooding from South Forty Foot Drain.	Flood Risk is a key consideration in the site selection process and development of the UK Onshore Scheme and will be considered in consultation with the Environment Agency and Internal Drainage Boards. NGVL will adopt a sequential, risk-based approach to locating development in areas of flood risk.
Electric and Magnetic Fields Concern has been raised in relation to the effects of an electromagnetic field created by the converter station and the potential health implications.	NGVL takes the issue of Electro-Magnetic Frequencies (EMF) very seriously and has a responsibility to ensure safe operation of all assets. 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.
Health Impacts Residents have shown concern for the health impacts associated with the converter station, which residents feel are elevated in context of CS5 given the proximity to the settlement of Swineshead.	The UK Onshore Scheme will not result in any significant adverse health effects to the local community. NGVL will ensure the equipment used and installation methods comply with all appropriate independent safety standards.

Table 7.3 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS5 (Questions 10 and 11)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Air Quality Concern has been shown for dust generation as a result of traffic which will impact on crops and the nearby settlement of Swineshead.	Requirements for dust mitigation / suppression during construction are likely to be a condition of any consent and will be dealt with through a Construction Environmental Management Plan, to be agreed with the relevant local planning authorities.
Communication / Consultation Approach A number of residents state that they received notification letters late and there appears to be some confusion between receiving letters for the consultation events and letters which request access to land.	Letters were sent to all residents within the consultation zone of the shortlisted CS sites at the beginning of April. The letter introduced the Viking Link project, informed people about the upcoming consultation and invited them to attend a public consultation event in their area. The consultation zone was agreed with the local planning authority. A separate letter was sent to landowners on 8 April (following an initial letter sent on 19 February) to update them about whether their land formed part the shortlisted areas for a CS site. During this time, NGVL had a team of specialist land agents meeting local landowners to discuss land access for surveys. The letters were issued to give people enough time to be made aware of the project. Public consultation events were staggered across two weeks to give everyone the best possible chance of attending at least one event. For those unable to attend, all the consultation materials were available on the project website, as well as available in hard-copy upon request. A dedicated project email address, free phone number and Freepost address were made available throughout the six-week consultation period (as well as before and after) to deal with any questions or comments from local residents.

Table 7.3 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS5 (Questions 10 and 11)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Project Development and Site Selection Out of the four converter station site options presented, there is significant opposition to CS5 being taken forward in the site selection process, the main concern being the proximity of CS5 to the settlement of Swineshead. Residents have also questioned the need for CS5 to be as large as it is, and why a previously developed site could not be utilised. Residents have also shown concern for the inability of CS5 to accommodate future expansion requirements and the space available for mitigation. Residents feel that CS5 is located too far from Bicker Fen 400 kV substation and existing wind farm, and a site closer to existing industrial development would be more suitable, reducing cost and disruption to the local community. A number of residents raised the issue that certain Parishes in the wider area have had little energy infrastructure and that other sites should be chosen over CS5 to share the local burden.	Not all the land indicated for CS5 will be required, should this site option be selected. The footprint required for the converter station operational site will be approximately 4.2 ha (10.5 acres) and some additional land may be required for landscape and drainage works. The site was identified based on field boundaries and then a 200 m buffer was applied around potential residential properties. The size of the site assessed allows some flexibility as to where the converter station might be located within the site and how it might be orientated and enables sufficient space for mitigation. NGVL have carried out a comprehensive site selection process to identify a shortlist of site options for a converter station and a landfall point. This involved technical and feasibility studies as well as engagement with statutory Consultees, local authorities, parish councils and local residents. The full details of the converter station and landfall siting assessment are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report (April 2016). The preferred converter station site will be selected following an assessment of the feedback received in relation to Phase 1 consultation, together with technical, environmental and engineering factors. The location of a converter station site will not be determined on the basis of distributing development evenly across Parish boundaries.

Table 7.3 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS5 (Questions 10 and 11)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Coordination with other Projects A number of residents have queried the extent to which dialogue has taken place with Triton Knoll. A number of residents are unclear as to why the projects could not be aligned in a bid to save time and money and minimise disruption to the environment and communities along to the route. Residents have shown concern that development of CS5 will lead to restrictions as to the extent of developable land surrounding Swineshead. Residents state that the settlement itself has been earmarked for a significant amount of future growth from Boston Borough Council. Concern has also been raised in relation to the due consideration to be given to other development which has been consented or is in the process of being constructed in vicinity of CS5.	NGVL has engaged with Triton Knoll. Triton Knoll is a separate project and has progressed further along the consenting process. It is to be consented under a different planning regime (Development Consent Order under the Planning Act 2008) and their consent application does not include for Viking Link. Viking Link will be consented under the local planning process. Viking Link and Triton Knoll are using two different technologies which are not compatible. There are also practical considerations which need to be taken into account including the timing and programme of the two projects, contract management, traffic management and the land that would be required to accommodate both projects together. Developments in the area which have been granted planning consent or are the subject of a potential allocation have been considered in the site selection process and will continue to be monitored as the UK Onshore Scheme develops. Consented developments, together with current and emerging allocations in the Swineshead area have specifically been taken into consideration in the context of CS5. CS5 is still considered to be technically feasible taking into account the current and future development proposed in Swineshead.
Construction Impacts In terms of construction feedback indicates that peat is present at CS5, which local residents feel could impact on foundations. In addition, concern has been raised in relation to the potential impacts on services and utilities in the surrounding area.	Noted. This information will be considered by NGVL when potentially considering further the engineering implications of developing CS5 if this is taken forward.

Table 7.3 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS5 (Questions 10 and 11)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Property Value and Compensation Residents are concerned about the impact on property prices and have queried whether or not compensation will be forthcoming for those affected.	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 the value of a property or loss of private rights to light are not material planning considerations.

Converter Station site CS9

7.3.7 A total of 74 people provided comments in response to Questions 12 and 13 which sought feedback on converter station site CS9. Questions 12 and 13 read:

- Question 12 reads "*Based on the information provided on the exhibition panel, do you have any comments on the proposed use of CS9 as a site for a converter station?*"; and
- Question 13 reads "*Do you have any other comments about the site option CS9 that you feel we should take into consideration?*"

7.3.8 The key themes raised in relation to both Questions and converter station site CS9 as an option which have not already been addressed previously are summarised below:

Table 7.4 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS9 (Questions 12 and 13)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Traffic and Transport A significant number of residents state that construction traffic should not use the local road network through Bicker. Residents state that both Boston Borough Council and Lincolnshire County Council share this opinion. Concern is shown for residents who live on Cowbridge Road as these properties abut the main access road to the existing Bicker Fen substation. Other feedback indicates that some residents are aware that there are a number of access options for this site and that one of these is the potential to utilise the existing wind farm haul road from the A52 to the south.	The feedback received in relation to the local highway network in terms of its use, capacity and safety issues is important to the project. NGVL is working closely with Lincolnshire County Council as the highway authority for this area to establish the key highway constraints and will continue dialogue to ensure access to the preferred site is safe. Traffic impacts will be considered and assessed as part of the Environmental Statement. A Traffic Management Plan will be agreed with Lincolnshire County Council and relevant Local Planning Authorities to ensure the temporary impact of construction traffic does not adversely impact on the local road network. NGVL will also look to ensure construction traffic avoids the local highway network and particularly roads running through nearby settlements, including Bicker.
Noise and Vibration A number of residents have cited noise and vibration from the converter station as a concern. This is not only in context of the construction phase, but also once the site is operational. Concern has also been raised that the development of CS9 will result in noise and vibration during construction which will disturb livestock. Other members of the community note that the nearest settlements of Bicker and Donington are situated over 2 km from CS9 which should minimise the impact of any audible intrusion.	Noise from the proposed converter station will be assessed against current guidance and standards and noise thresholds will be agreed with the relevant local planning authority. Low frequency noise will also be considered to ensure there are no significant adverse effects on surrounding receptors. Noise mitigation measures will be developed through more detailed noise assessments which will form the basis of the Environmental Statement. Such mitigation measures will be implemented as part of the UK Onshore Scheme and will be agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority.

Table 7.4 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS9 (Questions 12 and 13)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Landscape and Visual Impact The local community state that the development of CS9 would result in the converter station being viewed in context of existing industrial development in the area and that this would mean development would be located in a single location, rather than forming a proliferation of infrastructure in the wider area. Other residents have concerns that the converter station will still be visible from the settlements of Bicker and Swineshead, and the cumulative visual impact of development if CS9 is taken forward. Residents also state that the converter station building will be too large and that it will be an eyesore in the area. A significant number of residents agree that landscaping will be important and that this should be used in a bid to screen the development. Some residents are of the opinion that there is no current landscape structure in the area and there is not enough space to plant trees between the converter station and village. There is a general consensus that a significant amount of tree planting will be required, but this will not screen the converter station.	Visual impact is an important consideration in the site selection process and will inform the identification of the preferred option. All efforts will be made to reduce the potential visual impact of the converter station the design of which is likely to include screening planting, earth bunds, or a combination of both as part of an overall mitigation strategy. The dimensions of the converter station are partly constrained by technical requirements, but the form of the structure will be designed to take into account the character and scale of the landscape. All efforts will be made to reduce the potential visual impact of the converter station. The low-lying and level nature of this landscape does not permit the siting of the proposal in a location entirely 'out of sight'. NGVL are confident that CS9 could be delivered as a feasible option and includes sufficient land for landscape screening. It is not considered technically feasible that the building could be sunk in this location.
Socio-Economic and Tourism Feedback indicates that the site adjoins the Brown Fen Waterway Trail.	Noted
Ecology / Biodiversity Impacts Residents have concerns regarding the impact on local wildlife and the environment should CS9 be taken forward. Others residents are of the opinion that CS9 will have less environmental effects than some of the other shortlisted sites.	All effects on ecological features will be identified, assessed and mitigated where necessary to ensure no significant effects. Few ecological constraints have been identified following initial surveys, however the feedback received in relation to the potential presence of protected species will be carefully considered.

Table 7.4 Feedback in relation to Converter Station site CS9 (Questions 12 and 13)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Urban Design and Virtual Reality Modelling Feedback indicates that the converter station should be the minimum height required and that the design should be appropriate to a rural area.	The dimensions of the converter station are partly constrained by technical requirements, but the form of the structure will be designed to take into account the character and scale of the landscape. All efforts will be made to reduce the potential visual impact of the converter station. The low-lying and level nature of this landscape does not permit the siting of the proposal in a location entirely 'out of sight'.
Project Development and Site Selection Out of the four converter station site options presented, CS9 for many residents appears to be the logical choice. Residents draw particular attention to the proximity of CS9 to the existing Bicker Fen Substation and other existing infrastructure in the immediate vicinity such as the wind turbines. Residents state that the cable would result in less disruption, having a shorter distance to travel, and that the size of CS9 is sufficient to allow a flexible design to better fit the surroundings. This is not the view shared by all residents. Many feel that Bicker has had too much development of late and that the converter station should be located elsewhere. Some feedback has been received that residents would have liked more time to consider the other discounted options.	NGVL have carried out a comprehensive site selection process to identify a shortlist of site options for a converter station and a landfall point. This involved technical and feasibility studies as well as engagement with statutory Consultees, local authorities, parish councils and local residents. The full details of the converter station and landfall siting assessment are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report (April 2016). The preferred converter station site will be selected following an assessment of the feedback received in relation to Phase 1 consultation, together with technical, environmental and engineering factors. The location of a converter station site will not be determined on the basis distributing development evenly across Parish boundaries. Phase 1 Consultation ran for a period of six weeks. NGVL consider such a timeframe sufficient for residents to respond.

