

Gate Burton Energy Park Consultation Report: Appendices

APPENDIX H – s42 issues raised by prescribed consultees

Document Reference: EN010131/APP/4.2

January 2023

Regulation 5(2)(q)
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

Summary of issues raised by s42 stakeholders

Submissions received

No	S42	Organisation	Date received
1	a	Canal and River Trust	4th August - email
2	a	Coal Planning Authority	11th July – email
3	a	Environment Agency	3rd August – letter by email
4	a	Health and Safety Executive	29th July – letter by email
5	a	Historic England	28th July – email
6	a	Marion & Gate Burton Council (Representation from Cllr)	12th July – feedback form
7	a	Marion & Gate Burton Parish Council (Representation from Chair)	26th July – email/feedback form
8	a	Ministry of Defence	5th Aug – letter by email
9	a	Natural England	16th Aug – letter by email
10	a	National Grid	19th July – letter by email
11	a	Network Rail	5th August – email
12	a	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	22nd July – letter by email
13	a	Severn Trent Water	5th Aug – email
14	a	Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board	30th Aug – email
15	a	UK Health Security Agency	4th Aug – letter by email
16	a	Western Power Distribution	29th June – letter by email
17	a	Willingham by Stow Parish Council	31st July – email
18	b	Bassetlaw District Council	5th Aug – by email
19	b	City of Lincoln Council	15th July – letter by email 19th July – letter by email
20	b	East Lindsey District Council	11th July – letter by email
21	b	Lincolnshire County Council	5th August – letter by email Addendum - 9th Aug – by email
22	b	Nottinghamshire County Council	19th July – email
23	b	Nottinghamshire County Council	29th July – letter by email
24	b	North East Lincolnshire Council	19th July – email
25	b	West Lindsey District Council	5th Aug – letter by email

1) Canal and River Trust

Canal & River Trust

- Include the Trust in future discussions on location of the cable crossing and agreement on single crossing point (respective project promoters)
- Advise on issues that may affect navigational safety or our interests as an affected landowner
- Undergrounding the river crossing will assist in minimising visual impacts and navigation
- Will resist use of compulsory purchase powers on our land and reserve right to seek protections under s16 of Land Acquisition Act 1981
- Acquisition of Trust land should be secured by agreement and recommend early contact with the Trust's Utilities Team
- Must comply with the Trust's Code of Practice for Works Affecting the Canal & River Trust

Impact on Dredging Tips and Ground Contamination

- Land identified for cable crossing has been used as dredging tips (site to the east of Coates Lane is still used for this purpose). Any use of this land for cables could impact this use and future dredging activities. We recommend in consideration of the final cable route, this land is avoided.
- Environmental Statement to consider impact on dredging, including potential to contain elevated levels of contamination.

Impact on Dredging Tips and Ground Contamination

- River Trent could be used to minimise the need to utilise the highway network. Use of the River Trent should be included in the Transport and Access chapter of the Environmental Statement.

Noise and vibration

- Manage works to minimise risk of significant vibration or loading that could impact stability of the riverbank

Ecology and biodiversity

- Directional drilling on cable installation could result in sediment mobilisation, or the emission of pollutants. Consider impacts on fish and invertebrates in the water and sensitivity to sediment movement.
- Water monitoring should be undertaken during works to ensure any pollution incidents can be rapidly identified and dealt with

Landscape and visual impact

- Agree with PINS Scoping Opinion that advises glint and glare should include boats as receptors. This matter should be considered within the LVIA
- ES should consider the potential visual impact of construction operations on cable route corridor, in particular the siting of construction compounds considered within the LVIA, and river users considered as potential receptors

2) Coal Planning Authority

- No issues to raise

3) Environment Agency

Flood risk

- Cabling route crossing River Trent passes within flood zone 3b. Only water-compatible uses and essential infrastructure should be permitted in this zone.
- Recommend:
 - Easements are established around all watercourses and cable crossing points agreed with relevant parties, to include main rivers, watercourses and IDB assets
 - Critical infrastructure sequentially located to avoid areas of high fluvial flood risk and raised to a sufficient height to avoid flood water. Preference to be located within flood zone 1
 - All services within areas at risk to be designed to be flood resilient/water compatible
 - Site boundary/fencing designed to prevent minor obstructions, allowing continuation of flow routes through the site

