

**Application by Gate Burton Energy Park Limited for Gate Burton Energy Park
The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ3)
Issued on 25 October 2023**

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL (GABE-ISP002)

Answers to Examining Authority's Questions (ExQ3)

Gate Burton Energy Park EN10131

Deadline 5

Date: 20th November 2023

Preamble:

This document provides the response of West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) to the Examining Authority's questions.

Abbreviations used

A2008	The Planning Act 2008	LoNI	Letter of No Impediment
AC	Alternating Current	LPA	Local planning authority
ALA 1981	Acquisition of Land Act 1981	MMO	Marine Management Organisation
Art	Article	MP	Model Provision (in the MP Order)
AS	Additional Submissions	MW	Mega Watts
BDC	Bassetlaw District Council	NCC	Nottinghamshire County Council
BESS	Battery Energy Storage System	NE	Natural England
BMV	Best and Most Versatile land	NGED	National Grid Electricity Distribution (East Midlands) Plc
BoR	Book of Reference	NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
CA	Compulsory Acquisition	NPS	National Policy Statement
CPO	Compulsory purchase order	NRMM	Non-Road Mobile Machinery
CTMP	Construction Traffic Management Plan	NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
dB	Decibels	OLEMP	Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan
dDCO	Draft DCO	PoC	Point of Connection
EA	Environment Agency	PSED	Public Sector Equality Duty
EM	Explanatory Memorandum	PV	Photovoltaics
EMF	Electro Magnetic Field	R	Requirement
ERP	Emergency Response Plan	RR	Relevant Representation
ES	Environmental Statement	SI	Statutory Instrument
ExA	Examining authority	SOAEL	Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level
fCEMP	Framework Construction Management Plan	SoR	Statement of Reasons
foEMP	Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan	SoS	Secretary of State
Ha	Hectares	TA	Transport Assessment

HE	Historic England	TP	Temporary Possession
HSE	Health and Safety Executive	TPO	Tree Preservation Order
Kv	Kilo Volt	WFD	Water Framework Directive
LCC	Lincolnshire County Council	WLDC	West Lindsay District Council
LIR	Local Impact Report		

ExQ3 – 25th October 2023:

Responses due by Deadline 5: 20th November 2023

EXQ3	Question to	Question	WLDC Response
1	Principle and nature of development		
Q3.1.6	All Parties	<p>Joint Report on Interrelationships between NSIPs [REP4-050]</p> <p>Comment on Appendix E (Review of Cumulative effects) to the Joint Report on Interrelationships between NSIPs including the approach and overall conclusions.</p>	<p>WLDC have produced a separate response to the Joint Report on Interrelationships between NSIPs (REP4-050) , which has also been submitted at Deadline 5. The comments made relate to the document as a whole, including Appendix E</p> <p>WLDC comments are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There appear to be discrepancies between the Climate Change chapters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Methodologies and therefore the assessed impacts are different between the cumulative schemes. • There appear to be discrepancies between Cultural Heritage chapters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reviews of Cottam and WB assume negligible cumulative impacts with Tillbridge; Tillbridge claims it is too early to claim this. This is contradictory. • There appear to be discrepancies between Ecology chapters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cottam and WB claim moderate cumulative beneficial effects to reptiles and amphibians; this significant beneficial effect is not identified for GB. ○ Cottam and WB claim moderate cumulative adverse effects to Skylark; GB ES claims no significant cumulative effect on skylark populations. This is contradictory. • There appear to be discrepancies between LVIA chapters:

ExQ3 – 25th October 2023:

Responses due by Deadline 5: 20th November 2023

EXQ3	Question to	Question	WLDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cottam and WB claim no cumulative effects, but GB claims moderate adverse. This is contradictory. • There appear to be discrepancies between Socio-economics chapters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Several significant beneficial and adverse cumulative effects identified by Cottam and WB; GB does not identify any significant cumulative effects. • There appear to be discrepancies between Human Health chapters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ GB does not identify any significant cumulative effects; this differs to Cottam and WB. • There appear to be discrepancies between Waste chapters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Methodologies and therefore the assessed impacts are different.
Q3.1.11	All Parties	<p>Supporting Environmental Information Report [CR1-043]</p> <p>Does the supporting Environmental Information in relation to the Change request provide sufficient information to support its conclusions and does it alter any of the overall conclusions reached in respect of the Proposed Development that you have previously raised and submitted into the examination. Please explain any response.</p>	<p>WLDC raises no objections or concerns regarding the Environmental Information submitted in connection with the Change request.</p>
<p>2 Air Quality and Emissions</p>			
Q3.13.4	Lincolnshire County Council,	Appendix D to the Joint Report on	<p>WLDC have produced a separate response to the Joint Report on Interrelationships between NSIPs (REP4-050) , which has</p>

ExQ3 – 25th October 2023:

Responses due by Deadline 5: 20th November 2023

EXQ3	Question to	Question	WLDC Response
	Nottinghamshire County Council	Interrelationships between NSIPs Comment on Appendix D (Cumulative Impacts on Traffic Technical Note) to the Joint Report on Interrelationships between NSIPs [REP4-050] including on its approach and conclusions.	also been submitted at Deadline 5. The comments made relate to the document as a whole, including Appendix D. WLDC comments are summarised below: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The findings of the Traffic Technical Note are that there is no change from what was assessed in the GB ES: <i>'no projects identified [...] were considered (in combination) to impact any of the receptors identified in the assessment and that the effects were not significant'</i>.• However, this does not address conflicting timescales between the schemes.• The proliferation of construction traffic for 5 years or more will discourage the use of rural highways for recreation use, resulting in a further negative impact upon the wellbeing and mental health of local residents and people using the district for leisure purposes.• This does not take into account the local amenity impact of the cumulative construction traffic associated with the proposed solar schemes. Whilst it is acknowledged an assessment of access to local health services and work has been undertaken, this does take into account the impact on the mental health that traffic could have on the community.