

Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind

The Applicant's Responses to Host Authorities Local Impact Reports

Deadline 2

Date: November 2024

Document Reference: 19.3

Rev: 1.0

Company:		Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind		Asset:	Whole Asset	
Project:		Whole Wind Farm		Sub Project/Package:	Whole Asset	
Document Title or Description:		The Applicant's Responses to Host Authorities Local Impact Reports				
Internal Document Number:		PP1-ODOW-DEV-CS-REP-0242		3 rd Party Doc No (If applicable):	N/A	
Rev No.	Date	Status/Reason for Issue	Author	Checked by	Reviewed by	Approved by
1.0	November 2024	Response to Host Authorities Local Impact Reports (submitted at Deadline 1)	Outer Dowsing/SLR	Shepherd & Wedderburn	Outer Dowsing	Outer Dowsing

Table of Contents

Acronyms & Definitions	3
Abbreviations / Acronyms	3
Terminology	4
1 The Applicant’s Responses to Host Authorities Local Impact Reports.....	6
1.1 Local Impact Report from Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) (REP1-053)	7
1.2 Joint Local Impact Report from Boston Borough Council, East Lindsey District Council and South Holland District Council (REP1-052).....	55

Acronyms & Definitions

Abbreviations/Acronyms

Acronym	Meaning
ALC	Agricultural Land Classification
BEIS	Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (now the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ))
BMV	Best and Most Versatile
CEA	Cumulative Effects Assessment
CoCP	Code of Construction Practice
CTMP	Construction Traffic Management Plan
DBA	Desk Based Assessment
DCO	Development Consent Order
DESNZ	Department for Energy Security and Net Zero, formerly Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS), which was previously Department of Energy & Climate Change (DECC)
DLUHC	Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
ExA	Examining Authority
ETG	Expert Topic Group
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment
GLVIA	Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
GT R4 Ltd	The Applicant. The special project vehicle created in partnership between Corio Generation, TotalEnergies and GULF.
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicles
HLC	Historic Landscape Character
HVAC	High Voltage Alternating Current
HVDC	High Voltage Direct Current
LCC	Lincolnshire County Council
LIR	Local Impact Report
LNR	Local Nature Reserve
LPA	Local Planning Authority
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
LWS	Local Wildlife Site
MDS	Maximum Design Scenario
MHWS	Mean High Water Springs
MLWS	Mean Low Water Springs
N/A	Not Applicable
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPS	National Policy Statement
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
O&M	Operation and Maintenance

Acronym	Meaning
OCTMP	Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan
ODOW	Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind (The Project)
OLEMS	Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Strategy
OnSS	Onshore Substation
SMP	Soil Management Plan
SoS	Secretary of State
SRN	Strategic Road Network
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
TJB	Transition Joint Bay
UK	United Kingdom
WSI	Written Schemes of Investigation

Terminology

Term	Definition
The Applicant	GT R4 Ltd. The Applicant making the application for a DCO. The Applicant is GT R4 Limited (a joint venture between Corio Generation, Total Energies and Gulf Energy Development (GULF), trading as Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind. The Project is being developed by Corio Generation, TotalEnergies and GULF.
Biodiversity Net Gain	An approach to development that leaves biodiversity in a measurably improved state than it was previously. Where a development has an impact on biodiversity, developers are encouraged to provide an increase in appropriate natural habitat and ecological features over and above that being affected, to ensure that the current loss of biodiversity through development will be halted and ecological networks can be restored.
Cumulative effects	The combined effect of the Project acting additively with the effects of other developments, on the same single receptor/resource.
Cumulative impact	Impacts that result from changes caused by other present or reasonably foreseeable actions together with the Project.
Development Consent Order	An order made under the Planning Act 2008 granting development consent for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP).
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)	A statutory process by which certain planned projects must be assessed before a formal decision to proceed can be made. It involves the collection and consideration of environmental information, which fulfils the assessment requirements of the EIA Regulations, including the publication of an Environmental Statement (ES).
Environmental Statement	The suite of documents that detail the processes and results of the EIA.
Haul Road	The track within the onshore ECC which the construction traffic would use to facilitate construction.
High Voltage Alternating Current	High voltage alternating current is the bulk transmission of electricity by alternating current (AC), whereby the flow of electric charge periodically reverses direction.
High Voltage Direct Current	High voltage direct current is the bulk transmission of electricity by direct current (DC), whereby the flow of electric charge is in one direction.
Landfall	The location at the land-sea interface where the offshore export cables and fibre optic cables will come ashore.
Maximum Design Scenario	The project design parameters, or a combination of project design parameters that are likely to result in the greatest potential for change in relation to each impact assessed

Term	Definition
National Grid Onshore Substation	The National Grid substation and associated enabling works to be developed by the National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) into which the Project's 400kV Cables would connect.
Onshore Export Cable Corridor	The Onshore Export Cable Corridor (Onshore ECC) is the area within which the export cables running from the landfall to the onshore substation will be situated.
Onshore Infrastructure	The combined name for all onshore infrastructure associated with the Project from landfall to grid connection.
Onshore substation	The Project's onshore HVAC substation, containing electrical equipment, control buildings, lightning protection masts, communications masts, access, fencing and other associated equipment, structures or buildings; to enable connection to the National Grid
Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind	The Project.
Order Limits	The area subject to the application for development consent, the limits shown on the works plans within which the Project may be carried out.
The Planning Inspectorate	The agency responsible for operating the planning process for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs).
Pre-construction and post-construction	The phases of the Project before and after construction takes place.
The Project	Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind, an offshore wind generating station together with associated onshore and offshore infrastructure.
Statement of Common Ground	A statement of common ground is a written statement produced jointly between The Applicant and another Interested Party setting out the areas of agreement and /or disagreement between parties.
Transition Joint Bay	The offshore and onshore cable circuits are jointed on the landward side of the sea defences /beach in a Transition Joint Bay (TJB). The TJB is an underground chamber constructed of reinforced concrete which provides a secure and stable environment for the cable.
Trenched technique	Trenching is a construction excavation technique that involves digging a trench in the ground for the installation, maintenance, or inspection of pipelines, conduits, or cables.
Trenchless technique	Trenchless technology is an underground construction method of installing, repairing and renewing underground pipes, ducts and cables using techniques which minimize or eliminate the need for excavation. Trenchless technologies involve methods of new pipe installation with minimum surface and environmental disruptions. These techniques may include Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD), thrust boring, auger boring, and pipe ramming, which allow ducts to be installed under an obstruction without breaking open the ground and digging a trench.

1 The Applicant's Responses to Host Authorities Local Impact Reports

1. Local Authorities (as defined in section 56A of the Planning Act 2008) were invited to submit a Local Impact Report (LIR) at Deadline 1 (24 October 2024), in accordance with the Examining Authority's (ExA) Examination timetable (PD-011). A LIR is a report in writing giving details of the likely impact of the Project on the local authorities' respective administrative areas (or any part of those areas).
2. The following LIRs were submitted into the Examination:
 - Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) (REP1-053); and
 - Boston Borough Council, East Lindsey District Council and South Holland District Council (Joint LIR) (REP1-052).
3. This document presents the responses to the LIRs received in respect of the Application by GT R4 Limited trading as Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind (the 'Applicant') for development consent to construct, operate and decommission the proposed Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Farm (the Project).
4. The Applicant has responded to each section of these LIRs in Tables 1.1 and 1.2 laid out below. The ID assigned is taken from the paragraph numbering within the LIRs for ease of reference.

1.1 Local Impact Report from Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) (REP1-053)

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
Terms of Reference		
1.1	This report is the Local Impact Report (LIR) for Lincolnshire County Council (LCC). In preparing this LIR regard has been made to the purpose of LIRs as set out in s60(3) of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended), DCLG's Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent, the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note One: Local Impact Reports, as well as the Planning Inspectorate's 'Example Documents'.	These comments are noted by the Applicant.
1.2	This LIR relates to the impacts of the proposed development as it affects the administrative area of Lincolnshire County Council.	
Purpose and Structure of the LIR		
2.1	<p>The LIR covers topics where the Council has a statutory function or holds particular expertise. The Council defers to East Lindsey District Council, South Holland District Council and Boston Borough Council on all other matters.</p> <p>The topics the subject of this LIR cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Principle of the Development ▪ Landscape ▪ Highways and Transportation ▪ Public Rights of Way (PRoW) ▪ Flood Risk, Drainage and Surface Water ▪ Minerals and Waste ▪ Cultural Heritage – Archaeology ▪ Socio-economics – Jobs and Skills ▪ Health and Land Use – Loss of Agricultural Land ▪ Fire Safety 	This comment is noted by the Applicant, including deferring to East Lindsey District Council, South Holland District Council and Boston Borough Council on all other matters.
2.2	The LIR is structured by first identifying the relevant national and local policies, secondly identifying the local impacts, and lastly address the extent to which the development proposals accord with these policies. For each topic area, the key issues are identified on the extent the applicant addresses these issues by reference to the application documentation, including the draft DCO articles, requirements and obligation, where relevant.	This comment is noted by the Applicant.
2.3	The LIR will seek not to duplicate material covered in the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).	A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is being developed with LCC, which was submitted into the Examination as an initial draft at Deadline 1 (REP1-028).
Proposed Development		
3.1	The Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Generating Station (ODOW) with a projected generation capacity of 1500MW is proposed by Total Energies and Corio Generation. The project comprises of an offshore wind farm and associated onshore and offshore infrastructure including offshore and onshore high voltage electricity cables onshore and offshore electricity substations, connections to the National Grid and ancillary temporary works.	The Applicant notes the description of the Project provided, which is based upon Chapter 3 Project Description (APP-058).
3.2	In summary, the proposed development, known as Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind, would be an offshore windfarm located approximately 54km off the Lincolnshire Coast. The project includes infrastructure required to transmit the power generated by the turbines to an onshore substation (OnSS) at Surfleet Marsh and subsequently into the National Grid Transmission System	
3.3	The Outer Dowsing Wind Farm comprises of an offshore generating station and offshore and onshore transmission infrastructure. Only the onshore transmission elements of these proposals fall under Lincolnshire County Councils administrative boundaries	
3.4	The onshore Order Limits include the landfall compound at Wolla Bank, South of Anderby	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
	<p>Creek, the onshore export cable corridor (ECC) within which onshore export cables would be placed, the onshore substation (OnSS) at Surfleet Marsh, and the 400kV cable corridor between the OnSS and the National Grid Substation (NGSS), the grid connection point at Weston Marsh. The NGSS would be built, owned and operated by National Grid Energy Transmission separate to these proposals.</p>	
3.5	<p>The projects proposed landfall area is Wolla Bank, south of Anderby Creek. Landfall is the point at which offshore export cables would come ashore. Ducts would be installed underneath the beach, the dunes, the Anderby Creek Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and Roman Bank Road. A technique called Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) would be used to connect offshore cables to the onshore cables in the Landfall Compound which would be located west of Roman Bank Road.</p>	
3.6	<p>The projects cabling would consist of 70km of underground cabling from landfall at Wolla Bank to the connection point at Weston Marsh. The cabling comprises of two main elements, the cabling from landfall to the OnSS at Surfleet Marsh with a maximum cable voltage of 275kV (70km in length) and the cabling connecting the OnSS to the National Grid Substation at Weston Marsh, which would have a maximum cable voltage of 400kV (4km in length).</p>	
3.7	<p>The ECC would have a maximum trench depth of 3m. Where a trenchless methodology would be utilised for cable burial, the cable depth would vary between 2 and 25m.</p>	
3.8	<p>The export cables would be placed in up to four trenches. Construction compounds, temporary access routes and a temporary haul road would also be required for the works</p>	
3.9	<p>The cable corridor whilst varying in width to accommodate environmental and engineering constraints, would require a working width of 80m which would reduce to 60m post construction</p>	
3.10	<p>The project has committed to a single transmission technology type, High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC). However, the project has retained flexibility for two types of technology for the substation, Air Insulated Switchgear (AIS) and Gas Insulated Switchgear (GIS). The type of technology adopted influences the maximum footprints and heights of the substations final design. There would be one onshore substation, with a maximum footprint of 144,000m² (14.5 ha) (428m X 335m) and a maximum building height of 13m for AIS technology. Whereas there would be a maximum footprint of 72,600m² (7 ha) (270m X 268.5m) and a maximum building height of 16.5m for GIS technology. The maximum permanent footprint of the OnSS including associated infrastructure such as drainage, access requirements and onsite landscaping would measure 261,500m² (26 ha).</p>	
3.11	<p>Preparatory works would be necessary before onshore installation works could begin. These works would include, but may not be limited to, road and junction modifications and any new junctions off existing highways, hedgerow removal and vegetation clearance, drainage management, and ecological and archaeological mitigation.</p>	
3.12	<p>Temporary construction compounds of varying sizes would be required for the construction of the proposals. These compounds would be located within the projects onshore footprint and would be used for laydown and storage of materials, plant and staff, as well as areas for temporary offices, welfare facilities, security and parking. Compound areas would also be required for crossings (roads and rivers) and site operations such as drilling works</p>	
3.13	<p>During landfall and intertidal works a landfall compound would also be constructed which would include housing the Transition Joint Bay (TJB) and any drilling works. As temporary features, all construction compound areas would be reinstated to their original state following the completion to all construction works. The applicant has stated however that some of the compounds may be retained during the commissioning stages of the projects.</p>	
3.14	<p>The project would include the construction of a temporary haul road to provide access to the projects onshore infrastructure instead of relying on main roads. The proposed haul road would extend the entire length of the ECC and 400kV cable corridor (approximately 74km as mentioned</p>	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
	in onshore cabling above) with the exception of areas wherein a trenchless technique would be adopted.	
3.15	Once constructed the applicant anticipates that the operations and management of the project would last approximately 35 years. The OnSS would be an unoccupied installation with no onsite presence with the exception of routine maintenance and emergency repairs.	
3.16	At the end of the operational life of the project it would be decommissioned. The applicant expects that the onshore cables will be left in place, to avoid the occurrence of additional negative impacts.	
Description of Site and Surroundings		
4.1	The proposed onshore development is linear in nature and is located between Anderby Creek on the east coast of Lincolnshire and Weston Marsh, east of Spalding. The majority of the cable route passes through open countryside interspersed with small settlements. The Order Limit boundaries span three district councils, South Holland, Boston and East Lindsey.	This comment is noted by the Applicant.
4.2	The development site crosses a number of main highway routes including the A52, A158 and the A17 at various points along the ECC route as well as a number of 'B' roads and minor roads. There are also 33 of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) which have been identified that intersect the Order Limits.	
4.3	The ECC route intersects a number of waterways including Willoughby High Drain, The Lymm, Wainfleet Relief Channel, Steeping River, The Haven, and The River Welland. The route is located within areas at higher risk of flooding (flood zones 2 and 3).	
4.4	There are 22 statutory designated sites within the study area (up to 15km from the Order Limits), this consists of two Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) 15 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) 3 National Nature Reserves (NNR) and 2 Local Nature Reserves (LNR). There are 51 non-statutory sites designated for their nature conservation value located within 2km of the Order Limits, 17 of which are located wholly or partially within the Order Limit boundary	
4.5	A total of 75 heritage assets have been identified within the 5km study area of the site. This includes 7 Scheduled Monuments, 9 Listed Buildings, and 3 Conservation Areas. The ECC route also passes through two of Lincolnshire's historic landscape character areas, Area 8 Grazing Marshes and Area 10 The Wash as described in The Historic Character of the County of Lincolnshire (2011) document.	
4.6	The majority of the onshore export cable corridor (ECC) crosses agricultural land uses. The applicant has assessed the ECC route using Agricultural Land Classification, the applicant has stated that Natural England's ALC classification maps do not differentiate between Grades 3a and 3b, for the purposes of their assessment all Grade 3 land will be classified as Best and Most Versatile (BMV) considering the worst case scenario. A 14.1 hectare (ha) coastal area has not been graded as ALC mapping does not extend to the mean high water springs (MHWS). The development site (DCO boundary) covers a total of 857.17 ha, none of which falls below Grade 3 ALC and is all therefore classified as BMV land. 181.22 ha is classified as Grade 3, 184.08 ha is Grade 2 and the remaining 99.5 ha is Grade 1. The poorer quality agricultural land is located to the northern end of the cable corridor closest to the sea, the greater quality agricultural land is located at the southern end of the proposals	
4.7	There is no relevant planning history for minerals, waste or County Council developments in the Order Limits area.	
Policy Context		
5.1	The Secretary of State (SoS) is required to have regard to any relevant national policy statement (NPS), amongst other matters, when deciding whether to grant a DCO. Where there is a relevant NPS in place DCO applications are determined in line with Section 104 of the PA2008. However, where there are is no relevant NPS in place then Section 105 of the PA2008 takes effect and provides the legal basis for determining DCO applications. Section 105 requires the SoS to consider	<p>There are relevant NPS which have effect in relation to this application, therefore Section 104 of the 2008 Act applies. Section 104 provides that in determining an application, the Secretary of State (SoS) must have regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ any national policy statement (NPS) which has effect in relation to the type of development); ■ the appropriate marine policy documents (if any);

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
	<p>'important and relevant' matters which includes this LIR and any other matters which the SoS thinks are both important and relevant to its decision.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ any local impact report submitted to the Secretary of State before the deadline specified in a notice inviting the submission of local impact reports; and ■ any matters prescribed in relation to development of the description to which the application relates, and any other matters which the SoS thinks are both important and relevant to the decision.
5.2	<p>The NPS's set out assessment principles for judging impacts of energy projects and are a material consideration that the SoS will need to consider. The following NPS's are considered relevant to the determination of this DCO application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ EN-1 – Overarching National Planning Policy Statement for Energy ■ EN-3 – National Planning Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure ■ EN-5 – National Planning Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure 	<p>The Applicant has produced a Policy Compliance Document (AS-012) which has assessed compliance with all relevant national and local policies presented within this section of the LIR. It should also be noted that each onshore chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) contains a section on the relevant policy in relation to that topic.</p>
5.3	<p>EN-1 – Overarching National Planning Policy Statement for Energy. EN-1 (Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy) confirms the Government's commitment to the legally binding target to cut greenhouse gas emissions by 80% by 2050, compared to 1990 levels. It also identifies the need to increase dramatically the amount of renewable electricity generation capacity in order to meet the commitments under the EU Renewable Energy Directive and to improve energy security by reducing dependence on imported fossil fuels, decrease greenhouse gas emissions and providing economic opportunities.</p>	
5.4	<p>NPS EN-1 identifies wind and solar as the lowest cost ways of generating electricity, helping to reduce costs and providing a clean and secure source of electricity. It goes on to state that a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar. The Government has an ambition to deliver up to 50GW of offshore wind by 2030. The Government has concluded that there is a critical national priority (CNP) for the provision of nationally significant low carbon infrastructure. The NPS goes on to state that, subject to any legal requirements, the urgent need for CNP infrastructure to achieving the governments energy objectives will in general outweigh any other residual impacts not capable of being addressed by application of the mitigation hierarchy</p>	
5.5	<p>EN-3 – National Planning Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure. EN-3 was updated and adopted in January 2024, it covers nationally significant renewable energy electricity generating stations including offshore wind generating stations more than 100MW in England. NPS EN-3 reiterates that the government expects that offshore wind will play a significant role in meeting demand and decarbonising the energy system. Government has concluded that there is a critical national priority for the provision of nationally significant new offshore wind development and supporting onshore and offshore network infrastructure and related network reinforcement. EN-3 also sets out the key considerations and factors to take into account for design and site selection, these include national designations and other locational considerations, seabed leasing, marine licensing and climate change adaptation. EN-3 also refers to technical considerations, including network connections, flexibility of project details, micro siting and micro routing, repowering, monitoring and decommissioning. The NPS also houses a non-exhaustive list of key impacts for consideration.</p>	
5.6	<p>EN-5 – National Planning Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure. EN-5 (National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure) is also relevant as it recognises electricity networks as "transmission systems (the long distance transfer of electricity through 400kV and 275kV lines), and distribution systems (lower voltage lines from 132kV to 230V from transmission substations to the end-user) which can either be carried on towers/poles or underground" and "associated infrastructure, e.g. substations (the essential link between generation, transmission, and the distribution systems that also allows circuits to be switched or voltage transformed to a useable level for the consumer) and converter stations to convert DC power to AC power and vice</p>	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
	versa.” This is therefore relevant in so far as it relates to the proposed, underground onshore cables, onshore substation and grid connection	
5.7	The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2023) at paragraph 5 states that the document does not contain specific policies for NSIPs. These are to be determined in accordance with the decision-making framework set out in the Planning Act and relevant NPS’s for nationally significant infrastructure, well as any other matters that are considered both important and relevant (which may include the NPPF).	
5.8	The NPPF does, however, state that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change and support renewable energy and low carbon and associated infrastructure (paragraph 157).	
5.9	The government is currently reviewing the NPPF, the draft revised text is out for consultation, the proposed changes to the NPPF seeks to achieve sustainable growth in the planning system and seeks views on wider policy proposals including appropriate thresholds for certain Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects.	
5.10	The National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) outlines the guidance on the specific planning considerations that relate to renewable and low carbon energy, (013 Reference ID: 5-001-20140306). It states that increasing the amount of energy generated from low carbon and renewable technologies will help to ensure the UK has a secure energy supply, reduce greenhouse gas emissions to slow down climate change and stimulate investment in new jobs and businesses. Specific reference to wind turbines is also contained within this guidance (014 reference ID: 5 -014-20150618). However, in this instance, this guidance is not directly relevant as the proposed turbines would be located offshore whereas the associated infrastructure would be located onshore, within LCCs administrative boundaries.	
5.11	Notwithstanding, the NPSs provide the predominant policy context; and whilst the applicants DCO application has cross referred to the NPPF and NPPG where applicable, where there are any inconsistencies between the and the relevant NPS.	
5.12	Development Plan- The documents that comprise the development plan are listed below. Other policy documents that should be considered as a material consideration are also identified.	
5.13	South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP) - The South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 was adopted March 2019, this local plan covers the administrative boundaries of Boston Borough Council and South Holland District Council. LCC list the relevant Policies: Policy 2: Development Management, Policy 3: Design of New Development, Policy 4: Approach to Flood Risk, Policy 28: The Natural Environment, Policy 29: The Historic Environment, Policy 30: Pollution, Policy 31: Climate Change and Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Energy, Policy 32: Community, Health and Wellbeing and Policy 33: Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network.	
5.14	East Lindsey Local Plan Core Strategy (ELLP)- The East Lindsey Local Plan Core Strategy was adopted July 2018. LCC list Policies: Policy 10: Design, Policy 11: Historic Environment, Policy 16: Inland Flood Risk, Policy 17: Coastal East Lindsey, Policy 22: Transport and Accessibility, Policy 23: Landscape, Policy 24: Biodiversity and Geodiversity, Policy 25: Green Infrastructure and Policy 27: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy.	
5.15	There are no Neighbourhood Plans or Neighbourhood Development Orders that fall within the Order Limit boundaries.	
5.16	The planning policy framework for minerals and waste within Lincolnshire is set out in the adopted Lincolnshire Mineral and Waste Local Plan (2016). LCC list the relevant policies: Policy DM1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development, Policy DM4: Historic Environment, Policy DM6: Impact on landscapes and townscapes, Policy DM12: Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land, Policy M2: Providing for an Adequate Supply of Sand and Gravel, Policy M11: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources and Policy W1: Future Requirements for New Waste Facilities.	
5.17	In addition to the development plan documents listed above, there are additional policy documents which provide local policy on key topics of relevance to this development.	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
5.18	South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (March 2017). The SFRA has assessed the flood risk issues at a strategic scale to inform the spatial planning process.	
5.19	<p>Lincolnshire County Council Energy Infrastructure Position Statement (December 2023). The County Council position statement notes that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) cover a range of potential developments including solar farms and cable routes. All new energy sources need to be connected to the grid and this creates a risk. The Council’s position is that any cabling required should be underground unless connecting to an existing overhead line. The statement notes the advice contained in the NPPF that local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary Local Planning Authorities should require the use of areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of higher quality. Based on this the Council will object to development on Grade 1,2, 3a land. In considering NSIP proposals the protection of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land is the starting point for the Council for projects that involve significant land take. This principle will be cross referenced with other topics of consideration such as local environment, landscape, historic and community impacts to come to a view if there is any justification to override the loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Finally consideration should be given to the cumulative impact from proposals in combination for significant impact of numerous developments clustered within the same locality in a similar time period.</p>	
Assessment of Impacts		
6.1	<p>The following sections identify, for each topic heading listed below, the relevant policies, the key issues and impacts raised by the proposed development and the extent to which the applicant has addressed these issues in the application document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Principle of the Development – Climate Change; ▪ Landscape; ▪ Highways and Transportation; ▪ Public Rights of Way (PRoW); ▪ Flood Risk, Drainage and Surface Water; ▪ Minerals and Waste; ▪ Cultural Heritage; ▪ Archaeology; ▪ Socio Economics; ▪ Land Use – Loss of Agricultural Land; and ▪ Health and Fire Safety. 	The Applicant notes the structure of the LIR.
Principle of Development – Climate Change		
7.1	<p>Key Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 31: Climate Change and Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Energy (SELLP) • Policy 27: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (ELLP) 	These comments are noted by the Applicant.
7.2	Section 4.8 of NPS EN-1 addresses climate change adaptation and resilience in energy infrastructure development. It notes that the SoS should take the effects of climate change into account when developing and consenting infrastructure, referring to the potential long term impact of climate change	
7.3	Paragraph 4.10.8 states that ‘new energy infrastructure will typically need to remain operational over many decades, (35 years in the case of this development) in the face of a changing climate. Consequently, applicants must consider the direct (e.g. site flooding, limited water availability, storms, heatwave and wildfire threats to infrastructure and operations) and indirect (e.g. access	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
	roads or other critical dependencies impacted by flooding, storms, heatwaves or wildfires) impacts of climate change when planning the location, design, build, operation and, where appropriate, decommissioning of new energy infrastructure'	
7.4	The SoS should be satisfied that applicants for new energy infrastructure have taken into account the potential impacts of climate change using the latest UK Climate Projections and associated research and expert guidance available at the time the ES was prepared to ensure they have identified appropriate mitigation or adaptation measures. This should cover the estimated lifetime of the new infrastructure, including any decommissioning period (4.10.13).	
7.5	EN-1 notes that we must continue to accelerate efforts to end our contribution to climate change by reaching Net Zero greenhouse gas emissions reiterates the need to minimise the most dangerous impacts of climate change. It also emphasises the need for adaptation, which is necessary to manage the impacts of current and future climate change.	
7.6	Paragraph 2.3.5 notes the country's historic dependence of our energy system on fossil fuels, stating that this is still the case today. Although representing a record low, fossil fuels still accounted for just over 76 per cent of energy supply in 2020 . It goes on to state that we need to dramatical increase the volume of energy supplied from low carbon sources.	
7.7	Paragraph 2.3.6 acknowledges the need to transform the energy system, tackling emissions whilst continuing to ensure secure and reliable supply. Increasing the supply of clean energy is highlighted.	
7.8	EN-5 notes that as climate change is likely to increase risks to the resilience of some of the infrastructure that falls under the umbrella of EN-5 (electricity networks). It refers to risks such as flooding it goes on to state that applicants should in particular set out to what extent the proposed development is expected to be vulnerable, and, as appropriate, how it has been designed to be resilient	
7.9	<p>Policy 27 of the ELLP states that large scale renewable and low carbon energy development, development for the transmission and interconnection of electricity and infrastructure required to support such development will be supported where both their individual and cumulative impacts are considered to be acceptable.</p> <p>These impacts would be measured in acceptability in relation to residential amenity, surrounding landscape, townscape, and historic landscape character and visual qualities, the significance of heritage assets, sites or features of biodiversity, the local economy, highway safety and the water environment and quality.</p>	
7.10	Policy 31 of the SELLP is split into two segments, A, climate change and B, renewable energy. Part A states that all development proposals will be required to demonstrate that the consequences current climate change has been addressed, minimised and mitigated. Whilst part B states that with the exception of wind energy the development of renewable energy facilities, associated infrastructure and the integration of decentralised technologies on existing or proposed structures will be permitted provided individually or cumulatively they would not cause significant harm to the following; visual amenity, landscape character or quality, residential amenity, highway safety, agricultural land take, aviation and radar safety, heritage assets and the natural environment	
7.11	The Council acknowledges the target set by the UK Government of delivering over a third of electricity from offshore wind by 2030 and, therefore, it is supportive of the principle of offshore wind development in helping to tackle the challenges faced by climate change.	
7.12	The Council also recognises the national importance of having a balanced supply of electrical generation, including increasing renewable energy supplies from offshore turbines in helping decarbonise the UK's energy sector. Critical national infrastructure must not only deliver the Government's energy objectives, but also deliver sustainable societal and economic impacts in the regions that are hosting them. Therefore, the Project needs to be achieved without significant adverse effects on the environment, local communities, and economy of Lincolnshire.	The Applicant notes these overarching comments from LCC and highlights the approach to avoiding, reducing and minimising the environmental effects of the Project through commitments to be delivered through the management plans included in the DCO Application and secured by the draft DCO (Document 3.1, version 5). The Applicant has sought to identify appropriate mitigation, however, it must be acknowledged that for a project of this scale, it is not possible to avoid all significant adverse effects and these must be balanced against the benefits

