The Great Grid Upgrade

North Humber to High Marnham

NHHM-AEC-CNS-REP-0014

North Humber to High Marnham

Volume 5: Reports and Statements

Document 5.1 Consultation Report Appendix K - Responses to Statutory and Prescribed consultees

Final Issue A

October 2026

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN020034

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 Regulation 5(2)(q)

nationalgrid

Contents

Appendix K Responses to Statutory and Prescribed consultees K-1

Appendix K
Responses to Statutory and Prescribed consultees

Amcotts Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
I would like to note that Amcotts Parish Council have no comments to make at this stage.	National Grid note this feedback.

Anglian Water Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Anglian Water Services (AWS) is the appointed water services undertaker for part of the route once it enters Bassetlaw district at Tindale Bank Road and then proceeds south to High Marnham. These are sections 8 to 11 of the route. The other statutory undertakers for water supply and wastewater recycling are Severn Trent and Yorkshire Water. The following response is submitted on behalf of AWS in its statutory capacity and relates to water resources and water supply network. We previously submitted comments on the nonstatutory consultation dated 5th August 2024 which should also be read alongside this response. AWS's previous response identified a significant number of existing AWS water supply network assets which serve towns and villages along the route. We identified some concerns on the need to ensure that the proposed pylons and construction work will avoid impacting or being in close proximity to AWS assets. We note that a more detailed route alignment has been undertaken and provided through this statutory consultation.	National Grid note this feedback.
In view of the possible multiple locations for potential diversions and where changes to project asset locations could avoid impacts and diversions, we welcome preliminary engagement on the potential	Engagement between National Grid and AWS on the potential impacts the route and associated infrastructure might have on Anglian Water assets was held throughout the pre application stage.

Anglian Water Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
impacts the route and associated infrastructure including sub-stations might have on our assets. We ask that the project continues to ensure that adequate assessment is given to minimising the need to disrupt or divert utility assets which has a carbon impact and increases the risk of service disruption. We would welcome such engagement to ensure that AWS and the project have reached agreement on the approach to assets and connections in order that these matters are not drawn out during the Examination.	Discussions remain ongoing in regard to AWS assessment work for potential Project impacts upon AWS infrastructure. **Application Document 5.8.19 – Anglian Water** provides a Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and AWS.
AWS requests that the following stand-off distances are applied (as indicated in our template Protective Provisions) for working each side of the medial line of pipes where construction works are undertaken - including where cabling is undergrounded, CSE compounds, and where pylons are constructed. (a) 4 metres where the diameter of the pipe is less than 250 millimetres; (b) 5 metres where the diameter of the pipe is between 250 and 400 millimetres, and (c) a distance to be agreed on a case-by-case basis and before the submission of the Plan under sub-paragraph (1) is submitted where the diameter of the pipe exceeds 400 millimetres.	National Grid can confirm that the minimum stand off distances requested have been taken into account during the detailed design process and that appropriate separation distances and protection measures will be maintained where reasonably practicable.
Baseline work including ground investigation and archaeology geophysical surveys will enable minimisation interfaces with our assets. We recommend that the NH2HM team identify the location of AWS assets (both above and below ground) from a desktop study of utilities searches. This should be undertaken to establish the extent of AWS's current and planned assets which may be within the project application boundary. This is also relevant to the Strategic Pipeline Alliance (SPA) line Our strategic pipelines and other AMP8 investment schemes which may be planned in this area. Maps of our underground assets are available to view at the following link:	The Project identified the location of AWS assets (both above and below ground) from a desktop study of utilities searches as requested. The Project has requested that AWS provide all available asset information to support on-going design development and assessment of potential interactions with AWS infrastructure. National Grid will continue with utilities surveys and detailed design development to verify AWS assets.

Anglian Water Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
http://www.digdat.co.uk/ For queries relating to above ground assets and formal easements, you should contact AWS's estates team on: awsestates@savills.com	
These should be mapped to establish interactions with assets and the scheme designed to avoid impacts upon those assets. Your project team can then provide AWS with a crossing schedule for locations where groundworks are likely to require the diversion and/ or protection of AWS assets. We recommend that the project follows the same approach as the Bramford to Twinstead and other National Grid projects and provide a plan and GIS layer showing all AWS asset interactions and diversions. This can for example enable pylons and works areas to be amended to remove any interactions.	A crossing schedule for locations where groundworks are likely to require the diversion and/ or protection of AWS assets and a plan and GIS layer showing all AWS asset interactions and diversions has been provided.
We welcome the intention to produce a Construction Management Plan (CEMP) and Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). These should include steps to remove the risk of damage to AWS assets from plant and machinery (compaction and vibration during the construction phase) including any haul and access roads and crossings.	**Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice and Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** provide steps to remove the risk of damage to consultee's assets from plant and machinery (compaction and vibration during the construction phase) including any haul and access roads and crossings. **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** includes measures relating to potential damage to buildings and structures from construction vibration. It also includes measures which require the Main Works Contractor(s) to prepare detailed construction noise and vibration assessments and determine specific mitigation measures. With regards to vibration, this would include the use of alternative methods (i.e. the use of non-vibratory methods) or reducing energy to limit the level of vibration. Prior to construction a Noise and Vibration Management Plan will be prepared, substantially based upon **Application Document 7.7 Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan** which sets out the good practice construction practices (known as best practicable means (BPM)) in relation to noise and vibration) to be followed by the Project.

