



**Triton Knoll Offshore Wind Farm Limited
Triton Knoll Electrical System**



**Appendix 15: LCGM Site E / Field 6
Mitigation Update Note**

Date: 29 February 2016

**Appendix 15 of the Applicant's
Response to Deadline 8**

Triton Knoll Offshore Wind Farm Limited

Triton Knoll Electrical System

Appendix 15: LCGM Site E / Field 6 Mitigation
Update Note

Appendix 15 of the Applicant's Response to
Deadline 8

Date: 29 February 2016

Triton Knoll
Offshore Wind Farm Limited
4th Floor One Kingdom Street
Paddington Central
London
W2 6BD

T: 0845 026 0562
Email: info@tritonknoll.co.uk

www.rweinnogy.com/tritonknoll

Drafted By:	TKOWF
Approved By:	Kim Gauld-Clark
Date of Approval:	29 February 2016
Revision:	1.0

Triton Knoll
Offshore Wind Farm Limited
Copyright © 2015 RWE
Innogy UK Ltd
All pre-existing rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. LCGM Site E / Field 6 Mitigation Update Note	4
National Policy	4
Site Selection	4
Trenched Crossing Mitigation	5
Horizontal Directional Drill Crossing Mitigation	5

1. LCGM Site E / Field 6 Mitigation Update Note

National Policy

- 1.1 The Applicant refers the ExA to the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1) which sets out the relevant policy considerations in relation the Lincolnshire Coastal Grazing Marsh target areas and sites. In particular the ExA is directed to paragraph 5.3.13 which states:

“5.3.13 Sites of regional and local biodiversity and geological interest, which include Regionally Important Geological Sites, Local Nature Reserves and Local Sites, have a fundamental role to play in meeting overall national biodiversity targets; contributing to the quality of life and the well-being of the community; and in supporting research and education. The IPC should give due consideration to such regional or local designations. However, given the need for new infrastructure, these designations should not be used in themselves to refuse development consent.”

- 1.2 The Applicant notes that the provision set out above clearly states that given the need for new energy infrastructure the IPC (now the Secretary of State) should give due consideration to regional or local designations but that they should not be used in themselves to refuse development consent. It is the Applicant’s position that these considerations relate to ‘Local Nature Reserves and Local Sites’. The LCGM target areas and sites do not qualify as ‘Local Nature Reserves and Local Sites’ and are therefore not afforded this level of consideration and protection in national policy.

Site Selection

- 1.3 The Applicant notes that concerns have been expressed in relation to the routing of the cable corridor through the LCGM Target Area and Site E / Field 6. The Applicant refers the ExA to its previous responses on this, in particular section 4 of the Lincolnshire Coastal Grazing Marsh - Field 6 Site E Clarification Note submitted as Appendix 13 of the Applicant's Response to Deadline 5 [REP5-026].
- 1.4 The Applicant notes LWT’s continued objection to the routeing of the cable corridor through Field 6/Site E. The Applicant would refer the ExA to paragraphs 4.5 to 4.9 of the Coastal Grazing Marsh – Field 6 / Site E Clarification Note, submitted at Appendix 13 to the Applicant’s submission to Deadline 5 [REP5-026]. This explains that Appendix 1 to the LWT Deadline 1 submission [REP1-015] identifies the local grazing marsh constraints in the vicinity of the cable corridor and therefore demonstrates the lack of opportunities for avoiding this sensitive site.

-
- 1.5 Further, the Applicant note's LWT's objection to routing the cable corridor through the Huttoft and Burgh-le-Marsh LCGM Target Areas. The Applicant recognises the remit of LWT in respect of the LCGM but considers that LWT's view fails to consider the wider siting and design constraints of the cable corridor. For example LWT has informally expressed a preference for the route to go through the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB, a national designation, rather than through a LCGM target area, which has no national or local designation status. The Applicant's position is that routing the cable corridor through a nationally designated landscape in order to avoid a non-designated local asset would not be acceptable under wider national planning policy such as NPS EN-1 which states in paragraph 5.9.9;

"5.9.9 National Parks, the Broads and AONBs have been confirmed by the Government as having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. Each of these designated areas has specific statutory purposes which help ensure their continued protection and which the IPC should have regard to in its decisions. The conservation of the natural beauty of the landscape and countryside should be given substantial weight by the IPC in deciding on applications for development consent in these areas."

- 1.6 It is important that the continued objection from LWT is considered within that wider context, and in light of the fact that LWT's specific and principle concerns relating the Site E / Field 6 have been addressed through the adoption of the mitigation described below.

