

Dear Mr MacDonald

Responses to Examining Authority's First Written Questions

I refer to the recent Pre-Inquiry meeting, your subsequent Rule 8 letter dated 11th September, and the attached 'First Written Questions'. This letter constitutes East Lindsey District Council's response to those questions. In order to assist in the assimilation of these responses, we have used the same rubrics as your schedule.

DCO 1.13 – East Lindsey DC is content that five days is sufficient time to deal with the notification.

DCO 1.15 – East Lindsey DC is content with both points.

DCO 1.26 – East Lindsey DC is content that this provision can be included in the draft DCO.

DCO 1.32 – The way it has been explained by the applicants, East Lindsey DC find it a helpful approach to create separate stages.

DCO 1.55 – East Lindsey DC accept the time limit of 8 weeks.

Alt 1.31 – RWe (the then applicant) put forward a number of possible sites for the Intermediate Electrical Compound (IEC) within East Lindsey. East Lindsey District Council expressed concern regarding all of them. They included sites in the Orby area. This was of particular concern as there was not only an outstanding on-shore wind farm appeal very close to the site, but also the sites were in open countryside. To have such 'industrial elements' in open countryside would have presented an alien intrusion into what is defined in the Council's Landscape Character assessment as a simple rural landscape. We also expressed concern regarding the lack of any benefit by way of economic generation or job opportunity in this area of acknowledged deprivation. RWe then promoted the Industrial site at Skegness which had been stagnant for some time, and it was felt, that the Intermediate Compound would be a good catalyst to get the industrial area developing. Those involved in the discussions from the applicants' side were also able to confirm that the community fund to be established in relation to this project could also be used to further economic growth. The economy of the coast is reliant on tourism, hospitality and care and many of those jobs are seasonal. Anything that would make a contribution to the economic wellbeing of the coast was to be encouraged. This was felt to be such an initiative and the site put forward by

the applicants as a better option than Orby, both in terms of a) less harm to the environment, subject to clarification on noise impact, and b) most benefit to the economy, was supported by ELDC. (nb see response to Alt 1.33 below)

Alt 1.33 – The Vision for Skegness came forward from the landowner, actively supported by the County Council, a few weeks after the site had been chosen as a favoured location for the IEC. At a meeting attended by ELDC, agents for the owners and Lincolnshire County Council (both planning and economic development) the Vision was expounded. It included a new road, linking the A158 and the A52 together with a northern link road from the A158 to Ingoldmells which would ease traffic in the town centre of Skegness and provide a de facto by pass for the village of Orby which suffers from summer holiday traffic going to Ingoldmells, Chapel St Leonards and points north. In the light of that initiative, and the promised major investment into Skegness and its environs, particularly in the light of the northern link to be funded, we understood from that meeting, by the County Council, East Lindsey District Council were delighted to give their support. At the same time, a planning application was submitted for leisure development on the south side of the brown zone. In the light of the plans for 'The Vision' and the leisure development application, RWe decided to abandon the 'Brown Zone' as an area of search. Since that meeting and the abandonment of the Brown Zone, we have heard no more regarding 'The Vision for Skegness'. It is perhaps a question best put to the owners or the County Council regarding the current status of the 'Vision'.

Alt 1.35 – It is a correct statement. Having expressed concerns regarding the Orby site and then had the 'preferred' site in the brown zone effectively taken away, ELDC felt that it could not advise as to which site was a preference. They were in a very difficult position. We will address this in our LIR and in our written submissions.

Alt 1.36 – ELDC will address this in our written submissions. In general however ELDC have concerns regarding the consolidation of development in the area and the fact that remedial screening will take 15 years to mature; the life of the project being 25 years.

Alt 1.37 – The yellow zone, was felt to be quite open to view and as such would be a more prominent, alien, feature in the landscape and could not be supported.

AH 1.7 – ELDC has engaged the services of the Lincolnshire County Council Archaeological service to deal with this matter on their behalf and as such ELDC rely on their comments.

AH 1.8 - ELDC will address this in our written submissions. In general however the Policy A5 of the development plan is something that the proposed IEC will have difficulty complying with as it will have a harmful impact upon the character of the area. ELDC will draw particular attention to 2.92-2.96 of the explanatory notes for Policy A5.

CA 1.21- ELDC do not wish to be the body approving a guarantee. We are content with the suggestion in Article 38. This is National Infrastructure and as such there is national, rather than local responsibility.

LV 1.3 - The 3km and 1km radii were selected as pragmatic distances having regard to the scale of the developments within East Lindsey District.

LV 1.24 – This will be covered in the LIR.

I trust that this information is helpful.

Yours sincerely

David Loveday BSc MRTPI
(for East Lindsey DC)