General Converter Station Feedback

7.3.9 A total of 78 people provided general comments in relation to all shortlisted converter station site options. The key themes are summarised below:

Table 7.5 General Converter Station feedback	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Landscape and Visual Impact Residents feel that a greater footprint should be explored to ensure the converter station can be as low as possible, whilst using a combination of landscape screening and earth mounds to lessen the visual impact.	Visual impact is an important consideration in the site selection process and will inform the identification of the preferred option. All efforts will be made to reduce the potential visual impact of the converter station the design of which is likely to include screening planting, earth bunds, or a combination of both as part of an overall mitigation strategy. Parts of the converter station will reach a maximum height of 24 m because of the technology required for this type of infrastructure.
Environmental Impact Residents suggest that a number of environmental factors have not been taken into account when shortlisting the sites and that there is not enough information available on noise.	NGVL are confident that an appropriate and proportionate range of environmental factors have been considered through the site selection process. Additional survey work and assessment will take place and will form the basis of the Environmental Statement. Noise (as well as a number of other technical considerations) will be assessed against current guidance and standards and in consultation with the relevant statutory bodies. Additional noise surveys will be undertaken to support the assessment, conclusion and mitigation in the Environmental Statement.

Table 7.5 General Converter Station feedback	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Communication / Consultation Approach A number of residents had further questions which they felt had not been answered following the consultation events. Some feedback suggests that the reasoning given at the consultation events contradicted the site selection report and that the display was confusing for people new to the project. Some residents felt that the information presented at the consultation event was not detailed enough, whereas information in the site selection report was too detailed.	NGVL is disappointed that some residents left the consultation events with questions unanswered and would encourage those to contact the Viking Link Project Team. NGVL are confident that the narrative provided to date is consistent and clear throughout all project documents and consultation material. The converter station siting assessment included the identification and assessment of twenty one potential converter station sites. The assessment of sites considered potential impacts on the environment and local community alongside basic technical and engineering factors including land take required and accessibility. Four potential converter station sites (CS1, CS3, CS5 and CS9) were shortlisted and taken forward to the Phase 1 Consultation with stakeholders and the local community. NGVL acknowledge that different residents require varied levels of information, which is why the event boards provided key points emanating from the site selection process, and more detailed documents were available if required. NGVL representatives (covering a range of technical specialisms) were on hand at all consultation events to answer questions and engage with the community.

Table 7.5 General Converter Station feedback	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Project Development and Site Selection Some residents felt the information presented was clear and concise and that the four shortlisted options appeared to be the best out of the original 21. Some residents struggled to understand why Bicker had been selected as the connection point. Others understood why Bicker had been selected, but felt that the converter station should not be located on Fenland. Some residents were unclear on the criteria applied to the site selection process and queried the ability to shortlist sites given the timescales. Some residents questioned whether or not any of the 21 sites were suitable or appropriate and some residents felt that the reasons for discounting 17 of the sites were unclear. Some residents questioned why sites located a similar distance from settlements had been discounted and that CS5 had been shortlisted.	A number of different options were considered along the east of England. Bicker Fen 400 kV substation was identified as the most appropriate connection point to the electricity transmission system. Details of all the options identified and the assessments are included in a Connection Point Selection Report provided by NGET and a Strategic Options Report produced by NGVL. NGVL have carried out a comprehensive site selection process to identify a shortlist of site options for a converter station and a landfall point. This involved technical and feasibility studies as well as engagement with statutory Consultees, local authorities, parish councils and local residents. The full details of the converter station and landfall siting assessment are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report (April 2016). NGVL are confident that the four shortlisted converter station site options are feasible and these have been shortlisted having regard to a number of environmental, technical and engineering considerations.

Converter Station Design

7.3.10 A total of 69 people provided feedback in relation to the design and appearance of the converter station. This specifically concerned Questions 14 of the converter station consultation feedback form.

- Question 14 reads "*Do you have any thoughts on what design for a converter station might work best in your local area?*"

7.3.11 The key themes from Questions 14 are summarised below:

Table 7.6 Feedback on Converter Station Design (Question 14)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Urban Design and Virtual Reality Modelling When asked if they had any thoughts on what a design might look like for the converter station, a significant number of residents felt they were unable to comment until a preferred site had been selected. Those who did respond tended to favour a design which had a softened appearance, using materials synonymous to a rural area, and which as far as possible, would blend into the landscape. Out of the design options presented at Phase 1 consultation, a conceptual design was favoured the most, reflecting the general appearance of agricultural buildings already found in the area. Residents showed little appetite for a functional or landmark design. Some residents suggested that the building should be sunk or placed underground.	The dimensions of the converter station are partly constrained by technical requirements, but the form of the structure will be designed to take into account the character and scale of the landscape. All efforts will be made to reduce the potential impact of the converter station. The low-lying and level nature of this landscape does not permit the siting of the proposal in a location entirely 'out of sight'. Feedback received in relation to design styles has been noted and more detailed information in relation to design will be made available for consultation during Phase 2 in September 2016. NGVL do not consider it technically feasible to sink the building in this location.

Impacts and Mitigation

7.3.12 A total of 81 people provided feedback in relation to the potential impacts and mitigation for all shortlisted converter station sites. This specifically concerned Questions 4 and 5 that have not been addressed previously of the converter station consultation feedback form.

- Question 4 states "*Based on the information provided at the public information event and the information on our project website, www.viking-link.com, do you have any comments on the following: The potential impacts, environmental or otherwise, of the project?*"; and
- Question 5 states "*Based on the information provided at the public information event and the information on our project website, www.viking-link.com, do you have any comments on the following: Are there any additional measures you think we could take to further mitigate these impacts?*"

7.3.13 The key themes from both Questions 4 and 5 are summarised below:

Table 7.7 Converter Station Impacts and Mitigation (Questions 4 and 5)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Traffic and Transport With regard to traffic and transport, residents reiterated concern for the impact on the local road network during construction, with some citing the A17 as a dangerous road with a high accident rate. Other feedback suggested that the A17 should be prioritised over the A52. A significant number of residents state that construction traffic should not use the local road network through Bicker. Residents state that both Boston Borough Council and Lincolnshire County Council share this opinion. Concern is shown for residents on Cowbridge Road as these properties abut the main access road to the existing Bicker Fen Substation. Other feedback indicates that residents are aware of various potential access options for this site and that one of these is the potential to utilise the existing wind farm haul road from the A52 to the south. Residents also showed concern for disruption to country lanes and footpaths.	NGVL is working closely with Lincolnshire County Council as the highway authority for this area to establish the key highway constraints and will continue dialogue to ensure access to the preferred site is safe. Traffic impacts will be considered and assessed as part of the Environmental Statement. A Traffic Management Plan will be agreed with Lincolnshire County Council and relevant Local Planning Authorities to ensure the temporary impact of construction traffic does not adversely impact the local road network. NGVL will work with the Local Highways Authority in respect of any project impact on the existing road network or consider a haul road depending on the site to be taken forward. Such arrangements will be agreed with Lincolnshire County Council and are being investigated to minimise the potential impact on the local road network. Where possible, NGVL will try to minimise any disruption to Public Rights of Way and Cycle Routes, however, some temporary impacts are likely to be inevitable. NGVL will also look to ensure construction traffic avoids the local highway network and particularly roads running through nearby settlements.
Noise and Vibration Residents drew particular attention to noise as a consideration and raised concerns regarding fans in the roof of the converter station, low frequency noise, vibration and droning from cooling fans. Concern has also been raised that the converter station will result in disturbance to horses grazing nearby.	Noise from the proposed converter station will be assessed against current guidance and standards and noise thresholds will be agreed with the relevant local planning authority. Low frequency noise will also be considered to ensure there are no significant adverse effects on surrounding receptors. Noise mitigation measures will be developed through more detailed noise assessments which will form the basis of the Environmental Statement. Such mitigation measures will be implemented as part of the UK Onshore Scheme and will be agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority.

Table 7.7 Converter Station Impacts and Mitigation (Questions 4 and 5)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Landscape and Visual Impact Residents consider landscaping important regardless of which converter station site is selected, and would generally prefer the converter station as far away from residential properties as possible. Some residents feel that the scheme should be revisited entirely and that an industrial building should be located in an industrial setting and on a brownfield site. A number of residents have concerns for the visual impact of CS5 on the village of Swineshead, and others thought that CS9 would be intrusive, resulting in a detrimental impact on residential amenity.	Visual impact is an important consideration in the site selection process and will inform the identification of the preferred option. All efforts will be made to reduce the potential visual impact of the converter station the design of which is likely to include screening planting, earth bunds, or a combination of both as part of an overall mitigation strategy. NGVL have carried out a comprehensive site selection process to identify a shortlist of site options for a converter station and a landfall point. This involved technical and feasibility studies as well as engagement with statutory Consultees, local authorities, parish councils and local residents. The full details of the converter station and landfall siting assessment are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report (April 2016).
Urban Design and Virtual Reality Modelling A number of residents emphasised the importance of design and suggested that a green colour may be appropriate for the converter station building.	Noted
Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Local residents have stated that the development could have impacts on the historic village of Swineshead.	The impact on archaeology and cultural heritage will be carefully considered as the UK Onshore Scheme develops and NGVL are proactively engaged with Historic England and Lincolnshire County Council to identify, assess and evaluate sources of known archaeology and cultural heritage. These features will be considered in the Environmental Statement.
Planning Residents are concerned that consent for a converter station in this location could set a precedent for future development.	NGVL does not believe that if consented, the development will result in a precedent as each and every application is determined on its own merits.

Table 7.7 Converter Station Impacts and Mitigation (Questions 4 and 5)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Electric and Magnetic Fields Concern has been raised in relation to the effects of electric and magnetic fields created by the converter station and the potential health implications.	NGVL takes the issue of Electric and Magnetic Fields 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.
Health Impacts Residents have shown concern for the health impacts associated with the converter station, including those potentially generated from radiation and dust. Residents are also concerned that such impacts could also affect the village of Swineshead during construction.	The UK Onshore Scheme will not result in any significant adverse health effects to the local community. NGVL will ensure the equipment used and installation methods comply with all appropriate independent safety standards. The converter station will not emit any radiation and measures for dealing with dust during construction will be outlined and agreed in Construction Environmental Management Plan.
Environmental Impact Feedback in relation to Questions 4 and 5 reiterates the importance of considering all issues, including environmental, ecological, visual as well as the impact on local communities.	The UK Onshore Scheme will produce an Environmental Statement as part of any planning application where more detailed studies will be carried out.
Project Development and Site Selection Some residents feel that a site closer to Bicker Fen substation would be more suitable and that the height of the building should be reconsidered. Other residents understand that the building has to be a certain height, but sought reassurances that this would not exceed a maximum height.	The preferred converter station site will be selected following an assessment of the feedback received in relation to Phase 1 consultation, together with technical, environmental and engineering factors. Parts of the converter station will reach a maximum height of 24 m because of the technology required for this type of infrastructure.
Communication / Consultation Approach With regard to consultation, some residents have commented that visual presentations would have been useful to show the converter station in a local context. Some residents also felt that detail was not	The consultation events included a “Fly-around VSC” of a typical converter station which gave an indication of size and scale. NGVL have carried out a comprehensive site selection process to identify a shortlist of site options for a converter station and a landfall point. This involved technical and feasibility

Table 7.7 Converter Station Impacts and Mitigation (Questions 4 and 5)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
provided on all of the relevant considerations and that all potential impacts were not apparent. A number of residents commented that they were unable to provide further comment as they had insufficient information to make an informed response. Feedback also indicated that some residents would have liked more technical independent surveys to hand at the consultation events.	studies as well as engagement with statutory Consultees, local authorities, parish councils and local residents. The full details of the converter station and landfall siting assessment are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report (April 2016). Phase 1 consultation ran from 11th April to 20th May and all comments received have been considered. NGVL consider the consultation timeframe for Phase 1 to be proportionate to the material available for comment. NGVL acknowledge that different residents require varied levels of information, which is why the event boards provided the key points emanating from the site selection process and more detailed documents were available if required. NGVL considers that the consultation material presented has been accessible to most residents.
Property Value and Compensation Residents are concerned about the impact on property prices and have queried whether or not compensation will be forthcoming for those affected. A number of residents would be willing to engage with NGVL to seek settlement figures to relocate from the area. Others feel that compensation should be paid to those within a certain distance of the converter station.	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 the value of a property are not material planning considerations. Compensation will only be agreed where a landowner is directly affected by the project. Where this is the case, NGVL Land Agents will contact landowners.