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		of the Project, and what it will contribute to delivering renewable energy targets, in the overall decision making process.
7.13	The Outer Dowsing Offshore wind project would make a significant contribution towards renewable energy generation. This contribution aligns to key commitments at the national level and within the adopted NPS recognising the importance of the Government’s commitments to cut greenhouse gases by 80% of 2050	The Applicant welcomes LCCs comments on the significant, positive contribution the Project would make towards government targets for renewable energy generation.
7.14	Therefore whilst the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project by its nature offers significant positive impacts in terms of the production of clean renewable energy and the transition and movements towards Net Zero, in order to be supported it must be demonstrated that there are no significant adverse environmental impacts that cannot be appropriately managed and/or mitigated through the DCO process. The Council’s position is therefore that, adopting a ‘whole life’ approach to GHG emissions, there are no negative and neutral impacts and that significant positive impacts would accrue.	
Ecology		
8.1	<p>Key Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 28: Natural Environment (SELLP) • Policy 31: Climate Change and Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Energy (SELLP) • Policy 24: Biodiversity and Geodiversity (ELLP) • Policy 25: Green Infrastructure (ELLP). 	These comments are noted by the Applicant.
8.2	Section 5.4 of NPS EN-1 covers biodiversity and geological conservation. The government’s policy for biodiversity in England is set out in the Environmental Improvement Plan 2023, the National Pollinator Strategy and the UK Marine Strategy. The aim is to halt overall biodiversity loss in England by 2030 and then reverse loss by 2042, support healthy well-functioning ecosystems and establish coherent ecological networks, with more and better places for nature for the benefit of wildlife and people. Healthy, naturally functioning ecosystems and coherent ecological networks will be more resilient and adaptable to climate change effects. Failure to address this challenge will result in significant adverse impact on biodiversity and the ecosystem services it provides (5.4.2).	
8.3	Paragraph 5.4.39 states that the ‘SoS should have regard to the aims and goals of the government’s Environmental Improvement Plan 2023 and any relevant measures and targets, including statutory targets set under the Environment Act or elsewhere’. Paragraph 5.4.41 goes on to state that ‘the benefits of nationally significant low carbon energy infrastructure development may include benefits for biodiversity and geological conservation interests and these benefits may outweigh harm to these interests. The SoS may take account of any such net benefit in cases where it can be demonstrated’.	
8.4	EN-1 states that when considering proposals the SoS should maximise reasonable opportunities for building-in beneficial biodiversity or geological features as part of good design and give appropriate weight to environmental and biodiversity enhancements. As this can help towards delivering biodiversity net gain.	
8.5	Policy 28, the natural environment, of the SELLP states that a high quality, comprehensive ecological network of interconnected designated sites, sites of nature conservation importance and wildlife friendly greenspace will be achieved by protecting, enhancing and managing natural assets. It goes on to state that development proposals that would cause harm to internationally designated sites will not be permitted, except in exceptional circumstances where imperative reasons of overriding public interest exist. This policy refers to nationally or locally designated sites and protected or priority habitats and species, similarly stating that any proposals that would directly or indirectly	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
	<p>adversely affect these assets development would not be permitted unless, suitable prevention, mitigation and compensation measures are provided or the benefits of the development at the proposed site clearly outweigh the adverse impacts on the features of the site and the wider network of natural habitats.</p> <p>The policy also aims to address gaps in the ecological network by ensuring all development proposals provide an overall net gain in biodiversity. The policy states that this could be achieved by protecting the biodiversity value of the land, minimising the fragmentation of habitats, maximising the opportunities for restoration, enhancement and connection of natural habitats and species of principal importance.</p>	
8.6	<p>Policy 31 of the SELLP part A climate change states that development proposals should demonstrate that the consequences of climate change have been addressed, minimised and mitigated against. The incorporation of measures which promote and enhance green infrastructure and provide an overall net gain in biodiversity to improve the resilience of ecosystems within and beyond the site is specifically referenced.</p>	
8.7	<p>Policy 24, Biodiversity and Geodiversity of the ELLP aims to enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity value of land, minimise fragmentation and maximise opportunities for connectivity between natural habitats. The policy aims to protect internationally, nationally and locally significant sites, and protected species and habitats. It goes on to state that where new habitats are created it should be linked, where possible, to other similar habitats and provide a network of sites for wildlife.</p>	
8.8	<p>Policy 25 of the EELP, states that the council will safeguard and deliver a network of accessible green infrastructure by protecting all greenspace identified through the settlement proposals DPD so that there is no net loss, maximise opportunities for new and enhanced green infrastructure and publicly accessible open spaces, and seek opportunities to connect existing green infrastructure to improve the network of spaces and accessibility for both local population and wildlife.</p>	
8.9	<p>The biodiversity and ecological elements of the Applicant's Environmental Statement are broadly divided into offshore and onshore. The Council has reviewed the information in relation to onshore ecological impacts. APP-076 identifies a range of onshore ecological impacts, whilst APP-077 focuses on impacts to onshore ornithology. It is considered that information included in APP-076 and APP-077 provide a reasonable summary of ecological interest features and likely significant effects, mitigation, and residual effects of the proposed development.</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes LCCs comments that ES Chapter 21 Onshore Ecology (APP-076) and Chapter 22 Onshore Ornithology (APP-077) provide a reasonable summary of ecological interest features and likely significant effects, mitigation, and residual effects of the Project.</p>
8.10	<p>There are seven onshore European designated sites of importance to onshore and intertidal ecology and ornithology within 15km of the DCO Site Boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Humber Estuary SPA, SAC and Ramsar • Saltfleetby - Theddlethorpe Dunes and Gibraltar Point SAC • Gibraltar Point SPA and Ramsar • The Wash SPA and Ramsar • The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC • North Norfolk Coast SPA and Ramsar • Greater Wash SPA <p>There are also 15 nationally designated ecologically important sites (SSSI) within 15km of the DCO Site Boundary.</p>	<p>These comments are noted by the Applicant.</p>
8.11	<p>There are 43 non-statutory sites designated for their nature conservation value within 2 km of the DCO Site Boundary; these designations include Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and Local Wildlife Trust (LWT) sites.</p> <p>The Council notes that APP-076 Para 11 states <i>"The design has sought to minimise impacts on protected ecological sites by careful siting of the Order Limits to avoid direct impacts to designated</i></p>	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
8.12	<p><i>sites and avoidance of direct impacts on key areas of sensitivity including Priority Habitats which may support protected species, wherever possible” and welcomes this approach</i></p> <p>Given the potential for impacts on statutorily designated sites, a Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) screening report has been submitted (APP-239) and confirms that a full HRA will be required. A report to inform an Appropriate Assessment (AS1-095) has been produced. The Examining Authority will need to undertake a Habitats Regulations Assessment and satisfy itself that sufficient information has been submitted by the Applicant to enable this to be completed</p>	
8.13	<p>The applicant has worked with Natural England via the Discretionary Advice Service and potential impacts, such as habitat loss (both temporary and permanent), noise, pollution and disturbance relating to onshore elements of the scheme all appear to have been assessed appropriately. Where impacts were considered to potentially have a Likely Significant Effect (LSE) on the site(s) interest features appropriate, further evidence is provided and where necessary mitigation measures have been identified to ensure that they do not constitute an Adverse Effect on Integrity (AEOI). Overall the Council has no reason to disagree with the conclusions of the Report to Inform the Habitats Regulations Assessment as far as they relate to onshore ecology and ornithology. The Council advises that mitigatory measures should be secured in the Project Environmental Management Plan (PEMP) an outline of which is included at APP-277 and the DCO</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes LCCs comments that potential impacts relating to the onshore elements of the Project have been assessed appropriately and that the necessary mitigation measures have been identified to ensure impacts do not have an Adverse Effect on Integrity.</p> <p>Onshore ecological mitigation requirements are currently set out within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS) (PD1-054). Mitigation set out within the OLEMS will be secured by Requirement 12 of the DCO which requires the Applicant to produce an ecological management plan. As required by the DCO, the ecological management plan will include the following specific plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A protected species mitigation management plan; ■ A nesting birds management plan; and, ■ A non-native invasive species management plan.
8.14	<p>A range of both desk-based studies and field surveys has been undertaken to establish the suite of habitats present within the DCO site boundary. These are described in APP-076 and associated appendices. A suite of habitat types of local importance and above were identified. The Council is of the opinion that the level of survey effort, survey methods and desk-study research undertaken to identify important habitats and establish the baseline biodiversity value is appropriate.</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes comments from LCC that the level of survey effort, survey methods and desk study research undertaken to identify important habitats and establish the baseline biodiversity value is appropriate.</p>
8.15	<p>Likely impacts, impact avoidance measures, mitigation measures and enhancement measures are proposed to avoid significantly negative effects on the suite of habitats present within the development footprint. Any significant effects that cannot be avoided will require mitigation to be secured within the DCO. To this end an outline Code of Construction Practice (COCP) (APP-268) which sets out the general principles and management measures to be adopted during construction of the Onshore Infrastructure associated with the Project and an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Strategy (OLEMS) (AS1-103) which sets out the main mitigation measures that will be undertaken to manage the potential impacts to onshore ecological receptors have been produced.</p>	<p>These comments are noted by the Applicant. Preparation of the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) is secured in Requirement 18 of the DCO.</p> <p>The requirement to produce a landscape management plan is secured by Requirement 10 of the draft DCO, and the requirement to produce an ecological management plan is secured by Requirement 12 of the draft DCO. Both the landscape management plan and the ecological management plan must accord with the OLEMS.</p>
8.16	<p>The Council notes the intention to produce a Landscape Management Plan (LMP) and an Ecological Management Plan (EMP) which will be submitted for approval to this Council and the other relevant Local Planning Authorities prior to construction. The Council agrees with the Applicant’s approach and considers that impact avoidance and mitigation measures are appropriate and that they should be secured in the DCO.</p>	
8.17	<p>A Schedule of Mitigation (APP-287) has been prepared which provides a helpful summary of the mitigation identified for the Project including embedded mitigation measures, which have been designed into the project</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes this comment on the helpfulness of the Schedule of Mitigation (APP-287).</p>
8.18	<p>A suite of both desk-based studies and field surveys has been undertaken to identify protected and priority species likely to occur within the DCO Site Boundary. In the onshore environment, these are described in APP-076 and APP-077 and associated appendices. The Council has reviewed the application in accordance with Natural England's standing advice for protected species. Having considered APP-076 and APP-077 it is considered that the survey methods used, and the survey effort deployed were appropriate.</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes comment from LCC that the survey methods and survey effort are appropriate.</p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
8.19	Without mitigation, the proposed development has the potential to result in negative effects on the populations of a number of species/species groups. Impact avoidance measures, mitigation measures and enhancement measures are proposed to avoid significantly negative effects. Where protected species will be affected by the proposed development, a licence from Natural England will be sought and mitigation will be secured as part of the licensing process. The Council agrees with the approach and considers that impact avoidance and mitigation measures currently proposed are appropriate and that they should be secured in the DCO.	<p>The Applicant welcomes comments from LCC that they agree with the approach taken and that they consider the impact avoidance and mitigation measures to be appropriate.</p> <p>In respect of the proposed impact avoidance and mitigation measures proposed within the OLEMS (PD1-054), these are secured by Requirement 12 of the DCO which requires the Applicant to produce an ecological management plan which must accord with the OLEMS.</p>
8.20	The Council also notes that the OLEMS sets out principles relating to the aimed at avoiding the spread of Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS) during construction. This approach is welcomed.	The Applicant welcomes this comment on the proposed approach to INNS.
8.21	The delivery of at least 10% BNG is not currently mandatory for NSIPs however it is accepted as good practice. The Council welcomes the Applicant's intention to achieve BNG as a result of the development. Given the scale of the development the Council encourages the applicant to seek to deliver significantly more than the minimum of 10% BNG.	A Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report was submitted to the ExA in August 2024 (AS-014) which sets out the Project's BNG baseline and ambitions. It should be noted that BNG will be pursued in line with existing policy.
8.22	The Applicant has set out their broad principles and approach to BNG in APP-302 and states that this approach will be refined alongside detailed project design. The Council notes that <i>"The BNG assessment is proposed to be updated as required throughout the examination phase and then, post-DCO decision, based on the detailed scheme design stage."</i> The Applicant has used the Statutory Biodiversity Metric to establish the baseline and post-development biodiversity values. This was the most up-to date version of the metric at the point the assessments were undertaken.	This comment is noted by the Applicant.
8.23	Information included in APP-302 indicates that the post-development output of the metric shows that the development is currently predicted to result in a net loss of 143.58 Biodiversity Units for area-based habitat units, a net loss of 1.28 Biodiversity Units for hedgerow units and a net loss of 44.62 Biodiversity Units for watercourse units". This suggests that significant effort is still required to identify how a minimum of 10% BNG will be delivered. The Council considers that, subject to achieving a minimum of 10% BNG, the overall approach to BNG is considered to be acceptable.	The Applicant will continue to develop its approach to BNG in line with existing policy.
8.24	The Council encourages the Applicant to work closely with local stakeholders to refine the approach to BNG delivery and provide details of the biodiversity enhancement proposed. The Council advises that the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership has produced Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping (BOM) for the whole of Greater Lincolnshire which will be useful in helping to prioritise options. In addition to this a Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) is currently being produced for Greater Lincolnshire. The BOM and LNRS will both provide useful detail which can be used to refine the approach to BNG delivery and identify additional opportunities.	The Applicant thanks LCC for information relating to Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping (BOM) and has contacted the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership regarding this. Where possible and appropriate, BOM will be considered in the future ecological management plan. With regards to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS), the Applicant understands that this is still in development and therefore information relating to the Strategy cannot be considered at present. The future LNRS will be considered during the preparation of the Ecological Management Plan and will be used to guide the approach to BNG, if it becomes available in good time for consideration.
8.25	The Council also encourages the Applicant to work with other developers and stakeholders in the area to identify opportunities to deliver BNG strategically. The Council welcomes ongoing engagement with the Applicant in relation to BNG.	<p>The Applicant has addressed this comment in the response to RR-004.052 in The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>As set out in AS-014 the Applicant is actively pursuing opportunities for Biodiversity Net Gain and will continue to engage with LCC as and when any proposals are further developed.</i></p> <p>The Applicant is currently in communications with RSPB in respect of its Greater Frampton Vision Project.</p>
8.26	Given the current uncertainty around the level of BNG that will be achieved by the Project, The Council is of the opinion that a requirement to deliver a minimum of 10% BNG will need to be included in the DCO and the applicant will need to demonstrate that the commitments made to delivering BNG are achievable.	A Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report was submitted to the ExA in August 024 (AS-014) which sets out the Project's BNG baseline and ambitions. It should be noted that BNG will be pursued in line with existing policy.
8.27	There are a number of development proposals of varying scales in the vicinity of this proposal. These range from small scale housing developments to NSIP scale energy developments. A detailed assessment of the cumulative impacts of these proposals on sensitive ecological receptors in the area will be required. Details of the approach to cumulative effects in the onshore environment are presented in APP-148. The Council considers the approach to the assessment of Cumulative Effects appropriate.	The Applicant welcomes the comments from the LCC that the approach to the assessment of cumulative impacts is appropriate.