Cabling works – River Trent

- Recommend:
 - Launching and landing areas for cabling installation works are a min of 16m from defences
 - Permanent hazard markers on both banks of river
 - All excavated material not re-used is removed from floodplain
 - Further discussion with Partnerships and Strategic Overview Team

Water Framework Directive (WFD) and Biodiversity

- Otter surveys to include assessment of adjacent woodland for otter holt potential. Specific attention to water vole.
- Biodiversity Net Gain to meet 10% as minimum. Improvement in watercourses in the area of flora and fauna, water vole and management of invasive species
- Can marsh land be left and buffered
- Clarify what is mitigation and what is enhancement
- Confirm no potential impact on fish and eel

Water quality

- No polluting matter to enter any surface water or groundwater body without an Environmental Permit
- No water greater than 20m³/day to be removed without Abstraction Licence
- Park Wood East/West SSSI sites which may be affected to have permission from Natural England before work is undertaken

4) Health and Safety Executive

Major hazard pipeline across the site

- Further information required on locations of populations associated with the solar farm.
- Low Carbon must notify the pipeline operator for permission prior to construction within vicinity of pipeline easement – for all works associated with the connection routing
- Advice given in HSE letter 1 December 2021 remains valid

5) Historic England

- Refer to Local Government archaeological advisors re methodologies for assessment of trial trenching results
- Desirable for adjacent solar schemes to share a River Trent crossing option
- The reach of the Trent from around Marton/Littleborough to Torksey presents acute archaeological risks with the combination of Roman and Viking activity and the presence of windblown sand and alluvial deposits
- Consider topographical and tenorial context of the site, visual relationships to more distant assets such as Grade I listed church and scheduled monument at Stow
- Consideration should be given to:
 - Grade II Park Farm South Farmhouse
 - Knaith Park and Priory
 - Grade II Gate Burton Hall
 - Grade II Walled Garden, Church of St Helen, Old Rectory and Gate Burton Hall Cottages
 - Temple folly Burton Chateau
 - Former mill site to south and relationship to Knaith Park
- Important to integrate with an iterative programme of archaeological assessment with Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire County Council Historic Environment specialist
- Note crop marks on the NHRE
- Concerns regarding impact of scheme on Gate Burton Hall and Heynings Priory
- Request a site meeting to examine these matters

6) Marton & Gate Burton Parish Council (Councillor)

- North of Tillbridge start of cable corridor – check for MoD fuel pipeline and potential gas pipe running east to west
- Battery safety – particularly relating to fire access and training/equipment for Lincs Urban Fire Brigade
- Permissive right of way along Willingham Road – engage with Running Club, investigate Park Run
- Consider Ambulance landing place
- Keen to understand more on noise and would like a site visit

7) Marton & Gate Burton Parish Council (Representation from Chair)

- Cumulative impact concern
- Concern regarding loss of agricultural land
- Special consideration to be given to residential area of Gate Burton
- Query regarding what a 'Heritage Buffer' is
- Screening, additional tree and hedgerow planning to be signed off before site is commissioned
- Concern regarding wildlife movements caused by security fencing. Wildlife corridors need to be coordinated across all developments
- Low Carbon must be responsible for land drainage system for site
- Cooperation needed between developed on cable routes to minimise landscape impact
- Concern regarding Clay Lane for operational access, particularly on road condition and usage
- Clarity needed on proposed donation distributed to affected parishes
- Consider Ambucopter landing areas around site
- Consider a permissive path through or around the site for walking and recreational use
- Distribute a proportion of power generated to affected parishes

8) Ministry of Defence

- No safeguarding concerns

9) Natural England

- CEMP, oLEMP, oDEMP to undergo further review for the cable route and design of finalised project

Ecology and nature conservation

- ES should state if international sites within a 10km radius and if present a Habitats Regulation screening assessment is attached to the ES
- Recommend use of Biodiversity Metric 3.1
- DEFRA metric should not be used to assess impacts and calculate compensation for habitat damage. Any impacts should be assessed in accordance with planning policy and via environmental assessment
- CEMP and LEMP should explain how the site will continue to be managed and secured for the lifetime of the project
- Recommend use of Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping (BOM)

Cumulative effects and interactions

- Cumulative effects from the use of Best and Most Versatile land, along with landscape, should be considered regarding solar farm proposals at Six Hundreds Farm and Little Crow
- Sign up to District Level Licencing, if available

Socio economics

- Grid connection has not been surveyed and assessed for Agricultural Land Classification
- Expect a soil survey for areas permanently affected and detailed ALC to identify extend of BMV