Comments on the Landfall

7.3.14 A total of 47 people who attended the consultation events for the shortlisted converter station sites, provided comments in relation to the shortlisted landfall site options. This was covered by Question 15 of the converter station feedback form.

- Question 15 states "*Based on the information provided on the exhibition panel, is there anything you would like us to take into consideration when identifying a preferred landfall point?*"

7.3.15 The key themes from Question 15 are summarised below:

Table 7.8 Comments on the Landfall (Question 15)

Feedback	NGVL response
General When asked if they had any comments on the landfall, a number of residents felt they did not have enough information or did not have enough local knowledge of the landfall sites to make an informed decision.	Noted
Noise and Vibration Residents showed concern for noise during construction.	Noise impacts at the landfall will be temporary during construction. Noise will be considered as part of the Environmental Statement and detailed noise assessments will be undertaken in due course. Once this information has been compiled, appropriate mitigation measures will be agreed with the relevant local planning authority and will be conditioned with any consent.
Landscape and Visual Impact Residents feel that visual impacts should be minimised.	There will be no permanent visual impacts at the landfall once the works are complete and the land has been reinstated.
Socio-Economic and Tourism Residents felt it was important to avoid the summer period for construction activity as the landfall area comprises a popular holiday area. Residents also felt it was important to minimise any impact on the coast by selecting a landfall which was away from housing and where possible, lay the cable rather than digging a trench.	NGVL will take into consideration the tourist season in planning construction works, which will be secured through a Construction Environmental Management Plan agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authorities. Effects on tourism will be temporary during construction of the UK Onshore Scheme and the timing of works will take into consideration socio-economic impacts. Once operational, the scheme is not considered to have a significant effect on tourism. The cable installation method to be used at the landfall is set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report (April 2016).

Table 7.8 Comments on the Landfall (Question 15)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Ecology / Biodiversity Impact Residents have shown concern for potential impacts to wildlife at the coast, including the SSSI at Anderby Creek.	All effects on ecological features (including designated sites) will be identified, assessed and mitigated where necessary to ensure no significant effects.
Project Development and Site Selection Some residents felt that other landfall points should be considered away from the Lincolnshire coast, whilst others felt that a landfall point to the south would be most suitable as it would provide a shorter distance to Bicker.	NGVL have carried out a comprehensive site selection process to identify a shortlist of site options for a converter station and a landfall point. This involved technical and feasibility studies as well as engagement with statutory Consultees, local authorities, parish councils and local residents. The full details of the converter station and landfall siting assessment are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report (April 2016).
Construction Impact Residents feel there should be no disturbance to the land once works are complete.	Once the works are complete, the land will be fully reinstated.

Feedback from Converter Station consultation events

7.3.16 The following tables provide an overview of the consultation events held for the shortlisted converter station sites. A total of 90 people provided comments which relate to Questions 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 of the converter station consultation feedback form.

- Question 17 states "*What was your main reason for attending the public information event?*"

7.3.17 The key themes for Question 17 are summarised in the table below:

Table 7.9 Feedback from the consultation events for the Converter Station (Question 17)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Communication / Consultation Approach A number of residents attended the consultation events to gain further information on various aspects of the project, including the cable route. Some residents specifically attended the events to understand the impact of the converter station and where it might be built. Other residents attended the event to object to the project and voice their concerns and views. Some residents attended the event to express approval for the project and give general feedback, whilst others felt it important to comment on the shortlisted sites and raise issues important to them. Some residents attended the event as there was a chance that their land could be directly affected by the project. Others came along to get specific answers from people working on the project. Residents also wanted an opportunity to discuss the environmental effects of the project and to raise concerns regarding the potential cumulative impacts of development in the area. Some residents were unable to attend a consultation event and commented that it was poorly advertised, but sought information from other sources such as the Swineshead Action Group and VL project website. Some residents attended the event to ensure they would receive updates as the project develops.	The reasons for attendance at the landfall consultation events were varied and have been noted for Phase 2 Consultation. NGVL is disappointed that some residents left the consultation events with questions unanswered and would encourage those who have questions to contact the Viking Link Project Team.

- Question 18 states "*Do you feel this consultation event has provided you with all the information you needed?*"

7.3.18 The key themes from Question 18 are summarised in the table below:

Table 7.10 Feedback from the consultation events for the Converter Station (Question 18)	
Feedback	**Numbers of Respondents**
Yes	27
No	54
No Comment	9

- Question 19 states "*If no, please let us know what additional information we could have provided?*"

7.3.19 The key themes from Question 19 are summarised in the table below:

Table 7.11 Feedback from the consultation events for the Converter Station (Question 19)

Feedback	NGVL response
Communication / Consultation Approach Some residents felt that more information should have been available on the overall scheme (including all sites) and the reasons why some sites had been discounted. A significant number of residents would have liked to have seen more technical information available on noise from the converter station In addition, other residents felt that information in relation to design/appearance, scale, vibration, radiation, visual impact and potential pollution to the ground and waterways would have improved their experience. One resident suggested that the Site Selection Report should have been made more readily available. Some residents felt that the events were poorly publicised and were unstructured. Others felt that they left well informed and had as much information as they needed for the stage of the project. With regard to the availability of people on the day to answer any questions, some residents felt that there was not enough information available from those present on the day to satisfactorily answer the questions they had, and that there were not enough engineers available.	NGVL acknowledge that different residents require varied levels of information, which is why the event boards provided the key points emanating from the site selection process and more detailed documents were available if required, including multiple copies of the UK Onshore Site Selection Report. NGVL have carried out a comprehensive site selection process to identify a shortlist of site options for a converter station and a landfall point. This involved technical and feasibility studies as well as engagement with statutory Consultees, local authorities, parish councils and local residents. The full details of the converter station and landfall siting assessment are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report (April 2016). The scope and extent of consultation was agreed with the relevant local planning authorities and is considered to be reasonable given the extent of the UK Onshore Scheme and the matters subject to Phase 1 Consultation. NGVL acknowledge that people respond to information in different ways and are confident that the level and range of information provided was sufficient to gain meaningful feedback from the community during Phase 1 consultation. NGVL representatives (covering a range of technical specialisms) were on hand at all consultation events to answer questions and engage with the community.

Table 7.11 Feedback from the consultation events for the Converter Station (Question 19)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Project Need A number of residents felt that they should have been asked whether or not they wanted more energy infrastructure in the area before the project was progressed.	A number of different options were considered along the east of England. Bicker Fen 400 kV substation was identified as the most appropriate connection point to the electricity transmission system. Details of all the options identified and the assessments are included in a Connection Point Selection Report provided by NGET and a Strategic Options Report produced by NGVL.

- Question 20 states "*Do you have any other comments about this consultation event?*"

7.3.20 The key themes from Question 20 are summarised below:

Table 7.12 Feedback from the consultation events for the Converter Station (Question 20)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Communication / Consultation Approach Residents would like assurance that the feedback provided will be taken on board and will inform the project. It was felt by some residents that the events were a great improvement on those held by other projects and informative and had a clear emphasis on consultation with the community. However, some residents felt that the consultation was not advertised widely enough and could have had more structure, holding discussions in small groups. Some residents felt that there was a lack of clear information, particularly in relation to noise, and left the event with a number of questions unanswered. Others felt that the consultation was already a "done deal" and that there was insufficient presentation of facts and detailed information. (continued)	All feedback received from Phase 1 Consultation will be considered by NGVL and will feed into the selection of a preferred landfall and converter station site. The extent of public consultation and advertisement was carefully considered and agreed with the relevant local planning authorities. NGVL consider the scope and extent of public consultation to be proportionate to the scale of the project and the matters considered at Phase 1 Consultation. At the time of consultation, no decisions had been taken on the shortlisted landfall and converter station sites. All feedback received from Phase 1 Consultation will be considered by NGVL and will feed into the selection of a preferred landfall and converter station site. NGVL acknowledge that people respond to information in different ways and are confident that the level and range of information provided was sufficient to gain meaningful feedback from the community during Phase 1 Consultation. (continued)

Table 7.12 Feedback from the consultation events for the Converter Station (Question 20)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
(continued) Some residents suggested that more events could have been held and it might have been useful to hold follow-up events two weeks later once the information had been digested. Residents would have liked clearer maps on the information boards and would have found more detailed technical information relating to noise useful. Going forward, some residents have requested information be issued in advance of Phase 2 Consultation for those affected by the project (including the converter station site and cable route). In terms of attendance at the events, residents provided mixed views with some feeling there was plenty of staff on had to help with questions, and others feeling there were not enough staff to cope with visitors and particular a lack of engineers present. Some residents felt distracted by children playing in the hall and others felt that NGVL staff were unwilling to engage with them.	(continued) Noise (as well as a number of other technical considerations) will be considered in the Environmental Statement and will be assessed against current guidance and standards and in consultation with the relevant statutory bodies. NGVL are committed to meaningful engagement with the local community and welcome any feedback on the project. A wide range of NGVL representatives (covering a range of technical specialisms) were on hand at all consultation events to answer questions and engage with the community. Unfortunately it is not possible to issue any consultation material in advance of the start of Phase 2 consultation.

- Question 21 states "*Do you have any other comments about the Viking Link project?*"

7.3.21 The key themes from Question 21 are summarised in the table below:

Table 7.13 Feedback from the consultation events for the Converter Station (Question 21)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Noise and Vibration Residents feel that noise is an important consideration and that this should be assessed carefully. Residents would also like to understand how noisy the converter station will be.	Noise from the proposed converter station will be assessed against current guidance and standards and noise thresholds will be agreed with the relevant local planning authority. Low frequency noise will also be considered to ensure there are no significant adverse effects on surrounding residential receptors. Noise mitigation measures will be implemented as part of the UK Onshore Scheme and will be agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority.

Table 7.13 Feedback from the consultation events for the Converter Station (Question 21)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Communication / Consultation Approach Residents feel that more consultation could have taken place and that all feedback should be accounted for.	NGVL are confident that the level and range of information provided for Phase 1 Consultation is sufficient to gain meaningful feedback from the community during Phase 1 consultation. All feedback received will be considered by NGVL and will inform the selection of a preferred landfall and converter station site.
EU Referendum A number of residents queried the impact of the EU Referendum on the project and what impact this will have.	The result of the referendum has no bearing on the decision to develop the project. National Grid and its partner, Energinet.dk, believe there is a strong business case for Viking Link. The project, which will be jointly funded by National Grid and Energinet.dk, has been granted regulatory approval by Ofgem, which closely scrutinizes costs and benefits in the interests of UK consumers.
Project Funding Some residents openly accept the need for the project, recognising that linking energy networks will add resilience. Feedback suggests that some residents also consider it positive that alternative means of supply are being explored for the UK. Some members of the community feel that money should be invested in renewable energy projects to ensure self sufficiency for the UK.	Government Policy acknowledges that interconnectors will play a vital role in the UK's energy mix. The development and construction of Viking Link is a jointly funded project by National Grid and Energinet.dk.

Table 7.13 Feedback from the consultation events for the Converter Station (Question 21)	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Project Development and Site Selection A number of resident's fee that the converter station should be located somewhere other than Bicker and would be more suited to an industrial setting. Residents feel there is too much industrial development accumulating in one area and that landscaping will not mitigate the visual impact. One resident had concerns that the project will become outdated before it is brought to fruition, given advances in technology. A significant number of concerns were raised about the weighting to be applied to the number of objections received from some of the larger settlements in the area (i.e. Donington and Swineshead). Residents would like assurance that a decision by NGVL will not be based on numbers alone when coming to a final decision on a preferred converter station site.	NGVL have carried out a comprehensive site selection process to identify a shortlist of site options for a converter station and a landfall point. This involved technical and feasibility studies as well as engagement with statutory Consultees, local authorities, parish councils and local residents. The full details of the converter station and landfall siting assessment are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report (April 2016). At the time of consultation, no decisions have been taken on the shortlisted landfall and converter station sites. All feedback received from Phase 1 Consultation will be considered by NGVL and will feed into the selection of a preferred landfall and converter station site. The preferred converter station site will be selected following an assessment of the feedback received in relation to Phase 1 consultation, together with technical, environmental and engineering factors. The assessment of responses is based on the nature of the feedback rather than the quantity of feedback. The location of a converter station site will not be determined on the basis distributing development evenly across Parish boundaries. NGVL are not concerned that advances in technology will render the project unviable.