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
8.28	<p>The Council considers that to ensure the proposed mitigation for landscaping and ecology is achieved and maintained to the required standards the establishment of an Ecological Steering Group or similar for the Proposed Development is necessary. This group should consist of key ecological stakeholders (both statutory and non- statutory). The remit of the group would be to receive updates on project progress and to advise on issues encountered during construction as well as to refine delivery of required mitigation and enhancement measures. Meetings should be held at an appropriate frequency to ensure good communication between both the developer, stakeholders and other developers as further projects emerge and the need for a mechanism to secure collaboration between the projects is essential to ensure all the proposed mitigation measures are implemented and monitored.</p> <p>To ensure such a group is set up and provide the necessary information and evidence of the on-going landscaping and ecological works mitigation works it is recommended that contributions should be secured via a Section 106 Agreement to enable an Environment Compliance Officer to be secured for the duration of the construction phase and 10-year aftercare periods.</p>	<p>In respect of references to the Section 106 agreement please see the Applicant’s response to 17.1 below.</p> <p>As outlined in the Applicant’s response to 8.19, mitigation measures proposed within the OLEMS (PD1-054), are secured by Requirement 12 of the DCO which requires the Applicant to produce an ecological management plan which must accord with the OLEMS.</p>
8.29	<p>Also the establishment of an ecology, enhancement fund. The Environment Compliance Officer would monitor compliance with the approved documents, including the, stage specific Biodiversity Management Plans, stage specific BNG Strategies and stage specific LEMPs. They would provide a key point of contact for the Applicant and their contractor(s) in relation to addressing unforeseen ecological issues liaising with the Council’s Infrastructure Ecologist, receipt of monitoring reports, and reaching agreement, where necessary, over remedial works, such as where habitat re-instatement or creation has failed.</p>	
8.30	<p>A landscape and ecology enhancement fund would be used to deliver measures to conserve and enhance, habitats and heritage features across the diversity of landscapes impacted by the onshore cable route and on shore sub-station. This fund would be made available to landowners for projects such as hedge planting to improve habitat connectivity, through scrub control such as in the vicinity of the coastal country park.</p>	
8.31	<p>The Applicant’s Environmental Statement identifies a series of potential impacts on onshore ecology during the construction stage of the development. These range from minor adverse impacts to significant adverse impacts depending on the species, habitat or site concerned. Measures to address these impacts are proposed and should be secured in the DCO. If the mitigation measures including the establishment of an ecological steering group are secured and delivered as proposed the Council considers that the development would have a minor negative impact on onshore ecology.</p>	
8.32	<p>With regard to BNG, the Applicant has signaled an intention to deliver BNG though the level of this is currently unclear. Given the scale of the project the Council considers that the project should seek to deliver significantly more than 10% BNG.</p> <p>If this is achieved, it is considered that overall, the development could have a positive impact in terms of BNG. Commitments to deliver a minimum of 10% BNG should be secured in the DCO and subsequently monitored by the Environment Compliance Officer.</p>	<p>The Applicant will continue to develop its approach to BNG in line with existing policy.</p>
Landscape and Visual		
9.1	<p>Key Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 2: Development Management (SELLP) • Policy 3: Design of New Development (SELLP) • Policy 31: Climate Change and Low Carbon Energy (SELLP) • Policy 10: Design (ELLP) 	<p>These comments have been noted by the Applicant.</p>
9.2	<p>EN-1 states that the Secretary of State should consider whether the project has been designed carefully, taking account of environmental effects on the landscape and siting,</p>	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
	operational and other relevant constraints, to minimise harm to the landscape, including by appropriate mitigation (5.10.37).	
9.3	Paragraph 3.10.35 of EN-1 states that the ‘scale of energy projects means that they will often be visible across a very wide area. It goes on to stress that the SoS should judge whether any adverse impact on the landscape would be so damaging that it is not offset by the benefits (including need) of the project’. Paragraph 5.10.36 then sets out that the SoS should ‘consider whether any adverse impact is temporary, such as during construction, and/or whether any adverse impact on the landscape will be capable of being reversed in a timescale that the Secretary of State considers reasonable’.	
9.4	Paragraph 5.10.5 of EN-1 states that ‘virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape, but there may also be beneficial landscape character impacts arising from mitigation’.	
9.5	Paragraph 5.10.6 then goes on to state that ‘projects need to be designed carefully, taking account of the potential impact on the landscape. Having regard to siting, operational and other relevant constraints the aim should be to minimise harm to the landscape, providing reasonable mitigation where possible and appropriate’.	
9.6	Policy 2 of the SELLP states that proposals requiring planning permission for development should meet sustainable development considerations specifically in relation to the size, scale, layout, density and impact on the amenity, trees, character and appearance of the area and the relationship to existing development and land uses.	
9.7	Policy 3 of the SELLP aims to promote development of a high quality design that makes use of local traditional styles and materials. It states that design which is inappropriate to the local area, or which fails to maximise opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area will not be acceptable. The landscape character of the area is identified within this policy as a key consideration.	
9.8	Policy 31 of the SELLP, particularly section B relating to renewable energy states that consideration should be given to both the individual and cumulative impacts in relation to visual amenity, landscape character or quality or skyline considerations. It goes on to state that provision should be made for the post construction monitoring and removal of the facility and reinstatement of the site if the development ceases to be operational.	
9.9	Policy 10 of the SELLP states that the council will support well-designed sustainable development, which maintains and enhances the character of the districts towns, villages and countryside. Specifically by supporting the use of brownfield land for development, unless it is of high environmental value, seeking to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality, promoting the use of high quality materials and where the layout, scale, massing, height and density reflect the character of the surrounding area, and providing on-site landscaping to integrate the development into its wider surroundings and make provision for open space.	
9.10	The Council Landscape Consultants AAH have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, including regular design meetings, on-site visits and community events participation. The process has led to a detailed understanding of the parameters and constraints of the project. Enabling a strong understanding of the key issues, which are presented in the Environmental Statement. A full copy of the report prepared by AAH is	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
	attached as an Appendix C which has reviewed the DCO application documentation and the following summary is based on those comments and should be read in conjunction with the full document.	
9.11	The Environmental Statement Chapter on Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is generally well presented and follows a logical process of defining the baseline, identifying the project in detail and assessing the potential landscape and visual impacts before addressing mitigation proposals. The use of tables is welcomed; however, some large bodies of descriptive text remains and these could have also been summarised in tabular form to aid the reader. The methodology is concise and confirms to best practice principles such as those set out in GLVIA3.	The Applicant welcomes the comments made by LCC on the methodology and assessment undertaken. Guidance at paragraph 3.36 of GLVIA3 states the importance of presenting the assessment of landscape and visual effects in narrative text, stating; <i>'Tables and matrices should be used to support and summarise descriptive text, not to replace it.'</i>
9.12	These comments relate to the cable corridor and the On-Shore Sub-Station (OnSS) only.	These comments have been noted by the Applicant.
9.13	The document provides commentary on the consultation process undertaken thus far, alongside the adaptation of the proposals in response to the comments received. The OnSS has been assessed with a 5km study area, which was agreed during consultation and, given the scale and mass of the development is an acceptable parameter. The baseline assessment is thorough and the distinction between the cable route and the OnSS is welcome, the separation is a theme throughout the chapter, and this aids the readers understanding of the complexity of the project.	
9.14	Eleven representative viewpoints have been utilised, these were agreed with the Council during consultation and they provide an acceptable representation to assess the potential impacts. The cumulative baseline has been assessed in accordance with best practice including the use of GLVIA3 and IEMA 2013.	
9.15	The assessment is based on construction, operation and decommissioning stages of the development, it is clear in the tables and figures, how this has been undertaken. The use of the Maximum Design Envelope or Rochdale Envelope Approach is explained in Chapter 3 of the ES, its use here where the developer does not know the exact specifications of infrastructure is acceptable. However, given that the design is evolving, there is concern that views beyond 5km have already been scoped out. The Council reserves its position on this point and adequacy and seeks to assess this further as the design evolves.	The Rochdale Envelope, used as the basis of the LVIA, establishes the maximum extents which the OnSS will occupy. Any future design iteration will be contained within this envelope and therefore the effects will not exceed those assessed in the LVIA. The LVIA concludes that visual effects will be contained within a 1.3km radius of the OnSS (APP-083 LVIA Chapter Section 12.2). As the extents of the OnSS will not exceed the parameters that were originally assessed, then it will be unlikely for significant visual effects to extend beyond the 1.3km radius identified in the LVIA as the threshold for significant effects and the inclusion of views beyond 5km will not give rise to previously unidentified significant effects that would add to the assessment.
9.16	By reason of its mass and scale, the proposed development would lead to significant adverse effects upon landscape character and visual amenity. The development has the potential to transform the local landscape by altering the character on a large scale, which is likely to be exacerbated by the fragmented nature of the cable route spread over a wide area. The Council are particularly concerned about the effects upon the landscape character through changes to the land use, which would be spread throughout a wide area, rather than a more focused development plot being read as a OnSS development occupying a single site in a wider landscape.	<p>The Applicant has addressed this comment in the response to RR-004.060 in [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>As described in section 7.2.1 of the LVIA (Volume 1, Chapter 28: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (document reference 6.1.28)), the significant effects relate largely to the landscape and visual effects of the OnSS owing to its mass, scale and contrasting appearance amidst a predominantly rural landscape.</i></p> <p><i>In contrast, the effects of the onshore ECC are very limited and so while there will be 'whole project effects' arising where the construction of the OnSS and the onshore ECC are seen together or sequentially, the wider effects will be limited by the staged approach to the construction of the onshore ECC, whereby works will be concentrated in one section of the wider route at any one time. Furthermore, the relatively small scale of the onshore ECC construction works, its location in a heavily modified agricultural landscape where the land is routinely disturbed, the extensive use of HDD which minimises further disturbance, and the temporary nature of these works further limits their contribution to the overall effect of the wider development. During the operational phase, the concealed location of the onshore ECC underground, removes the potential for landscape and visual effects to arise in relation to this infrastructure, which means that operational effects will relate solely to the presence and influence of the onshore substation (OnSS).</i></p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		<p><i>In respect of potential effects on land use, these have been minimised along the length of the onshore ECC through careful siting of the route and the use of HDD at approximately 211 locations. The mitigation planting around the onshore substation has been designed to align with existing rural roads and field boundaries to ensure that farm fields are largely kept complete and not divided by new planting.</i></p>
9.17	<p>The scale and extent of development would also lead to significant adverse effects on views from receptors, changing from views within an agricultural or rural landscape to that of a landscape containing a large building and ancillary infrastructure housing the OnSS. From close range views, the development has been identified in the LVIA as resulting in a significant change to high and medium sensitivity receptors. The views and receptors have been satisfactorily selected following desk-based and on-site research, these accurately provide a representation of the potential for visual and character impacts as a result of the development.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed this comment in the response to RR-004.061 in [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>Visual effects arising as a result of the onshore substation will be especially localised owing to a combination of the relatively flat landscape and the enclosure provided by trees, hedgerows and built development in the surrounding landscape. During the construction phase, there will be significant effects on the visual amenity of people in the local area around the OnSS and out to a maximum range of 1.3km owing to the presence and influence of the construction works and associated emerging OnSS. Significant effects over the same extents will occur during the operational phase but will gradually reduce to not significant over a 5 to 15 year period owing to the growth of mitigation planting around the OnSS. Not only will the effects be limited in terms of their geographical extent, but also in terms of their duration owing to the screening that the mitigation planting will provide within the short to medium term.</i></p>
9.18	<p>The cumulative landscape and visual effects of the proposed development are also of concern, particularly when assessed alongside proposed developments within the study area. The mass and scale of these projects combined would lead to adverse effects upon landscape character and visual amenity over an extensive area. The landscape character of the area may be completely altered, particularly when experienced sequentially.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed this comment in the response to RR-004.062 in [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>As set out in the cumulative assessment at section 9.4 of the LVIA (Volume 1, Chapter 28: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (document reference 6.1.28)) the conclusion is that the cumulative effects are contained and not extensive as the representation suggests. The considered location of the OnSS on the north-western side of the River Welland creates a visual divide from the National Grid Substation at Weston Marsh, such that clear intervisibility of both projects will only be readily apparent from the raised embankment of the River Welland itself. The screening effect of the mitigation planting around the onshore substation would reduce significant cumulative effects to not significant following approximately 15 years of growth. This is because the visibility of the onshore substation would be reduced to the extent that it would have a very limited influence on landscape and visual receptors in the local area, despite the fact that these receptors could still be notably influenced by the other developments in the local area.</i></p>
9.19	<p>Additional information is required with respect to the impact upon, or protection of, existing trees, hedgerows and other important vegetation in order for comment to be made at this stage. These impacts are not limited to the cabling and OnSS development areas, but associated with access and highways works to facilitate the development, such as construction access, particularly from large plant, or access points and associated visibility splays, it is unclear on the landscape and ecology plans as to the extent of vegetation removal proposed, and the LVIA implies little or no vegetation removal is proposed.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed this comment in the response to RR-004.063 in [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>While detailed information regarding the exact number of tree and hedgerow removals will be identified at detailed design stage, the LVIA has taken a worst-case scenario approach to the assessment of the impacts upon existing trees and hedgerows across all development areas, including those associated with access and highways works. Therefore, the losses identified at detailed design stage will be within the parameters assessed in the LVIA. Further information on the loss of hedgerows is outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (8.10 Version 3), which identifies that worst case losses are limited to two short stretches of hedgerow, and this is within the parameters assessed in the LVIA.</i></p> <p><i>This has been achieved by the following embedded mitigation and approach to project design. Firstly, site selection, careful routing, and extensive use of HDD has meant that the landfall, onshore cable route, onshore substation, and associated infrastructure have all been designed to notably reduce potential losses. Secondly, the onshore infrastructure is located in a heavily modified landscape where there are very few natural areas and very few trees and hedgerows. This means that it is possible to locate the majority of the construction compounds and access tracks without incurring loss of vegetation. Thirdly, in the instances where there would be a loss of hedgerows and even fewer trees, these losses will be small in scale, will ultimately be less than that considered within the LVIA Maximum Design envelope and therefore the Applicant can confirm will have a very limited effect on landscape character and visual amenity as demonstrated by the LVIA Assessment. The associated additional cumulative effect resulting from the contribution of the project to the overall cumulative landscape will therefore also be very limited.</i></p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		<p>As set out at section 7.3.2 of the LVIA (APP-083), vegetation losses associated with the onshore infrastructure will be limited owing to a combination of the limited presence of vegetation in this intensively farmed landscape, the extensive use of HDD to avoid most ditches and roads, which typically include those hedgerows and trees that are present, and the careful and considered siting of the onshore infrastructure. The detailed extent to which vegetation losses will occur will be calculated once the detailed design of the onshore infrastructure has been resolved.</p>
9.20	<p>The wider highways elements of the scheme do not appear to be fully considered in the LVIA beyond increased traffic during construction phases, despite the potential adverse effects on the rural landscape these may have included vegetation loss, urbanisation or visual amenity through any required improvements.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed this comment in the response to RR-004.064 in [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>As described above, the LVIA takes a worst-case scenario approach to the assessment of the loss of trees and hedgerows, and all highways elements are considered in the assessment. The limited reference to the effects of the highways' elements in the LVIA reflects the limited effect that these components of the project will have on landscape and visual receptors for the following reasons. Firstly, the highways' elements are ground level elements in a flat landscape which means that the extent of their visibility is limited to within a close range and this limits the range of their effect to within the close range. Secondly, they will be located in a landscape in which roads and vehicles are an established and frequent baseline feature and therefore, will not appear incongruous with the existing rural character and this will further moderate their effect. Thirdly, the limited presence of trees and hedgerows in this landscape will result in very few losses. Fourthly, while the highways' elements may contribute to the overall effect of the Project to some small extent, following a proportional approach, the focus of the LVIA is therefore on the effects of the onshore substation and the construction compounds which have the potential to give rise to significant adverse effects.</i></p> <p><i>The description of the wider highway elements is set out at Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description 8.1.5.2 (APP-058). These include two permanent accesses; one at the TJB sites taken from Roman Bank Road; and one at the OnSS taken from the A16/Surfleet Bank. These will be required to be maintained throughout the Project's operational period. A total of 55 temporary access points off the highway will be installed to facilitate vehicular access from the road and into the Project onshore ECC during construction and a temporary haul road will be established along the onshore ECC and 400kV cable corridor to provide access for construction vehicles from access point/compounds to cable installation sites. The most notable impact will be the construction traffic as referenced at Section 7.3.2 of the LVIA (APP-083). The roads themselves will have a very limited impact owing principally to the fact that roads and tracks are an evident and widespread feature in the baseline landscape, as well as that the flatness of the landform means that the extent to which the roads are visible is limited, the location of the accesses to coincide with existing roads and tracks in most locations, and the very limited loss of vegetation as a result of careful siting of the accesses. Consideration has also been given to the temporary nature of all but two of the accesses</i></p>
9.21	<p>The proposal would deliver landscape and ecological improvements through mitigation areas and planting. However, this will be dependent upon the implementation and management strategy to ensure successful establishment, these aspects should be further explored, and it is assumed these will be refined at the detail design stages. Again an Ecological Compliance Monitoring Officer is needed to give confidence to the community that the implementation of the required mitigation schemes are undertaken in a timely manner and to the agreed standard.</p>	<p>Post-consent, the Landscape Management Plan (LMP) will be developed to present more detail on the implementation and management strategy for the proposed mitigation planting to ensure successful establishment and management.</p> <p>In respect of references to the Section 106 agreement please see the Applicant's response to 17.1 below.</p>
9.22	<p>The sub-station will be a large industrial structure in an area that is generally open and flat in character. The Council believe the mitigation needs to be carefully considered and should commence with an approach that seeks to not just hide a functional building through bunding and vegetation. A design panel has been part of the design development process and the Council would welcome clarification as to how this Panel will operate during the examination process and beyond. To date this dialogue has formulated a dynamic</p>	<p>The aim of the proposed mitigation planting is to mitigate significant landscape and visual effects within the first 5 to 15 years of the operational phase. This approach takes into consideration the potential significant effects on the visual amenity of nearby residents, road-users and recreational users of PRoWs such as on the Macmillan Way. The planting will not screen the OnSS instantly, instead taking a number of years to mature during which time the OnSS will not be hidden but instead be experienced within its landscape setting. The Applicant has committed to a further Design Review Panel session in Q1 of 2025.</p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
9.23	<p>approach that combines different strategies to help the development sit comfortably within the character of the study area.</p> <p>The submission is light on the process of establishment and management of landscape mitigation. The Council accept this is yet to be finalised given the developing nature of the design, however, do stress that the applicant team fully understand that if mitigation planting is to be used, the success rate needs to be high. By default, a robust management and establishment plan needs to be agreed for a period of 15-25 years. Given the extremes of climatic conditions the UK is experiencing and is likely to continue to experience the design and maintenance of planting strategies is of fundamental importance.</p>	<p>It is agreed that a robust plan for the establishment and management of the proposed mitigation planting will be required that takes into account the potential effects of climate change in order to successfully deliver a high success rate. This will be presented in the LMP secured under Requirements 10 and 11 of the DCO. Section 3.8 and 3.9 of the OLEMS (PD1-054) outlines reinstatement, enhancement and creation of habitats and principles of monitoring and management during both construction and operation. Careful consideration of species selection and soil preparation will be undertaken in consultation with LCC.</p>
9.24	<p>Areas requiring further discussion</p> <p>The areas of clarification that the Council wish to pursue during the examination are as follows:-</p> <p>Welcome on-going participation in the design development of the OnSS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council submits the assessment of effects on the existing landscape fabric of the study area, has been under-considered given the small local road network and the scale of the construction traffic for the OnSS. • The Council has concerns regarding the onus on landscape planting as a mitigation strategy, given the open expansive character of the study area. The Council does not reject the stance of using planting to settle the structures in the landscape but would resist the over-reliance of planting to screen a functional building. • Agree that given the evolving design that the worst-case scenario has been adopted along with the Rochdale envelope principle, however, wish to see the detail design of the development to be fixed with urgency so the LVIA can be reassessed during the examination. • Recommend a robust monitoring policy to ensure the successful establishment of any landscape mitigation measures. This would initially comprise the scrutiny of planting procurement and installation methodologies. The Council would then look to collaborate in the development of management plans to ensure successful plant establishment. • Through collaboration with the Council the detailed management documents which cover all aspects of the mitigation planting and establishment for a period of no less than 20 years will be produced and accepted as the method of appraising success. The focus would be to establish vibrant habitats rather than a minimum standard to simply screen and mitigate. Recommend that Council initiated monitoring for a period of a minimum of 10 years would be essential to the success of the mitigation planting in biodiversity net gains and this should be secured using an appropriately funded Ecological Compliance Officer. <p>With the above points still requiring clarification and based on the national and local policies set out above the Council concludes at this stage that the development will have a negative impact on the landscape and character of the area during both construction and operational stages.</p>	<p>Design development of the OnSS will be progressed based on close collaboration with stakeholders. The effects of creating new accesses and other highway works have been considered and the additional effects are thought to be relatively limited taking into account their relatively small scale, the limited loss of vegetation, their temporary nature and their location in a heavily modified agricultural landscape. The mitigation planting is important to mitigate both landscape and visual effects, taking into consideration the effects on nearby residents, road-users and recreational users of the landscape. It is also especially important when considering the wider potential cumulative effects and to enable the successful mitigation of these effects. Any design refinements to the OnSS will be contained within the extents of the Rochdale Envelope. It is agreed that a robust plan for the establishment and management of the mitigation planting will be required, and that careful monitoring will form a critical component of the process. The management plan will cover the 35 year operational life. The planting will be designed to the highest standard with British Standards referenced. It will look to maximise biodiversity value and create vibrant habitats, while contributing positively to local landscape character.</p> <p>In respect of references to the Section 106 agreement please see the Applicant's response to 17.1 below.</p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
Highways and Transportation		
10.1	Key policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 33: Delivering a more sustainable transport network (SELLP) • Policy 22: Transport and Accessibility (ELLP) 	These comments have been noted by the Applicant.
10.2	Paragraph 5.14.8 of the 2024 EN-1 sets out the that the SoS should consider the substantial impacts of traffic and therefore should ensure ‘that the applicant has sought to mitigate these impacts, including during the construction phase of the development. Where the proposed mitigation measures are insufficient to reduce the impact on the transport infrastructure to acceptable levels, the SoS should consider requirements to mitigate adverse impacts on transport networks arising from the development’. Moreover, applicants may be willing to enter planning obligations to for funding infrastructure and otherwise mitigating adverse impacts.	
10.3	With regards to mitigation, EN-1 states that the SoS may attach requirements to a consent where there is likely to be substantial HGV traffic that control numbers of HGV movements to and from the site in a specified period during its construction and possibly on the routing of such movements, make sufficient provision for HGV parking including to avoid prolonged queuing on approach roads and ensuring satisfactory arrangements for reasonably foreseeable abnormal disruption (paragraph 5.14.14).	
10.4	Policy 33 of the SELLP states that Local Planning Authorities will work with partners to make the best use of, and seek improvements to, existing transport infrastructure and services within, and connecting to South East Lincolnshire. For the road based transport network this includes working with the Highway Authority to mitigate against congestion and securing delivery of new local access roads.	
10.5	Policy 22 of the ELLP states that the Council will support accessibility and seek to reduce isolation in the district by supporting development that gives pedestrian and cycle movements priority and requiring any development that involves loss of an existing parking facility to include a robust parking survey.	
10.6	The construction works associated with the installation of the onshore cable route, substation, and other ancillary infrastructure are expected to have a negative impact on the local road network and the local communities the roads pass through. These negative impacts are a consequence of the anticipated increase in vehicular traffic arising from the workforce and material deliveries during the construction phase, and the resultant potential safety and amenity issues that may occur. Once the construction phase is complete, traffic generation would be limited to that required for inspection and maintenance purposes. The resultant movements during the operational phase are unlikely to be discernible from other traffic using the network. Once operational, the development would have neutral impact on the local highway network	ES Chapter 27 Onshore Traffic and Transport [AS1-052] assesses the potential traffic and transport effects associated with the construction of the Project. The conclusions drawn in the chapter are that, with the proposed highway improvement works such as the highway widening and schemes of passing places on the local construction vehicle access routes and the implementation of a construction traffic management plans and a travel plan for each stage of the onshore works, there would be no significant effects.
10.7	Due to the length of the onshore cable route and the requirement to gain access to it, a significant number of construction access points have been proposed by the Applicant. Existing and proposed vehicular accesses are intended to provide construction and operational access. The final details of the access details will need to be submitted and agreed with the Council as Highway Authority.	The Applicant understands that the detailed design of any Highway Works will require technical approval from LCC prior to construction and requirement 20 (Highway Accesses) of the draft DCO provides for this.
10.8	The Project will generate increased vehicle movements on the highway network during construction; this will include increased HGV activity. The increase in vehicle movements will add to existing congestion issues. Whilst impacts would be worse at network peak times, the Project will still result in a notable impact particularly on lightly trafficked rural roads throughout the proposed working day. These impacts may result in safety and/or other amenity issues.	The forecast increase in vehicle movements associated with the peak period of construction of the Project during the peak hours on the highway network on the core construction vehicle access routes is (with the exception of the A16 between the between the A158 and A1028) between 1% and 9%, which is less than 10%, whereby the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) Guidance for the Environmental Assessment of Transport and Movement (GEATM) states at Paragraph 1.22: <i>“At a basic level, it should therefore be assumed that projected changes in traffic of less than 10% create no discernible environmental impact.”</i>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		<p>It should be highlighted that the most likely months when construction traffic associated with the Project might be expected in the peak hours on the highway network is in the winter months, due to the availability of daylight (see 6.3.27.1 ES Chapter 27 Appendix 1 Transport Assessment Annex K [AS1 093]), not during periods of increased baseline traffic due to tourism.</p> <p>The forecast increases in traffic along the local construction vehicle access routes is mitigated with a scheme of passing places along each route (see 6.3.27.1 Chapter 27 Appendix 1 Transport Assessment Annex N [AS1 094]).</p> <p>The assessment of pedestrian amenity, and vulnerable road users and road safety in 6.1.27 ES Chapter 27 Onshore Traffic and Transport [AS1-052] concluded that with the implementation of measures with the 8.15 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [APP-289], there would be no significant effects.</p>
10.9	<p>Access will be required along rural roads that are not designed or constructed to accommodate HGVs, resulting in increased wear and damage to the local highway network. Given the anticipated vehicle movements, there is the potential for damage to result to certain roads. The use of these roads will need to be carefully managed with mechanisms included within any phase specific management plan to enable damage to be repaired.</p>	<p>Section 4.1.3 of the Outline CTMP [APP-289] states pre and post construction surveys of roads used by construction traffic associated with the Project would be undertaken, to be agreed with the local highway authority. These surveys would inform any works that may be required to rectify specific damage to the road network as a direct result of construction work.</p> <p>The Outline CTMP [APP-289] is secured in the draft DCO Requirement 21, which states a construction traffic management plan must for each stage of onshore work must be submitted to and approved by the relevant highway authority in consultation with the relevant planning authority and must be in accordance with the Outline CTMP.</p>
10.9	<p>The use of rural roads, which have no dedicated provisions for pedestrians, cyclists, or equestrians, may result in the increased potential for conflict between these user groups and construction traffic. There is a clear safety issue associated with increasing vehicle activity on roads that have no specific provision for non- motorised road users. Vehicular activity on these roads should be restricted, where possible, with specific mitigation otherwise provided as part of phase specific construction management plans.</p>	<p>The forecast increases in traffic along the local construction vehicle access routes is mitigated with a scheme of passing places along each route (see 6.3.27.1 Chapter 27 Appendix 1 Transport Assessment Annex N [AS1 094]).</p> <p>Section 4.1.4 of the Outline CTMP (APP-289) states specific locations for safety measures for walking, cycling and horse-riders would be considered, which would form part of phase specific CTMPs.</p> <p>Section 4.1.2 of the Outline CTMP (APP-289) sets out how drivers of all Project vehicles would be encouraged to drive in a safe and defensive manner at all times, with a zero-tolerance policy to be adopted by all contractors. Additional measures to promote awareness specifically related to non-motorised users of the highway, could be included in phase specific CTMPs.</p> <p>Whilst the design of the Project has minimised the use of the very minor roads where possible, by maximising the use of on-site haul roads, the use of such roads for construction access vehicles is required in a small number of cases. Due to the nature of many of the local construction vehicle access routes being single track or narrow rural roads, heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) associated with the construction of the Project would be travelling at very low speeds, which would result in any risk of conflict with a non-motorised user on or adjacent to the carriageway would be minimised.</p>
10.10	<p>The Council generally, agree with methodology and approach in the Transport Assessment. Vehicle generation, distribution and assessment is acceptable for this scheme. Whilst the traffic impacts (Table 27.36) are acceptable for this scheme considered in isolation, they are still projected as around 5% - 10% over existing flows and would be noticeable.</p> <p>However, the Council is aware that there are other potential NSIPs in this area (two National Grid schemes and Ossian Off-Shore Wind and Cable route) – if these other schemes were to generate traffic of a similar scale to Outer Dowsing and occur at the same time –this could result in a situation where the transport impact is between 20%-40% uplift on key existing ‘A’ roads in the east of the County. This would be a major concern and critical Routes like the A16 through Boston and the A158 through Horncastle could not accommodate such changes.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed this comment in the response to RR-004.003 in the Applicant’s Responses to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>As presented in Chapter 5 Appendix 3 (Cumulative Effects Assessment Approach Onshore) of the EIA and throughout the EIA technical chapters, a detailed cumulative impact assessment has been undertaken of all reasonably foreseeable developments for which sufficient details were available at the time of submission.</i></p> <p><i>In reference to cumulative impacts on Traffic and Transport, Section 27.9 of the Onshore Traffic and Transport Chapter (Doc Ref APP-219) sets out the assessments of the other known projects at the time of submission (this included a NSIP (Boston Alternative Energy Facility), three residential developments and the proposed National Grid Substation at Weston Marsh). The potential for cumulative vehicle movements associated with the</i></p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		<p><i>construction of ODOW and the other projects included in the assessment would only occur on the core vehicle access routes, capable of accommodating high volumes of traffic and the assessment concluded that there would be no significant effects.</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant has engaged with all the 3 projects referenced by Lincolnshire County Council, noting the National Grid's Grimsby to Walpole project and Eastern Green Links 3 and 4 project have both held non statutory consultations between January and July 2024 which provided outline details of their emerging preferred route corridor and graduated swathe where their proposals could be located. National Grid will be considering the responses to this non statutory consultation to prepare for their statutory consultation (no date confirmed). No detailed information is available for Ossian Offshore Wind as their project is at an earlier stage of development. The Applicant will continue to monitor the development and availability of environmental, spatial and temporal project information for other projects in the region to foster collaboration, noting it will be the responsibility of future projects that come forward for planning to undertake their own Cumulative Effects Assessment as per the guidance in Advice Note 17. It is also worth noting that the forecast levels of the Project's construction traffic at the peak period within the proposed construction programme is over two months (months 19 and 20) only, with construction vehicle movements significantly lower than the peak in most of the other months. Based on the average across the other months in the construction period, the maximum total traffic increase on a core vehicle access route, including the A158 between Horncastle and Skegness and the A16/A52 through Boston, is 2.1%. Given that an overlap with other NSIPs during construction months 19 or 20 - (when the Project is at the peak of construction) is unlikely, and taking the average percentage increase into account, the potential for an uplift of 20%-40% on key existing A roads, (as suggested in LCC's relevant representation) is also unlikely. It is worth noting that as the Project is at a more advanced stage of development, and these future projects will be required to undergo the same DCO/EIA application process, detailed traffic information will be available to those projects for them to consider the Project as part of their cumulative effects assessment.</i></p> <p>With regard to cumulative impacts from other NISP projects, the Applicant was requested by the ExA (PD-011) to provide an initial 'Inter-relationship with other infrastructure projects' Report at Deadline 2, which is then requested to be updated at subsequent deadlines. This report has considered 18 other NSIPs across Lincolnshire.</p> <p>The report highlights the Applicants commitment to working with other NSIP developers of relevant NSIP projects to share information which will help to reduce possible cumulative effects where construction programmes have the potential to overlap.</p>
10.11	<p>Para 93 lists roads to be crossed using trenchless technique, the Council considers this should also include other roads such as Ingoldmells Road, Sloothby High Lane, South Ings Road and Marsh Lane, as all of these roads have reasonable levels of existing traffic. Other roads may also need to be crossed by trenchless technique, the final list will depend on the traffic management and construction issues yet to be considered in detail, but discussed in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) paras 49-56.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed this comment in RR.004.004 in the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>The Applicant acknowledges that there was an error in the initial submission. Cable installation at all adopted roads will be facilitated by trenchless technology, as shown in the Project Description Plan (Indicative Onshore Infrastructure (Detailed) Basis of Assessment Figs 3.4.1-3.4.57 (document 6.2.3, APP-089). Corrected versions of the Traffic & Transport Chapter (document 6.1.27, AS1-052)) and Transport Assessment (AS1-086) were submitted with the Applicant's response to the Section 51 Advice.</i></p>
10.12	<p>Figures 27.1.7, 27.1.8 and 27.1.9 do not show any flows – the flows are available in the Tables, but the Figures would be useful if they were corrected.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed this comment in RR.004.005 in the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>The Applicant acknowledges that this figure omitted the flows, due to a technical error. An updated version of the Traffic and Transport Chapter (AS1-086) was submitted with the Applicant's response to the Section 51 Advice including the corrected figures.</i></p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
10.13	The proposals for Passing Places (Annex N) is agreed in terms of indicative numbers and locations of proposed passing places – technical details of these will need to approved by the Council as Section 278 Minor Works.	<p>The Applicant has addressed this comment in RR.004.006 in the Applicant’s Responses to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>The Applicant has engaged with LCC regarding the Minor Works Permit process and the details that will be required, in relation to the installation of the passing bays.</i></p>
10.14	Annex F provides General Arrangements of Accesses. AC-15 which is the access at Croft Bank A52 shows swept paths using the full A52 and extending across the verge and outside the highway boundary. This access needs to be modified so turning vehicles can enter/exit the site safely.	<p>The Applicant has addressed this comment in RR.004.007 in the Applicant’s Responses to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>The Applicant acknowledges that this drawing contained an error which has been corrected. An updated version of the Transport Assessment, Annexe F (Construction Access General Arrangements) (AS1-090) was submitted with the Applicant’s response to the Section 51 Advice including the revised access drawing Sheet 5, AC-15. This demonstrates that turning vehicles can enter/exit the site safely.</i></p>
10.15	The Draft DCO text is similar to other NSIPs draft and approved DCOs in Lincolnshire in that Articles 9-16 (Streets) provide powers for works in the streets, TROs, road closures all without the Highway Authority approval. The Council would require the developer to obtain detailed prior technical approval of their works (accesses, passing places etc) from the Council as Highway Authority. The applicant will also need to gain approval of when the works are to be implemented and the diversions/traffic management through LCC Permitting scheme.	<p>The Applicant has addressed this comment in RR.004.008 in the Applicant’s Responses to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>The Applicant is engaging with LCC regarding the appropriate processes, under the LCC Permit Scheme, for the implementation of different authorised works and understands that Highway Works will require technical approval and will be coordinated through the LCC Permit scheme.</i></p>
10.16	Document 8.15 (OCTMP) – This does allow for discussion of details for accesses, haul road crossings, diversions, temporary road closures, passing places and road widening and requires prior agreement of LCC (see paragraphs 32, 33, 46, 54, 73, 87). So whilst the draft DCO wording is a concern, the proposed process and methodology in the OCTMP is encouraging and what the Council would expect: i.e. that once the applicant have DCO approval they will discuss and obtain technical approvals from the Council for works in the highway.	<p>The Applicant has addressed this comment in RR.004.009 in the Applicant’s Responses to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>As noted above, the Applicant is engaging with LCC regarding the LCC Permitting Scheme, and the preconstruction process required, to obtain the necessary technical approvals. The Applicant has identified the need for Highway Permits in the ‘Other Consents and Licenses’ document (AS1-027).</i></p> <p>The Applicant welcomes confirmation that the OCTMP (APP-289) contains the required process and methodology and is as expected from LCC as the Highways Authority.</p>
10.17	There is also a need to ensure that the DCO provides a mechanism for the Highway Authority to review and provide the necessary specification for works in the Highway that would normally be captured via a Section 278 Agreement and the mechanism as how this will be achieved is still under discussion in the drafting of the DCO. Due to the uncertainties regarding the impact of cumulative impacts from combined traffic flows during the construction phases of other NSIPs being promoted in this area, the Council concludes that traffic and transport impacts during the construction and operation, is currently negative.	This comment has been noted by the Applicant, the Applicant has committed to complying with the permitting scheme outlined by the LCC.
Public Rights of Way		
11.1	<p>1.1 Key policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 32: Community, Health and Wellbeing (SELLP) • Policy 33: Delivering a more sustainable transport network (SELLP) • Policy 25: Green Infrastructure (ELLP) 	These comments are noted by the Applicant.
11.2	Paragraph 5.11.24 of EN-1 sets out that the SoS should consider imposing requirements to ensure the functionality and connectivity of the green infrastructure network is maintained in the vicinity of the development and that any necessary works are undertaken, where possible, to mitigate any adverse impact and, where appropriate, to improve that network and other areas of open space including appropriate access to National Trails and other public rights of way and new coastal access routes.	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
11.3	Policy 33 of the SELLP states that Local Planning Authorities will work with partners to make the best use of, and seek improvements to, existing transport infrastructure and services within, and connecting to South East Lincolnshire. Part C of this policy relates to cycling, walking and other sustainable transport. The policy seeks to protect existing footpaths, cycle routes and public rights of way from development, improve connectivity creating a more coherent network and ensure new major developments provide for walking and cycling routes. Whereas Policy 32 aims for the development to contribute to the creation of a socially-cohesive and inclusive community, reducing health inequality and improving the communities health and wellbeing. The policy seeks to protect and enhance existing public rights of way and create new links to the right of way network.	
11.4	Policy 25 of the ELLP seeks to safeguard and deliver a network of accessible green infrastructure by protecting and safeguarding all greenspace identified through the Settlement Proposals DPD so that there is no net loss, maximising opportunities for new and enhanced green infrastructure and publicly accessible open spaces in and around all communities and seek opportunities to connect existing green infrastructure to improve the network of spaces and accessibility for both the local population and wildlife.	
11.5	At the point of landfall and the surrounding area impacted by the cable route, there could be interruption to lawful users' ability to access the coast. This is a well-used amenity and the local PRow network is key for many to gain access to this popular and important environment as part of the County's Coastal Country Park.	<p>The Project has committed to using HDD under the beach at landfall, which will begin past the tidal zone and then break ground west of the Roman bank. The project is committed to not closing the beach during construction works.</p> <p>The PRow in the vicinity of landfall that would be crossed by the Onshore Export Cable Corridor (Hogs/57/1, Ande/19/1, Ande/19/2, Ande/19/3 and Chap/21/4) would remain open with a managed crossing, as set out in Procedural Deadline - 8.17 Outline Public Access Management Plan [PD1-062]. Therefore, the interruption to lawful user's ability to access the coast using the PRow network would be minimised.</p> <p>The assessment of potential effects to users of PRow in Table 23.37 of 6.1.27 Chapter 27 Onshore Traffic and Transport [AS1-051] concluded the level of effect would be minor adverse for the PRow in the vicinity of landfall and therefore not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.</p>
11.6	During the construction phase, there will be a negative impact on lawful users of the PRow due to the considerable construction works proposed to take place. This will vary in distance from the PRow network but will negatively impact the amenity of the routes for users and their enjoyment of what is usually, in most cases, a rural environment. These comments relate to the compounds along the proposed route and also the substation site at the southern end of the Project. The existence of the compounds during construction will adversely impact the environment for walkers visually through the construction phase as will the substation site, which will continue to adversely impact visual enjoyment of the local area through the operational phase as well.	In locations along PRow where visibility of the construction of the landfall, onshore cable corridor or associated construction compounds will be visible, there is the potential for the views of walkers to be affected. These effects will be short term over the duration of the construction phase and reversible on completion of construction. Significant effects will be limited to locations where PRow come within close proximity of construction works as set out in the assessment in Table 7.1 of Section 7.3.2 of the LVIA Chapter (APP-083). In respect of the effects extending beyond the construction phase and into the operational phase, this will only occur in respect of specific sections of footpath and over a limited timeframe as explained in respect of 11.7 below.
11.7	During the operational phase, the visual impact of the new infrastructure at the substation will continue. This will be a negative impact on what is currently a rural environment. The path that appear to be most impacted is the McMillian Long Distance Footpath.	Effects on walkers during the operational phase includes the effects on walkers on the McMillian Long Distance Footpath arising as a result of the onshore substation. The assessment of these effects is set out at Sections 7.3.3.5 and 7.3.3.6 of Chapter 28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (APP-083). The assessment concludes that these effects will be mitigated within the first 15 years of operation owing to the screening effect of the mitigation planting around the onshore substation.
11.8	In terms of long-term visual impacts, with particular reference to the above ground infrastructure of the onshore substation, a commitment should be made to mitigate this as much as possible by offering landscaping to restrict visibility of infrastructure by lawful users of the McMillian Long Distance Footpath.	Mitigation planting has been included as part of the design of the onshore substation and has been located to ensure that visual effects on walkers on the McMillian Long Distance Path will be mitigated within the first 15 years of operation. Viewpoints 4 (APP-128 and APP-129) and 5 (APP-130 and APP-131) show views from the McMillian Long Distance Footpath. The mitigation planting is shown on Figure 28.15 (APP-124) and explained in more detail in the OLEMS (PD1-054).