Trenched Crossing Mitigation

- 1.7 The Applicant has spent considerable amount of time developing mitigation with key stakeholders, including LWT and Natural England, in relation to the crossing of the two LCGM target areas and in particular Site E / Field 6.
- 1.8 The mitigation measures proposed (Appendices 22 and 27 of Response to Deadline 4 [REP4-049] and [REP4-054] respectively) ensure that there are **No Significant** impacts on the local flora and fauna (including that of the LCGM) (as agreed with Natural England - paragraph 4.80, Appendix 18 of the Response to Deadline 2; and the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust – paragraph 4.33, Appendix 34 of the Response to Deadline 4 [REP4-064]). It is noted that minor adverse effects will reduce to be negligible or nil following restoration of habitats.
- 1.9 The Applicant maintains that this mitigation is both appropriate and adequate to minimise impacts on the environment and in particular the impact on the LCGM.

Horizontal Directional Drill Crossing Mitigation

- 1.10 In advance of pre-construction surveys, and while maintaining that it is not necessary to mitigate impacts further, the Applicant has carried out a further engineering evaluation and
-

considers that a horizontal directional drill crossing while adding engineering and scheduling risk is technically feasible for Site E/Field 6.

1.11 The Applicant maintains that a trenched crossing is appropriate and agrees with Natural England and LWT that the agreed trenched mitigation ensure that any impacts will be minor adverse at worse. However, in light of the continued concern expressed by local stakeholders, the Applicant is able to provide a further commitment to crossing this locally valued site through a horizontal directional drill under the entire site.

1.12 The Applicant has set out in the Outline Construction Method Statement (Revision E) submitted as Appendix 29 of the Applicant Response to Deadline 7, its updated suite of mitigation for LCGM Site E / Field 6 as follows:

- *“Drains bordering the field (reference numbers DK 179, RD 180, DK 181, UT 182 and DK 183) and the entire length of LCGM Site E / Field 6, will be crossed using a horizontal direction drilling technique. The crossing launch and exit pits (located outside the field) will be situated at least 10m away from the ditch bank. This will ensure that measures taken by the LCGM project to raise water table levels will not be compromised by the installation of cable ducts; If following site investigation a horizontal direction drill of the entire length of LCGM Site E / Field 6 is deemed to be not technically feasible a trenched crossing will be reserved as a back-up option between the drain crossings.*
- *Haul road (~340m) to be constructed of temporary panels laid on surface without soil stripping located to the edge of the Order limits;*
- *To enable remaining grassland to be managed appropriately, livestock will be granted access to cross the Order Limits (through gated access in fences) when it is possible to be safely and carefully managed. Grass sward within the Order Limits will be managed appropriately using mechanical measures (e.g. grass mowing, strimming etc.);*
- *Use netting or other barrier to screen the working area from surrounding area if required (to be determined by the ECoW);*
- *To schedule the works appropriately to minimise impacts to wintering/breeding birds and to avoid times of inundation. During detailed construction scheduling duct installation will be scheduled to begin within this field between August and October to minimise potential disturbance of breeding lapwing;*
- *To reinstate the scrapes/blind ended ditches as currently in place to the current layout. The location, depth and form of scrapes will be accurately plotted via a topographical survey prior to construction beginning within the field to ensure that the current landscape can be restored accurately following removal of the haul road;*
- *To discharge any water pumped from the working area to scrapes/blind ended ditches should this be determined as a benefit to biodiversity;*
- *Restore the site once the haul road has been removed*
- *Following restoration the re-instated foot drains will be refilled with water to an agreed level if necessary. This activity would only be carried out should the relevant authority grant*

a temporary abstraction licence. The need for this measure would be determined by the ECoW and the Agricultural Liaison Officer in discussion with the landowner.”

- 1.13 It is the Applicant’s position that this additional mitigation also provides further confidence that the impacts on Site E / Field 6 are minor adverse or below and that impacts have been minimised as far as practicable.
- 1.14 It is the Applicant’s position that this additional mitigation, although not necessary to ensure no significant impacts, provides further confidence that the impacts on Site E / Field 6 are minor adverse or below, that impacts have been minimised as far as practicable. Further, the Applicant is seeking to secure £25,000 enhancement mitigation funding package for the Lincolnshire Coastal Grazing Marsh through a bilateral agreement with LWT. Together, these two measures address LWT’s, Mr Wardle’s and Mr Spence’s concerns about open trenching and future grazing marsh creation.