7.4 Other Comments

Other feedback received in relation to the Converter Station

7.4.1 A total of 440 people provided feedback on the shortlisted converter station sites by means other than the converter station feedback form (i.e. by letter or email etc). The key themes are summarised in the table below:

Table 7.14 Other feedback received in relation to the Converter Station	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Traffic and Transport Residents are concerned that the local road network is incapable of coping with the increase in traffic numbers; Some residents are concerned that construction traffic will conflict with agricultural vehicles and therefore increase the chance of road accidents. Residents stated that the A17 is officially classified as a "red route" and that the development of CS5 will potentially result in more traffic accidents. Some residents are of the opinion that a traffic study should be carried out on the A17; Residents are concerned that access to the Fen will be restricted; The local community state that National Grid's management of construction traffic was poor when the substation was constructed; Some residents state that the wind farm caused significantly negative impacts during construction, particularly on the local highway network, however, other residents note that CS9 already benefits from an access which serves the wind farm; Residents have queried whether or not temporary haul roads are able to accommodate construction vehicles and plant, and whether or not these would be removed once construction is complete; Some residents believe that the Triton Knoll access road should be considered to minimise disruption.	The feedback received in relation to the local highway network in terms of its use, capacity and safety issues is important to the project. NGVL is working closely with Lincolnshire County Council as the highway authority for this area to establish the key highway constraints and will continue dialogue to ensure access to the preferred site is safe. Traffic impacts will be considered and assessed as part of the Environmental Statement. A Traffic Management Plan will be agreed with Lincolnshire County Council and relevant Local Planning Authorities to ensure the temporary impact of construction traffic does not adversely impact on the local road network and avoids local villages. NGVL will work with the local highway authority in respect of any project impact in the local road network. Such arrangements will be agreed with Lincolnshire County Council and are being investigated to minimise the potential impact on the local road network. Where possible, NGVL will try to minimise any disruption to Public Rights of Way and Cycle Routes, however, some temporary impacts are likely to be inevitable. Access to the Fen will still be possible. Should Triton Knoll be consented and come to fruition and CS3 result in being the preferred converter station site, NGVL will look to engage with Triton Knoll in pursuit of a shared haul road from the A17.

Table 7.14 Other feedback received in relation to the Converter Station	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Noise and Vibration Residents are concerned with noise from converter station from construction traffic. Residents are also concerned with vibration impacts from the converter station; Residents are concerned with the risk of infrasound, whereby noise can travel long distances and resonate with buildings, having impacts on residents and wildlife; Residents are concerned with electromagnetic noise interference, which results in radio static from cables, causing interference with receivers such as TV and radio; Residents feel that other sites should be considered which have potentially lower noise impacts; Residents feel that any noise assessments should be verified by an independent body;	Noise from the proposed converter station will be assessed through the Environmental Statement and against current guidance and standards. Noise thresholds will be agreed with the relevant local planning authority. Low frequency noise will also be considered to ensure there are no significant adverse effects on surrounding residential receptors. Noise mitigation measures will be implemented as part of the UK Onshore Scheme and will be agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority. Noise mitigation is likely to form a condition of any consent.
Agricultural Land Residents have queried the depth of the cable and the restrictions that will be placed on farming practices if sited on agricultural land. A number of residents are concerned that the development of CS5 will adversely affect agricultural employment in the area. A number of residents note that CS5 is located further from the Bicker Fen Substation which could lead to greater impacts on agricultural land and fenland.	Extensive feedback on the depth of cable burial has been received and will form the basis of discussions with landowners affected by cable routeing. Comments received in respect of CS5 are noted.

Table 7.14 Other feedback received in relation to the Converter Station	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Landscape and Visual Impact Residents are concerned with the visual impact of the converter station and that this will spoil views across fenland. Residents are concerned with the cumulative impacts of development in this area and feel that cumulative impacts have not been sufficiently considered; Some residents feel that the converter station would create an industrial skyline development of its own accord; Residents have queried whether or not siting infrastructure in one place is positive or negative in the site assessment; Residents feel that the converter station will place a strain on the landscape and the impacts will be significantly worse than the existing turbines; Some residents feel that CS9 would fit better in the landscape, given the location next to existing infrastructure; Residents are concerned that a converter station at CS5 will be impossible to conceal given the height and proximity to the road network. Residents feel that sites other than CS5 (located deeper into the Fen), are likely to have less visual impact;	Visual impact is an important consideration in the site selection process and will inform the identification of the preferred option. All efforts will be made to reduce the potential visual impact of the converter station the design of which is likely to include screening planting, earth bunds, or a combination of both as part of an overall mitigation strategy. The cumulative effects of development will be considered in full through the Environmental Statement. The dimensions of the converter station are partly constrained by technical requirements, but the form of the structure will be designed to take into account the character and scale of the landscape. All efforts will be made to reduce the potential visual impact of the converter station. However, the low-lying and level nature of this landscape does not permit the siting of the proposal in a location entirely 'out of sight'. Comments on specific shortlisted converter station site options have been noted.
Ecology / Biodiversity Impacts SPA species have been regularly noted at CS3 and CS9; Residents are concerned with the potential impact to a wooded area which could be affected by the cable route at CS5. Residents are concerned with impacts on wildlife including badgers, foxes, hares, rabbits, hawks and owls;	All effects on ecological features will be identified, assessed and mitigated where necessary to ensure no significant effects. Few ecological constraints have been identified following initial surveys, however the feedback received in relation to the potential presence of protected species will be carefully considered.

Table 7.14 Other feedback received in relation to the Converter Station	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Urban Design and Virtual Reality Modelling Some residents are of the opinion that the design styles will not make the building less conspicuous; Residents are of the opinion that the converter station building will not fit in with the surroundings;	All efforts will be made to reduce the potential visual impact of the converter station, the design of which is likely to include screening planting, earth bunds, or a combination of both as part of an overall mitigation strategy. The dimensions of the converter station are partly constrained by technical requirements, but the form of the structure will be designed to take into account the character and scale of the landscape. However, the low-lying and level nature of this landscape does not permit the siting of the proposal in a location entirely 'out of sight'.
Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Some residents are concerned with the impact on St Mary's Parish Church, which is a listed building; Residents are concerned with the damage to the cultural heritage of Swineshead which includes 11 Listed Buildings and 2 Scheduled Monuments. One resident states that the settlement of Swineshead can be traced back to 675AD and as a result there are a number of medieval sites around the village;	The impact on archaeology and cultural heritage will be carefully considered as the UK Onshore Scheme develops and NGVL are proactively engaged with Historic England and Lincolnshire County Council to identify, assess and evaluate sources of known archaeology and cultural heritage. These features will be considered in the Environmental Statement.
Hydrology and Land Drainage Feedback indicates that drainage is a key consideration which should be considered very carefully. Residents are concerned that the impacts on natural drainage measures during construction will alter the natural make-up of the local drainage network. This will result in crop losses and should be compensated; Some residents are concerned that the HVDC cable will result in a threat to groundwater;	Drainage is a key consideration in the site selection process and development of the UK Onshore Scheme and will be considered in consultation with landowners, the Environment Agency and Internal Drainage Boards. NGVL will seek to minimise any disruption to the local drainage network and where this is unavoidable, drains will be fully reinstated using recognised best practice.

Table 7.14 Other feedback received in relation to the Converter Station	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Planning A number of residents state that a significant amount of housing (approx. 400 houses by 2036) are proposed at Swineshead, as Boston Borough Council is struggling to meet its five year housing land supply.	Developments in the area which have been granted planning consent or are the subject of a potential allocation have been considered in the site selection process and will continue to be monitored as the UK Onshore Scheme develops. Consented developments, together with current and emerging allocations in the Swineshead area have been taken into consideration in relation to CS5.
Health Effects Residents are concerned with unknown health risks associated with the converter station;	The UK Onshore Scheme will not result in any significant adverse health effects to the local community. NGVL will ensure the equipment used and installation methods comply with all appropriate independent safety standards.
Environmental Impact Some residents are of the opinion that CS9 will have less environmental impacts than some of the shortlisted converter station sites; Some residents feel that the project should be put on hold until a full impact analysis has been undertaken;	A full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will be undertaken for the UK Onshore Scheme which will consider all environmental effects and secure necessary mitigation where required.
Air Quality Residents are concerned with the potential for dust to be created during construction. Residents are particularly concerned that this would become airborne and travel significant distances over open Fenland. Residents were concerned that dust will have a huge impact on crops and could lead to a deterioration in air quality.	Requirements for dust mitigation / suppression during construction are likely to be a condition of any consent. The impact of the UK Onshore Scheme on air quality will be assessed and considered as part of the Environmental Statement.

Table 7.14 Other feedback received in relation to the Converter Station	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Communication / Consultation Approach Some residents feel that early engagement with communities has not taken place; Residents feel that further information could have been available at the consultation event including photo montages and typical plans of switchgear around the substation; Residents feel that a number of copies of the Site Selection Report should have been made available during consultation; Some residents feel that the consultation period for Phase 1 was not long enough and did not allow sufficient time for residents to study the available documents. Residents were concerned that there was no audio equipment available for the visually impaired; Some residents felt that the consultation excluded some groups including non-English speaking residents and those without internet access. The consultation should be considered flawed; Residents feel that there were mixed messages from NGVL representatives at the consultation events in relation to access arrangements and working hours; Residents note that there was not a representative from National Grid available at the consultation events; Some residents are of the opinion that project communication is deliberately vague and lacks detail, because decisions have already been made; (continued)	The converter station siting assessment included the identification and assessment of twenty one potential converter station sites. The assessment of sites considered potential impacts on the environment and local community alongside basic technical and engineering factors including land take required and accessibility. Four potential converter station sites (CS1, CS3, CS5 and CS9) were identified and taken forward to the Phase 1 Consultation with stakeholders and the local community. The extent of public consultation and advertisement was carefully considered and agreed with the relevant local planning authorities. NGVL consider the scope and extent of public consultation to be proportionate to the scale of the project and the matters considered at Phase 1 Consultation. NGVL are confident that the narrative provided to date is consistent and clear throughout project documents and consultation material. NGVL acknowledge that different residents require varied levels of information, which is why the event boards provided the key points emanating from the site selection process and more detailed documents were available if required. NGVL representatives (covering a range of technical specialisms) were on hand at all consultation events to answer questions and engage with the community. All feedback received from Phase 1 Consultation will be considered by NGVL and will feed into the selection of a preferred landfall and converter station site.