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
11.9	<p>The Applicant has proposed measures to mitigate these effects, through the Public Access Management Plan in accordance with the outline public access management plan which is secured through a Requirement in the draft DCO. Although it does set out clear mitigation for the network, this will negatively impact lawful path users within the County due to the temporary closures and diversions that are proposed. To reduce disruption to lawful users as much as possible, the Council would need to see a strong commitment to a phased construction programme and its securement through an appropriate requirement within the DCO. If this can be secured there will be negative impacts during construction as temporary diversions and other measures are put in place to footpath users but this will reduce to neutral during the operational phase.</p>	<p>Schedule 1, part 3, Requirement 8 of the Draft Development Consent Order (document 3.1, version 5) secures that the detail of the stages of works are to be submitted and approved by the relevant planning authority. The detailed design stage will be undertaken post consent, which will include construction phasing.</p>
Flood Risk, Drainage and Surface Water		
12.1	<p>Key Policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 4: Approach to Flood Risk (SELLP) • Policy 16: Inland Flood Risk (ELLP) 	<p>These comments are noted by the Applicant.</p>
12.2	<p>Section 5.16 of the 2024 NPS EN-1 focusses on water quality and resources. In the decision making process, the SoS should note that all activities that discharge to the water environment are subject to pollution control (5.16.11). Moreover, the SoS will 'generally need to give impacts on the water environment more weight where a project would have an adverse effect on the achievement of the environmental objectives established under the Water Framework Directive' (5.16.12).</p>	
12.3	<p>EN-1 also states that 'the risk of impacts on the water environment can be reduced through careful design to facilitate adherence to good pollution control practice' (5.16.9). It further elaborates that the SoS should consider 'proposals to mitigate adverse effects on the water environment and any enhancement measures put forward by the applicant and whether appropriate requirements should be attached to any development consent and/or planning obligations are necessary'.</p>	
12.4	<p>Paragraph 5.8.7 of EN-1 notes that new energy infrastructure should only be permitted by exception in flood risk areas (for example where there are no reasonably available sites in areas at lower risk), and that it should be safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, should reduce flood risk overall. It should also be designed and constructed to remain operational in times of flood. Paragraphs 5.8.9 and 5.8.10 confirm the requirement for the flood risk sequential and exception tests to be applied.</p>	
12.5	<p>The guidance confirms that the Exception Test should only be engaged where "the Sequential Test has identified reasonably available, lower risk sites appropriate for the proposed development where, accounting for wider sustainable development objectives, application of relevant policies would provide a clear reason for refusing development in any alternative locations identified". The examples of such 'relevant policies' which would provide a clear reason for refusing potential alternative sites are those relating to landscape, heritage and nature conservation designations, for example Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), SSSIs and World Heritage Sites.</p>	
12.6	<p>Section 2.3 of EN-5 relates to climate change adaptation and resilience. It states that climate change is likely to increase risks to the resilience to some of the electricity network infrastructure and specifically refers to flood risk as an example. Paragraph 2.3.2 states that 'applicants should in particular set out to what extent the proposed development is expected to be vulnerable, and, as appropriate, how it has been designed to be resilient to flooding, particularly for substations that are vital to the network; and especially in light of changes to groundwater levels resulting from climate change'.</p>	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
12.7	<p>Policy 4 of the SELLP states that development proposed within an area at risk of flooding (flood zones 2 and 3) of the Environment Agency’s flood map or at risk during a breach or overtopping scenario would be permitted where it can be demonstrated that there are no other sites available at a lower risk of flooding, the application is supported with a site-specific flood risk assessment, covering risk from all sources of flooding including the impacts of climate change, the development proposes appropriate flood resistance and resilience measures, the development includes appropriate flood warning and evacuation procedures where necessary, the development incorporates the use of Sustainable Drainage System and demonstrates that the proposal will not increase risk elsewhere and that opportunities through layout, form of development and green infrastructure have been considered as a way of providing flood betterment and reducing flood risk overall and demonstrates that adequate foul water treatment and disposal already exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.</p>	
12.8	<p>Policy 16 of the ELLP states that all new development must show how it proposes to provide adequate surface water disposal, including avoiding impacting on surface water flow routes or ordinary watercourses. The Council will expect this to involve the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems along with other appropriate design features, including the retention of any existing water features on a site. It goes on to state that the Council will support development that demonstrates an integrated approach to sustainable drainage that has positive gains to the natural environment. All new development must show how it can provide adequate foul water treatment and disposal or that it can be provided in time to serve the development. It finally states that the Council will support improvements to the existing flood defences, the creation of new flood defences, infrastructure associated with emergency planning, washlands and flood storage areas.</p>	
12.9	<p>Surface Water, Flooding and Drainage – the Council as Lead Local Flood Authority for Drainage has reviewed Document 8.1.5 -The Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy – This is a relatively short and high level document. The Council agrees with the principles and proposals in this document, the details will need to be delivered and agreed through the Drainage Management Plan and secured by appropriate worded requirement.</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes confirmation that the Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy (APP-273); contains the required principles and processes and is as expected from LCC as the Lead Local Flood Authority.</p> <p>Requirement 18 (code of construction practice) of the draft DCO (PD1-024) requires the submission of a Code of Construction Practice which must include a surface water drainage strategy (which must accord with the Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy (APP-273); therefore the final plan is already secured through an appropriately worded DCO Requirement. The final plan must be submitted to and approved by, the relevant planning authority, in consultation with LCC</p> <p>For clarity, the Applicant would point out that the Surface Water Drainage Strategy relates to the construction phase and secured through the CoCP, while the Operational Drainage Management Plan is a separate plan, relating to drainage of the OnSS during the operational phase and secured separately by DCO Requirement 15.</p>
12.10	<p>In summary, subject to the development being carried out as proposed within the DCO application documents and further details being agreed as part of subsequent DCO Requirements, the Council as Lead Local Flood Authority for Lincolnshire, is of the view that impacts of this proposal for both construction and operational phase are neutral.</p>	<p>This comment is noted by the Applicant.</p>
Minerals and Waste		
13.1	<p>Key Policy – Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2016)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy M2: Providing for an adequate supply of sand and gravel ▪ Policy M11: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources ▪ Policy W1 Future Requirements for New Waste Facilities 	<p>These comments are noted by the Applicant.</p>
13.2	<p>Section 5.15 of EN-1 NPS covers resource and waste management. EN-1 states that the government policy on ‘hazardous and non-hazardous waste is intended to protect human health and the environment by producing less waste and by using it as a resource wherever possible. Where this is not possible and disposal is required as a last resort, waste management regulation ensures that</p>	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
	waste is disposed of in a way that is least damaging to the environment and to human health'. It goes on to state that sustainable waste management is implemented through the waste hierarchy wherein the 'disposal of waste should only be considered where other waste management options are not available or where it is the best overall environmental outcome'.	
13.3	Paragraph 5.15.4 states that 'all large infrastructure projects are likely to generate some hazardous and non-hazardous waste. The EA's Environmental Permit regime incorporates operational waste management requirements for certain activities. When an applicant applies to the EA for an Environmental Permit, the EA will require the application to demonstrate that processes are in place to meet all relevant Environmental Permit requirements'.	
13.4	No part of the site affects safeguarded mineral resources, and consequently due to the nature of the proposals the Council remain satisfied that no sterilisation of mineral resources will occur. There are no existing/allocated mineral sites in proximity to the cable route or location of the sub-station.	
13.5	The Council would like to understand the potential impact on the provision of minerals in this area as it begins the review of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Therefore details of the amount of mineral; such as chalk that would be required in the construction works for haul roads and construction compounds would be helpful to the Minerals Planning Authority to plan for future mineral provision.	The Applicant has engaged with LCC on this matter and provided as much detail as is possible at this stage of the Project.
13.6	As the Council have no mineral safeguarding objections to the proposals and the impacts on the minerals resource is assessed as neutral .	These comments are noted by the Applicant.
13.7	<p>With respect to waste the relevant document is the Outline Site Waste Management Plan (APP-274/doc 8.1.6). It is generally acceptable although it does not provide much detail of the applications impact on waste other than a general description of the legislation and policy that is relevant and needs to be taken into account. The Council draw the Examining Authority (ExA) attention to the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (para 12) This document only applies to the onshore elements of the project; ▪ Legislation & Policy (paras 30 & following) – Looks reasonable in terms of waste-related information; and ▪ Waste arisings (para 91) – The majority of the expected waste (62,000 m3) appears to be from "trenchless crossings". Even having looked in the Project Description (APP-058/doc 6.1.3), It is not clear what this waste would be or how it is proposed to be dealt with. <p>Whilst clarification on the above matters would be helpful to the Waste Planning Authority at this time there is assessed to be a neutral impact for both the construction and operational stages of the development with regard to waste.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed this comment in RR-004.001 in the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>The waste material referred to relates to arisings from the trenching and trenchless crossing works (replaced localised subsoil material for cables and thermal bedding). Treatment of such waste would align with the Outline Site Waste Management Plan, applicable UK legislation and best practice. It would also depend on the methodology adopted for the trenchless crossings as to whether the drilling arisings may be suitable for local reinstatement. As such, detailed consideration of waste treatment and final destination will not be possible until the detailed design stage has been undertaken, however waste management measures will adhere to the waste hierarchy and with due consideration of the potential interactions with re-use of waste with the local environment. For clarification regarding the table following para 91 of APP-058, a conservative scenario has been used whereby the calculations assume that all arisings from trenchless crossings works are considered unsuitable materials/waste; however, the Applicant considers this a worst case scenario to cover all eventualities prior to detailed design and engineering taking place, and the Applicant will endeavour to minimise waste material being created as far as reasonably practicable. The arisings from the trenching works and trenchless works (subject to applied methodology) will be considered inert. The Applicant intends to reuse the inert material from the works.</i></p> <p><i>Where the material is unsuitable or impractical for reuse it will be removed offsite via a licenced agent and suitably disposed of.</i></p> <p><i>The management of all site waste will comply with the Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) and Environmental Management Plan (EMP) under the final Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) that will be submitted for approval prior to construction start under Requirement 18 (Code of construction practice) of the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (document 3.1, version 3).</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant can confirm that the Outline Site Waste Management Plan (APP-274/doc 8.1.6) relates solely to waste arising from onshore activities. For information, offshore waste management provisions and arrangements will be included within the Project Environmental Management Plan as set out in Section 7 of the Outline Project Environmental Management Plan (APP-277). The submission and approval of a Project Environmental Management Plan, which must accord with the Outline Project Environmental Management Plan, is required</i></p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		<i>under condition 13(e) of the deemed marine licences forming Schedules 10 and 11 of the draft DCO (document 3.1, version 3), and condition 10(d) of the deemed marine licences forming Schedules 12-15 of the draft DCO.</i>
Cultural Heritage and Archaeology		
14.1	Key Policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 29: Historic Environment (SELLP) • Policy 11: Historic Environment (ELLP) 	These comments are noted by the Applicant.
14.2	EN-1 states that the ‘construction, operation and decommissioning of energy infrastructure has the potential to result in adverse impacts on the historic environment above, at and below the surface of the ground’	
14.3	Paragraph 5.9.21 states that ‘where there is a high probability (based on an adequate assessment) that a development site may include, as yet undiscovered heritage assets with archaeological interest, the Secretary of State will consider requirements to ensure appropriate procedures are in place for the identification and treatment of such assets discovered during construction’.	
14.4	Paragraph 5.9.7 states that the SoS ‘should also consider the impacts on other non- designated heritage assets (as identified either through the development plan making process by plan-making bodies, including ‘local listing’, or through the application, examination and decision making process). This is on the basis of clear evidence that such heritage assets have a significance that merits consideration in that process, even though those assets are of lesser significance than designated heritage assets’. ‘In considering the impact of a proposed development on any heritage assets, the SoS should consider the particular nature of the significance of the heritage assets and the value that they hold for this and future generations. This understanding should be used to avoid or minimise conflict between their conservation and any aspect of the proposal’ (5.9.24). EN-1 also states that ‘where appropriate, the SoS will impose requirements on the Development Consent Order to ensure that the work is undertaken in a timely manner, in accordance with a written scheme of investigation that complies with the policy EN-1 and which has been agreed in writing with the relevant local authority’.	
14.5	Policy 29 of the SELLP seeks to conserve and where appropriate enhance distinctive elements of South East Lincolnshire’s historic environment. It goes on to state that to respect the historical legacy, varied character and appearance of South East Lincolnshire’s historic environment, development proposals will conserve and enhance the character and appearance of designated and non-designated heritage assets, such as important known archaeology or that found during development, historic buildings, conservation areas, scheduled monuments, street patterns, streetscapes, landscapes, parks (including Registered Parks and Gardens), river frontages, structures and their settings through high-quality sensitive design.	
14.6	Policy 11 of ELLP states that the Council will support proposals that secure the continued protection and enhancement of heritage assets in East Lindsey, contribute to the wider vitality and regeneration of the areas in which they are located and reinforce a strong sense of place. It continues to state that proposals will be supported where they preserve or enhance heritage assets and their setting, preserve or enhance the special character, appearance and setting of the District’s Conservation Areas, have particular regard to the special architectural or historic interest and setting of the District’s Listed Buildings, do not harm the site or setting of a Scheduled Monument; any unscheduled nationally important or locally significant archaeological site, preserve or enhance the quality and experience of the historic landscapes and woodland of the District and their setting, are compatible with the significance of non-designated heritage assets in East Lindsey and do not have a harmful cumulative impact on heritage assets.	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
14.7	<p>While the submission documentation on archaeology and heritage is substantial, it is disappointing that the issues the Council have identified in the scoping and PIER responses remain unaddressed. Evaluation continues to focus on finding more information on known archaeology while blank areas of unknown potential remain unevaluated through successive phases of evaluation work. No field evaluation has been undertaken so there can be no site specific informed appropriate mitigation measures across the Order Limits boundary.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.012 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>The baseline assessment presented within the ES follows standard protocols in accordance with best practice, acknowledging that the archaeological potential of the Order Limits which varies according to historic topography and episodes of inundation, should inform the selection of and targeting of evaluation techniques as appropriate. It is not standard to deploy all archaeological techniques to any given site. On projects of this scale, it is imperative that desk-based assessment and fieldwork is chosen carefully and targeted where it is necessary and appropriate. Against this backdrop, geophysical survey has targeted areas where deposit modelling and coastline studies indicate a potential for significant impacts associated with occupation, whether that be occupation of Iron Age, Roman or medieval date; an understanding of historic topography and coastlines informed the geophysical deployment. The Onshore Archaeological Geophysical Report (Document reference 15.8) has been submitted alongside this response.</i></p> <p><i>The results of the magnetometer geophysical survey (PD1-080), which included a number of anomalies which could reference occupation, have informed a targeted trial trenching campaign which is underway. The targeting of geophysical anomalies in this way is standard and widely practiced. Whilst it is normal to test 'blank areas' it is not standard to test blank areas in preference to targeting known areas of potential in the first instance. It should be noted however that the archaeological works underway have included slit trenching/test pitting in 'blank' areas as directed by potential favourable geology inferred by deposit modelling.</i></p> <p><i>The trenching works currently underway are being undertaken in accordance with the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI) (PD1-052) and a subordinate WSI which has been approved by the LCC Historic Environment Officer. As outlined in the OWSI further pre-construction trenching works will be undertaken. The Applicant can confirm that additional blank areas will be tested as part of a preconstruction trial trenching campaign. In respect to any 'blank' areas not being tested by the trenching works underway, the geophysical survey included electromagnetism alongside magnetometer survey. To assist in the best placement of trenches in 'blank' areas; a review of the electromagnetism survey will help inform the strategic placement of trial trenches as part of the preconstruction trial trenching to be undertaken preconstruction.</i></p> <p><i>Aside from potential occupation remains, the only other potential significant impact identified within the ES was on the potential impacts to organic remains within thick deposits of peat. Further fieldwork, currently underway, including geoarchaeological boreholes and slit trenches/test pits has been carefully targeted to evaluate the thicker deposits of peat. RR-004.013 references preservation in situ options which could be deployed if necessary, in the event that remains of high importance are present. Response 14.11 references the OWSI and subordinate WSIs which will provide for the implementation of all necessary mitigation measures.</i></p>
14.8	<p>The evaluation rests on the premise that directional drilling can theoretically be deployed along almost the entire route therefore evaluation results are not required for determination.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.013 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p>
14.9	<p>Sufficient baseline information on the archaeology to be impacted across the site is required by National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), EIA Regulations and National Policy Statement</p>	<p><i>It is accepted that at EIA a developer is required to set out the likely significant effects which includes the worst-case scenario of a development. The Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (APP-180 to APP-187), which utilised the results of geophysical survey and deposit modelling, identified likely worst-case impacts to buried archaeological remains.</i></p>
14.10	<p>EN-1 states, "The applicant should ensure that the extent of the impact of the proposed development on the significance of any heritage assets affected can be adequately understood from the application and supporting documents (5.8.10)."</p>	<p><i>These are tabulated in full in the ES chapter in Table 20.9 (AS1-048). These impacts include specific archaeological receptors identified through geophysical survey but also reference the potential worst-case impacts across the Order Limits, such that other receptors not yet specifically located but nonetheless anticipated from a review of</i></p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		<p><i>the baseline as a whole are included in the impact assessment. Column 2 of Table 20.9 (AS1-048) sets out where receptors are anticipated. Worst case potential impacts including all likely significant impacts have been identified.</i></p> <p><i>The ES chapter concludes that with due regard to the potential for preservation in situ that is provided by the potential to adopt trenchless techniques, that no significant impacts to archaeological remains are predicted.</i></p> <p><i>The OWSI (PD1-052) confirms that all archaeological works will be undertaken in accordance with WSIs approved by LCC in consultation with HE, as secured by Requirement 17 of the draft DCO (AS1-024).</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant acknowledges that the further pre-construction archaeological works will inform the WSIs to be submitted for each stage of the onshore transmission works, As such, requirement 17(i) of the draft DCO (document 3.1, Version 3) has been updated to include the underlined text: “No stage of the onshore transmission works may commence until a written scheme of archaeological investigation (which must accord with the outline onshore written scheme of investigation for archaeological works and is informed by the archaeological investigations referred to in sub-paragraph (2)) for that stage has been submitted to and approved by Lincolnshire County Council in consultation with the relevant planning authority and Historic England.”</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant’s approach is not atypical of similar projects, is in line with standard practice and is considered appropriate and proportionate. Noting specifically the Project’s commitment to the adoption of trenchless techniques to avoid significant impacts through preservation in situ where potential remains of high importance are encountered.</i></p>
14.11	<p>Directional drilling is a standard mitigation in a suite of potential mitigation responses to deal with developmental impact upon surviving archaeology in a proportionate and appropriate way. A suite of mitigation types cannot be reasonably deployed until there is an evidence base which establishes the archaeological potential: there must be site-specific understanding of the presence, significance, depth and extent of surviving archaeology across the full impact zone to inform an effective and fit for purpose mitigation strategy.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.014 in the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>The Applicant welcomes LCC’s position that directional drilling is standard mitigation.</i></p> <p><i>The OWSI (PD1-052) sets out a suite of potential mitigation measures that will be employed by the project in response to archaeological remains, including trenchless techniques which, as noted above, have been committed to where required to avoid significant impacts through preservation in situ.</i></p> <p><i>The details of the mitigation to be deployed in response to the OWSI (PD1-052) will be informed by further investigations pre-commencement of works, and the measures will be proportionate to the impact.</i></p> <p><i>The OWSI (PD1-052) confirms that all archaeological works will be undertaken in accordance with WSIs approved by LCC in consultation with HE, as secured by Requirement 17 of the draft DCO (AS1-024). Response 14.8-14.10 outlines the updates made to the draft DCO wording to reflect the requirement for subordinate WSIs to also be informed by preconstruction investigations. As set out within the OWSI, mitigation measures would include preservation in situ, archaeological watching briefs and strip, map and sample excavation as necessary. Response 14.8-14.10 references preservation in situ options which could be deployed if necessary, in the event that remains of high importance are present.</i></p>
14.12	<p>For the overarching WSI (8.9 Outline Onshore Written Scheme Investigation for Archaeological Works) the approach is for archaeological work including evaluation techniques such as trenching as well as mitigation to be pushed to post-consent, and that evaluation is focused on finding out more information on what is already known. This is an extremely risky strategy, as known archaeology can be easily mitigated. The lack of evaluation at all levels (air photos, geophysical survey, trenching) in areas which are currently ‘blank’ means that the potential remains unknown and therefore unmitigatable, pushing increasingly high levels of risk to post consent with the potential for field evaluation and the resulting appropriate levels of archaeological mitigation being pushed into impacting the work programme, schedule and corresponding budgetary impacts.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.015 in the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>To avoid repetition, the responses set out above justify the strategy deployed on this Project; response 14.7 references that ‘blank’ areas are included in the current trial trenching campaign and will be tested further by additional preconstruction trial trenching as clarified in the updates OWSI (PD1-052).</i></p> <p><i>With regard to risk, the OWSI references preservation in situ as a potential mitigation option. This option could be deployed, if necessary, in the event that remains of high importance are recorded by preconstruction trial trenching. The OWSI and subordinate WSIs which will provide for the implementation of all necessary mitigation measures in consultation with and under the approval of LCC.</i></p>
14.13	<p>The proposed post-consent works include trial trenching, strip map and sample, set piece excavation and watching briefs and also includes reference to the potential for preservation in situ.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.016 in the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
	<p>There is little detail in the document where the Council would expect details of what is proposed: for preservation in situ for example the Council need clarity on whether there would be enforceable measures such as fencing around preservation in situ mitigation areas throughout the construction phase and during maintenance groundworks, whether there would be an Archaeological Clerk of Works, and whether these areas will be included in the Construction and Management Plans.</p>	<p><i>An updated OWSI (PD1-052) has been submitted alongside this response to include additional details in the preservation in situ section (section 9.7) and confirmation of objectives (section 3.2).</i></p> <p>Since that submission the Applicant has received confirmation from LCC that they are content with the updates to the OWSI.</p>
14.14	<p>In section 3.2 Objectives there is no mention of determining the significance of archaeology which will be impacted, this is essential to understand what would be reasonable and appropriate levels of archaeological mitigation.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.017 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>An updated OWSI (PD1-052) has been submitted which includes further information on developing our understanding of significance.</i></p> <p>Since that submission the Applicant has received confirmation from LCC that they are content with the updates to the OWSI. .</p>
14.15	<p>In the same section there is no mention of contributing to knowledge and understanding which is a primary focus on development-led archaeology, nor is there mention of any public benefit through engagement, outreach or legacy projects.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.018 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>An updated OWSI (PD1-052) has been submitted to include reference to these matters. Requirement 17 of DCO also references public dissemination of the results of fieldwork.</i></p> <p>Since that submission the Applicant has received confirmation from LCC that they are content with the updates to the OWSI.</p>
14.16	<p>Historic England Advice Note 17: Planning and Archaeology states that there are environmental, economic and social public benefits, for example 'Social benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • delivering new knowledge about an area, a public benefit derived from knowledge gain that would not be available from any other source. • Learning and development (education) and the ability to acquire new knowledge and skills. • Enhanced community cohesion and a stronger cultural identity e.g. via community heritage projects. • Contributing to community wellbeing and promoting social capital, leading to improvements in health, wealth and education. The social value of archaeology increases when opportunities for wider public engagement are available. • Wider benefits that could inform future research and practice, including for example knowledge about past human diseases that could help preventative health strategies.' (Box 3: Realising public benefit through archaeology). 	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.019 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>An updated OWSI (PD1-052) has been submitted to include reference to these matters. Requirement 17 of the draft DCO also references public dissemination of the results of fieldwork.</i></p> <p>Since that submission the Applicant has received confirmation from LCC that they are content with the updates to the OWSI.</p>
14.17	<p>The archaeological Desk Based Assessment (APP-180 to APP-187) which is in eight parts lays out information which is tied to specific project reference codes, this makes it impossible to understand without including a document relating these reference codes to the real world. It is obvious much work has been undertaken so it is most unfortunate it is currently an unworkable document in parts</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.020 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p>The DBA is supported by a number of figures which illustrate the location of the 14 sections that the Order Limits has been split into. See Appendix 20.1 Part 2 Desk Based Assessment (APP 181) - Figures 20.1.1, 20.1.2, 20.1.3, 20.1.4, 20.1.5, 20.1.7, 20.1.8, 20.1.9 and 20.1.10. The segment references are marked by black and white boundary splits in Figure 3.3 (APP-089). Since that submission, LCC have responded to state that they are content with this clarification.</p>
14.18	<p>Figures showing the extent of completed and proposed geophysical survey (Figure 20-8 in the Table of Contents in DBA volume one, but numbered for example as Figure 20.1.8.11 in DBA volume two) show that while some geophysical survey still needs to be undertaken there are substantial sections of the Order Limits which are neither completed nor proposed with at least a third of the route not subject to geophysical survey.</p>	<p>In terms of the figures, please see the response to 14.17 above.</p> <p>In terms of the reference to LiDAR Assessment please see the response to 14.19 below.</p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
	<p>DBA volume 4 (APP-183) is Appendix C7: LiDAR Assessment and Aerial Photographic Review.</p> <p>Historic England’s Aerial Archaeology Mapping Explorer and Historic England’s Aerial Photo Explorer are included in the areas which were looked at but often had no photos.</p>	
14.19	<p>Historic England’s photographic archives were consulted (in section 2.2.3) for an area around Slackholme the Scheduled Deserted Medieval Settlement. Archaeological features were identified on the air photos but the section concluded that geophysical survey provided more detailed evidence of activity at the sample location than was visible on the aerial photographs.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.022 in the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>It is not necessary to deploy all methods of desk-based assessment to sufficiently understand archaeological potential and significant impacts. With particular reference to the location of the Order Limits within an area subject to repeated and prolonged episodes of inundation there is sufficient reasoning to justify the Applicant’s approach to aerial photographic assessment where occupation, particularly occupation prior to the post medieval period, is unlikely, specifically the southern part of the Order Limits. Elsewhere within the Order Limits, deposit modelling infers that the depths of overburden could in many areas preclude the formation of crop marks. In these circumstances and in acknowledgement of the Applicant’s sample area testing to determine the usefulness of aerial photographic assessment (see APP-183 sections 2.2.3, 2.11.3, 2.13.3, 2.14.3 & 2.15.3) alongside the results of geophysical survey it is determined that full aerial photographic assessment is not necessary; aside from cropmarks associated with post medieval field boundaries, the sample testing did not record any cropmarks indicating the presence of archaeological remains not already identified through LiDAR or geophysical survey.</i></p>
14.20	<p>There are a number of factors that can contribute to how effective an archaeological prospection method can be, from geology to later activity such as Medieval ridge and furrow masking earlier archaeology to different types of archaeology. As stated in the geophysical report (Appendix C9, DBA volume 6 APP- 185), ‘results will be affected by a complex range of influences, including background levels of ground saturation, agricultural practices such as draining, and the presence of lenses of contrasting or poorly sorted material such as the Glacial Till and mudflat deposits identified along the route of the corridor.’ (section 7.2.4)</p>	
14.21	<p>These techniques are complimentary, and an assessment should include all the information available to start to build up an understanding of what is known in order to determine archaeological potential. The study of both air photography and LiDAR is essential in undertaking a robust desk based assessment, and while the LiDAR included in the DBA is excellent few air photos have been looked at for this scheme. LCC expect full assessment of all available air photos as they are a fundamental part of archaeological desk based work as thousands of new sites, and new information about existing sites, are found in this way.</p>	
14.22	<p>Those areas not adequately assessed using standard desk based sources and techniques, for example geophysical survey and air photo assessment, will need a higher percentage of trial trenching to effectively obtain sufficient baseline evidence to inform appropriate mitigation through these areas along with the rest of the redline boundary.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.023 in the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>As set out in previous responses ((RR-004.012 & RR-004.22), areas not subject to geophysical survey were not selected for geophysical survey on sound judgement of archaeological potential i.e. the unsuitability of areas for occupation activity due to inundation and/or extreme marginality. It is not therefore appropriate or proportionate to undertake additional (disproportionate) trial trenching in these areas. Recognition of the lack of archaeological potential should be acknowledged within a bespoke mitigation response which extends to the placement of trial trenching.</i></p>
14.23	<p>Sufficient trenching is required across the full impact zone to determine the presence, absence, significance, the depth and extent of any archaeological remains which could be impacted by the development. Trial trenching results are essential for effective risk management, project management, programme scheduling and budget management. Failing to do so could lead to unnecessary destruction of heritage assets, potential programme delays and excessive cost increases that could otherwise be avoided.</p>	<p>Please see the Applicant’s response to 14.12.</p>
14.24	<p>The trenching strategy will need to target potential archaeology identified from the desk based assessment, full air photo and LiDAR assessment, and geophysical survey results. The trenching strategy will also need to target those areas where the above have not been successful in locating archaeology. Targeting blank areas is an essential part of determining the archaeological potential across a proposed development as different types of archaeology and geology may limit or mask the effectiveness of non-intrusive evaluation techniques. Forthcoming archaeology regional policy recommends that a range of between 3% and 5% trenching of the impact zone will offer a more balanced approach to risk, while acknowledging that some archaeological sites will still be missed.</p>	<p>Please see the Applicant’s responses to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 14.7 with regard to ‘blank areas’; ■ 14.7 and 14.22 with regard to geophysical survey; and ■ 14.19-14.21 with regard to aerial photography. <p>In respect to the reference to percentage of trenching of the impact zone, please see the Applicant’s response to 14.12 and 14.22. The Applicant has also addressed this comment in the response to RR-004.026:</p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		<p><i>Bespoke evaluation strategies referencing site specific potential are a more appropriate and proportionate way in determining trenching requirements. It is considered that any emerging regional policy will acknowledge that a blanket approach is not always suitable.</i></p>
14.25	<p>The results of trial trenching will inform a robust mitigation strategy which should have been agreed and included in the Environmental Statement and submitted with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application in accordance with EIA Regulations. Also included in the submission documents is Chapter 3: Project Description, Section 2: Design Envelope Approach which states that the project has adopted the 'Rochdale Envelope' approach. (6.1.3) The document states that 'Through this consultation the Project has identified matters that have led directly to design changes and commitments that have been made to the proposed construction methodologies' including 'The avoidance of archaeological features through project design, such as at Slackholme End.'(section 3, point 19).These measures cannot be taken when archaeology which currently survives within the redline boundary has not been discovered and identified because of inadequate evaluation.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.026 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>It is accepted that at EIA a developer is required to identify, describe and assess potential significant impacts. The Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (APP-180 to APP-187), which utilised the results of geophysical survey and deposit modelling, identified likely worst-case impacts to buried archaeological remains. These are tabulated in full in the ES chapter in Table 20.9 (AS1-048). These impacts include specific archaeological receptors identified through geophysical survey but also reference the potential worst-case impacts across the Order Limits, such that other receptors not yet specifically located but nonetheless anticipated from a review of the baseline as a whole are included in the impact assessment. Column 2 of Table 20.9 clearly sets out where receptors are anticipated. Worst case potential impacts including all likely significant impacts are therefore identified as well as robust mitigation strategy Section 10.8 (AS1-048) response 14.8-14.10 references preservation in situ options which could be deployed if necessary, in the event that remains of high importance are present. Response 14.11 references the OWSI and subordinate WSIs which will provide for the implementation of all necessary mitigation measures.</i></p>
14.26	<p>The Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Nine states that 'Implementation of the Rochdale Envelope assessment approach should only be used where it is necessary and should not be treated as a blanket opportunity to allow for insufficient detail in the assessment.</p> <p>Applicants should make every effort to finalise details applicable to the Proposed Development prior to submission of their DCO application. Indeed, as explained earlier in this Advice Note, it will be in all parties' interests for the Applicant to provide as much information as possible to inform the Pre-application consultation process.' (5.2)</p>	<p><i>Nevertheless, the Applicant has progressed archaeological trial trenching to begin further inform the mitigation requirements. This trial trenching and additional preconstruction trial trenching is referenced within the OWSI (PD1-052).</i></p>
14.27	<p>There is a standard suite of evaluation techniques which should be used across the impact zone to inform any proposed development. The submission documents for Outer Dowsing show that some of these techniques have been used to a greater or lesser degree but do not maximise their potential for contributing to the evidence base across the Order Limits. A small sample area has been adequately assessed using aerial photographs which are a fundamental aspect to building a desk based assessment; geophysical survey has been undertaken and is proposed in certain parts of the Order Limits but again much of the impact zone is not included; and standard trial trenching and its results are not seen to be necessary for determination.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.029 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>There is not a standard set of archaeological techniques. Techniques should be selected as appropriate and proportionate to any given site. As set out in previous responses (response 14.7), areas not subject to geophysical survey were not selected for geophysical survey on the basis of sound judgement of archaeological potential i.e. the unsuitability of areas for occupation activity due to inundation and/or extreme marginality. Also as set out in previous responses (response 14.19-14.21), with particular reference to the location of the Order Limits within an area subject to repeated and prolonged episodes of inundation there is sufficient reasoning to justify the lack of aerial photographic assessment where occupation predating the post medieval period is unlikely, specifically the southern part of the Order Limits. Elsewhere within the Order Limits, deposit modelling infers that the depths of overburden would preclude the formation of crop marks in many areas. In these circumstances and in acknowledgement of some testing of the usefulness of aerial photographic assessment alongside the results of geophysical survey it is determined that full aerial photographic assessment is not necessary.</i></p> <p><i>With regard to trial trenching, the ES submission indicates that all significant impacts could be avoided through preservation in situ. For this reason, the necessity for trial trenching to inform determination is not necessary. Trial trenching is currently underway alongside geoarchaeological works which include geoarchaeological boreholes and slit trenches/test pits. All results will be shared with stakeholders following completion of the 2024 campaign.</i></p>
14.28	<p>Historic England Advice Note 17: Planning and Archaeology states that 'Appropriate evaluation can support the smooth and speedy progression of the development and help to manage the developer's risk early in the planning process' (section 131). It also states that 'Data gathered can also help to inform a costed mitigation strategy, the benefits of which include a reduction in the chances of unexpected risks and associated costs, and potentially the scope to allocate the cost of archaeology appropriately into financial forecasts' (section 132).</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.030 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>The Applicants flexibility with preservation in situ is relevant to 'risk'. The OWSI sets out a suite of potential mitigation measures that will be employed by the project in response to archaeological remains, including trenchless techniques which have been committed to where required to avoid significant impacts through preservation in situ.</i></p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		<p><i>The results of preconstruction trial trenching alongside the results of the trial trenching campaign currently underway which will help refine and implement a robust mitigation response to be implemented through WSIs prepared in accordance with the OWSI.</i></p> <p><i>The completion of trial trenching will enable for timetabling and costings in relation to construction schedules and budgets and will reference trenchless techniques where this is required by stakeholders in respect to remains of high importance or preferred by the developer on cost grounds.</i></p>
14.29	<p>The High Court Appeal decision In R.(Low Carbon Solar Park 6 Ltd) v SoS, 5 April 2024. '... an understanding of the significance of heritage assets is the starting point for determining any mitigation, and it is not appropriate to assess mitigation without that understanding... There needs to be an understanding of significance in order to assess whether any mitigation appropriately addresses any harm.' (section 49).</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.031 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>The significance of potential archaeological remains is tabulated in the ES chapter, Table 20.9 (AS1-048). Significance is set out with reference to specific archaeological receptors identified through geophysical survey but also in reference to potential remains across the Order Limits (see response 14.25).</i></p> <p><i>Noting specifically the Project's commitment to the adoption of trenchless techniques to avoid significant impacts through preservation in situ where potential remains of high importance are encountered, the OWSI (PD1-052) sets out a suite of potential mitigation measures that will be employed by the project in response to archaeological remains. The details of the mitigation to be deployed will be informed by trial trenching and the measures will be proportionate to the impact. The OWSI (PD1-052) sets out that all works will be undertaken in accordance with WSIs approved by LCC in consultation with HE.</i></p>
14.30	<p>There is insufficient evaluation across the Order Limits and the lack of any trenching results means there is insufficient baseline evidence to inform a reasonable fit for purpose site specific mitigation strategy to deal with the developmental impact which is proportionate to the significance of the currently surviving archaeology.</p>	<p>Please see the responses to 14.8, 14.9 and 14.10.</p>
14.31	<p>As stated in the Council's PEIR response, the EIA requires the full suite of comprehensive deskbased research, non-intrusive surveys, and intrusive field evaluation for the full extent of proposed impact. The results should be used to minimise the impact on the historic environment through informing the project design and an appropriate programme of archaeological mitigation.</p>	<p>Please see previous responses 14.7, 14.18-14.21, 14.22 and 14.27.</p>
14.32	<p>Sufficient information on the archaeological potential must include evidential information on the depth, extent and significance of the archaeological deposits which will be impacted by the development. The results will inform a fit for purpose mitigation strategy which will identify what measures are to be taken to minimise or adequately record the impact of the proposal on archaeological remains which must be submitted with the EIA.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.034 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>The potential impacts on archaeological remains are understood as set out in the ES (AS1-048) and a package of suitable mitigation options have been identified.</i></p>
14.33	<p>This is in accordance with The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 which states "The EIA must identify, describe and assess in an appropriate manner... the direct and indirect significant impacts of the proposed development on... material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape." (Regulation 5 (2d)).</p>	<p><i>Trial trenching which is underway, geoarchaeological works which are underway and additional preconstruction trial trenching will provide data on the depth, character, extent and significance of archaeological remains. Results will help refine and implement a suitable mitigation strategy in accordance with the OWSI.</i></p>
14.34	<p>Whilst there is still uncertainty around the amount of archaeology to be disturbed and that recovered to be placed in the archives. The Order Limits extends to around 850ha and noting the amount of items that were recovered on recent cable projects in this area (Viking Link) there is a need for additional archives storage and recording to be established as a result of this project.</p>	<p>Please see the Applicant's response to 17.1 which sets out the current position in respect of the Section 106 agreement.</p>
14.35	<p>Given the scale of the Project and the anticipated size of the resulting archive, which will likely be above and beyond the standard rates of collection for the Lincoln Museum, the existing facilities do not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the likely archive. There is a need for provision of additional storage facilities in order to comply with the requirements for archiving. Provision for the infrastructure to accommodate the archive is required.</p>	
14.36	<p>There is potential for the discovery of treasure as part of the archaeological mitigation requirements. Under the legislation pertaining to treasure items there is a legal obligation to report all finds of Treasure. Treasure belongs to the Crown, until it is disclaimed or acquired by a museum. On confirmation an item is Treasure, it is valued by the Treasure Valuation Committee, with the</p>	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
	valuation being the amount comprising the reward for finders/landowners. This is the amount a museum must fundraise in order to acquire an object valued as Treasure. Finders/landowners can only be encouraged to gift the object to a museum, but are not required to. The vast majority of museums in England have little to no acquisition budget and must instead fundraise to acquire objects identified as Treasure. Fieldwork at the potential scale of Outer Dowsing given the geographic area has the potential to result in treasure finds.	
14.37	The need to partially offset the anticipated degree of harm to the historic environment with a bespoke public benefit, interpretation and outreach programme. There is a need to ensure that the outreach programme is fit for purpose and will be able to meet the anticipated demand, given the high profile of the scheme.	
14.38	Therefore as part of a mitigation package it is submitted that a Section 106 Agreement is forthcoming to secure funds to create addition archives storage and documentation to provide the additional capacity that will be needed to document the finds recovered as a result of this project, Treasure Acquisition Budget and an appropriate Outreach programme.	
14.39	There is therefore a negative construction impact upon the archaeological remains in relation to the Order limits with the degree of harm as yet unquantifiable due to the insufficient evaluation undertaken so far and the need for appropriate funding to compensate the Council for the additional burden it will place on its Cultural Heritage resources as a result of this development.	
14.40	Heritage Statement (6.3.20.2) The Heritage Statement primarily addresses setting impacts to built heritage concerning the On Shore Sub-Station (OnSS). It would be beneficial to explore if any site-specific considerations have been made for individual assets beyond the DBA and Visual Impact Assessment.	The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.035 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]: <i>The Heritage Statement (APP- 188) assesses potential impacts through setting change to assets within the vicinity of the OnSS and the vicinity of the onshore ECC. Visual change has been assessed but reference has also been made to auditory change relating to construction and where relevant changes associated with construction traffic. These are referenced in the Heritage Impact Assessment part of the Heritage Statement for each asset, as necessary and relevant. This is on page 74 onwards under the sub-title 'change' for each asset.</i>
14.41	Embedded Mitigation (Table 20.5, Environmental Statement 6.1.20). Table 20.5 outlines the embedded mitigation for each project phase. Clarification is needed on whether the table's mitigation measures for the construction of the ECC apply to non-designated heritage assets above ground, specifically farmsteads.	The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.036 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]: <i>Clarification – all extant farmsteads are avoided. The Order Limits have been designed to avoid upstanding buildings including non-designated farmsteads.</i>
14.42	Scoped Impacts (Table 10.1.1, Consultation Report Appendix 5.1.2 Scoping Part 2) Table 10.1.1 details the impacts to be scoped in or out of the project. Onshore non- designated heritage assets are not listed under Archaeology and Cultural Heritage. A more detailed table specifying which topics of built heritage are proposed to be scoped in or out for each project phase is required. Without referencing the HS (6.3.20.2), it is unclear which category of assets, designated or non-designated, are proposed to be scoped in or out for the ECC or OnSS.	The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.037 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]: <i>Clarification - Paragraph 20.5.1 of the ES Chapter 20 sets out what was scoped in and out of the assessment (APP-075).</i>
14.43	Heritage Assets (Annex 1, 6.3.20.2 Chapter 20 Appendix D Heritage Statement). Annex 1 lists the heritage assets and baseline data of each Segment ECC1 to ECC14. A total of 10 built heritage assets within all ECC segments are to be demolished. It would be helpful for the Council to know if this assumption is correct and then will make an assessment once confirmed.	The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.038 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]: <i>Clarification – no farmsteads will be demolished. Any reference to a demolished farmstead is referring to the fact that it has already been demolished and is identified from historic mapping only.</i>
14.44	Annex 1, segment ECC12, table 1.84 lists non-designated heritage assets within the study area. Confirm if all assets for this segment, except for MLI123123, MLI123126, and MLI123127, are outside the order limits. For example, is MLI123125 not in close proximity to the order limits.	The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.039 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]: <i>Clarification –</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>MLI123123 - –this asset is referenced as being located within the Order Limits but it is actually located on the boundary of the Order Limits. However, this asset exists as below ground remains of a demolished</i>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		<p><i>farmstead only and so is not an asset which would be considered in respect to setting change. This error does not affect the assessment.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>MLI123126 is within the Order Limits as stated within the table but it is a demolished farmstead not sensitive to setting change.</i> • <i>MLI123127 – this asset is referenced as being within the Order Limits but it is actually outside of the Order Limits. However, this asset exists as below ground remains of a demolished farmstead only and so it not an asset that would be considered in respect to setting change. This error does not affect the assessment.</i> <p><i>MLI123125 – This asset is located 420m from the Order Limits. It is not considered to be in close proximity to the Order Limits and is not considered to be sensitive to setting change.</i></p>
14.45	<p>Evaluation of Assets (Heritage Statement 6.3.20.2)</p> <p>The Heritage Statement evaluates all assets concerning their setting, including potential visual changes to non-designated farmsteads (refer to Heritage Statement 6.3.20.2, 20.1.30 Non-Designated Farmhouses). Assessments for some farmsteads are conducted in groups rather than individually (see 20.1.31 Other non-designated farmsteads). It would be helpful if the impact on these farmsteads, whether temporary or short term, are set out in greater detail for each asset. It is not clear how the lack of impact to key setting elements of each farmstead would apply equally, given the inevitable variation between each. The current proposal considers an asset 300m from the Order Limits the same as one located adjacent.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.040 in the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>Historic England’s Good Practice Advice Planning Note 3 (The Setting of Heritage Assets) references that assessment of impact through setting change needs to be proportionate to the significance of the heritage asset and proportionate to the degree of change.</i></p> <p><i>The grouping of non-designated farmhouses within the vicinity of the cable route, reflects the grouping of assets of low importance where potential impacts will be temporary. This level of assessment is in accordance with best practice and avoids unnecessary repetition.</i></p> <p><i>It is not anticipated that differential proximity to the cable route would alter conclusions around the potential harm through setting change. In no instance would it be anticipated that farmhouses within the vicinity of the cable route would experience an impact of greater than minor adverse effect. There is no potential for significant effects. The assessment of farmhouses within the vicinity of the cable route is considered sufficient on these grounds.</i></p>
14.46	<p>Direct Impacts on Above Ground Assets (Heritage Statement 6.3.20.2)</p> <p>The Heritage Statement discusses setting impacts but lacks detail on direct impacts to above ground assets. This includes concerns about structural vibrations during construction, changes to ground settlement, land use patterns, dewatering, or access disruptions affecting heritage assets. It would be helpful if these issues were addressed with the statement or if supporting documentation, such as Groundwater Risk Assessment, were signposted for the reader.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.041 in the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p>Chapter 24 Onshore Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Flood Risk sets out the potential impact to groundwater levels. This is discussed in the Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (APP-180 - section 20.11.2). Pertinent points are as follows:</p> <p>With regard to effects on ground water levels, information supporting Chapter 24 sets out that the majority of the construction parameters would affect deposits of low permeability. Only at deeper parameters associated with the trenchless entry and exit pits and works at the TJB would proposals have the potential to affect existing groundwater flows. At the trenchless entry and exit pits the volume of water encountered is anticipated to be small and negligible in relation to the overall size of the aquifer and at the TJB a low likelihood of impact on the groundwater flow has been identified.</p> <p>Against this backdrop significant effect through groundwater change are not predicted.</p> <p>With regard to potential access disruptions, the Outline CTMP sets out access routes (APP-289 -Figure 3). This would ensure the avoidance of access through all Conservation Areas within the search area except for Wrangle whose northern boundary includes the A52. The use of the A52 for construction traffic at this location would not be deemed to affect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>With regard to potential impact through vibration, the Project’s potential receptors would comprise built heritage assets such as designated and non-designated farmhouses etc.</p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		<p>The British Standard utilised for guidance on the levels of groundborne vibration required to cause damage to structures is BS 7385-2 1993 <i>Evaluation and measurement for vibration in buildings – Part 2: Guide to damage levels from groundborne vibration</i>.</p> <p>The guidance states that to cause damage to residential type buildings a Peak Particle Velocity (PPV) of approximately 15mm/s⁻¹ (at 4Hz) is required. With regards to heritage buildings, which are considered more sensitive to vibration the guidance does not specify a limit; however, it is considered a lower limit for these buildings would be required.</p> <p>For example, other large infrastructure projects such as Crossrail imposed a precautionary PPV limit of 3mm/s⁻¹ for heritage buildings which is consistent with the German Standard DIN 4150-3:1999 Effects of vibration on structures.</p> <p>The project is committed to reduce construction noise and vibration levels and, at worst, a ‘minor level of effect’ is predicted at residential receptors which is based on the human response to vibration rather than damage to buildings. With regards to vibration this equates to a PPV level of 0.9mm/s⁻¹ during the daytime and below 0.3mm/s⁻¹ during the night-time.</p> <p>As can be deduced from the above, PPV levels from construction operations which the project is committed to are below the level where damage could occur to buildings.</p>
14.47	<p>Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) The Heritage Statement (6.3.20.2, Annex 3, Appendix D0.2) mentions that breaches to historic hedgerows will be reinstated (Annex 2: Hedgerow Assessment). Is there a mitigation plan for managing this? The same question applies to other features such as sea banks and ridge and furrow.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.042 in the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>No earthworks associated with seabanks will be breached. No upstanding earthworks associated with ridge and furrow will be breached.</i></p> <p><i>The OLEMS (document 8.10, version 3) contains details on the Applicant’s commitment to reinstate habitats as soon as practicable following construction. Hedgerows will be reinstated using a species-rich, locally appropriate native mixture. Where trees are lost these will be replaced with heavy standard trees at a 3:1 ratio (section 3.8.2). Requirement 10 of the draft DCO (AS1-024) requires the preparation of a landscape management plan in accordance with the OLEMS and must be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with Lincolnshire County Council.</i></p>
14.48	<p>Section 42 Responses (Environmental Statement 6.1.20, Table 20.2, Summary of consultation relating to Archaeology and Cultural Heritage). Table 20.2 addresses comments from Historic England (p.37), stating that all extant areas of ridge and furrow within the order limits will not be impacted. However, the DBA (6.3.20.1) shows ridge and furrow in segments ECC 4, 5, and 6. Need confirmation if these assets have been considered and will remain undisturbed</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.043 in the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>Clarification –</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The ridge and furrow in ECC4 (MLI98096) has been eroded through intense arable cultivation – no earthworks remain.</i> <i>The ridge and furrow in ECC5 (LiDAR feature 25) would be avoided by trenchless techniques. This is already identified as an area to be avoided through direction drilling.</i> <i>The ridge and furrow in ECC6 – while referenced within the DBA, is not located within the Order Limits (see LiDAR feature 28, Figure 20.1.4.6, document APP181)</i>
14.49	<p>The Council requests an expanded list of non-designated heritage assets for further assessment. Additional detailed proposals for suitable mitigation measures for built heritage would also be useful. While some measures will be discussed later in the planning process, the current assessment, especially regarding non-designated assets, requires more information. Addressing these issues now will reduce concerns about potential effects on historic buildings and landscapes earlier in the examination process</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.044 in the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>It is assumed that this relates to the comment around the grouping of non-designated heritage assets. With reference to the reply above (14.45), no expanded list is proposed.</i></p> <p><i>With regard to mitigation measures, where these are anticipated to be necessary, the Heritage Statement references core mitigation planting which is proposed to screen the OnSS. This is discussed in respect to each asset</i></p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		<p><i>within the vicinity of the OnSS as appropriate within the Heritage Impact Assessment section of the HS – (APP 188 - page 74 onwards). Where appropriate figures and images associated with Chapter 28 (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment) are referenced (APP122- APP136).</i></p> <p><i>With respect to setting change through noise, either the significance of assets has not been identified to be sensitive to noise or the effect of noise has been identified (with reference to the Noise chapter (Chapter 26)) to be negligible in magnitude during construction and operation (APP 081).</i></p>
14.50	Until the additional information requested is received the Council remains of the view that there is a negative impact on above ground heritage assets for both the construction and operational phase of the development.	This comment has been noted by the Applicant.
Socio-economics, Land Use and Agriculture		
15.1	<p>Key Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy 10: Design (ELLP) ▪ Policy 31: Climate Change and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (SELLP) 	These comments have been noted by the Applicant
15.2	EN-1 Paragraph 5.11.12 states that ‘applicants should seek to minimise impacts on the best and most versatile agricultural land (defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification) and preferably use land in areas of poorer quality (grades 3b, 4 and 5)’.	
15.3	Paragraph 5.11.34 goes on to state that the SoS ‘should ensure that applicants do not site their scheme on the best and most versatile agricultural land without justification. Where schemes are to be sited on best and most versatile agricultural land the Secretary of State should take into account the economic and other benefits of that land. Where development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality’.	
15.4	Policy 10 of the ELLP states that the council will support well-designed sustainable development, specific reference is made to the support of the use of brownfield land for development unless it is of high environmental value, seeking to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality.	
15.5	Policy 31 of the SELLP states that renewable energy development should consider the individual and cumulative impacts of, among other considerations, agricultural land take.	
15.6	A full assessment of the impacts on agricultural land is set out in the report attached at Appendix D – Soils and Agricultural Land Classification Report for Outer Dowsing. This report notes that soil and agricultural land quality Impacts from the development should be considered in light of the Government's policy for the protection of the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land as set out in paragraph 180 of the NPPF and the recent Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) of 15 May 2024. The WMS now includes a requirement for information on soil surveys meeting an agreed standard and it is considered that going forward that Natural England or a suitably qualified independent person inspects work as it is undertaken to confirm the veracity which is something that has been missing to date and LCC would be prepared to contribute to checking the credibility of this survey work.	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.067 in the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>Paragraph 180 of the NPPF was referenced and addressed within table 25.1 of the Land Use chapter (AS1-050).</i></p> <p><i>The Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) of 15 May 2024 (Statement UIN: HCWS466) was published after the submission of the ES and is in reference to the impact that solar developments have upon BMV land, rather than renewable energy developments in general. A Research Briefing for the House of Common, ‘Planning for Solar Farms’, from 20 May 2024 shows that the average land requirement of an existing commercial solar farm in the UK is approximately 2.4 hectares (ha) per Megawatt (MW) of solar power, with future solar farms predicted to require approximately 1.2ha per MW.</i></p> <p><i>The same Research Briefing states that the average capacity of solar farms that have been submitted for planning permission to Local Planning Authorities (LPA) in 2023 was 26MW, which would equate to an average land</i></p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		<p><i>requirement ranging from 31.2ha to 62.4ha for forthcoming and existing projects, respectively, for their operation. The Project requires approximately 26.38ha of land for its operation and is expected to generate up to 1,500MW; a new solar farm would require approximately up to 1,800ha to generate the same amount of renewable electricity.</i></p> <p><i>As per the Outline Soil Management Plan (SMP) (document 8.1.3, Version 2), section 2.4, a competent expert will ensure the current land/soil conditions are obtained, recorded and verified through the undertaking of a detailed pre-construction condition survey, and the impacts further verified through a post construction condition survey. Paragraph 11 acknowledges that the works must also be monitored to audit compliance with the SMP and to allow ongoing advice on soil handling to be provided</i></p> <p><i>. As per section 2 of the Outline SMP, roles and responsibilities have been outlined for the effective oversight of soil and land management pre, during and post construction. The Project will appoint an Agricultural Liaison Officer (ALO), or similar, to ensure that the specifications of the SMP and site-specific construction method statements/soil management plans are implemented. It is envisaged that the ALO will have sufficient soil science experience or will work in cooperation with a Soil Clerk of Works (SCoW) with soil science capability.</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant would also appoint a SCoW, providing advice on the impacts of the construction activities, undertaking any necessary pre-construction soil surveys, any required monitoring, supervising the implementation of specific mitigation measures and maintaining contact with relevant stakeholders, amongst others.</i></p>
15.7	<p>The current Framework at paragraph 180 recognises the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Footnote 62 within paragraph 181 of the NPPF requires where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. In addition, the availability of agricultural land used for food production should be considered, alongside the other policies in the Framework, when deciding what sites are most appropriate for development.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.068 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>As detailed in Section 8.4 and Section 9.4.1.2 of the Site Selection and Consideration of Alternative ES Chapter (APP-059) the Applicant had due consideration of the relevant policies in respect of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land during their site selection work. As discussed in Section 8.4 (APP-059), it was not possible to locate the onshore substation (OnSS) outside of Grade 1 Land, however the Applicant made a significant alteration to the onshore ECC in response to feedback (as set out in Section 9.4 of APP-059) which significantly lowered the amount of BMV Grade 1 land that would be temporarily impacted by the construction of the onshore ECC. The Applicant has and continues to work closely with affected landowners, particularly in relation to soil management and reinstatement of land and to ensure these temporary impacts are minimised.</i></p>
15.8	<p>Lincolnshire is home to 10% of English agricultural production. Its combination of climate, soil type and topography make the county ideal for a variety of crops. There are significant proportions of wheat, oilseed rape, sugar beet and potatoes, with the county producing 12% of England's arable crops.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.069 and RR-004.70 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>The impact of the Project on the UK vegetable market was considered in sections 29.8.2 (construction), 29.8.3 (operation) and 29.9 (cumulative) of the Socio-economic Characteristics chapter of the ES (APP-084) and concluded a negligible impact.</i></p>
15.9	<p>Lincolnshire is also home to around 25% of the UK's vegetable production, and 21% of ornamental crop production. This high level of production is vital to the county's economy, generating a Gross Value Added of £446m in 2012. To preserve fresh produce and minimise supply chain distance, highly productive food hubs have built up in the south of the county. The importance of this sector for the local economy is reflected in the number of jobs it generates: if this food supply chain is included alongside food retail and catering in the county, the number of employees exceeds 100,000.</p>	<p><i>The assessment of the impacts on the vegetable market is focussed on the BMV Land because it is assumed that the vegetable production is focused in these areas and there are fewer opportunities for the vegetable production on this land to be substituted with vegetable production elsewhere in the UK.</i></p>
15.10	<p>The cable route has not yet been surveyed in detail for ALC. As part of the process the applicant states that they have sought to avoid BMV where possible. The Outline Soil Management Plan confirms that ALCs will be completed for the approved route and confirmation as to when this will be undertaken so that it can be assessed is requested.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.071 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		<p><i>The ALC surveys will be undertaken prior to construction (pre-commencement). The Applicant has provided a response in reference to the timing of soil surveys in Section 1.4.2.1 of The Applicant's Response to the Rule 17 Letter dated 3 July 2024 (AS-013).</i></p>
15.11	<p>A schedule of appropriate requirements will be essential to ensure this is undertaken to the necessary standards. A full record of condition on a plot-by-plot basis should be undertaken including photos pre and post construction.</p> <p>Prior to and post construction, a competent person should be employed to ensure that information on existing agricultural management and soil/land conditions is obtained, recorded and verified by way of a detailed pre and post construction condition survey. If Agricultural Land Classification surveys and British Standard soil testing are to be undertaken across the areas in which construction activities are proposed, then survey points should be made at least every 100m and in each field where the field is less than 100m in length.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.072 and RR-004.73 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>The Outline Soil Management Plan (SMP) (APP-271), provides an overview of the pre and post construction surveys, which include the ALC surveys, in section 2.4.</i></p> <p><i>As per paragraph 20 of the SMP, it has been proposed that a full record of condition will be undertaken on a plot-by-plot basis and would include a photo log. This would be produced to the landowner to give a true reflection of the land parcel prior to construction and post-construction, the landowners' signature gained as agreement.</i></p> <p><i>This has been proposed in paragraph 15 of the Outline SMP (APP-271).</i></p>
15.12	<p>The productivity of the farmland has been considered (see section 8.4), it is noted that all land within a c.6km radius of connection point is classified as Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Grade 1, the highest and most valuable grading (as identified in ES Chapter 25 Land Use (document 6.1.25) and presented in Figure 25.2 (document reference 6.2.25.2). As such, applying the search area as defined in Section 8.2 Table 8.1, all land in this search area is ALC Grade 1 and therefore could not be avoided when identifying potential On Shore Sub-Station location at Weston Marsh. Constraints mapping that included proximity to Land Use (and ALC) was undertaken when identifying route options and the selected route option impacted less Grade 1 land than the original route.</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes the acknowledgment by LCC of the site selection process undertaken. As detailed in Section 8.4 and Section 9.4.1.2 of the Site Selection and Consideration of Alternative ES Chapter (APP-059) the Applicant had due consideration of the relevant policies in respect of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land during their site selection work.</p>
15.13	<p><u>Soil Management Plan</u> - Currently this is an outline document, but it appears to be an acceptable document which needs to be secured via a requirement so that it forms part of any Development Consent Order granted and the recommendations implemented. An agricultural liaison officer and Soil Clerk of Works are proposed who will supervise works as they proceed.</p>	<p>As set out in the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071), the draft DCO previously secured the mitigation measures set out in the Outline SMP via requirement 18 (code of construction practice) which required the submission and approval of a code of construction practice which must include a soil management plan (which must accord with the Outline SMP) prior to commencement of any stage of the onshore transmission works. Following receipt of LCC's LIR which included a request for a standalone soil management plan requirement, and further discussions with LCC, the Applicant has agreed to secure the mitigation measures set out in the Outline SMP via a separate requirement which is presented in the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 2 (document 3.1, version 5) as Requirement 31. Requirement 18 (Code of construction practice) has been amended to remove the need to submit a soil management plan as part of the code of construction practice.</p>
15.14	<p>The Outline SMP sets out the principles and procedures for general good practice mitigation for soil management during the onshore construction works to minimise the adverse effects on the nature and quality of the soil resource. In populating the document it will be necessary to identify the individual areas of land and the route for soil stripping, trenching, restoration and similar.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.076 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>The final SMP will be based upon the Outline SMP (APP-271), supplemented by survey data where required, and submitted to the relevant local planning authority for approval in consultation with LCC, prior to the commencement of any stage of the construction works. As per paragraph 10 of the outline SMP, the Final SMP will be implemented through the 'location-specific construction method statements'. 'Locations' will be determined by the contractor and/or the Soil Clerk of Works (SCoW) depending upon several factors including the works to be undertaken, the machinery to be used, soil types and results of any additional survey works, and site constraints, with the works monitored to audit their compliance with both the final SMP and the 'location-specific construction method statements'.</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 43 of the Outline SMP further details that the final SMP and location-specific construction method statements will be defined based on the results of the site investigation and soil survey reports, where available. Each location-specific construction method statement shall include details of the methods of working, proposed site machinery and tillage equipment, materials and Health, Safety, Security and Environment (HSSE) requirements.</i></p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
15.15	The SMO identifies a number of soil based challenges including running sand and drainage issues which will need to be addressed in detail.	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.077 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>These impacts have been identified in the Outline Soil Management Plan (SMP) (APP-271) and will be addressed in more detail in the final SMP.</i></p>
15.16	The Cables will generally be laid so as to avoid continued interference with normal agricultural operations as far as reasonably practicable. The Cables should be laid to contour with a depth of cover of not less than 1.2 metres from the original surface to the top of the protective tile above the Cables, except where necessary for good engineering reasons and with the agreement of the Landowner and/or occupier.	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.078 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>As per table 2 of the Schedule of Mitigation (APP-287) (mitigation reference: 109), the cables will be buried at a depth to allow agricultural activities to continue unaffected.</i></p> <p><i>As per table 8.5 of the Project Description chapter of the ES (APP-058), the minimum trench depth to the cable protection tile would be 1.2m unless there are engineering constraints in which a minimum depth of 0.9m will be utilised.</i></p>
15.17	<u>Drainage:</u> Impacts in agricultural drainage have been assessed in the ES Chapter 23 Geology and Ground Conditions (document 6.2.23), with any relevant impacts or mitigation used to inform the Land Use Chapter (document reference 6.1.25) where necessary. The Project has also appointed a local drainage contractor to ensure the Project's pre and post construction drainage schemes are designed in a harmonic way with existing drainage systems.	This comment is noted by the Applicant.
15.18	It is noted that no ALC survey has been undertaken regarding the cable route, though a full ALC of the final route is proposed. The details of this with soil assessment will be invaluable. The proposed development is likely to have a mainly temporary impact on agriculture and soils that will result in the temporary loss of agricultural production in the development area generally and/or the possible more permanent loss of production from mostly very good and excellent quality agricultural land with the exception of the Onshore Sub-Station which will involve the permanent loss of Grade 1 agricultural land. Land Drainage issues remain of concern to farmers and landowners in restoring the land after cable burial.	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.080 and RR-004.081 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>The ALC surveys will be undertaken prior to the construction of the Project commencing. The impacts along the cable route are not considered to be significant, however, the area of land required for the OnSS is considered as a permanent loss in EIA terms.</i></p> <p><i>See also response to RR-004.076:</i></p> <p><i>As per paragraph 17 of the Outline SMP (APP-271), landowners will be contacted as part of the pre-condition survey to identify the provision of any temporary drainage requirements and/or drainage diversions. Section 5.6 details the management of agricultural drainage, stating that many post-construction drainage designs will be considered and discussed with the landowners.</i></p>
15.19	In considering the impact on the overall farming enterprises both locally and across the Cable Route, it is necessary to seek additional information on the impact on the individual farms themselves. Though it is noted an Agricultural Officer is to be employed which will assist in securing this information and would be helpful if a mechanism could be provided to demonstrate how this information will be secured and how it will operate.	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.082 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>The Project intends to appoint an Agricultural Liaison Officer (AL), as per section 2.2 of the Outline Soil Management Plan (SMP) (APP-271) who will consult with landowners as part of their remit. As per paragraph 17, this liaison with landowners would include identifying potential constraints and barriers to construction and identify the provision of any temporary drainage requirements and/or drainage diversions.</i></p>
15.20	There is a tension in relation to BMV impacts given that around site by area comprises land in Grades 1,2 or 3a and a full survey of the cable route has yet to be assessed but is predicted to be around 50-60% BMV. The NPSs direct that previously developed land, brownfield land, contaminated land, industrial land and non-BMV land should be developed as a preference, and where policies seek to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land so as to preserve opportunities for food production and the continuance of the agricultural economy. A significant permanent and negative impact as a consequence of the loss of agricultural land is identified, a proportion of which of which is classed best and most versatile land. This loss is not only at a local level but significant when	As detailed in Section 8.4 and Section 9.4.1.2 of the Site Selection and Consideration of Alternative ES Chapter (APP-059) the Applicant had due consideration of the relevant policies in respect of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land during their site selection work. As discussed in Section 8.4 (APP-059), it was not possible to locate the onshore substation (OnSS) outside of Grade 1 Land, however the Applicant made a significant alteration to the onshore ECC in response to feedback (as set out in Section 9.4 of APP-059) which significantly lowered the amount of BMV Grade 1 land that would be temporarily impacted by the construction of the onshore ECC. The Applicant has and continues to work closely with affected landowners, particularly in relation to soil management and reinstatement of land and to ensure these temporary impacts are minimised.

