

Examining Authority  
National Infrastructure Planning  
The Planning Inspectorate

SENT BY EMAIL ONLY

17 February 2016

Dear Examining Authority

TRITON KNOLL ELECTRICAL SYSTEM  
UNIQUE REFERENCE NUMBER: 10031863  
RESPONSE TO THE EXAMINING AUTHORITY'S THIRD WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Thank you for inviting responses from the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust on the Examining Authority's third written questions. We note that the ExA is seeking comments from the Trust in response to two questions, LVI 3.1 and LVI 3.2. See Appendix 1 for the Trust's response to these questions.

The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust wishes to make some additional comments in response to Appendix 13 Lincolnshire Coastal Grazing Marsh - Field 6 Site E Clarification Note [REP5-026] further to those made in Appendix 1.

Section 5.1 of Appendix 13 lists the potential impacts associated with the installation and operation of cables in Field 6 / Site E. We would just like to point out that the third impact listed should say 'actual' temporary loss of coastal grazing marsh habitat. Unless the Applicants agree to cross the field by trenchless means then there will be a loss of grazing marsh habitat during the construction phase.

With regard to biodiversity enhancements we note that the Applicant is offering to provide £25,000 to the Lincolnshire Coastal Grazing Marshes Project to be held by East Lindsey District Council. Whilst we are disappointed that the contribution being offered is not greater we welcome that the Applicant is offering to make this contribution to the project for capital projects to create or restore grazing marsh habitat. Biodiversity enhancements linked to the grazing marshes project is to be welcomed given that the project, if consented, will be impacting on existing grazing marsh sites. We are pleased that the Applicant recognises the importance of this habitat and therefore has a desire to ensure that there is a net gain in grazing marsh habitat within the project target areas.

It is not the Trust's intention to repeat comments made previously in written representations and responses to ExA questions. However, given that the ExA queried the Trust's agreement to mitigation measures for the grazing marshes at the hearing on 19 January 2016 we would like to reiterate that the Trust has only agreed to mitigation measures in the event that consent is granted with the cable route as currently proposed crossing through the middle of the site. The Trust's preference would be for Field 6 / Site E to be crossed by trenchless means or the suggested

Banovallum House  
Manor House Street  
Horncastle  
Lincolnshire  
LN9 5HF

Tel: 01507 526667  
Fax: 01507 525732

info@lincstrust.co.uk  
www.lincstrust.org.uk



Lincolnshire Wildlife  
Trust is a company  
limited by guarantee  
registered in  
England, no. 461863  
and is registered as a  
charity, no. 218895  
VAT no. 613 9067 44

alternative route adjacent to the ditch and road. This was stated in our response to Question EOn 2.5 and at the hearing on 19 January 2016.

Thank you again for the opportunity to submit further comments. Should you have any queries on the above or Appendix 1 please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Elizabeth Biott.

Elizabeth Biott  
Conservation Officer

## **APPENDIX 1**

**LINCOLNSHIRE WILDLIFE TRUST  
UNIQUE REFERENCE NUMBER: 10031863**

**TRITON KNOLL ELECTRICAL SYSTEM**

**RESPONSE TO THE EXAMINING AUTHORITY'S THIRD WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

### **LVI 3.1**

*The ExA notes the comments from the Applicant in section 2 of Appendix 13 [REP5-026] relating to the dispute between the Applicant and Mr Spence in respect to how the habitat was created. The Applicant said this was achieved by impeding the flow of water (entering as rainfall) into the drainage ditches that surround the site through the compaction of soil around the field's perimeter and the breaking of the existing drainage infrastructure; Mr Spence stating it was achieved differently.*

*Can the Applicant and Mr Spence establish the correct method of drainage?*

*If the Applicant concedes that Mr Spence is correct, does this affect how construction techniques would be deployed at the site, particularly as Appendix 1 of the Construction Method Statement [REP4-048] says that trenchless techniques would be used at the site's boundaries?*

The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust considers that the second question is more for the Applicant to address rather than LWT as we do not have the expertise in construction techniques to answer such a question. However, the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust understands that the Applicant intends to continue to include trenchless crossing techniques at the site's boundaries within the suite of mitigations to provide extra comfort that a preferential drainage pathway leading to the drainage ditches would not be created (see paragraph 5.21 of Appendix 13 [REP5-026]).

### **LVI 3.2**

*Provide comments on the statement made by the Applicant in Section 4 and Appendix 1 of Appendix 13 Lincolnshire Coastal Grazing Marsh - Field 6 Site E Clarification Note [REP5-026] in respect of the disadvantages and potential other issues from realigning the cable route closer to the boundaries of the site.*

The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust does not have the technical expertise to comment on the engineering disadvantages to moving the cable route closer to the boundaries of the site, such as cable tension. Regarding the proximity to the boundary ditch however we would query the requirement for a 10m stand off and would suggest that this could be reduced given the size of the ditch and the pollution prevention measures that would be put in place during construction. If pollution is thought to be a potential problem then the ditch could be temporarily bunded at either end.

Whilst we welcome the Applicant's attempt to demonstrate how the proposed and alternative routes compare visually in Figure 1, and in area of overlap in paragraph 4.8, it should be noted that the cable corridor width used is incorrect. Figure 1 and the areas given are based on a cable corridor of 60m. One of the mitigation measures agreed for Field 6/Site E is for the cable corridor to be reduced to 40m. The area of overlap of a 40m corridor as proposed and on the realigned route would therefore be less than 1.3 ha. Should the realigned route be closer to the boundary ditch than 10m then this overlap would reduce further. We acknowledge that the realigned route would still involve works undertaken across the linear channels (referred to as foot drains in Appendix 13), however, it would cause less disruption than trenching through the middle of the field and we understand from Andrew Spence that if water loss is found to be a problem after the site is restored then it would be much easier to rectify if the realigned route were used rather than the proposed route across the middle of the site, which cuts the linear channels in two.