- ALC map should be labelled that it is a semi-detailed survey

10) National Grid

- Any proposed buildings must not be closer than 5.3m to the lowest conductor. No permanent structures are build directly underneath overhead lines.
- Only low and slow growing species to be planted underneath and adjacent to existing overhead lines
- Avoid drilling if potential to disturb tower foundations
- No permanent structures are to be built over cables or easement strip
- No altering to ground levels above cables

11) Network Rail

- Key concerns:
 - Glint and glare to rail line and mitigation
 - Impact on railway assets (level crossings and bridges)
 - Management of construction works
 - Details of boundary treatments
 - Lighting and drainage systems that may impact rail operations
- Construction traffic must not impacts level crossings
- Glint and glare study consider impact on level crossing users
- Information not sufficient to assess potential impacts of the scheme on the railway
- Liaise with Network Rail Asset Protection
- Condition of DCO – detailed specification of scheme, Glint and Glare assessment and traffic management plans
- Consideration to be given to ensure construction and maintenance can be carried out without adversely affecting the safety of Network Rail's adjacent land

12) Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

- Local Wildlife Sites are at least of county -level importance and there should be a presumption against development within sites of county biodiversity value
- No reference is made to the mitigation hierarchy in relation to the LWS and not clear on consideration to alternative route to avoid negative impacts on the LWS
- Expect whole LWS to be surveyed for habitat composition, not just development footprint
- Expect every effort to minimise impact on habitats within the LWS. Measures to remove or reduce habitats should be included within the CEMP
- Survey of Cow Pasture Lane Drains should be used to identify areas for additional habitat management to ensure biodiversity net gain
- Cabling operations should be carried out to a PMW or Ecological Method Statement in the presence of an Ecological Clerk of Works

13) Severn Trent Water

- Query relating to impact on Severn Trent property and assets. Subsequently confirmed that no property within order limits owned by Severn Trent (email 9th September) and that only property was a sewage works which was in process of being removed

14) Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board

- Byelaw Number 3 – two areas of concern where historic flooding has occurred; Toft Dyke at Clayworth and Cuckstool Dyke, East of Ossington at Sutton on Trent
- Byelaw 10 – no building or structure within nine metres of the landward toe of the bank - relates to the location of the arrays, compounds and transformer stations
- Attention drawn to Byelaw 17
- All watercourses to be crossed by means of HDD at a depth no less than 2 metres plus the cable safety distance below the hard bed level of all watercourses
- All culverting or other works within the bed of any riparian watercourse will require consent

15) UK Health Security Agency

- Contradiction within the PEIR assessments Section 15.3.26 and 15.2.27 relating to construction traffic estimates. Clarification required on construction traffic and if IAQM criteria are met
- Information on EMF is not provided in Chapter 14 as suggested in Vol3 Appendix 1-C. Justification is required within ES to demonstrate that potential for health impacts is not significant
- An assessment of significance will be required for those health determinants scoped into the population and human health chapter
- Any proposed approach is agrees with OHID/UKHSA and the local Director of Public Health
- Baseline data does not consider local health priorities identified within the local Joint Strategic Needs Assessments, Health and Wellbeing Strategies or other local published data sources
- PINS requirement to use 2022 census data, and so should be used where available
- ES must report the level of significance relating to the construction impacts on the PROW
- CEMP or separate PRoW Management Plan should include sufficient detail regarding mitigation measures for each PRoW

16) Western Power Distribution

- Identified a number of sites in the proposal affect land WPD has assets on. Will object to development until certain assets are protected

17) Willingham by Stow Parish Council

- Concern regarding loss of agricultural land and impact on food production, including restoring land when panels removed
- Concern regarding impact on wildlife, archaeology and local jobs, pus footpaths during construction and local road safety
- Concern regarding local landscape character
- Concern regarding water run off and flooding

18) Bassetlaw District Council

Highway Authority - No objections

Conservation – no additional comments to make

Cultural Heritage (Archaeology) – comments relating to cable route through Bassetlaw District. Comments same as submitted by Lincolnshire County Council – 5th Aug (Historic Environment Officer)