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
	considered in-combination with the loss of land from other NSIP scale solar developments that are also being promoted and considered across Lincolnshire contrary to Policy.	Cumulative effects for land use have been assessed in Chapter 25 Land Use of the ES (AS1-050). The projects considered within this assessment, including solar developments, where there was enough detail to undertake a cumulative assessment, have been set out in Table 25.25.
15.21	Consequently in terms of agricultural land during the construction stage it is assessed to be a negative impact which is reduced during the operation stage to minor negative impact once the agricultural land subject to the cable route is restored but also note the long-term loss of BMV land for the development of the OnSs. Some of this impact could be mitigated by the provision of an Agricultural Compliance Officer to ensure the mitigation measures proposed by the applicant are undertaken and completed to the required standards and also an additional requirement is secured for the approval and implementation of a Soil Management Plan.	In respect of the provision of an Agricultural Liaison Officer please see the Applicant's response to 17.1 below. In respect of the additional requirement for the Soil Management Plan, please see the Applicant's response to 15.13.
15.22	<u>Tourism</u> - For tourism, the impact of construction is considered by the Council to be potentially negative. Visitors may be deterred from undertaking visits, such as to coastal resorts, recreational routes, and to beaches. This would occur either due to the setting of these being changed by visual impacts from onshore and offshore works during construction, the, or from changes to the general perception of the area as a visitor location. This could result in loss of income and the jobs this supports. Construction phases should avoid peak visitor attraction time, when the visitor economy provides employment and income for local communities. 'bad press' about congestion, additional HGVs etc can have a big impact on the number of visitors who come to the area, and this must be taken into account when planning the scheme.	The Applicant has considered potential impacts on tourism and recreation assets have been considered as part of the design and construction methodologies for Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind. For example, horizontal direct drilling (HDD) will be used at the landfall to reduce the potential impacts to users of the beach, by avoiding beach closures and the use of haul roads along the cable route to reduce the impacts to users of the highway. The socio-economic impact assessment in the EIA has reached the conclusion that there would be no significant effects as a result of the construction of the Project. This includes effects as a result of visual impacts or a general perception of the area. This assessment is based on how the key drivers of the tourism sector in the area are likely to be impacted by the development. For example, for each of the key drivers of tourism in the area the assessment considers whether these will experience direct environmental effects as a result (e.g. landscape and visual) and how sensitive the visitors to these receptors will be to these changes. For example, attractions that are dependent on a single viewpoint or attribute, and unlikely to be able to adapt to changes have been identified as having a High sensitivity.
15.23	Consequently the Council do not consider that the impacts of the construction phase on tourism have been satisfactorily addressed. The construction period runs for a significant period of time and whilst its impact in an particularly location maybe modest it does not appear that any consideration has been given to the fact that certain locations will be more sensitive to working taking place in the peak visitor attraction times than others. The Council request further consideration should be undertaken to identify the locations that are more sensitive (from a tourism perspective) to the impact of working in the holiday season and plan for construction activities in these areas to take place outside of the main tourism season (April to September).	The Applicant acknowledges that there may be concerns about how the perceptions of an area may change, or how sensitive visitors are to these changes. Data from across the UK shows that the construction of onshore energy and grid infrastructure does not have a significant impact on tourism. This is because either the construction of this infrastructure does not change the perception of a destination, or visitors are not sensitive to these perceptions. The data used to inform this assessment includes quantitative and survey focused studies of relative tourism performance in areas that have experienced new grid infrastructure, namely; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ BiGGAR Economics (2020) East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarms Tourism Impact Review – this study considered how the tourism sector had performed in local authorities that had experienced the construction of the onshore grid connection works for offshore wind farms in England and in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This found that the construction of an offshore wind farm does not impact the performance of the local tourism economy. ■ Roger Tym & Partners (2006) Scotland/Northern Ireland Interconnector Ex Post Tourism Impact Assessment – This study included a mixture of data analysis and a survey of tourism businesses in the impacted area. This found that despite initial concerns, 97% of tourism businesses reported no negative impact as a result of the construction of the Scotland/Northern Ireland Interconnector. ■ Peter Brett Associates (2011) National Grid Second Yorkshire Line – Ex Post Tourism Assessment – This study also considered a mixture of data analysis and a survey of business tourism to identify any impacts from the construction of the Overhead Line on the tourism economy. It found that there was no direct link identified in the data on tourism performance and that 96% of businesses reported that there had been no impact on their businesses as a result.