Table 7.14 Other feedback received in relation to the Converter Station	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
(continued) Some residents felt that the consultation feedback form was too closed. Some residents believe that it is archaic to encourage people to respond via post; Residents would like to understand how they can review feedback; Residents note that South Kyme and Heckington Parish Councils have not been consulted and are therefore not in receipt of the facts. Residents would like all Parish Councils to be kept informed as the project develops;	

Table 7.14 Other feedback received in relation to the Converter Station	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Project Development and Site Selection Some residents feel that the connection point study should have been subject to consultation and that the timescales for site selection were tight. Some residents feel that there is a lack of information as to why Bicker is the chosen connection point; Residents feel that the converter station does not need to be located at Bicker, only within a 5km radius and therefore the other sites should be considered; Some residents are concerned that the project is being considered in stages rather than as a whole; Some residents have queried why CS5 is larger than the other shortlisted options; Some residents feel that there are some non-disclosed reasons why some sites have been discounted; Some residents have queried the weighting which has been given to each criteria for the discounted sites; A number of residents are of the opinion that some sites have been discounted prematurely and that the reasoning in the Site Selection Report does not stack up. Some residents feel that there should be full and proper reconsideration of the 21 sites; One resident feels that CS2 should be used as the site is adjacent to the railway which could provide access. It is also suggested that delivery of materials could come from rail to reduce the impact on the local road network and the environment; Residents noted that CS4, CS6 and CS10 were all rejected on grounds of potential disturbance to large numbers of people. CS5 should be discounted on similar grounds. provided is not supported by evidence or statistics; (continued)	NGVL applied to National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) for a connection to the national electricity transmission network. NGET undertook a study of possible connection points and a number of different options were considered along the east of England. NGET, together with NGVL, identified Bicker Fen substation as the most appropriate connection point. Details of all the options identified and the assessments are included in a Connection Point Selection Report provided by NGET and a Strategic Options Report produced by NGVL. NGVL have carried out a comprehensive site selection process to identify a shortlist of site options for a converter station and a landfall point. This involved technical and feasibility studies as well as engagement with statutory Consultees, local authorities, parish councils and local residents. The full details of the converter station and landfall siting assessment are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report (April 2016). The preferred converter station site will be selected following an assessment of the feedback received in relation to Phase 1 consultation, together with technical, environmental and engineering factors. Feedback is measured on quality of responses and the issues raised rather than quantity. Not all the land indicated for CS5 will be required, should this site option be selected. The footprint required for the converter station operational site will be approximately 4.2 ha (10.5 acres) and some additional land may be required for landscape and drainage works. All feedback received from Phase 1 Consultation will be considered by NGVL and will feed into the selection of a preferred landfall and converter station site.

Table 7.14 Other feedback received in relation to the Converter Station	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
(continued) Some residents feel that the site selection process is heavily weighed against the residents of Bicker and that sites have only been selected for economic reasons rather than suitability; Some residents feel that financial and technical reasons have been prioritised over people's lives;	
Construction Impacts Residents believe that NGVL will be presented with construction challenges in the area due to running silt and a high water table; Residents have asked whether or not temporary construction facilities, including compound and laydown areas are to be returned to former condition once the need for them has passed; Residents suggest that a spare transformer should be kept on site in case of a breakdown to minimise impacts during operation;	The comments in relation to construction will be considered by NGVL engineers. The UK Onshore Scheme will necessitate temporary compounds and laydown areas to facilitate construction, however, once the scheme is complete, these will be removed and the land reinstated to its former condition.

8 Phase 1 Consultation Feedback – Stakeholders

8.1 Overview

8.1.1 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.

8.1.2 Some stakeholders have provided written responses to Phase 1 Consultation. This section highlights the key themes and site specific issues that were raised for both the shortlisted landfall and converter station site options, and seeks to draw out and respond to some of the key issues raised.

8.1.3 Further details on how representations received from stakeholders during Phase 1 Consultation will influence the decision for a preferred landfall and converter station site are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Preferred Sites Report.

8.1.4 The following stakeholders have provided written responses to Phase 1 Consultation. The feedback received has been summarised and is presented in tabular form to reflect the issues raised:

- Natural England;
- The Environment Agency;
- Historic England;
- The National Trust;
- Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust;
- The Crown Estate;
- The National Farmers Union;
- Lincolnshire County Council; and
- Boston Borough Council.
- (Note that North Kesteven and South Holland District Councils advised they had 'no comment' on Phase 1 Consultation.)

8.2 Natural England

8.2.1 The following comments have been received from Natural England. These are summarised in two separate tables below, one for the landfall and another for the converter station.

Table 8.1 Feedback received from Natural England – Landfall	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Licensing for protected species may be required for the UK Onshore Scheme and will fall to NGVL to determine this.	All effects on ecological features will be identified, assessed and mitigated where necessary to ensure no significant effects. The need for protected species licences will be considered and agreed with Natural England.
Competent authorities (in this instance the local planning authority) must have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive when exercising any of their functions, including whether or not to grant planning permission. This includes having regard to whether the development proposal is likely to negatively affect any European Protected Species (EPS) and whether any necessary licence is likely to be granted by Natural England.	NGVL are aware of the regulatory framework within which Local Authorities must operate. NGVL intends to continue with proactive stakeholder engagement to ensure such issues are considered and agreed with relevant stakeholders.
All three of the shortlisted landfall sites fall within or within close proximity to the Lincolnshire Coastal Grazing Marsh Project. Further investigation is advised when considering options for the cabling route and for minimising the impacts from the cable installation.	NGVL intends to consult on cable route option(s) in September 2016 through Phase 2 Consultation. The impact on the Lincolnshire Coastal Grazing Marshes will be considered through this process.
The Local Planning Authority should be contacted to discuss impacts on the Lincolnshire Coastal Country Park;	NGVL is in regular dialogue with the relevant local planning authorities and in particular the coastal country park department.
Reference should be had to National Character Areas (NCA) which divides England into 159 distinct natural areas (NCA 42 for Viking Link). A particular feature of interest in this NCA is the archaeological remains, particularly Roman and Bronze Age.	NGVL will have regard to National Character Areas when considering cable route options.
Natural England is currently in the process of finalising the proposed route for the Skegness to Mablethorpe coastal path, and would be happy to further engage in discussions about any interaction the Viking Link project may have.	NGVL will proactively engage with Natural England on such matters.

Table 8.1 Feedback received from Natural England – Landfall	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Natural England advise that a Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) should be undertaken for all shortlisted landfall sites;	NGVL will be undertaking a Habitat Regulations Assessment as part of the offshore scheme.
Natural England have submitted formal advise to Defra on a possible new SPA in the Greater Wash. Natural England advise that this is scoped into the HRA;	NGVL will be undertaking a Habitat Regulations Assessment as part of the offshore scheme.
LF1 Natural England advise that an assessment should be undertaken of the permeable substrate to ensure that any de-watering that may be carried out as part of LF1 will not impact on the hydrology of the Sea Banks Clay Pits SSSI. Natural England advise that LF1 would be the most straightforward site to manage in ecological terms.	If LF1 is selected as the preferred landfall, NGVL will undertake an assessment of the permeable substrate in accordance with advice from Natural England.
LF2 Natural England advise that any proposal for a landfall at this location should not impinge on the boundary of the Chapel Point to Wolla Bank geological SSSI; Natural England advise that an assessment should be undertaken of the permeable substrate to ensure that any de-watering that may be carried out as part of LF2 will not impact on the hydrology of the Sea Banks Clay Pits SSSI; Natural England advise that LF2 would result in a need for greater consideration of ecological and geological issues;	If LF2 is selected as the preferred landfall site, NGVL will ensure that construction works will not impinge on Chapel Point to Wolla Bank geological SSSI. Similarly, if LF2 is progressed, NGVL will undertake an assessment of the permeable substrate in accordance with advice from Natural England.

Table 8.1 Feedback received from Natural England – Landfall	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
LF1A Natural England advise that LF1A is within 0.4km south of the Huttoft Bank Pit and 0.3km north of Sandilands Pits which fall within the group of Sea Banks Clay Pits SSSIs. Natural England recommend that an assessment of the permeable substrate is carried out to ensure that any de-watering that may be carried out as part of the proposed landfall site will not impact on the hydrology of the SSSI;	If LF1a is selected as the preferred landfall, NGVL will undertake an assessment of the potential impact of the works on the hydrology of the SSSI.

Table 8.2 Feedback received from Natural England - Shortlisted Converter Station Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
CS1 Natural England welcome the potential to make enhancements through habitat creation;	NGVL will seek to create habitat enhancements where this is reasonable and necessary.
CS3 Natural England state that the landscape at CS3 falls within a landscape character type of moderate to high landscape sensitivity.	Visual impact is an important consideration in the site selection process and will inform the identification of the preferred option. All efforts will be made to reduce the potential visual impact of the converter station the design of which is likely to include screening planting, earth bunds, or a combination of both as part of an overall mitigation strategy. A full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will be undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement.

Table 8.2 Feedback received from Natural England - Shortlisted Converter Station Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
CS5 CS5 falls within Grade 1 agricultural land which is classified as Best and Most Versatile (BMV) and would potentially take over 20ha of land (47.16 ha). Reference should be had to paragraph 112 of the NPPF. Natural England advise that if the development proceeds at CS5, NGVL should use an appropriately experienced soil specialist to advise on, and supervise, soil handling, including identifying when soils are dry enough to be handled and how to make the best use of the different soils on site.	The overall site size at CS5 enables flexibility when looking at siting the converter station and not all the land shown will be required. Should CS5 be selected, the footprint required for the converter station operational site will be approximately 4.2 ha (10.5 acres) which is significantly less than the current site area, however, it is expected that some additional land may be required for landscape and drainage works should CS5 be selected as the preferred option. NGVL acknowledges the requirements of planning policy at paragraph 112 of the NPPF. Should CS5 be selected as the preferred converter station site, NGVL will enlist a soil specialist and produce a Soil Management Plan.
CS9 Natural England acknowledge that the site selection report has identified wintering birds on this site.	All effects on ecological features will be identified, assessed and mitigated where necessary to ensure no significant effects. Few ecological constraints have been identified following initial surveys.

8.3 Environment Agency

8.3.1 The following comments have been received from The Environment Agency. These are summarised in two separate tables below, one for the shortlisted landfall sites and second for the shortlisted converter station sites.

Table 8.3 Feedback received from The Environment Agency – Shortlisted Landfall Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
The Environment Agency considers the geological and hydro-geological information in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report to be accurate for all sites.	Comment noted.

Table 8.3 Feedback received from The Environment Agency – Shortlisted Landfall Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
The Environment Agency note that borehole records show that the principal Chalk aquifer is at least 19 m deep (LF3) and up to 23.5 m deep (LF2). The Environment Agency state that it is unlikely that any HDD would penetrate this depth and the risk to the aquifer is considered to be low.	Comments noted. This information will be used when further considering works at the preferred landfall site.
The Environment Agency state that there are no source protection zones, safeguard zones or known contaminated land issues at any of the proposed landfall locations.	Comment noted.
LF1 and LF1a – there is a deregulated abstraction used by Sandilands Golf Club for irrigation. The Environment Agency state that boreholes are worth considering for cabling obstructions. If any of these locations are in close proximity to the cable route, the golf club should be contacted for further information on the location of these boreholes.	Comments and information noted.
The Environment Agency state that borehole records close to LF2 record water strikes at around 3m depth, which rise to around 1.8m on standing.	Comments noted. This information will be noted if LF2 is selected as the preferred landfall site.
The Environment Agency note that two of the shortlisted landfall sites (LF1 and LF2) lie within areas with bathing waters designated under Bathing Water Directive. The Environment Agency state that if either of shortlisted sites LF1 or LF2 are taken forward, the project will need to ensure that the works do not impact the 'excellent' status currently enjoyed at these beaches.	The UK Onshore Scheme will not impact on the 'excellent' status of the bathing waters and beaches at LF1 or LF2 if either of these shortlisted landfall options are taken forward.
All the potential landfall sites are shown to be within the floodplain as detailed on the Environment Agency's Flood Zone Maps;	Noted.

Table 8.3 Feedback received from The Environment Agency – Shortlisted Landfall Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
The Environment Agency state that the crossing of the sea defences will need to be undertaken using HDD techniques, rather than open trenching methods, to ensure the defence integrity is maintained.	NGVL will use HDD techniques to cross sea defences
Environment Agency note that there will be no permanent above ground infrastructure at the landfall for the project	Noted and accurate.
The EA note that NGVL no longer intend to include the use of an electrode in the proposal and are keen to understand what other alternatives are now being considered and if these will have any ecological consequences;	NGVL are only promoting the scheme as set out in its UK Onshore Scheme which includes the construction of a converter station close to Bicker Fen 400 kV substation in Lincolnshire and a pair of underground and submarine HVDC cables. An electrode does not form part of the scheme being promoted.
The EA note that the Greater Wash draft Special Protection Area (SPA) may be designated for red throated diver and little gull and have asked what species of fish the divers eat and if the underwater cable is likely to affect their abundance?	EA's comments are noted, this will be considered in the UK Offshore Scheme Environmental Statement.
The Environment Agency require further information in respect of potential construction noise and vibration in the marine environment;	EA's comments are noted, this will be considered in the UK Offshore Scheme Environmental Statement.