- Study area from boundary of Grid Connection Route to be at least 1km to maximise potential for known archaeology
- Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) data is required
- The future baseline will change following the results of trial trench evaluation
- Programme of recording required for historic earthworks which may be damaged or destroyed during construction
- Thought required for both embedded methodology and on site solutions for potential decommissioning impacts on the Historic Environment
- Non-intrusive solar PV installation – specific impacts will need to be considered. Any proposal in archaeologically sensitive areas will require a firm evidence base proving that works will have no impact on the archaeology
- A staged archaeological programme of investigation and recording is a core aspect of effective archaeological mitigation strategy.
- A mitigation programme strategy will need to be submitted as part of the Environmental Statement

Environmental health

- Study area from boundary of Grid Connection Route to be at least 1km to maximise potential Request further studies on noise and vibration impact
- Share cabling corridors where possible
- All artificial lighting designed to prevent glare or light shining directly into sensitive receptors

Planning

- Cable route to follow least sensitive route and avoid statutory and non-statutory designations and consider appropriate mitigation
- Would have been preferable to consider alternative sites before selection of main site
- Cumulative impact: ES to take into account of the Tillbridge Solar Farm project within submission
- A consistent approach to referencing the Bassetlaw Local Plan is required
- No reference given to policies DM4 and DM 8 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy. ES must make reference to these policies
- Sturton Ward Neighbourhood Plan is absent from list of relevant development plan documents
- No relevant policies from Rampton and Woodbeck and Treswell and Cottam Neighbourhood Plans, which should be in the ES
- Neighbourhood Plan Policies should be stated explicitly
- Development should be viewed in the context that it will reduce total carbon emissions in excess of 100,000 tonnes per annum
- The following Neighbourhood Plans are relevant to cultural heritage:

- Rampton and Woodbeck NP Policy 6 and Character Assessment
- Sturton Ward NP Policy 6 and Design Code
- Treswell & Cottam NP Policy 2 and Character Assessment
- No reference to Policy DM8 of Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Section 16 of the NPPF only referenced once
- A more detailed planning policy assessment in ES would be welcomed
- The following Neighbourhood Plans are relevant to ecology and biodiversity:
 - Rampton & Woodbeck NP Policy 10
 - Sturton Ward NP Policies 2a and 2b
- The following Neighbourhood Plans are relevant to water environment:
 - Sturton Ward NP Policy 4
- The following Neighbourhood Plans are relevant to landscape and visual amenity:
 - Rampton and Woodbeck NP Character Assessment, Policy 10
 - Sturton Ward NP Design Code, Policy 2a
 - Treswell & Cottam NP Policy 2 and Character Assessment
- No Bassetlaw Local Plan policies have been reference in relation to landscape and visual amenity or Chapter 8

19) City of Lincoln Council

No objections

20) East Lindsey District Council

No comments to make

21) Lincolnshire County Council

Cumulative impacts

- Cumulative impact assessment must include NSIPs beyond the 5km search zone and must include all other NSIPs in the West Lindsey District, including Tillbridge Solar

Skills training

- Low Carbon to foster a local skills base, with agreement of financial measures in respect of relevant skills training within the local area

Community benefits

- Consideration to be given to community benefits and legacy opportunities

Archaeology

- Study area from boundary of Grid Connection Route to be at least 1km to maximise potential for known archaeology
- Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) data is required
- The future baseline will change following the results of trial trench evaluation
- Programme of recording required for historic earthworks which may be damaged or destroyed during construction

- Thought required for both embedded methodology and on site solutions for potential decommissioning impacts on the Historic Environment
- Non-intrusive solar PV installation – specific impacts will need to be considered. Any proposal in archaeologically sensitive areas will require a firm evidence base proving that works will have no impact on the archaeology
- A staged archaeological programme of investigation and recording is a core aspect of effective archaeological mitigation strategy.
- A mitigation programme strategy will need to be submitted as part of the Environmental Statement

Planning Authority

- Minerals Safeguarding Area: Documentation does not appear to include any consideration of the potential sterilisation of safeguarded mineral resources.
- A more detailed consideration of the proposed grid connection corridors which pass through the MSA is requested
- To minimise sterilisation of resources, wherever possible, cable route to follow existing constraints and infrastructure corridors or follow the edge of significant landscape features rather than across open fields

Economic Development and Growth

- S106 may wish to be considered due to the disturbance of cable laying in local affected areas

Highways and Lead Local Flood Authority

- The FRA will need to address any large areas of impermeability that may be created, particularly during construction