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
15.24	<p>In respect of the cumulative section as noted above in the sections on ecology, transport and heritage assets not all of the current NSIPs in Lincolnshire have been identified in the documents and therefore the fully cumulative impacts are not assessed. The Council is aware of 22 NSIPs in Lincolnshire not 14 as stated in paragraph 313 and whilst it is accepted that this number is growing all the time as more schemes emerge, 14 significantly underestimates the current number. In relation to paragraph 314 it is not clear why only Grade 1 Best and Most Versatile Agricultural land has been captured and not all land that constitutes BMV which is Grade 1, Grade 2 and Grade 3a.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.092 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>The projects listed in table 26.90 Socio Economics Chapter (APP-084) were taken from the Planning Inspectorate website. Of the other 33 NSIPs listed within the East Midlands region, 14 were found to be within Lincolnshire with one of these having no design information available due to the early stage of the project, and a further two only partially within Lincolnshire. The NSIPs assessed were selected based upon their location within Lincolnshire, permanent impact on BMV land and the availability of data regarding the prior two points.</i></p> <p><i>The assessment was based upon the most current data available on the number of NSIPs from the Planning Inspectorate, as well as the information on the potential land take of each of these projects that was available at the time.</i></p> <p><i>All land that constitutes BMV was considered and assessed, paragraph 314 is referencing that this is inclusive of Grade 1 land, please also refer to paragraph 396 of the Land Use Chapter (AS1-050) where this value is referenced and from where it was utilised for the purposes of the Socio-economics assessment.</i></p> <p>With regard to cumulative impacts from other NISP projects, the Applicant was requested by the ExA (PD-011) to provide an initial 'Inter-relationship with other infrastructure projects' Report at Deadline 2, which is then requested to be updated at subsequent deadlines. This report (Document 19.6) has considered 18 other NSIPs across Lincolnshire.</p> <p>The report highlights the Applicants commitment to working with other NSIP developers of relevant NSIP projects to share information which will help to reduce possible cumulative effects where construction programmes have the potential to overlap.</p>
15.25	<p>The detail in Table 29.60 is incorrect for example - West Burton the amount of BMV exceeds 26% and the amount of land which is Grade 1 BMV is 17 ha (2.3%). There are other inconsistencies in this table for the other sites included and request that it is re-done with accurate information with all BMV land captured not just Grade 1 and therefore this table should be updated with accurate details.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these comments in RR-004.093 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [PD1-071]:</p> <p><i>The data provided by LCC regarding the volume of BMV land (>26%) and Grade 1 land (2.3%) lost to the West Burton Solar Project has been sourced from Table 19.10 of West Burton Solar Project's ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture (EN010132/APP-057). It is noted that these figures are for the extent of the 'detailed ALC surveys', which were predominately undertaken two years prior to the submission of the West Burton ES and are inclusive of land which was subsequently excluded from the application boundary.</i></p> <p><i>The West Burton ES itself stated "there will be no permanent loss of agricultural land, regardless of ALC Grade" and therefore, the data presented was considered unreliable due to covering a wider area than the proposed development and that "no permanent loss" would not be possible due to the proposed development including "substations and an Energy Storage System" (totalling approximately 4.27ha) which would undoubtedly result in a permanent loss of agricultural land.</i></p> <p><i>As the data was unreliable, assumptions had to be drawn in order to action LCC's request that a cumulative assessment be undertaken for NSIP projects within Lincolnshire. The 'ES Technical Note- Updated Information on Cumulative Projects' for the Heckington Fen Solar Park project (EN010123/REP5-004), which was sourced in the Land Use Chapter (AS1-050), had taken a similar view and had applied assumptions to quantify the permanent loss of BMV land using their own data and that of other developments, which resulted in approximately 2ha.</i></p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		<p><i>The results of the Land Use assessment were significant, a further increase in the volume of BMV land impacted by other prospective developments would not result in any changes to the outcome of the assessment as the residual effect is already considered to be Major.</i></p> <p><i>From a socio-economics perspective, the impact on the vegetable market would depend on the amount of land that was removed from production, compared to the scale of the equivalent farmland used for the production of vegetables across the UK and how this has changed over time. Across the UK, there is approximately 88,000 hectares of land used in the production of vegetables and this has decreased by approximately 16,000 hectares since 2015. In that time period, prices have increased by 1%. Therefore, the volume of BMV land would need to increase to 4,400 hectares (noting the total anticipated value from the Land Use Cumulative impact assessment was 390 Ha) for the magnitude of the impact on the vegetable market to change from negligible to low.</i></p>
15.26	Due to the potential displacement of visitors from the area, both local and wider users of recreational activities and tourists, and the effect on the tourism economy sector, it is assessed that during the construction phase there is a negative impact on the tourism sector. The Council would like to see mitigation measures proposed by the Applicant to reduce, mitigate and compensate impacts on the tourism sector.	This comment has been noted by the Applicant. In terms of mitigation, mitigation built in to reduce other environmental impacts will in turn minimise any negative socio-economic impacts. No specific mitigation for the tourism sector has been proposed on the basis that no demonstrable effects have been evidenced. Please also see the Applicant's response to 17.1 where the approach to the Section 106 agreement is set out. Please also see response to 15.22 and 15.23 above.
Health and Fire Safety		
16.1	Key Policy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 30: Pollution (SELLP) • Policy 23: Landscape (ELLP) 	These comments have been noted by the Applicant.
16.2	Paragraph 1(8) of Schedule 4 to the EIA Regulations requires consideration to be given to the risks of major accidents and disasters, but does not include a definition of these terms. Paragraph 4.4.1 of EN-1 states that 'energy infrastructure has the potential to impact on the health and well-being ("health") of the population. Access to energy is clearly beneficial to society and to our health as a whole. However, the construction of energy infrastructure and the production, distribution and use of energy may have negative impacts on some people's health'.	
16.3	EN-3 identifies the need for offshore wind to meet Government targets. As such, it has been identified as a critical national priority. Paragraph 3.8.14 identifies the SoS's approach to non-HRA residual impacts of CNP infrastructure, it states that 'where there are residual non-HRA impacts, of any sort other than those that present an unacceptable risk to, or unacceptable interference with, human health, national defence or navigation, these are unlikely, in all but the most exceptional cases, to outweigh the urgent need for this type of infrastructure and are therefore unlikely to result in an application being refused'.	
16.4	Paragraph 3.8.15 goes on to state that 'as a result, the SoS will take as the starting point for decision-making that such infrastructure is to be treated as if it has met any test requiring a clear outweighing of harm, exceptionality, or very special circumstances within EN-1, EN-5 or any other planning policy'.	
16.5	Policy 30 of the SELLP states that development proposals will not be permitted where, taking account of any mitigation methods, they would lead to unacceptable adverse impacts upon the health and safety of the public by way of air quality, including fumes and odour, noise, including vibration, light levels, land quality and conditions and surface and groundwater quality.	
16.6	Policy 23 of the ELLP, whilst primarily referring to landscape matters does state that the district's landscapes will be protected, enhanced, used and managed to provide an attractive and healthy working and living environment.	
16.7	To assist with some of the comments set out below regarding cumulative impacts the applicant should establish the baseline, using the Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) and the updated Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy for Lincolnshire (2024). Information contained on Fingertips and Local Health websites will also be helpful. Human health should be assessed using	The human health baseline (and assessment) makes only a passing reference to the JSNA, because at the time of writing, the Lincolnshire Research Observatory (LRO) was the primary source of baseline information for the study. However, at that time, the main source of information within the LRO was the JSNA. As such, the host

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
	<p>evidence (from published research and best practice guidance, etc.) wherever possible as opposed to entirely subjective, professional judgement. It is recognised that many likely and potentially significant issues associated with the proposed development will be based on a preliminary judgment of significance.</p>	<p>authority can be confident that, as suggested, the JSNA has been used to form the baseline of the assessment, although not referenced directly.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy update 2024 was not available at the time of writing, however, this updated document does not introduce any materially new information that would change the baseline or outcome of the assessment.</p> <p>Whilst some of the baseline section may have been kept more succinct, the assessment section does include further detail and includes additional relevant baseline information and evidence where necessary.</p> <p>The Host authority should be reassured that JSNA/ Lincolnshire Research Observatory data collected in establishing the baseline, draws upon the Census and Fingertips data as recommended. So whilst some data may have been collected from the JSNA, the original source for some of this information is from the Census and Fingertips. Adding in additional baseline information will not change the overall outcomes of the health assessment.</p> <p>The assessment of health is dependent upon the findings from other technical chapters, which are signposted throughout the chapter. With regards to the assessment methodology used, the applicant understands that the host authority has concerns over the potential overuse of subjective professional judgment. To that end, the chapter assessment has applied best practice guidance (IEMA guidance), and it has used the clear significant thresholds defined within that guidance, as was set out and agreed during the Expert Topic Group meetings as part of the Evidence Plan Process prior to application.</p>
16.8	<p>It is essential to ensure that key design and construction decisions do not result in unacceptable or adverse impacts on residents within Lincolnshire over the onshore construction period. Given the duration of the onshore construction programme and the potential for overlap with other NSIP projects construction phases being promoted in this area, there is a lack of construction phasing information, which should be presented more clearly to enable local communities and the Council to understand if the impacts have been appropriately addressed and mitigated through the outline control documents.</p>	<p>Section 11 of Chapter 3: Project Description [APP-058] provides a summary of the indicative construction programme that has informed the assessments within the ES.</p> <p>Schedule 1, part 3, Requirement 8 of the draft DCO (Document 3.1, version 5) secures that the detail of the stages (equivalent to phases) of works are to be submitted and approved by the relevant planning authority. The detailed design stage will be undertaken post consent, which will include construction phasing.</p> <p>The relevant ES onshore chapters present a cumulative impact assessment with known other projects. With regard to cumulative impacts from other NSIP projects, the Applicant was requested by the ExA (PD-011) to provide an initial 'Inter-relationship with other infrastructure projects' Report at Deadline 2, which is then requested to be updated at subsequent deadlines. This report has considered 18 other NSIPs across Lincolnshire.</p> <p>The report highlights the Applicant's commitment to working with other NSIP developers of relevant NSIP projects to share information which will help to reduce possible cumulative effects where construction programmes have the potential to overlap.</p>
16.9	<p>Operational impacts are considered across the wider route to be lesser potential impacts to human health; however, the above ground infrastructure at the substation site must be better documented in terms of engagement with the affected communities and how the outcome of those engagements have influenced the Applicant's assumptions, chosen locations for these infrastructure elements, and on the proposed mitigation measures to reduce these impacts. Again this is important given that other substations are proposed in the vicinity of the proposed sub-station.</p>	<p>The Applicant took a reactive and dynamic approach to the site selection process in both the consideration of alternatives and in the final refinement of the Order Limits for both the offshore and onshore elements of the Project. While there are a multitude of factors that were considered in this process, these can be summarised into three driving principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Engineering considerations – what infrastructure is required to achieve an economic and efficient development; ■ Environmental considerations – how can the engineering be achieved to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the environment without compromising the Project's overall purpose; and ■ Consultation – how has the Applicant taken on board the feedback from stakeholders and the local communities in developing the Project.