Table 8.4 Feedback received from The Environment Agency – Shortlisted Converter Station Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
The Environment Agency state that aquifers are likely to be protected with even if piling is required for the preferred converter station site.	Comments noted.

Table 8.4 Feedback received from The Environment Agency – Shortlisted Converter Station Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Given the scale and nature of the development, the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) should consider the Upper End allowance categories, which for the Anglian River Basin District accounts for a 65% increase on flows. The Environment Agency states that the FRA would have to be of a 'detailed' nature, which would likely require detailed hydraulic modelling to be undertaken, to take into account the new climate change figures.	A detailed FRA for the selected Converter Station site will be undertaken, the methodology of which will be agreed with the EA, and form part of any planning application.
A sequential approach should be taken to the location of the converter station in accordance with the NPPG;	NGVL will apply a sequential approach in accordance with the NPPG when considering the siting of the converter station.
The Environment Agency will require a legal agreement for crossing main rivers;	Comment noted. NGVL considers this to be standard practice and will enter into such agreements where required.
Contact may also be required with the Environment Agency Estate team where the EA is a land owner;	NGVL Land Agents will secure all land agreements where necessary.
The Environment Agency recommend a joined up approach with the Internal Drainage Boards when considering potential cable route(s);	NGVL encourage collaborative working and would be happy to engage with both the EA and IDB on drainage matters.

8.4 Historic England

8.4.1 The following comments have been received from Historic England. These are summarised in two separate tables below, one for the shortlisted landfall sites and another for the shortlisted converter station sites.

Table 8.5 Feedback received from Historic England – Shortlisted Landfall Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Historic England are of the opinion that archaeology and cultural heritage should be considered in more depth at this stage;	Impacts on archaeology and cultural heritage will be considered in detail through the Environmental Statement once a preferred landfall sites has been selected

Table 8.5 Feedback received from Historic England – Shortlisted Landfall Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Historic England consider the main issue at the landfall to be direct impacts on archaeological remains;	Comments noted. NGVL will undertake a full archaeological watching brief as part of the UK Onshore Scheme.
Historic England welcome avoidance of the Lincolnshire Coastal Grazing Marshes given the long and rich cultural history;	Where possible, NGVL have sought to avoid environmental constraints including the Lincolnshire Coastal Grazing Marshes.
Historic England consider there to be potential for archaeological remains at LF1, LF1A and LF2, and features of interest at Huttoft, adjacent to Sandilands Gold Course and at Anderby;	Comments noted.
For assessment purposes, Palaeoenvironmental deposits should be considered Heritage Assets;	Comments noted. NGVL will consider Palaeoenvironmental deposits as heritage assets when undertaking archaeological and cultural heritage assessments.
Historic England note that there is substantial prehistoric peat and a submerged forest at Mablethorpe, Sutton-on-Sea and Anderby Creek;	Comments noted.
Historic England is concerned that a lack of access at LF1 means a greater chance of a haulage road being used and therefore potential impacts on Heritage Assets. Historic England would prefer existing roads to be used to minimise impacts;	Comments noted.
Historic England considers that a borehole survey would be of use to establish the extent and depth of peat deposits.	NGVL will be undertaking a borehole surveys at all shortlisted landfall sites.
HDD should be informed by the depth of peat;	Noted. The depth of peat will be one factor to inform the depth of HDD at the landfall.

Table 8.5 Feedback received from Historic England – Shortlisted Landfall Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Historic England have queried whether or not foreshore trenching will be required within the intertidal area;	NGVL intend to use trenchless techniques to bring the offshore cables to the Transition Joint Pit. The use of this technique and associated works is designed to not impact on the Lincshore scheme if it is still in operation at the time of the cable installation works. Further assessment of installation techniques is ongoing and will be considered as part of the UK Onshore and UK Offshore Environmental Statements
The depth of HDD should be informed by the historic environment at the chosen landfall site;	Noted. The historic environment will be one factor to inform the depth of HDD at the landfall.
Historic England have queries whether the dark line (indicated to represent the "study area" in the figure legend) is meant to represent the Mean Low Water Mark (the limit of jurisdiction of the relevant terrestrial local authority);	NGVL have now corrected these figures, and new versions have been issued to HE.
Historic England have requested confirmation that "environmental constraints" is inclusive of historic or archaeological features and sites;	Features and sites of cultural heritage and archaeology are considered environmental constraints for the purposes of the site selection assessment.
Historic England have requested that scaled maps are produced to illustrate proposed cable installation works with suitable illustration of environmental constraints;	NGVL will produce detailed maps of environmental constraints, plans of which will form part of the ES submission.
Historic England has queried whether HDD will extend 300m below MHWM or 300m below MLWS?	The feasibility and exact parameters of HDD at the landfall will be confirmed through further investigative work once a preferred landfall site has been selected.
Historic England advised that mapping should be produced to illustrate the spatial relationships between the area of foreshore subject to the "Lincshore" re-nourishment programme;	NGVL will seek to avoid any conflicts with the Lincshore beach re-nourishment scheme which is currently in operation, by using HDD techniques at the landfall. The offshore and onshore Environmental Statements will consider Lincshore in their respective intertidal chapters.

Table 8.6 Feedback received from Historic England – Shortlisted Converter Station Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Historic England state that a key concern at the converter station will be the impact that a visually intrusive modern development of this nature will have on the significance heritage assets and their setting. Historic England advise that these impacts will need to be understood in detail to identify which site represents the least harmful option in historic environment terms, a factor that should inform the final site selection process; The openness of the views in this area means that heritage assets, such as church spires and towers, often form key visual receptors and landmarks. As such, the impact of the proposed converter station on these heritage assets will need to be understood in detail; Historic England also note that Assets beyond 5km from the proposed development may also have potential to be affected and this would need to be considered in detail. Historic England advise that further work is required to establish whether there is potential for views of the tower of the Grade I listed St Botolph's Church in Boston (known as Boston Stump) to be affected by the development.	The impact on archaeology and cultural heritage will be carefully considered as the UK Onshore Scheme develops and NGVL are proactively engaged with Historic England and Lincolnshire County Council to identify, assess and evaluate sources of known archaeology and cultural heritage. Once a preferred converter station site has been selected, the impacts on archaeology and cultural heritage will be considered in the Environmental Statement. NGVL note the comments received in relation to the openness of the area and the potential visual impacts on taller receptors and landmarks.

Table 8.6 Feedback received from Historic England – Shortlisted Converter Station Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
CS1 Historic England note: · 4 Scheduled Monuments; · 44 Listed Buildings (6 Grade I & II*); and · 2 Conservation Areas within 5km of CS1. Historic England highlights the need for the potential impacts on the Grade I listed churches of St Swithin in Bicker, St Mary and the Holy Rood in Donington and the Conservation Areas in these two villages to be considered in depth. Historic England states that CS1 offers opportunities for the development to be screened and from some views it would be seen in the context of existing infrastructure development. A comparatively large number of designated heritage assets still have potential to be affected;	The comments received in relation to CS1 will inform the site selection process.

Table 8.6 Feedback received from Historic England – Shortlisted Converter Station Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
CS3 Historic England note: · 5 Scheduled Monuments; · 27 Listed Buildings (2 Grade II); and · 2 Conservation Areas within 5km of CS3. Historic England highlight the need for careful assessment of the potential impacts on the Grade I listed churches of St Swithin in Bicker and St Mary in Swineshead and the Conservation Areas in both villages as well as the scheduled monument of The Manwar Ings motte and bailey castle due to the importance of visibility across the landscape. Historic England state that a relatively small number of designated heritage assets affected at CS3 and that this site is the furthest removed from the location of those assets, with the closest being 2.5km away. In addition, the South Forty Foot it would be seen in the context of existing infrastructure development;	The comments received in relation to CS3 will inform the site selection process.

Table 8.6 Feedback received from Historic England – Shortlisted Converter Station Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
CS5 Historic England note: · 4 Scheduled Monuments; · 52 Listed Buildings (6 Grade I and II*); and · 4 Conservation Areas within 5km of CS5. Historic England highlight the need for careful assessment of the potential impacts on the Grade I listed churches of St Swithin in Bicker, St Mary in Swineshead and St Mary and the Holy Rood in Donington, the Conservation Areas in all those villages as well as the scheduled monuments of The Manwar Ings motte and bailey castle and Swineshead Abbey with its Grade II listed house. From a heritage perspective, Historic England state that CS5 is likely to result in significant environmental effects on the significance of a large number of designated heritage assets due to its proximity to Swineshead;	The comments received in relation to CS5 will inform the site selection process. NGVL consider CS5 is the least favourable site from a cultural heritage perspective.

Table 8.6 Feedback received from Historic England – Shortlisted Converter Station Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
CS9 Historic England note: · 6 Scheduled Monuments; · 54 Listed Buildings (6 Grade I and II*); and · 3 Conservation Areas within 5km of CS9. Historic England highlight the need for careful assessment of the potential impacts on the Grade I listed churches of St Swithin in Bicker, St Mary in Swineshead and St Mary and the Holy Rood in Donington, the Conservation Areas in all those villages as well as the scheduled monuments of The Manwar Ings motte and bailey castle and Swineshead Abbey with its Grade II listed house. At CS9 Historic England state that the close proximity to existing infrastructure development may help to limit the overall harmful impact of the development on the historic environment by containing the industrial development within this part of the reclaimed fen. However a comparatively large number of designated heritage assets may still be affected.	Comments noted.
The setting of heritage assets should be carefully considered and consultation should be had with local authority Conservation Officers; Historic England are of the view that sufficient information is not yet available to shortlist a preferred site;	The impact on archaeology and cultural heritage will be carefully considered as the UK Onshore Scheme develops and NGVL are proactively engaged with Historic England and Lincolnshire County Council to identify, assess and evaluate sources of known archaeology and cultural heritage. Once a preferred converter station site has been selected, the impacts on archaeology and cultural heritage will be considered in the Environmental Statement.

8.5 National Trust

8.5.1 The following comments have been received from the National Trust.

Table 8.7 Feedback received from The National Trust

Feedback	NGVL response
The vast majority of Gunby Hall and its surroundings is inalienable land;	NGVL note the position concerning inalienable land, but would like greater clarity from National Trust as to the exact extent of such land.
Gunby Estate includes a number of Listed Buildings and is of high archaeological interest;	NGVL recognise the known and potential archaeology and cultural heritage at Gunby Hall. This will be considered for cable routeing.
Impacts on the Gunby Estate should be considered in context of the NPPF and East Lindsey Local Plan;	NGVL understand and acknowledge the planning policy framework against which the UK Onshore Scheme will be considered.
A wide number of heritage assets, dating from the Bronze Age to 19th century have been recorded within the estate, including a moated manor site and two medieval villages;	NGVL recognise the known and potential archaeology and cultural heritage within the estate. This will be considered for cable routeing.
Due to the nature of the extant earthworks at Gunby, National Trust strongly advise that that emerging options for the cable corridor should avoid Gunby Estate.	Comments noted for cable routeing.
The Gunby Estate is ecologically rich, including Great Crested Newt.	Should cable routeing include National Trust land at Gunby Hall, all effects on ecological features will be identified, assessed and mitigated where necessary to ensure no significant effects.

