

**COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO EX Q2**

**Q2.1.1** Further to the ExA's question regarding Grid Connection it is worth noting that Navenby was an important staging post on a major Roman Road, Ermine St. There have been many finds in and around the village. The Proposed Navenby Substation is only just over one kilometre from the road. One of the reasons for the delay in submitting a planning application is the requirement for further trial trenching. To date, the only geophysical surveying undertaken has been gradiometry. I assisted my wife, Anne Heard PhD, in undertaking geophysical surveys as part of her Doctorate in Archaeology. Across six successive summers we undertook geophysical surveys including on the Lincoln heath; I speak from experience, gradiometry will show anomalies that resistivity will not and vice-versa. Therefore, there maybe archaeological anomalies within the site not already identified on the gradiometry surveys. Given the potential for important archaeological remains within the site, it may not be possible to mitigate the impact. How can the Applicant be so certain that there will be no reason for planning not to be approved for the Navenby Substation?

**Q2.5.1** Climate monitoring would confirm or otherwise the Applicant's claims regarding Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Given that the UK Government's 2030 target (Clean Power Action Plan) is to reduce the carbon intensity of generation from the grid "to well below 50gCO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh in 2030" and that the Applicant has stated the lifetime intensity of the Proposed Development will be 84.1 gCO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh (Appendix 2 to Response to Deadline 1 Submissions), ie **34.1 gCO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh above the Government 2030 target**, how will the Proposed Development contribute to that target?