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		<p>Chapter 4 Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (APP- 059) outlines the process undertaken by the Applicant. Table 2.2 and Table 2.3 provide a summary of the consultation and refinement phase responses received and how the Applicant used this feedback as part of the design evolution of the onshore elements of the Project.</p> <p>Plate 2.1 within the same chapter also provides a visual representation of the consultation phases and onshore design development.</p> <p>A complete list of consultation responses received to each of the Project’s Section 47 and Section 42 Consultations and how the Project have had due regard of these is included in the Consultation Report, Appendix 4 (APP-037 and AS1-036).</p> <p>The final design for the substation will be developed in line with the design review process, as set out in the Design Approach Document (Document Reference APP-2928.18) and the Onshore Design Principles Document (Document Reference APP-2938.19).</p>
16.10	<p>It is important that the cumulative effects of this development and others in the locality, county, are considered and that mental health effects, as well as physical health effects, are reflected so at this time the proposed development is assessed to have a negative impact on public health during the construction phases.</p>	<p>As outlined in Chapter 30 Human Health (AS1-054)] there will be no significant effects on physical or mental health as a result of the Project (or cumulatively with other projects). In respect of potential increased noise levels, dust and emissions as a result of construction processes and associated construction traffic, embedded mitigation and additional mitigation has been designed to reduce these effects, including as set out in the Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan (APP-269) and the Outline Air Quality Management Plan [APP-270], which form part of the Outline CoCP (APP-268).</p>
Section 106		
17.1	<p>The topics above have identified an assessment of the potential impacts on a variety of topics and the majority have concluded negative impact particularly during the construction phase but also during the operational phase. To ensure the mitigation identified is delivered and maintained, the additional burden of the Council resulting from expected archaeological finds during construction and also to mitigate the impact on the tourism and recreational sector contributions to mitigate these impacts need to be secured. Consequently the Council would welcome a dialogue on the setting up of a Section 106 with the Council to secure funding for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Funding of Environmental Compliance Officer ▪ Landscape and ecology enhancement fund ▪ Archive deposition, archives provision and storage enhancement ▪ Treasure Acquisition Budget ▪ Tourism strategy and action plan to support local visitor economy and mitigate the impact of the proposed development on the tourism sector ▪ Outreach interpretation and public benefit package. ▪ Agricultural Specialist. 	<p>The Applicant is reviewing the requests for mitigation and/or compensation by way of development consent obligation in relation to the relevant policy set out in para 4.1.18 of the National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1. Any such obligation must be relevant to planning, necessary to make the Project acceptable in planning terms, directly related in scale and kind to the Project and reasonable in all other respects. The Applicant is continuing to engage with LCC in relation to the Section 106 asks detailed within the LIR and will seek to agree any appropriate mitigation/compensation as soon as possible. The Applicant notes the programme established by the ExA (PD-011), with a requirement for completion of any Section 106 Agreement by Deadline 6 (4 April 2025).</p>
Other Topics		
18.1	<p>The Council may wish to make further representations as appropriate during the examination and at issue specific hearings relating to matters that are not contained within this LIR particularly with regard to the draft DCO. Therefore, the comments contained above are provided without prejudice to the future views that may be expressed by the Council in its capacity as an Interested Party in the examination process.</p>	<p>The Applicant will continue to engage with LCC through the Examination phase to address matters of concern raised through the process.</p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
Summary		
19.1	This LIR has undertaken an assessment of the likely issues and impacts that the Council considers will arise from the construction and operation of the Outer Dowsing project. The LIR has identified the predicted positive, neutral and negative effects during the construction and operational stage based on the information that is available at the time the LIR was prepared.	The Applicant has set out the response to the LIR within this document and will continue to engagement with LCC on matters raised.
Appendix A - Landscape and Visual Review of the Development Consent Order (DCO) Application for Outer Dowsing		
This appendix was prepared by AAH Consultants, who has been commissioned by LCC to prepare a review of the onshore Landscape and Visual elements of the Development Consent Order (DCO) Application. This has informed LCC's position on landscape and visual matters, as outlined in Section 9 Landscape and Visual above, and the Applicant's responses to the matters raised by LCC are also set out in that section. Those responses have not been repeated here.		
Appendix B Soils and Agricultural Land Classification Report for Outer Dowsing		
This appendix was prepared by Landscape Land and Property, who has been commissioned by LCC to prepare a review of the onshore Landscape and Visual elements of the Development Consent Order (DCO) Application. This has informed LCC's position on landscape and visual matters, as outlined in Section 15 Section 15 Socio-economics, Land Use and Agriculture above, and the Applicant's responses to the matters raised by LCC are also set out in that section. Those responses have not been repeated here.		
Appendix C Summary of changes necessary to the draft DCO		
Part 3, Articles 9-16	In respect of these Articles the Highway Authority wishes to ensure that it retains the same control and approval process that it would do if the application was submitted under the Town and Country Planning Act and subject works in the highway would need the approval of the Highway Authority using the Section 278 of the Highway Act process. This comes down to a highway safety concern to ensure that the works in the highway are undertaken to the correct specification. In terms of Traffic Regulation Orders the Council should be able to co-ordinate this so that there is not a situation where other statutory undertakers are undertaking works in the highway in the same location and at the same time as the developer causing traffic congestion in the local area. If the Highway Authority is not aware of the developer undertaking works as they are not required to secure a permit or approval for these works this could enable traffic lights or other means of traffic management tools to be set up in the highway without the prior approval of the Highway Authority.	The Applicant has committed to complying with the Lincolnshire Permit Scheme (as made under the Traffic Management Act 2004) by providing notice of street works in order to book time on the highway which will be achieved through a permit granted by LCC. This is set out in the Other Consents and Licences document (AS1-027). The DCO has does not seek to disapply the Lincolnshire Permit Scheme. The Applicant does not consider that a change to the DCO is therefore necessary.
Part 3 Article 13	The works are indicated to have deemed consent if the Planning Authority does not respond within the stated timeframe. However, the wording within 13(b) requires the Relevant Planning Authority to consult with the Highway Authority. In the situation that the Planning Authority does not respond and the works are consented, this places the Highway Authority in an unreasonable position of having to take forward works it has not had an opportunity to review. It is considered that it should be clearer in Requirement 20 (Highway Access) that Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) is the relevant planning authority for discharging this requirement. Therefore LCC is in control of the whole process as both local highway authority and also relevant planning authority. For deemed consent to be retained, a longer time frame (suggested 56 days) should be included in line with Schedule 20 (Article 39) 1 (3) (a) (unless this is changed as suggested in comments to Schedule 20 below)	The Applicant notes LCC's position and, on this basis, is content to adopt a deemed consent period of 56 days for each of Articles 12, 13, 15, and 16. The Applicant has amended the DCO and Explanatory Memorandum at Deadline 2 to reflect these amendments. With regard to Requirement 20 (Highway Accesses) of the DCO, Lincolnshire County Council (as the relevant highway authority) would be the discharging authority. As such, no amendment to Requirement 20 is required.
Part 3 Article 16	Makes reference to traffic authority other articles reference street authority and others the highway authority. Can it be made clearer that all of these authorities are actually the same authority. Also question the need for deemed consent and if that is justified request a longer period of 56 days for the reasons set out for Article 13 above	The Applicant notes that while in relation to the Project all the noted authorities are LCC, they are distinct authorities with different statutory functions set out in the relevant legislation and the Applicant considers that it is appropriate that the relevant articles refer to the authority whose jurisdiction the powers being sought relate to. Each authority is defined in the DCO (article 2(1)) by reference to the relevant legislation: Highway authority is defined in the DCO (article 2(1)) as having the same meaning as in the Highways Act 1980. The Highways Act 1980 section 1 provides which body is defined as the highway authority in respect of particular types of roads and sets out when the council of the county is the highway authority.

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		<p>Street authority is defined in the DCO (article 2(1)) as having the same meaning as in Part 3 of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. Section 49, Part 3 of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 provides that, subject to the provisions of section 49 which deal with particular circumstances, the street authority is:</p> <p>(a) if the street is a maintainable highway, the highway authority (which, as noted above, is defined by the Highways Act 1980), and</p> <p>(b) if the street is not a maintainable highway, the street managers.</p> <p>Traffic authority is defined in the DCO (article 2(1)) as having has the same meaning as in section 121A of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Section 121A of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 provides which body is defined as the traffic authority in respect of particular types of roads and sets out when the council of the county is the traffic authority.</p> <p>As noted in the response above, the Applicant notes LCC's position on time limits for deemed consent and is content to adopt a deemed consent period of 56 days for each of Articles 12, 13, 15, and 16. The Applicant has amended the DCO and Explanatory Memorandum at Deadline 2 to reflect these amendments.</p>
Part 3 Article 12 and 15	Question the need for deemed consent and if that is justified request a longer period of 56 days for the reasons set out for Article 13 above.	The Applicant notes LCC's position and, on this basis, is content to adopt a deemed consent period of 56 days for each of Articles 12, 13, 15, 16. The Applicant has amended the DCO and Explanatory Memorandum at Deadline 2 to reflect these amendments.
Part 7 Article 35 and 36	Advice Note 15 says, if there is a general power of removal the powers themselves should be subject to later consent, so therefore LCC are of the opinion that the same ought to be included in the articles. In other words, Advice Note 15 is clear that the powers should be limited and that it is preferable that is also in the drafting of the articles rather than solely through the approval of other plans/ requirements, so it is clear on the fact of the DCO itself. the absence of a schedule of trees to be removed in the dDCO, LCC consider that its concerns could be resolved if the wording of articles 35 and 36 were amended to limit the removal of trees, tree groups and hedgerows to those shown on tree and hedgerows plans in the applicant's arboricultural report. Any tree and hedgerow removal beyond this would require separate approval of the relevant planning authority.	<p>The Applicant has taken on board the point made by LCC about compliance with Advice Note 15. The Applicant notes that Advice Note 15 recommends DCO articles for the removal of hedgerows are made relevant to the specific hedgerows intended for removal and that to support the ExA, the article should include a Schedule and a plan to specifically identify the hedgerows to be removed. In order to address this, the Applicant intends to update the DCO at Deadline 3 to include a new part in Schedule 17 which will set out the detail of the hedgerows proposed for removal using the powers conferred by Article 36 (which was previously Article 35), and Article 36 will be amended to reflect this accordingly. A plan will also be provided at Deadline 3 which shows these hedgerows, and that plan will be cross-referenced in Schedule 17.</p> <p>Advice Note 15 also recommends that the draft DCO should include a relevant Schedule and plan identifying the trees likely to be affected that are protected by tree preservation orders and/ or are otherwise protected. As set out in paragraph 9.6 of the Explanatory Memorandum (document 3.2, version 3) in relation to Article 37 (Trees subject to tree preservation orders) (which was previously Article 36), the Applicant has committed to installing cables by trenchless techniques under the existing trees subject to tree preservation orders within the Order Limits, which are shown on the Important Hedgerows and Tree Preservation Order Plan (PD1-020). As such, no schedule of trees subject to a tree preservation order is provided in the DCO as no trees currently subject to such protection are considered to be affected, and the draft DCO is not seeking powers to remove those trees, as the powers conferred by article 37 only apply to any tree subject to a tree preservation order made after 13 October 2024.</p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
Include an Interpretation section for this Part	<p>Interpretation 1. In this Part—“relevant planning authority”, unless as provided otherwise, means— (a) Lincolnshire County Council for the purposes of— (i) Requirement 8 (Stages of authorized development onshore); (ii) Requirement 10 (Provision of Landscaping); (iii) Requirement 11 (Implementation and maintenance of landscaping) ; (iv) Requirement 12 (Ecological Management Plan); (v) Requirement 15 (Operational drainage management plan); (vi) Requirement 17 (Onshore archaeology); Requirement 20 (Highway accesses); Requirement 21 (Traffic); Requirement 22 (Public Right of Way); Requirement 23 (Restoration of land used temporarily for construction; Requirement 31 (Soil management plan); and Requirement 32 (Biodiversity)</p>	<p>There is a general interpretation article (article 2 of the draft DCO) which applies to the entirety of the DCO including Schedule 1, Part 3 (Requirements). This is standard practise across similar DCOs.</p> <p>In particular, Article 2(1) already provides a definition of relevant planning authority, which is “the district planning authority for the area in which the land to which the relevant provision of this Order applies is situated” It is not considered necessary or standard practice to define “relevant planning authority” in the way proposed.</p> <p>It is considered (subject to the ongoing discussions between LCC and the local planning authorities referred to below) that the approach taken for each requirement is appropriate and ensures plans and documents are being considered by the most appropriate authority in consultation with other relevant authorities. It should be noted that in respect of Requirement 17 (Onshore archaeology), Requirement 20 Highway accesses), Requirement 21 (Traffic) and Requirement 22(Public rights of way), LCC is the discharging authority, ether because it is specifically named as such or because it is the relevant highway authority.</p>
Requirement 8	...approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the District Councils	<p>The Applicant is aware that there are ongoing discussions between the local planning authorities and the LCC in respect of the appropriate authority to discharge these requirements and will update when these discussions have concluded. While the Applicant is not proposing to amend the definition of relevant planning authority, if the local planning authorities and LCC agree that LCC is better placed to discharge any of these requirements, it will of course amend the wording for the requirements accordingly.</p>
Requirement 10	...approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the District Councils	
Requirement 11	...approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the District Councils	
Requirement 12	...approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the District Councils and relevant statutory nature conservation body	
Requirement 17 Onshore Archaeology	<p>It is considered that the Applicant’s proposed wording is unnecessarily complicated. Given there is outstanding archaeological trenching still to be done to provide sufficient baseline evidence to inform a fit for purpose and reasonable mitigation strategy to deal with the developmental impact upon surviving archaeology, we recommend the Archaeological Requirement for the recently consented Mallard Pass DCO be used.</p> <p>The authorised development may not commence until: a scheme for additional trial trenching has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, in consultation with Historic England; additional trial trenching has been carried out in accordance with the scheme approved under sub-paragraph (a); and updates are made to the outline written scheme of investigation to account for the results of the additional trial trenching carried out and the updated outline written scheme of investigation is submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority in consultation with Historic England. (2) The authorised development must be carried out in accordance with the updated outline written scheme of investigation approved under sub-paragraph 1(c).</p>	<p>The Mallard Pass requirement is not appropriate or necessary.</p> <p>The DCO permits “onshore preparation works” to be carried out which includes archaeological investigations, prior to commencement of the onshore transmission works. The additional pre-construction trial trenching will form part of the archaeological investigations that will take place under the remit of onshore preparation works. Any archaeological investigations carried out as part of onshore preparation works taking place must, under Requirement 17(2) of the draft DCO, only take place in accordance with a specific written scheme of investigation (which must accord with the outline onshore written scheme of investigation for archaeological works) which has been submitted to and approved by Lincolnshire County Council in consultation with the relevant planning authority and Historic England. Therefore, LCC have final approval over the proposed pre-construction trial trenching.</p> <p>Requirement 17(1) of the draft DCO requires a written scheme of archaeological investigation (which must accord with the outline onshore written scheme of investigation for archaeological works and is informed by the archaeological investigations carried out as part of the onshore preparation works) to be submitted to and approved by LCC in consultation with the relevant planning authority and Historic England before any stage of the onshore transmission works can commence.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate for the development to be carried out in accordance with an outline scheme as this does not provide the detailed proposals. It is considered that the approach set out in requirement 17 for both archaeological investigations carried out as part of onshore preparation works and any archaeological works during each stage of the development of the onshore transmission works provides a greater level of oversight for LCC as the approving authority in respect of the WSIs required.</p>
Requirement 18	(2) (d) Remove soil management plan from this requirement	<p>The Applicant is happy to remove the reference to a soil management plan from Requirement 18 (Code of construction practice) and instead secure the submission of a soil management plans by the proposed standalone requirement. The Applicant has therefore deleted limb (d) from Requirement 18 and has proposed a new Requirement 31 (Soil management plan) in the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 2.</p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
Requirement 20	Delete Highway Authority and replace with approved by relevant planning authority	Please see the Applicant's Response to Part 3 Article 16.
Requirement 21	Delete highway authority and replace with approved in writing by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the District Council	Please see the Applicant's Response to Part 3 Article 16.
Requirement 22	Delete highway authority and replace with approved by the relevant planning authority.	Please see the Applicant's Response to Part 3 Article 16.
Requirement 23	Delete highway authority and replace with approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the District Council	Please see the Applicant's Response to Part 3 Article 16.
Proposed Requirement 31	Soil management plan - (1) No part of the authorised development may commence until a soil management plan has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. (2) The soil management plan must be substantially in accordance with the outline soil management plan. (3) The soil management plan must be implemented as approved	As noted above, the Applicant is happy to secure the submission of a soil management plan by a separate requirement and has added a new Requirement 31 (Soil management plan) to the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 2. The wording of that requirement differs slightly to that proposed by LCC, but the changes made are to ensure the wording aligns with the format of other onshore requirements within the draft DCO and that it and uses the defined terms set out therein. The new requirement is: 31. Soil management plan (1) No stage of the onshore transmission works may commence until a soil management plan (which must accord with the outline soil management plan) for that stage has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with Lincolnshire County Council. (2) The soil management plan must be implemented as approved.
Proposed Requirement 32	Biodiversity -The authorised development may not commence until a biodiversity net gain strategy has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, in consultation with the relevant statutory nature conservation body. (2) The biodiversity net gain strategy must include details of how the strategy will secure a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain in habitat units will be reached, for all of the authorised development during the operation of the authorised development, and the metric that has been used to calculate that percentage. (3) The biodiversity net gain strategy must be substantially in accordance with the outline landscape and ecological management plan and must be implemented as approved and maintained throughout the operation of the authorised development to which the plan relates.	The Applicant has noted LCC's comments. There is currently no legal obligation for NSIPs to deliver a specific percentage of biodiversity net gain as the provisions of the Environment Act 2021 relating to biodiversity net gain for NSIPs have not yet come into force and are not expected to until at least November 2025. As such, the Applicant does not consider it is necessary or appropriate to include the proposed requirement in the draft DCO.
Schedule 20– procedure for discharge of requirements (1) Application made for certain approvals	3 (a) Do not consider that 56 days is sufficient time in relation to providing the undertaker with a decision and this should be increased to 13 weeks 3(b) Where further information is required 56 days is not long enough and this should be increased to 13 weeks so that sufficient time to review and consult other parties. Any application made to the relevant planning authority pursuant to paragraph 1 (1) must include a statement to confirm whether it is likely that the subject matter of the application will give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects compared to those in the environmental statement and if it will then it must be accompanied by information setting out what those effects are. Where an application has been made to the relevant planning authority for any consent, agreement or approval required by a requirement included in this Order and the relevant planning authority does not determine the application within the period set out in sub-paragraph (3) and is accompanied by a report pursuant to sub-paragraph (4) which states that the subject matter of such application is likely to give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects compared to those in the environmental statement then the application is to be taken to have been refused by the relevant planning authority at the end of that period.	With regard to LCC's comments on the timescale for discharging requirements, Advice Note 15, Appendix 1, provides standard drafting for dealing with procedure for discharge of certain approvals. The Applicant has provided such a procedure, following the style of Advice Note 15, in Schedule 20 (Procedure for discharge of requirements). The decision period set out by the Applicant is 56 days from the day immediately following that on which the application is received by the discharging authority or, where further information is requested, 56 days from the day immediately following that on which the further information has been supplied by the undertaker. This provides a longer period than the period suggested in the standard drafting in Advice Note 15, which provides a decision period of 42 days from receipt of the application or receipt of further information. The Applicant considers this 56 day period to be reasonable, and notes this is standard across a number of other offshore wind DCOs such as the Hornsea Four Offshore Wind Farm Order 2023, the Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm Order 2022, the Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm Order 2021, the East Anglia ONE North Offshore Wind Farm Order 2022, and the East Anglia TWO Offshore Wind Farm Order 2022 (although it is noted that in the latter two orders that a lesser period of 42 days was provided following receipt of the further information). As such, the Applicant does not consider that 13 weeks is an appropriate or reasonable time scale. With regard to LCC's request that any application made to the relevant planning authority pursuant to paragraph 1 (1) must include a statement to confirm whether it is likely that the subject matter of the application will give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects compared to those in the environmental statement and if it will then it must be accompanied by information setting out what those effects are, the Applicant does not consider this to be necessary or appropriate as the Applicant can only carry out the development in accordance with the principles of what is assessed in the ES. This is clear in respect of updating approved details, where Requirement 29(2) (amendments to approved details) provides that "Any amendments

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		to or variations from the approved details must be in accordance with the principles and assessments set out in the environmental statement. Such agreement may only be given in relation to immaterial changes where it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the relevant planning authority or that other person that the subject matter of the agreement sought is unlikely to give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects from those assessed in the environmental statement.”

1.2 Joint Local Impact Report from Boston Borough Council, East Lindsey District Council and South Holland District Council (REP1-052).

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
Introduction		
1.1	This Local Impact Report (LIR) has been provided on behalf of East Lindsey District Council, Boston Borough Council and South Holland District Council. This joint LIR aims to provide details of the impact of the proposed Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind project within the boundaries of the three local authorities. Where necessary this report clarifies if an impact is shared or site specific with relevance to one local authority.	These comments have been noted by the Applicant.
1.2	This LIR is based on the guidance as set out within S60(3) of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and the Planning Inspectorate’s Local Impact Report Advice Note.	
1.3	Previously representations for all three Councils have been submitted as well as confirmation of the adequacy of consultation. Currently a draft Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) is in review with the Applicant and we have made comments on this document.	
1.4	All three Councils reserve the right to amend or supplement the content of the following LIR should it become necessary, for example if updated information is submitted or the SOCG amended.	
1.5	This LIR’s primary purpose is to identify the policies in Local Plans as far as they are relevant to the proposed development and the extent to which the development accords with these policies. It does this under topic-based headings (following the form of the overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy (EN-1)) reflecting the likely nature of impacts. The key issues for the local Authorities and the local communities are then identified, followed by commentary on the extent the applicant addresses these issues by reference to the application documentation, including the DCO articles, requirements and obligations, as relevant.	
The Site Area		
1.7	The site for review within the scope of this report starts at the landfall position of the subsea cable route at Anderby Creek and ends at the substation located at Surfleet Marsh Here with over 70km of land within the local authorities boundaries affected by the development.	These comments have been noted by the Applicant.
1.8	East Lindsey District Council is the most northerly of the local authorities and here the landfall position at Anderby Creek and cable route affect the area.	
1.9	Boston Borough Council is the next local authority south of East Lindsey and here the majority of proposed development includes underground cable routing.	
1.10	The last and most southerly local authority is South Holland District Council which is impacted by both underground cable works and the proposed termination at the newly erected substation.	
1.11	There are other associated works to facilitate the development which are considered in the following sections of the report. These include temporary construction compounds and access routes amongst other elements.	
1.12	Whilst the application has been sub sectioned this LIR considers the impacts as a whole from landfall within the East Lindsey boundary, the cable route south east out of East Lindsey and through Boston, to the final cable route and substation located in South Holland’s boundary.	
Statutory Development Plans		