Table 8.7 Feedback received from The National Trust	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Gunby Hall and the Estate serve as a visitor attraction. Proposals should therefore aim to minimise noise, visual impact and other forms of disturbance associated with construction. Peak visitor periods should be avoided;	Should cable routeing include National Trust land at Gunby Hall and the Estate, NGVL will take into consideration any impacts on tourism when planning construction works, which will be secured through a Construction Environmental Management Plan, to be agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority. Effects on tourism will be temporary during construction of the UK Onshore Scheme and the timing of works will take into consideration such impacts. Once operational, the scheme is not considered to have a significant effect on tourism.
NGVL should work closely with Lincolnshire County Council and the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust to avoid adverse impacts on landscape and ecology at the Landfall.	NGVL are currently engaged in ongoing dialogue with a number of stakeholders, including Lincolnshire County Council (on a number of fronts) and the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust. This engagement will continue as the UK Onshore Scheme develops.
National Trust feel there is a disappointing disconnect between NGVL and Triton Knoll and lack of strategic thinking.	NGVL has undertaken dialogue with Triton Knoll. Triton Knoll is a separate project and has progressed further along the consenting process. It is to be consented under a different planning regime (Development Consent Order under the Planning Act 2008) and their consent application does not include for Viking Link. Viking Link will be consented under the local planning process. Viking Link and Triton Knoll are using two different technologies which are not compatible. There are also practical considerations which need to be taken into account including the timing and programme of the two projects, contract management, traffic management and the land that would be required to accommodate both projects together.

8.6 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

8.6.1 The following comments have been received from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust.

Table 8.8 Feedback received from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

Feedback	NGVL response
The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust state that their preferred landfall site is LF1A as LF1 and LF2 involve crossing a nature reserve at Huttoft Marsh or Anderby Marsh;	Comments noted.
Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust has concerns for the use of HDD and that transition joint pits might need to be located in the nature reserve.	Comments noted. The use of HDD at the landfall will be considered in more detail at once a preferred landfall site has been selected and survey results interrogated.
Concerns regarding hydrological impacts as both nature reserves are wetland sites;	Comments noted. NGVL will seek to minimise any hydrological impacts at the landfall through careful liaison with landowners, the Environment Agency and Internal Drainage Boards.
Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust will seek firm assurances of no impacts if LF1 or LF2 are to be taken forward;	Comments noted.
Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust notes that LF1 requires HDD under Sandilands Golf Course, which is a local wildlife site. The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the use of HDD in this location to avoid impacts;	NGVL will seek to avoid any significant impacts on the environment at the landfall, by using HDD techniques. This will, however, require further investigation as the UK Onshore Scheme develops.
The timing of works will need to be considered due to birds in the area and should be informed by data searches;	NGVL is liaising with Natural England, Lincolnshire County Council and the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust to ensure all ecological impacts are assessed and where appropriate, mitigated. NGVL will ensure appropriate ecological data is acquired to inform the UK Onshore Scheme.
Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust has no specific comments on the converter station sites and supports the notion that they have avoided locally designated sites;	All effects on ecological features will be identified, assessed and mitigated where necessary to ensure no significant effects. Few ecological constraints have been identified following initial surveys.

Table 8.8 Feedback received from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Ecology surveys should be used to inform site selection and mitigation applied where appropriate;	All effects on ecological features will be identified, assessed and mitigated where necessary to ensure no significant effects.
Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust note that a cable route has not been selected, but would have concerns if this were to go through the Lincolnshire Coastal Grazing Marshes, particularly at Burgh-le-Marsh;	NGVL will, where possible, seek to avoid environmentally sensitive locations when undertaking a cable routeing exercise.

8.7 Lincolnshire County Council

8.7.1 The following comments have been received from Lincolnshire County Council. These are summarised in two separate tables below, one for the shortlisted landfall sites and another for the shortlisted converter station sites.

Table 8.9 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – Shortlisted Landfall Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
LF1 Environmental Services – object to this option. The dunes are situated within an area covered by the Sandhills Act. The dunes form part of the Huttoft Car Terrace to Marsh Yard Dunes Local Wildlife Site. The beach is a Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS). Land between Huttoft Car Terrace and Huttoft Bank is Huttoft Bank nature reserve. It is jointly managed as grazing marsh habitat by LCC and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust. Public Access: permissive footpath (all mobility) is being created immediately behind the dunes to give access to Huttoft Marsh Nature Reserve. This will form the route of the England Coast path due to open in 2017. If HDD is required to start 300m east of MHWM to avoid Lincshore operations, then it may not be possible to avoid the Transition Joint Pit (TJP) being located within the nature reserve causing damage to the grazing marsh habitat and disturbance to the associated wildlife. (continued)	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council are noted in relation to LF1.

Table 8.9 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – Shortlisted Landfall Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
(continued) LCC require assurances that new wetland scrapes can be created over the cables and that water levels can be increased in this hydrological unit. Archaeology - a Neolithic polished flint axe has been found within the site, within a Lower Paleolithic flint blade just south of the site and a WW11 pillbox just to the south-west. Transport/Highways – note that it is proposed to be accessed by new haul road from A52 which would be appropriate since Roman Bank, Sea Lane, Sea Road and other existing roads are too narrow and alignments are inappropriate for construction vehicles. Agricultural Land Classification – note this site falls within the Lincolnshire Coast Grazing Marsh area and note that may require substantial additional land for access purposes as the suitable main road is 2.3km from the site.	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council are noted in relation to LF1.

Table 8.9 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – Shortlisted Landfall Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
LF2 Environmental Services – object to this option. Landfall lies within Lincolnshire Coastal Country Park (LCCP). Dunes lie within area covered by Sandhills Act. Dunes form part of Anderby Creek Sand Dunes LWS. Land between the dunes and Roman Bank road is Anderby Marsh nature reserve owned and managed by LWT. It is an important grazing marsh habitat, part of a single hydrological unit between Anderby and Chapel Six Marshes. Public Access: permissive footpath runs north to south through the dunes between the Round House and Wolla Bank overlooking Anderby Marsh nature reserve and Wolla Bank Reedbed nature reserve (SSSI). This will form the route of the England Coast Path to be open in 2017. If HDD is required to start 300m east of MHWM to avoid Lincshore operations then it may not be possible to avoid the TJP being located within the nature reserve causing damage to the grazing marsh habitat and disturbance to the associated wildlife. LCC require assurances that new wetland scrapes can be created over the cables and that water levels can be increased in this hydrological unit. Transport/Highways – note that it is proposed to be accessed by new haul road from A52 which would be appropriate since Roman Bank, Sea Lane, Sea Road and other existing roads are too narrow and alignments are inappropriate for construction vehicles. Archaeology – Roman potsheds have been found in the north and the south of the site boundaries with a Neolithic flint knife found just south of the area. Agricultural Land Classification – site situated within Lincolnshire Coast Grazing Marsh area. There may be negative factors associated with proximity to the TK cable land fall location should this development proceed.	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council are noted in relation to LF2.

Table 8.9 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – Shortlisted Landfall Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
LF1A Environmental Services - landfall lies within LCCP. Dunes lie within the area covered by the Sandhills Act (see above). Sandilands golf course lies immediately west of sea defence/sea wall and is part of Sandilands Golf Course and Dunes Local Wildlife Site. Public access for pedestrians and cyclists along the promenade / sea wall between Sandilands and Huttoft Car Terrace will form the route of the England Coast Path from 2017. This is the narrowest section of land between the MHWM and Roman Bank (approx. 125m). This will enable the cable to be HDD between the stated 300m east of MHWM to arable land, west of Roman Bank. Ideally if the HDD method is used then the TJP could be located in arable land to the west of Roman Bank with no disturbance to the golf course. Transport/Highways – note that it is proposed to be accessed by new haul road from A52 which would be appropriate since Roman Bank, Sea Lane, Sea Road and other existing roads are too narrow and alignments are inappropriate for construction vehicles. Archaeology - prehistoric Beaker found just north of site. Agricultural Land Classification – outside Coastal Grazing Marsh area. Although there would be impact this would be potentially less than the LF1 and LF2 sites.	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council are noted in relation to LF1A.

Table 8.9 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – Shortlisted Landfall Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Additional information required A sufficiently detailed archaeological desk top assessment combined with archaeological field walking and geophysical survey where appropriate would allow an assessment to be made on whether intrusive trail trenching may be required to support the Environmental Statement. Highways/Transport – junction layout proposals for temporary and final designs @ 1:500 scale generally to DMRB standards; Swept paths of access proposals and along designated routes at key junctions; and estimate of construction traffic, routings, duration, time of year (note seasonal traffic flows in this area – peaks in summer). Agricultural Land Classification – detailed ALC survey in accordance with Natural England Technical Note TIN049. Soil Management Plan to show how soil will be protected during construction and how land will be restored following construction. Land Drainage – detailed assessment of existing land drainage schemes should be documented with proposals agreed for mitigation both temporary during construction and permanent post construction both in respect of any temporary working areas, or where site has a potential impact on neighbouring land uses. Noise - Whilst not a direct responsibility of the County Council it is considered that further work needs to be undertaken to explain the noise levels from the CS and from the electrical process and cooling fans. It is acknowledged that a full noise assessment will need to be submitted with the Environmental Statement and this should address the noise issues in more detail.	A number of technical assessments will be undertaken in due course which will inform the Environmental Statement; the scope of assessments will be agreed with relevant consultees at the appropriate time.

Table 8.9 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – Shortlisted Landfall Sites	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Based on the detailed Environmental Services comments the preferred option is location LF1a. The other 2 options should be discounted due to the potential negative impacts on the nature conservation value contained within sites LF1 and LF2. NGVL should be aware of the cumulative impacts should Triton Knoll be given approval.	Comments noted.

Table 8.10 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – Converter Station	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
CS1 Archaeology – An archaeological evaluation is required to assess the impact on Prehistoric or Romano-British settlement cropmarks; Transport / Highways – The proposed new access haul road from the A52 Donington by-pass would be more suited to access midway along bypass between Church Street and Station Road roundabout. Dependent upon the number of turning movements a suitable dedicated right-turn facility may be required to minimise the interruption of normal traffic flows and prevent abnormal queuing. This haul road would assist in avoiding impact on residential properties. Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) – CS1 has a Grade 2 ALC. LCC note that distance from CS1 to the Bicker Fen 400 kV substation is 1.29 km and there could be difficulty connecting this site with the public highway.	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council are noted in relation to CS1.

Table 8.10 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – Converter Station	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
CS3 Archaeology - evidence of medieval and post medieval pottery scatter, undated enclosures and ditches south of site. Records show a variety of archaeological features and artefacts which indicate a potential for impact on underlying archaeological remains. An archaeological evaluation would be required to assess the impacts. Transport/Highways – use of existing roads on highway network not be suitable without substantial upgrades being considered. Potential for a new access onto A17 strategic route will need careful consideration. Close proximity of Swineshead Bridge Level Crossing presents potential and significant safety issues and will require support and approval of Network Rail. A dedicated ghost right turn facility would be required to ensure safe turning movements of vehicles into new access road and sufficient queuing space to prevent any potential for blocking back to the level crossing. Another possibility is to create a left turn only movement resulting in traffic wishing to turn right having to use the A17/52 roundabout to the south. If Triton Knoll comes to fruition, Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) suggest that both developers work together to enable joint use of one access road onto the A17 due to its strategic importance and the level of traffic using the A17 throughout the year. Agricultural Land Classification - site is Grade 2 whilst the size of the consultation site is smaller compared to some of others, the additional land potentially required to provide a viable access and distance from the sub-station would increase the impact of this site. The site is approximately 2km from the Bicker Fen 400 kV substation, and as a result the likely cumulative impact of this site could be significant. From a desk-top analysis, CS3 is the preferred site	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council are noted in relation to CS3.