Landscape and visual impact

- Since Scoping Report issued, the redline boundary has been amended along the western boundary to include two large plots to cover two access points along the A156. These areas have not been captured in discussions
- It is expected to have a reasonable design fix for the final Environmental Statement clearly setting out parameters for the development, such as heights and locations of elements that have been used in the assessment.
- Requested that further landscape and visual consultation is carried out between AAH/LCC and District Authority landscape specialists and the developer team

PEIR Volume 1

- No details in the final location and appearance of taller/larger elements that form part of the development. Have concerns in regards to the larger and taller elements, such as the substation (up to 11m), Control building and office.
- Expect the location and worst cast extent (footprint) of these elements to be identified for the LVIA
- Clarify if any above ground lines and associate poles are proposed
- Extent of vegetation loss to facilitate construction access or the permanent site access is not identified. Also any vegetation loss to facilitate any potential wider highways works is not identified
- Expect any proposed vegetation removal to be surveyed to BS:5837
- It is requested AAH and Low Carbon and other relevant stakeholders are involved and consulted further in regards to the combined crossing and cable corridor. Additional viewpoints and AVRs of the crossing may need to be included within the LVIA

- Expect reference to be made in the LVIA to specific consultation comments regarding 10.2 of the PEIR, such as AAH TM01 and AAH TM02, along with these comments (as AAH TM03)
- Requested that further landscape and visual consultation is carried out between AAH/Low Carbon and District Authority landscape specialists and the developer team
- The LVIA Chapter should include a clear statement on the justification for the extent of the final PEIR Study Area
- Identification of receptors – do not have details on the location and appearance/extent of taller/larger elements which would likely have visual impacts
- The LVIA should clarify why local landscape character assessments were carried out and how they reflect published character assessments. Figure 10.7 is not clear and the legend should reflect the text
- A finer grained site-level character assessment and identification of individual elements is suggested to form the baseline
- The Area of Great Landscape Value should be detailed within the baseline and form a landscape receptor
- Useful to take into account information collated as part of *The Historical Character of the County of Lincolnshire (Sept 2011)*
- Useful to have an assessment of how the development will address the priorities outlined in the Trent Vale Landscape Conservation Management Plan (June 2013) and the Trent Vales Landscape Character Assessment
- Request opportunity to review and discuss additional viewpoint photographs
- Visual receptor assessment should include dog walkers, horse riders and leisure cyclists
- PEIR Vol 2 Fig 2.2 is incorrectly referenced. Actual offset distances are not provided
- The baseline should identify the key elements and features that make up the character area, and the assessment should look at how these would be affected, not just the scale of the project in relation to the character area

PEIR Volume 2

- Mapping:
 - Some figures would benefit from enlarged sections that focus on the site and immediate context, such as viewpoints and PROW information
 - Suggest OS 1:25,000 scale for some figures to aid clarity
- PROW adjacent within the site are unclear, particularly those along red line boundaries. Final plan to be clearer
- Environmental Masterplan – final plan to identify if the mitigation are indicative to allow for flexibility or fixed
- Further meetings and workshops requested on landscape and visual in regards the development, cable route corridor, location of larger structures and mitigation
- PROW adjacent and within the site are unclear
- Legend will be more legible if landscape character assessments identified the regional character areas they are based upon and it matched the text of the report (Table 10.5)
- Suggest a ZTV of taller elements is produced to aid an understanding of potential views

PEIR Volume 3

- Clarify overview of process defining 3km study area now that taller elements indicated on layouts

- Recommend 1:25,000 and 1:10,000 for base mapping
- Effects within the AGLV should be assessed to understand what the change would be in that part of the local landscape designation and what identified key elements of value are impacted and how development change would affect those
- It is not the case that only designated landscapes may have a medium of high value
- Landscape sensitivity – how value and susceptibility are combined as a matrix to assess Sensitivity may be more useful
- Methodology of visualisations would include full details/parameters of the elements that have been modelled for transparency of what is being illustrated and enable this to be references against the worst case design parameters

Viewpoint photography

- Expect full resolution images for the final LVIA
- Ensure images align with the Landscape Institute TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of development proposals
- Elements in mid to long distance often not distinguishable
- VP01 may provide more indication of visibility of substation if either rotated to the right or extended to capture more of the eastern extents
- VP07, C4 and C5 – image does not provide clarity of long distance view and beyond 1 to 2 km appears pixelated
- VP10 – Extending the view to the left would capture site access points
- VP13 – if selected for A156 access option, more context to the view would assist

Climate change questions:

- How are the batteries to be decommissioned?
- What is total battery capacity?
- What battery technology is considered?
- What other sources of emissions have been considered in the worst-case estimate?
- What are possible emissions during operations?
- What is the replacement rate for the sources of emissions in operations?
- What are the emissions sources and total carbon emissions in decommissioning?
- What is the replacement rate of the batteries during operations?
- Is grid decarbonisation considered in the GHG emissions estimations and what is the total net savings from the plant with a decarbonising grid?
- What are the projections of grid decarbonisations over the lifespan of the project?