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
2.1	There are a number of local and national planning policies which are considered relevant and should be taken account of as part of the development process. These plans and local knowledge have been formed over several years and have come from a significant evidence base.	The Applicant has produced a Policy Compliance Document (AS-012) which has assessed compliance with all relevant national and local policies presented within this section of the LIR.
2.2	<p>East Lindsey District Council</p> <p>The Local Plan for East Lindsey comprises the Core Strategy 2018 and the Settlement Proposals Document 2018. The relevant objectives and policies within the East Lindsey Local Plan (ELLP) are:</p> <p>Vision and Objective 1 - Seeks a network of thriving, safer and healthy sustainable communities, where people can enjoy a high quality of life and an increased sense of well-being and where new development simultaneously addresses the needs of the economy, communities and the environment.</p>	It should also be noted that each onshore chapter of the ES contains a section on the relevant policy in relation to that topic.
2.3	Vision and Objective 3 - Seeks a growing and diversified economy that not only builds on and extends the important agriculture and tourism base but supports the creation of all types of employment.	
2.4	Vision and objective 6 - Seeks a commitment to tackling the causes and effects of global climate change through local action.	
2.5	Vision and Objectives Para 1.11 - Seeks to achieve the vision of a commitment to tackling the causes and effects of global climate change through local action, Support is provided for new development to ensure it does not cause flood risk to existing properties and encourage new development to reduce flood risk to existing properties.	
2.6	Vision and Objectives Para 1.11 - Supports the use of renewable energy but balanced against the protection of the District's distinct landscapes.	
2.7	Strategic policy 10 (SP10) – Design - Development around water sources will only be supported if it contains adequate protection preventing pollution from entering into the water source.	
2.8	Strategic policy 11 (SP11) – Historic Environment - The Council will support proposals that secure the continued protection and enhancement of heritage assets in East Lindsey, contribute to the wider vitality and regeneration of the areas in which they are located and reinforce a strong sense of place.	
2.9	Strategic policy 13 (SP13) – Inland Employment - The Council will support growth and diversification of the local economy by: Strengthening the rural economy by supporting in the large, medium and small villages: Development where it can provide local employment.	
2.10	Strategic policy 16 (SP16) – Inland Flood Risk - The Council will support development that demonstrates an integrated approach to sustainable drainage that has positive gains to the natural environment. The Council will support development for business, leisure and commercial uses in areas of inland flood risk where it can be demonstrated that accommodating the development on a sequentially safer site would undermine the overall commercial integrity of the existing area. Such developments must incorporate flood mitigation measures in their design.	
2.11	Strategic policy 17 (SP17) – Coastal East Lindsey - All relevant development will need to provide adequate flood mitigation. The council will support improvements to flood defences, infrastructure associated with emergency planning and the development and replacement community buildings. Development must also demonstrate that it satisfies the Sequential and Exception Test and will need to provide adequate flood mitigation.	
2.12	Strategic policy 21 (SP21) – Coastal Employment - The Council will support the rural coastal economy by supporting development in the large, medium and small villages where it: Provides local employment and help support local services.	
2.13	Strategic policy 23 (SP23) – Landscape - The District's landscapes will be protected, enhanced, used and managed to provide an attractive and healthy working and living environment. Development will be guided by the District's Landscape Character Assessment and landscapes defined as highly sensitive will be afforded the greatest protection.	
2.14	Strategic Policy 24 (SP24) - Biodiversity and Geodiversity - Development proposals should seek to protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity value of land and buildings and minimise	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
	fragmentation and maximise opportunities for connection between natural habitats.	
2.15	Strategic Policy 25 (SP25) – Green Infrastructure - In the case of sites not identified on the Inset Maps, development will only be permitted on open spaces provided unacceptable harm will not be caused to their appearance, character or role.	
2.16	<p>Strategic Policy 27 (SP27) – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Large-scale renewable and low carbon energy development, development for the transmission and interconnection of electricity, and infrastructure required to support such development, will be supported where their individual or cumulative impact is, when weighed against the benefits, considered to be acceptable in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • residential amenity; • surrounding landscape, townscape and historic landscape character, and visual qualities; • the significance (including the setting) of a historic garden, park, battlefield, building, conservation area, archaeological site or other heritage asset; • sites or features of biodiversity or geodiversity importance, or protected species; • the local economy; • highway safety; and • water environment and water quality 	
2.17	Strategic Policy 28 (SP28) – Infrastructure and S106 Obligations - Infrastructure schemes will be supported provided they are essential in the national interest; contribute to sustainable development, and respect the distinctive character of the district.	
2.18	<p>Boston Borough Council & South Holland District Council</p> <p>The South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (SELLP) was adopted jointly by South Holland and Boston Borough Council on the 8 March 2019.</p>	
2.19	<p>The relevant policies within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 are:</p> <p>Policy 2 ‘Development Management’ – requires proposals to demonstrate sustainable development considerations have been met through a number of criteria.</p>	
2.20	Policy 3 ‘Design of New Development’ – requires development to create distinctive places through the use of high quality and inclusive design, demonstrating compliance with a number of considerations.	
2.21	Policy 4 ‘Approach to Flood Risk’ – developments must satisfy the sequential test and be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment covering risk from all sources of flooding including the impacts of climate change. It must be demonstrated that surface water from the development can be managed and will not increase the risk of flooding to third parties.	
2.22	Policy 28 ‘The Natural Environment’ – Requires the protection, enhancement and management of natural assets, by ensuring all development proposals provide an overall net gain in biodiversity.	
2.23	Policy 29 ‘The Historic Environment’ - Distinctive elements of the South East Lincolnshire historic environment will be conserved and, where appropriate, enhanced.	
2.24	<p>Policy 30 ‘Pollution’ Development proposals will not be permitted where, taking account of any proposed mitigation measures they would lead to unacceptable adverse impacts upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • health and safety of the public; • the amenities of the area; or • the natural, historic and built environment; <p>by way of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • air quality, including fumes and odour; • noise including vibration; • light levels; • land quality and condition; or • surface and groundwater quality. <p>Planning applications, except for development within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse as specified</p>	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
	<p>within Schedule 2, Part 1 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, or successor statutory instrument, must include an assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on the proposed development from poor air quality from identified sources; • impact on air quality from the proposed development; and • impact on amenity from existing uses. 	
2.25	Policy 31 'Climate Change and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy' - All development proposals will be required to demonstrate that the consequences of current climate change has been addressed, minimised and mitigated.	
2.26	Policy 32 'Community, Health and Wellbeing' - Development shall contribute to the creation of socially cohesive and inclusive communities; reducing health inequalities; and improving the community's health and well-being.	
2.27	Policy 33 'Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network' – reinforces the national approach to promoting sustainable alternatives to the car through new development, making the best use of, and seek improvements to, existing transport infrastructure and services. Solutions that are based on better promotion and management of the existing network and the provision of sustainable forms of travel are supported. To achieve this, a Transport Assessment and associated Travel Plan will be submitted with proposals.	
Impact Assessment		
3.1	<p>The Local Impact Report guidance indicates this report should provide a statement of positive, neutral, and negative local impacts but should not contain a balancing exercise, as that is for the Examining Authority to determine. The existing statutory consultation responses should be read in conjunction with this LIR as well as the SOCG once agreed.</p>	The Applicant notes the structure of the LIR.
3.2	<p>The key elements of the development with the potential for impact have been identified as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landfall location at Wolla Bank • Onshore export cables between Wolla Bank and Western Marsh • Cable corridor of 80m during construction and 60m post construction • Onshore Substation • Temporary construction compounds for laydown and storage of materials, plant and staff, as well as space for small temporary offices, welfare facilities, security and parking. • A temporary haul road will be constructed to provide access to the Project's onshore infrastructure instead of relying on the main roads. The temporary haul road, typically 6.8m wide (up to 9m at passing places) will limit damage to the agricultural land and reduce construction traffic on the main road networks. This will extend the entire length of the Project onshore ECC and 400kV cable corridor (except where the Project has committed to not construct a haul road, such as in locations where trenchless techniques will be adopted). • An onshore construction program of around 4 years for landfall and substation works with 3 years for the cable ducting and installation. 	These comments have been noted by the Applicant.
3.3	<p>The Potential Positive Impacts of the Proposal are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socio-economic factors during construction; and • Provision of renewable energy supply 	
3.4	<p>The Potential Neutral Impacts of the Proposal are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underground cable route; • Air quality and dust management depending on mitigation; • Landscape and visual impact; • Noise and vibration; • Socio economic factors once construction is complete; • Traffic and transport, subject to LCC agreement; and • Waste management, subject to LCC agreement 	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
3.5	<p>The potential Negative Impacts of the Proposal are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality and dust management depending on mitigation; • Biodiversity subject to Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (LWT) and Natural England (NE) agreement; • Dust, odour, artificial light, smoke, steam, insect infestation, subject to Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue agreement; and • Historic Environment, subject to Lincolnshire Heritage (LH) and Historic England (HE) agreement. 	
3.6	<p>The following sections identify the relevant policies within the development plan, the key issues raised by the proposed development and the extent to the applicant addresses them and thus the proposal complies with local policy. For ease of reference, the headings broadly reflect those used in Part 5 of the overarching NPS for Energy (EN-1) 'Generic Impacts'.</p>	
Impact Assessment – Air Quality and Emissions		
3.7	<p>Local Plan Policy</p> <p>Whilst the associated text of the ELLP states the importance of air quality with regards to residential amenity and quality of life (Page 11), the Core Strategy does not set out a specific policy with regards to Air pollution.</p>	<p>These comments have been noted by the Applicant.</p>
3.8	<p>The SELLP sets out the local policy position with regards to air pollution at Policy 30.</p>	
3.9	<p>Commentary</p> <p>Air quality will be impacted during construction from the generation of dust during the cable installation. Dust travelling (wind-blown) can then have wider impacts within land nearby the cable corridor. As approximately 70km of cable is proposed across the development area, a suitable mitigation and management plan is required in order to minimise the onward impact. All three Local Authorities consider air quality as a key consideration to maintaining residential amenity quality of life and are aware of representations made from landowners including farmers who have expressed concern about the potential impact of dust on their crop production.</p>	<p>Chapter 19 Onshore Air Quality (AS1-046) includes an assessment of the impacts of construction dust generated by the Project on the environment.</p> <p>The construction dust assessment has been conducted in accordance with the latest 2024 Institute of Air Quality Management guidance (IAQM, 2024), which represents the standard practice for evaluating major construction activities in the UK. This methodology is recognised and accepted by PINS and statutory consultees and was agreed through the EIA and expert topic group process. The methodology is formulated by a working group of professional experts, based on their practical experience.</p> <p>The IAQM methodology employs a risk-based approach to determine the appropriate level of mitigation required in response to the risk of dust impacts. The level of dust impact risk is determined by assessing the dust emission magnitude associated with construction activities (demolition, earthworks, construction, and trackout) and their impact on the surrounding area. Demolition was scoped out of the assessment. The assessment addresses the following potential impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dust soiling effects on people and property; ▪ Health effects from increased particulate matter (PM₁₀) exposure; and ▪ Harm to ecological receptors. <p>The risk of impact for each activity is calculated iteratively, as impacts can vary based on the nature of the activity (demolition, earthworks etc.), and receptor context (ecology, human health etc.), providing a tailored assessment. The maximum risk level - identified through these iterative calculations - is then used as a benchmark to inform mitigation measures, both generically and in response to specific activities (e.g., earthworks, construction, and trackout). This ensures a comprehensive assessment, capturing all construction activities and impacts.</p> <p>To ensure a precautionary approach to the assessment, a series of conservative assumptions have been incorporated to establish a Maximum Design Scenario (AS1-046 Table 19.11). For example, the assessment considers the entire onshore Order Limits, rather than discrete sections which will increase the opportunity for greater derived sensitivities and dust emission magnitudes ensuring a robust assessment. As a result, it may</p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		<p>recommend higher levels of mitigation than would typically be required both generally and at specific locations, thereby ensuring comprehensive protection.</p> <p>The assessment addresses potential worst-case impacts on both human and ecological receptors. Concerns regarding dust impacts on crop production are inherently covered in the assessment of dust soiling effects on people and property. By way of example, paragraph 4.5 IAQM guidance explains that receptors for dust soiling may include horticultural operations such as salad or soft-fruit production which are prone to dust soiling effects. It therefore features as an inherent consideration.</p> <p>With regards to the level of sensitivity, the IAQM guidance refers to farming (unless commercially sensitive horticultural) as a low sensitivity receptor distinguishing between low and high sensitivities based on commercial importance. The IAQM guidance also assigns high sensitivity to land uses where dust soiling could diminish the appearance, aesthetics, or value of property (e.g., car showrooms). Car showrooms would similarly request a high-level of protection from construction dust, in the same manner as commercially sensitive farmland, as it could undermine their commercial performance. Based on this analysis, it would be reasonable to assume that commercially sensitive horticultural land would comprise a high sensitivity receptor in relation to dust soiling effects on people and property.</p> <p>To define sensitivity, the assessment considered residential properties, identified as high-sensitivity receptors, due to their prevalence near the Order Limits. For each activity, the highest sensitivity level (e.g., high) was assigned. Any additional specific consideration for properties of high aesthetic value, such as sensitive crops, would not alter this outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Earthworks: High Risk ▪ Construction: High Risk ▪ Trackout: High Risk <p>This represents the maximum level of dust impact for each activity and based on this risk the assessment recommends the full suite of best available controls prescribed within the IAQM guidance (IAQM, 2024) to minimise dust. Primary examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Erection of solid screens or barriers around dusty activities or the site boundary. Therefore, the assessment is inherently precautionary. ▪ Supply of water on site for effective dust/particulate matter suppression. ▪ Use of water-assisted dust sweeper(s) on the access and local roads, to remove, as necessary, any material tracked out of the site. This may require the sweeper being continuously in use. ▪ Implementation of a wheel washing system (with rumble grids to dislodge accumulated dust and mud prior to leaving the site where reasonably practicable). <p>As per the IAQM guidance (IAQM, 2024), upon effective implementation of these controls, residual effects associated with construction dust will be not significant, including on sensitive crops within proximity to the Order Limits. These measures have formed the basis of the Outline Air Quality Management Plan (APP-270) which secures their implementation and residual outcomes. The Outline Air Quality Management Plan forms part of the overarching Outline CoCP (APP-238), which also includes methods to reduce dust. Further, the Outline SMP (PD1-040) addresses dust via wind erosion in Section 5.9.</p>

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
		<p>The Outline Air Quality Management Plan (APP-270) also includes a robust monitoring framework to continuously evaluate the effectiveness of control measures and provide necessary assurances. Key elements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Daily on-site and off-site inspections near sensitive receptors, with results recorded and made available to the local authority upon request. ▪ Increase the frequency of site inspections by the person accountable for air quality and dust issues on site when activities with a high potential to produce dust are being carried out and during prolonged dry or windy conditions. ▪ Conduct dust deposition, dust flux, or real-time PM₁₀ continuous monitoring locations at pre-agreed locations. ▪ Record all dust and air quality complaints, identify cause(s), take appropriate measures to reduce emissions in a timely manner, and record the measures taken. ▪ Make the complaints log available to the Local Authority when asked. Record any exceptional incidents that cause dust and/or air emissions, either on- or offsite, and the action taken to resolve the situation in the logbook. ▪ Implementation of a communications procedure, including a Stakeholder Communications Plan. <p>The mitigation set out in the Outline Air Quality Management Plan are secured by Requirement 18 (Code of Construction Practice) of the draft DCO (document 3.1, version 5). Requirement 18 requires the submission of a final code of construction practice which must include a final air quality management plan tailored to the stages of the onshore transmission works. These documents will need to be approved by the relevant planning authority and other relevant consultees before any onshore transmission works commence. Further, Requirement 18 ensures that the final code of construction practice aligns with the principles established in the Outline CoCP.</p>
3.10	<p>Adequacy of the application</p> <p>Air quality has been directly assessed within chapter 19 of the submitted Environmental Statement as well as the Outline Air Quality Management Plan. Chapter 19 reviews the impacts during construction with regards to soil works and vehicle movements whilst the Outline Air Quality Management Plan</p>	<p>These comments have been noted by the Applicant.</p>
3.11	<p>It was noted at the recent meeting that landowners are concerns regarding the impacts of dust and therefore the robustness of the management plan is key with regards to ensuring the mitigation of impacts. As stated within Table 2.1 of the Outline Air Quality Management Plan, communications will play a highly important role in the management and mitigation of dust emissions. The measures as listed in Table 2.1 are deemed robust and compliant with Local Policy, however an ongoing line of communication is needed to ensure the measures are adhered to for the protection of air quality.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed concerns regarding the impacts of dust on surrounding properties and sensitive land (e.g., crops) in 3.9 above.</p> <p>Communication is a key element of the Outline Air Quality Management Plan (APP-270, Table 2.1), and a proactive communication strategy is vital to effectively address concerns and ensure compliance. Measures to facilitate effective communication and maintain accountability include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A comprehensive Stakeholder Communications Plan that includes community engagement before work commences on site; ▪ Displaying contact details for the head or regional office; and ▪ Clearly displaying the name and contact information of the person(s) accountable for air quality and dust management within the Order Limits, such as the environment manager/engineer or the site manager.

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
Impact Assessment – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation		
3.12	<p>Local Plan Policy</p> <p>The ELLP at Strategic Policy 24 (SP24) sets out the policy for Biodiversity and Geodiversity. It states that Development proposals should seek to protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity value of land and buildings and minimise fragmentation and maximise opportunities for connection between natural habitats.</p>	These comments have been noted by the Applicant.
3.13	<p>The SELLP at Policy 28 requires the protection, enhancement and management of natural assets, by ensuring all development proposals provide an overall net gain in biodiversity.</p>	
3.14	<p>Commentary</p> <p>Local biodiversity impact will be from site clearance of any vegetation on the cable route corridor and the loss of agricultural land at the substation. The impact on biodiversity is potentially negative as a result of this loss.</p>	<p>Temporary and permanent habitat loss has been assessed in Chapter 21 of the impact assessment [APP-076]. In relation to Priority Habitats, in the absence of mitigation measures, a minor negative effect at the site level has been predicted. Impacts on individual species/species groups have been assessed. Chapter 21 concludes no significant effect on any terrestrial ecological receptors. Commitments to the reinstatement of temporarily impacted habitats, and habitat creation around the OnSS presented in the Biodiversity Net Gain Report [AS-014] will help minimise negative impacts upon local biodiversity, along with commitments to obtain protected species licences or implement reasonable avoidance measures where necessary.</p>
3.15	<p>Adequacy of the application/DCO</p> <p>Chapter 21 of the submitted Environmental Statement details Onshore Ecology. No technical errors have been identified that would lead to the challenge of ES Chapter 21. The chapter is coherent and adopts a robust methodology. The chapter is therefore considered adequate for the Examination Authority to assess the ecology impacts associated with the construction, operation and decommissioning of the proposed development.</p>	These comments have been noted by the Applicant.
Impact Assessment – Flood Risk		
3.16	<p>Local Plan Policy</p> <p>The ELLP sets out the policy for Inland Flood Risk at Strategic Policy 16. The Council will support development that demonstrates an integrated approach to sustainable drainage that has positive gains to the natural environment. The Council will support development for business, leisure and commercial uses in areas of inland flood risk where it can be demonstrated that accommodating the development on a sequentially safer site would undermine the overall commercial integrity of the existing area. Such developments must incorporate flood mitigation measures in their design.</p>	These comments have been noted by the Applicant.
3.17	<p>The SELLP contains Policy 4: Approach to Flood Risk (See Appendix 3). Essential infrastructure is referred to in paragraph 2. The issue is also featured in Policy 2: Development Management (See Appendix 1), Policy 3: Design of New Development (See Appendix 2), Policy 28: Natural Environment (See Appendix 4), Policy 30: Pollution (See Appendix 6) and Policy 31: Climate Change and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (See Appendix 7).</p>	
3.18	<p>Commentary</p> <p>The maximum design scenario (MDS) has been considered for the assessment of impacts. The MDS includes the maximum development footprint (temporary and permanent) and therefore the largest possible area of disturbance to surface water features. Open trenching as a crossing option for smaller watercourse crossings has been considered to represent the greatest potential for change to surface hydrology and effect on water quality.</p>	
3.19	<p>Adequacy of the application</p> <p>Flood risk has been assessed within Chapter 24 of the submitted Environmental Statement. No technical errors have been identified that would lead to the challenge of ES Chapter 24. The chapter is coherent and adopts a robust methodology. The chapter is therefore considered adequate for the examination Authority to assess the ecology impacts associated with the construction, operation and decommissioning of the proposed development. Lincolnshire County Council act as Lead Local Flood Authority and may comment directly on the proposed development.</p>	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
Impact Assessment – Historic Environment		
3.20	<p>Local Plan Policy</p> <p>The ELLP Strategic policy 11 (SP11) Historic Environment is relevant to this impact topic area. The Council will support proposals that secure the continued protection and enhancement of heritage assets in East Lindsey, contribute to the wider vitality and regeneration of the areas in which they are located and reinforce a strong sense of place.</p>	These comments have been noted by the Applicant.
3.21	The SELLP contains Policy 29: The Historic Environment. distinctive elements of the South East Lincolnshire historic environment will be conserved and, where appropriate, enhanced.	
3.22	<p>Commentary</p> <p>Construction traffic through the conservation area of Wrangle has not been approved. The type of historic environment that will be impacted in some way by the proposal is archaeology. The impact on archaeology could be potentially negative or potentially neutral. This is currently unclear owing to the cable route not having completed trial trench investigation and having the results available to inform the mitigation strategy.</p>	<p>The Traffic Management Plan (APP 289 Figure 3.5) confirms that construction traffic will not pass through the footprint of Wrangle Conservation Area as shown on the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan and submission drawings (APP-181 Figure 20.1.1.3).</p> <p>A first phase of trial trenching has been undertaken in consultation with LCC. This commenced in August 2024 and will close in November 2024. Further preconstruction trial trenching will be undertaken. There will be sufficient trial trenching to inform an appropriate hierarchy of mitigation as set out within the OWSI (PD1-052).</p>
3.23	<p>Adequacy of the application</p> <p>Chapter 20 of the Environmental Statement details onshore archaeology and cultural heritage impacts and identifies a number of heritage assets within a certain proximity of the Order Limits. This reveals that the cable route corridor and substation has heritage setting assessments, archaeology desk based assessments and a mitigation strategy has been prepared although trial trench evaluation has not been completed. The chapter is supported by appendices.</p>	See response to paragraph 3.22.
3.24	The Council acknowledges that Historic England, Heritage Lincolnshire and LCC are the expert bodies for this issue and the adequacy of the evidence.	These comments have been noted by the Applicant.
Landscape and Visual		
3.25	<p>Local Plan Policy</p> <p>Policies from the SELLP which are relevant to landscape and visual impacts are: Policy 3: Design of New Development and Policy 31: Climate Change and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy – particularly part B which refers to consideration of visual amenity, residential amenity and landscape character.</p>	These comments have been noted by the Applicant.
3.26	<p>Policies from the ELCS which are relevant to landscape and visual impacts are: Strategic Policy 10 (SP10) – Design, which makes reference to maintaining and enhancing the character of the district, utilizing appropriate landscaping and protecting amenity. Furthermore, it requires consideration of layout, scale, massing, height and density to reflect the character of the surrounding area. Strategic Policy 23 (SP23) – Landscape sets out requirements to protect and enhance the district’s landscape. Strategic Policy 27 (SP27) – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy sets out requirements for large scale renewables projects, including transmission to weigh the impacts on landscape/townscape character and visual qualities against the benefits of the development.</p>	
3.27	<p>Commentary</p> <p>Long term landscape and visual impacts arising from the development are anticipated to primarily relate to the OnSS element. Embedded mitigation measures (see figure 28.15), including on and off-site planting are considered likely to be effective in mitigating for landscape and visual impacts from the OnSS as indicated in visual representations included within Chapter 28. Impacts relating to the landfall and cable route are anticipated to primarily be temporary, occurring during the construction phase.</p>	<p>The importance of landscape character, visual amenity and residential amenity are reflected in the location of the onshore substation in a non-designated landscape, the limited number of visual receptors in this local area and the considerations made in the design of the proposed mitigation planting to ensure that significant effects on landscape character and visual amenity will be effectively mitigated in the shortest practicable timeframe .The proposed mitigation planting maintains the character of the district by retaining open fields where possible and enhances it through additional tree planting that will add visual contrast and enclosure, and which is a familiar feature in this local landscape. The introduction of the OnSS will change local landscape character and the proposed mitigation planting will deliver an effective means to mitigate the significant effects that will arise as a consequence.</p>
3.28	<p>Adequacy of the application</p> <p>Chapter 28 of the ES forms the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, and associated figures was submitted in April 2024 following consultation in June, September and November 2023 during which</p>	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
	the scope of the assessment, including landscape receptors, viewpoint locations and resultant visual receptors were agreed. During this process all consultation responses were addressed and the submitted Landscape and Visual chapter appropriately incorporated these elements. The Landscape and Visual Chapter is considered adequate for the examination Authority to begin assessing the impact of the proposal.	
Impact Assessment – Noise and Vibration		
3.29	Local Plan Policy Whilst the ELLP does not include a direct policy on noise and vibration, protection of amenity is considered in both Policy SP10 and SP27.	These comments have been noted by the Applicant.
3.30	The SELLP contains Policy 30: Pollution It considered noise including vibration as well as other issues.	
	<p>Commentary</p> <p>There is the Potential for construction and operational noise and vibration to impact on human health and result in a negative impact.</p>	<p>These comments have been noted by the Applicant, however, construction noise and vibration impacts have been assessed at the nearest human receptors to the landfall, ECC and OnSS and operational noise has been assessed at the nearest human receptors to the OnSS.</p> <p>Where significant construction noise and vibration impacts have been identified a number of mitigation measures have been outlined. With reference to these measures the specific mitigation to be implemented would be determined during the detailed design process and included within the final NVMP.</p> <p>Where operational noise impacts have been identified specific mitigation measures have been recommended to reduce these impacts.</p> <p>The mitigation measures would the reduce construction and operational noise levels and construction vibration levels so, at worst, a <i>'minor level of effect'</i> is experienced at the nearest human receptors, which is also a commitment of the project. This level of effect has been determined in conjunction with relevant standards and guidance which, in turn, consider the human response to potential noise and vibration impact.</p>
3.31	Adequacy of the application Chapter 26 of the Environmental Statement details Noise and Vibration impacts. The chapter is coherent and adopts a robust methodology. The chapter is therefore considered adequate for the Examination Authority to assess the ecology impacts associated with the construction, operation and decommissioning of the proposed development.	These comments have been noted by the Applicant.
Impact Assessment – Socio-Economic Impacts		
3.32	Local Plan Policy The ELLP Policy 13 (SP13) and Policy 21 (SP21) seek to encourage the strengthening of the rural economy by supporting development where it can provide local employment.	These comments have been noted by the Applicant.
3.33	The SELLP does not have a single policy that considers this issue. However, Policy 31: Climate Change and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy does relate to this issue in part owing to it supporting renewable energy development. As a consequence, it encourages economic activity through the construction of such schemes and with its links to mitigating climate change ameliorates societal impact.	
3.34	<p>Commentary</p> <p>The assessment does the minimum amount required to be considered acceptable. The economic methodology relies on single, unexplained assumptions to which it applies basic methodologies. However, it is unlikely that any further details provided would change the overall assessment of significance due to the large size of the Economic Impact Study Area.</p>	These comments have been noted by the Applicant. As the Project is currently at the development stage, sector-wide assumptions have been applied to the socio-economic assessments submitted at DCO application. It is correctly noted that the level of sensitivity of these assumptions to the significance of these impacts is low. The Applicant notes these comments and will continue to engage with Local Authorities and other stakeholders on socio-economics issues.
3.35	Adequacy of the application Chapter 29 of the Environmental Statement reviews the socio-economic impacts. We will continue to work with the Developer to consider the socio-economic impact of the proposal and we are requesting areas of clarification but consider the information adequate for the examination Authority to begin assessing the impact of the proposal on these issues.	These comments have been noted by the Applicant and will continue to engage with the LPAs and other stakeholders on socio-economics issues.

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
Impact Assessment – Traffic and Transport		
3.36	<p>Local Plan Policy</p> <p>The ELLP at Policy 22 (SP22) sets out the criteria for transport and accessibility for development within the district. The SELLP Policy 2: Development Management considers this issue under criterion 4.</p>	These comments have been noted by the Applicant.
3.37	<p>Commentary</p> <p>Regarding the traffic and transport impacts we would adopt the position of Lincolnshire County Council Highway Authority.</p>	
3.38	<p>Adequacy of the application</p> <p>Lincolnshire County Council act as highways Authority and may comment directly on the proposed development. Having reviewed the information put forward, the approach taken appears reasonable and we have no specific comments to offer.</p>	
Impact Assessment – Waste Management		
3.39	<p>Local Plan Policy</p> <p>The Minerals and Waste LP of the Lincolnshire County Council and the related National regulations are relevant to how the waste arising from the construction of the solar park will be organized, recycled and disposed of.</p>	These comments have been noted by the Applicant. It has been assumed that the reference to solar park should be read as a reference to the Project.
3.40	<p>Commentary</p> <p>The submitted Outline Site Waste Management Plan identifies the project obligations with regard to waste legislation. It is understood that the detailed management plan will be submitted for Local Authority approval prior to the commencement of construction.</p>	No stage of the onshore transmission works may commence until the Applicant submits a Site Waste Management Plan (which accords with the Outline Site Waste Management Plan) as part of Requirement 18, Code of Construction Practice of the DCO. This will need to be approved by the relevant planning authority following consultation with LCC.
3.41	<p>Adequacy of the application</p> <p>It is acknowledged that LCC as Waste Disposal Authority are the expert body for this issue and the adequacy of the evidence as submitted. The detailed SWMP should be sent to the Local Authorities for review and comment with regard to Local Policy at the relevant time.</p>	
Impact Assessment – Water Quality and Resources		
3.42	<p>Local Plan Policy</p> <p>Strategic Policy 10 (SP10) - Design. Clause 9 requires that: "Development around water sources will only be supported if it contains adequate protection preventing pollution from entering into the water source." Strategic Policy 17 (SP17) - Coastal East Lindsey. This policy sets out which settlements and areas the coastal policy applies to, which includes those areas of the development shown to be in the combined Flood Hazard Map of East Lindsey on The Coastal Zone map at the start of Chapter 10 in the ELLP. For those areas of the development which fall outside the Coastal Zone Strategic Policy 16 (SP16)</p> <p>- Inland Flood Risk will be relevant which also refers to surface and foul water. SP17 and SP16 both require developments to provide adequate flood mitigation measures.</p>	These comments have been noted by the Applicant.
3.43	<p>The SELLP Policy 30: Pollution (See Appendix 6) considers water quality. It is cross-referenced in the justification for Policy 2: Development Management</p>	
3.44	<p>Commentary</p> <p>We have not previously made comments on this part of the assessment and the impacts of the proposal on any water quality issues so would revert to Lincolnshire County Council Highways who also act as Lead Local Flood Authority.</p>	
3.45	<p>Adequacy of the application</p> <p>Lincolnshire County Council act as Lead Local Flood Authority and may comment directly on the proposed development. Having reviewed the information put forward, the approach taken appears reasonable and we have no specific comments to offer.</p>	

ID	Local Impact Report Comment	Applicant Response
Conclusion		
4.1	It is considered that subject to the requirements in the draft Development Consent Order, that in isolation, or taken cumulatively, the local impacts of this development would be acceptable, and that broadly the scheme would accord with local and National policies.	The Applicant welcomes the conclusions presented by the LPAs within this LIR.