Table 8.10 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – Converter Station	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
CS5 Archaeology – CS5 is adjacent to Stenning Deserted Medieval Village which may extend into this site and Estovening Hall which is a moated site. To south-east adjacent to Medieval Manor site and to south-west adjacent to Prehistoric or Romano- British settlement cropmarks. Indication that a Romano-British settlement in centre of the site. The site is given high potential for archaeology and a full archaeological evaluation would have to be undertaken to assess the scale of the impact. Transport/Highways – use of the existing highway network (namely Park Lane) is a possibility as there is an existing junction onto the A17. However this would require a substantial upgrade to accommodate the level of traffic anticipated and a need to review the junction arrangements to ensure safety is not compromised and there are no adverse effects on the A17. Agreement would need to be reached with Network Rail. A ghost island right turn would be required for the haul road. If TK is approved then it would be preferable for same access point to be used. Agricultural Land Classification – although the site has been selected for further consideration it is not considered that there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate this site is suitable. The site is Grade 1 land which is of excellent agricultural merit and high productive. For this reason this site is opposed when there are alternatives available on Grade 2 land. Due to the high agricultural value of this land it should be discounted. (continued)	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council are noted in relation to CS5.

Table 8.10 Feedback received from Lincolnshire County Council – Converter Station	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
(continued) The emerging South-East Lincolnshire Local Plan has identified that Swineshead will accommodate a further 400 dwellings over the next 20 years which could bring residential properties closer to site CS5 as some of these potential sites are situated between the village curtilage and CS5. CS5 should be discounted and removed from the process.	
CS9 Archaeology – CS9 borders post medieval flood defence ditches. Records show that there is potential for Neolithic and prehistoric sites in the area. An archaeological evaluation would need to be undertaken to assess the impact on underlying remains. Transport/Highways – this site could utilise the existing haul road that exists from the A52. The use of Cowbridge Road would not be suitable due to impacts previous developments had in this area. Construction of a dedicated access route to the north-east would be preferred. Use of Bicker Road and Vicarage Drove would need to be assessed in terms of the level of traffic movements anticipated as part of the development. Agricultural Land Classification – the site is Grade 2 which is preferable to Grade 1 from. The site benefits from close proximity to Bicker Fen 400 kV substation being 0.07 km distant. From an ALC perspective this is the site that is most suitable for further consideration. The CS9 site will be opposed by the residents of Bicker due to its proximity to the village and due to the problems encountered with site construction traffic using local public roads for the windfarm development. Local residents fear that similar issues will be experienced again.	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council are noted in relation to CS9.

8.8 Savills (on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council)

8.8.1 Savills (UK) Limited ("Savills") has been instructed on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council to provide comment on the shortlisted landfall and converter station site options subject to Phase 1 Consultation for the UK Onshore Scheme.

8.8.2 Savills' comments relate to the impact of the proposal on agriculture, land use, and soils, including related issues of agricultural land drainage. Savills have also been asked by Lincolnshire County Council to confirm what information would be required at the planning application stage.

8.8.3 The comments received from Savills (on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council) are summarised below:

Table 8.11 Feedback received from Savills on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council

Feedback	NGVL response
Traffic and Transport Savills note that the shortlisted converter station site options will require site access which could result in the loss of further agricultural land. Savills would like to see any impacts minimised and note that many of the roads found locally are unsuitable for construction traffic, including Timm's Drove.	Traffic impacts will be considered and assessed as part of the Environmental Statement. A Traffic Management Plan will be agreed with Lincolnshire County Council (as highway authority) and relevant Local Planning Authorities to ensure the temporary impact of construction traffic does not adversely impact on the local road network and avoids local villages. NGVL will look to make improvements to the local road network or consider a haul road depending on the site to be taken forward. Such arrangements will be agreed with Lincolnshire County Council and the local planning authority and are being investigated to minimise the potential impact on the local road network.

Table 8.11 Feedback received from Savills on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Agricultural Land Savills would prefer a converter station site in an area of Grade 2 land rather than Grade1. Savills note that the National Planning Policy Framework states that "*Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality*".	As identified on the most currently available Agricultural Land Classification mapping, all the land within a 5 km radius of Bicker Fen 400 kV substation is Best and Most Versatile (BMV) quality and hence the development of the converter station on BMV land is unavoidable. Although the land taken by the converter station would be permanently lost to agricultural use, the area of loss in relation to the amount of BMV land within the locale is very small. Additionally, appropriate mitigation measures would be in place to ensure that the soils were correctly handled and stored to minimise loss of soil function. Agricultural land will be taken out of production for the cable on a temporary basis. NGVL note the planning policy position outlined at paragraph 112 of the NPPF.
Site Size Savills question the need for variations in site size between the shortlisted converter station site options.	Converter station sites were identified on the basis of environmental constraints, field boundaries and a 200 m buffer applied around potential residential properties. The size of converter station sites allow some flexibility as to where the converter station might be located within the site and how it might be orientated. The converter station operational site will be approximately 4.2 ha (10.5 acres).
Cumulative Impacts Savills recognise the benefits from siting the converter station within close proximity to Bicker Fen 400 kV substation (given technical requirements), and recognise that there are opportunities to mitigate the project through shared access and reducing the impact on local drainage.	NGVL will consider the cumulative impacts of development through the Environmental Statement and where possible, will aim to minimise the cumulative effects of development in the area. With regard to Triton Knoll, NGVL will consider a potential shared access road and means of reducing impacts on local drainage. This is predicated on the basis that Triton Knoll will be consented, will come to fruition and the preferred converter station site lends itself to collaborative working.

Table 8.11 Feedback received from Savills on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Shortlisted Converter Station Sites Savills desktop assessment of the proposals based on the information within UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report, points to a preferred site of CS9. In Savills opinion, the cumulative impact of site CS9 on the scheme could be potentially reduced through collaboration with Triton Knoll (if indeed this comes to fruition) on matters including inter alia, access and drainage. This could further strengthen the suitability of CS9.	Savills's assessment and comments provided in relation to the shortlisted converter station sites are noted.
Shortlisted Landfall Sites Taking into account the relevant factors, the most preferable location is LF1a. Savills note that this falls outside of their remit and that the main pitfall of this site is its proximity to a residential site.	Savills's assessment and comments provided in relation to the shortlisted landfall sites are noted.
Further information required Further information to support a planning application: · A detailed Agricultural Land Classification Survey; · A Soil Management Plan; · A detailed assessment of existing drainage schemes; · Detailed information for site access (both temporary and permanent); · Justification for the size of shortlisted sites; and · The entire scheme should be assessed as one.	NGVL will be undertaking a range of technical and environmental assessment which will form the basis of the Environmental Statement. The comments received in respect of further work to support a planning application are noted.

8.9 The Crown Estate

8.9.1 The following comments have been received from The Crown Estate and are summarised in the table below:

Table 8.12 Feedback received from The Crown Estate	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
The Crown Estate state that Onshore and Offshore infrastructure from the Viking Link Interconnector has the potential to impact on seabed, foreshore, river crossings and agricultural land owned by the Crown Estate;	Comments noted.
The Crown Estate indicate that a number of agreements will need to be progressed in relation to the UK Onshore Scheme. The first for foreshore and seabed and second for agricultural / rural land.	NGVL will engage with the Crown Estate where such agreements are appropriate and necessary.

8.10 The National Farmers Union

8.10.1 The following comments have been received from The National Farmers Union.

Table 8.13 Feedback received from The National Farmers Union	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
Once of the key issues for farmers and the NFU is why the cable has to connect with the electricity grid at Bicker, which involves severely affecting more than forty miles of farmland, when in the NFUs view, it could connect at Killingholme with a much shorter route.	NGVL applied to National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) for a connection to the national electricity transmission network. NGET undertook a study of possible connection points and a number of different options were considered along the east of England. NGET, together with NGVL, identified Bicker Fen substation as the most appropriate connection point. Details of all the options identified and the assessments are included in a Connection Point Selection Report provided by NGET and a Strategic Options Report produced by NGVL.
Farmers and Parish Councils are already speaking to the NFU about their contact with NGVL Land Agents. The NFU would like to be kept in the loop for key discussions and project developments.	NGVL will continue to engage with the NFU as the UK Onshore Scheme progresses.

Table 8.13 Feedback received from The National Farmers Union	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
The NFU are very interested in the Bicker Fen site and how low it is in comparison to the surrounding land. The NFU are also keen to understand what plans NGVL have to make the grid connection at Bicker resilient.	NGVL and NGET met with the NFU on the 4th August and ran through these matters.

8.11 Boston Borough Council

8.11.1 The following comments have been received from Boston Borough Council and are summarised in the table below:

Table 8.14 Feedback received from Boston Borough Council	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
BBC are disappointed that the presentation made to Members was based on four shortlisted sites rather than the initial 21.	The converter station siting assessment included the identification and assessment of twenty one potential converter station sites. The assessment of sites considered potential impacts on the environment and local community alongside basic technical and engineering factors including land take required and accessibility. Four potential converter station sites (CS1, CS3, CS5 and CS9) were identified and taken forward to the Phase 1 Consultation with stakeholders and the local community.

Table 8.14 Feedback received from Boston Borough Council	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
BBC did not have any input into the shortlisting of sites and feel the consultation process has moved very quickly from 21 to 4 sites. BBC are of the opinion that the list of sites moved from 21, to 8 and then 4 in isolation of each other and the Council would have expected some comparisons site against site to establish the relative advantages and disadvantages. BBC are of the view that there is no evidence of how or what the relative weighting of each factor was in the site selection process. BBC are unable to see how the balancing exercise has been carried out; "Local Authority Weighting" should have been included in the site selection process and could have been extended to include Parish Council or Statutory Bodies;	NGVL have carried out a comprehensive site selection process to identify a shortlist of site options for a converter station and a landfall point. This involved technical and feasibility studies as well as engagement with statutory Consultees, local authorities, parish councils and local residents. The full details of the converter station and landfall siting assessment are set out in the UK Onshore Scheme Site Selection Report (April 2016). The feedback received from stakeholders and the local community will be used to inform a preferred landfall and converter station site from the four shortlisted sites.
BBC state that the consideration of planning policy is flawed. Policies G5 and G9 of the Adopted Local Plan are not saved. BBC state that Policy CO1 should be included, however the relevance of Policy ED11 is questioned;	The comments provided in respect of planning policy are noted.
BBC would prefer to review the Consultation Feedback Report before expressing a preference for a converter station site out of the shortlisted options;	Comments noted.
BBC would like to review any technical and environmental assessments used to inform the preferred site options;	NGVL met with BBC on the 24th June and ran through the assessment process used to inform site selection.
BBC are of the view that all of the relevant Council(s) should be consulted once the Consultation Feedback Report and supporting technical and environmental assessments are available;	NGVL are keen to continue proactive engagement with all stakeholders. However, the next stage of formal consultation will be Phase 2, commencing in September 2016, which will seek feedback on cable routeing and provide more detail in relation to converter station design.

Table 8.14 Feedback received from Boston Borough Council	
Feedback	**NGVL response**
BBC do not wish to suggest that alternative sites are considered at this stage;	Comments noted.
Consideration should be had to the deliverability of access routes in context of landowner engagement;	NGVL are currently speaking to landowners affected by the shortlisted landfall and converter station site options. This dialogue will develop as the project progresses and the feasibility of access options will better understood as relationships with landowners develop.
BBC acknowledges that the South East Lincolnshire Plan should only be attributed little weight given the stage of preparation. However, BBC consider it would be useful for any scoring matrix to acknowledge that there are three potential housing allocations between Swineshead and the A17;	Developments in the area which have been granted planning consent, are allocated for development or are the subject of a potential allocation have been considered in the site selection process and will continue to be monitored as the UK Onshore Scheme develops.
The four shortlisted converter station sites should be subject to more detailed noise scrutiny before coming to a decision.	NGVL are confident that all shortlisted converter station sites can be sited and designed to meet expected noise thresholds. Detailed noise assessments will take place once a preferred landfall and converter station site have been selected.
The site Selection Report indicates that each of the preferred sites is capable of being mitigated to the noise thresholds, but no details have been included either individually or cumulatively;	NGVL are confident that all shortlisted converter station sites can be designed, constructed and appropriately mitigated to meet expected noise thresholds.
There is no reference to low frequency noise;	Low frequency noise will be considered in more detail once a preferred site has been selected through ongoing dialogue with the local environmental health officer.
BBC is in agreement with the approach to consenting, including the process of the planning application and the fee administration;	Comments noted.

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.