Lincolnshire County Council - Addendum

- Allocation of land size does not equate to the number of battery cabins that can be installed and the capacity of the BESS unit
- From statement (6.3.30, 6.10.12 and Table 6-19 (Figure 3), given the replacement rates of the products highlighted the estimation of the embodied emission during the operational stage seems to be underestimated

Additional questions:

- Solar PV site allocated space falls below the recommended sizing (2ha to 1MW). How will panels be packed into the space without affective the output energy yield?
- How are the batteries going to be decommissioned considering they will be replaced several times over the plant lifespan?
- What is the total battery capacity?
- Given panels are manufactured in China, how are embodied emission rates of panels estimated?
- What rate of embodied emissions from the BESS is utilised?
- Is grid decarbonisation considered in the GHG emissions estimations and what is the total net savings from the plant with a decarbonising grid?
- What are the projections of grid decarbonisation over the lifespan of the project?
- What is the comparison of Gate Burton with other forms of Energy Generation Technologies?
- GHG Intensity comparison with other forms of Energy Generation Technologies is broad. Can an estimate of the net GHG savings of an equally rated power plant (as Gate Burton) be made?

22) Nottinghamshire County Council

Minerals and waste

- Northern cabling route option buffer zone runs through or close to permitted sand and gravel site at Sturton Le Steeple quarry
- Could cause an issue in terms of safeguarding existing waste management facilities

Rights of way

- Closures during construction to be managed sensitively to optimise connectivity of wader PROW network

Landscape

- Closures during construction to be managed sensitively to optimise connectivity of wader PROW network
- EMD Team to continue to be involved in discussions about location of the cable route corridor and crossing of the river Trent

23) Nottinghamshire County Council

Minerals

- Northern cabling route buffer zone runs close to permitted sand gravel site at Sturton Le Steeple quarry. Check to make sure picked up in scoping as quarry not currently active.

Waste

- Proposed development could cause an issue in terms of safeguarding existing waste management facilities

Rights of way

- Requested that any PROW closures in construction are employed sensitively, and any works that affect the safe use of the PROW should be closed temporarily

Landscape

- Requested that any PROW closures in construction are employed sensitively, and any works that affect the safe use of the PROW should be closed temporarily
- The EMD Team request to continue to be involved in discussions about the location of the cable route corridor and crossing of the River Trent and any new buildings/substations at or around the existing Cottam Power Station

24) North East Lincolnshire Council

No comments to make

25) West Lindsey District Council

- Helpful to explain if the 60 year lifetime is a conservative estimate, applying the Rochdale Envelope
- Relevant policy includes the Lea Neighbourhood Plan
- Are tracking panels part of the proposals?
- National Grid connection to Cottam station is not clear if above or below ground
- Alternative sites – not clear how DCO site was identified and alternative sites considered. Clarity of search parameters.
- Consideration of overhead lines not clear
- Appendix 5-A missing from documents on website (list of other developments)
- Significant impact on seven heritage assets including Heynings Priory Scheduled Monument
- ES will need to reflect findings on marsh/marshy grass land surveys
- North east corner crosses an area of FZ2/3 associated with Padmore Drain; there are localised areas at high risk from surface water
- Justification needed for 3km and not 5km study area for landscape and visual amenity
- LVIA needs to assess sequential effect on transient receptors – car bicycle, walking/hiking and train
- Noise and vibration - an identified environmental impact that needs to be addressed through mitigation
- Findings of agricultural land classification survey (12.12) has not been included in appendices. A plan which displays the ALC findings has not been provided
- Concerned that criteria employed as 12.6.28 should not exclude the site as 'not significant'
- Concern that methodology employed give too much emphasis to the temporary nature of the project and conclusion that impact on agricultural land would be negligible
- Effects of removal of 635HA of agricultural land from production for 60 years needs to be properly assessed in ES
- Baseline study should set out current agricultural use of the sites on a seasonal basis and impact on tourism in Lincolnshire and the visitor economy