Anglian Water Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Water Resources and Water Supply	
In view of the guidance in the National Policy Statements, we welcome reference to water supply and water resources in the PEIR. Chapter 11 section 11.4.19 states that: "It is also assumed that there would be no new temporary or permanent abstractions from surface water sources and that the water supply needs of the Proposed Overhead National Grid Line during construction would be sourced either from mains water supply or, in remote locations where this option may not be available, water would be brought to site in tankers…The results of the initial assessments are being consulted on in a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) during our statutory consultation before being refined and submitted in an Environmental Statement (ES) which will form part of the eventual DCO application."	Noted.
The NH2HM project is located within the Water Resource Zones (WRZ) of 'Lincolnshire Retford and Gainsborough' and designated as being within a 'seriously water stressed' region. In view of the potential impacts on water resources, the Applicant is advised to consider the published Water Resources East Regional Plan and AWS's Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) - Water resources management plan The WRMP should therefore be added to the data sources listed.	**Application Document 6.11 Water Environment** contains a Water Resource Assessment at **6.11.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.2 - Water Resources Assessment** taking into consideration the Project location with the Lincolnshire Retford and Gainsborough WRZ and its designation as a 'seriously water stressed' region having given consideration to the Water Resources East Regional Plan and AWS's Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP). No impacts are expected to arise from the Project on water resources.
The project's EIA will need to consider water resources and water efficiency through the preparation of a Water Resources Assessment (WRA). AWS recommends that the WRA is an integral part of Chapter 11 Water Environment. AWS does not consider that sufficient information has been provided to reach a conclusion on the project's potential impacts regarding water supply. Impacts of climate change	The Environmental Impact Assessment has considered water resources and water efficiency impacts, including impacts from climate change in terms of water availability, arising from the Project during construction and operation. These have been assessed and are presented in **Application Document 6.11: Water Environment** and the accompanying **Appendix 6.11.2 Water Resource Assessment.** No potential

Anglian Water Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
in terms of water availability for the construction and operation stages are also of relevance.	significant effects following application of the good practice measures set out in **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice** have been identified.
AWS has a statutory duty to supply water for domestic purposes. This means we are legally obliged to supply water to all household properties as well as any domestic requirements (e.g., drinking water, hand-basins, toilets and showers) of non-household properties. In many cases, domestic demand will be the only requirement for non-household properties (e.g., schools, hospitals, offices, shops and hairdressers). Non-domestic demand refers to water use for industrial processes, (e.g., agri-food production or car washes), and there is no legal requirement for us to supply for this type of water usage where it might put at risk our ability to supply water for domestic purposes. Although AWS does not have a statutory obligation to supply for non-domestic purposes in these circumstances, we factor this into our WRMP and we do everything we can to support businesses in the region, with the help of the water retail market. AWS is currently in the unfortunate position that it needs to limit requests for additional water for process use to up to 20m3/day per site. AWS advises through it's 'Non Domestic Water Requests Policy' December 2024 (copy attached) - that new non-household water supply requests (construction and operational phases) may be declined as these could compromise our regulatory priority of supplying existing and planned domestic growth.	A Water Resource Assessment is appended to **Application Document 6.11: Water Environment** in **Appendix 6.11.2 Water Resource Assessment**. This quantifies the Project's water demand and describes the proposed water use efficiency measures that would be adopted and secured through a commitment within **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments**. The WRA outlines the projects non-domestic (and domestic) water supply requirements during its construction. During operation of the Project there will be no demand on water resources for domestic or non- domestic uses.
However, for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects that are requesting over 20m3/day of non-domestic water (as defined above) for a scheme, a WRA must be completed. This is so we can better understand water demands, water efficiency measures and more effectively forecast water supply requirements. This will help enable us to support projects that help achieve national ambitions such as achieving net zero carbon and unlocking sustainable growth.	The Water Resource Assessment presented as **Application Document 6.11.2** quantifies the Project's water demand and describes the proposed water use efficiency measures that would be adopted and secured through a commitment within **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments**, including explanation of water requirements for

Anglian Water Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
To assess these requests, we require a WRA to be submitted as part of our planning process setting out a daily demand for each stage of the project and whether this is for domestic or nondomestic uses. A copy of our WRA template is attached with this letter. The Applicant should confirm whether there will be temporary concrete batching facilities with consequent water demands or would be produced offsite and so not require an on-site supply. Water requirements for firefighting measures and construction traffic (dust suppression/ wheel washing areas) should also be explained. AWS also requires that the project seeks to minimise its demand for water and records this in the WRA.	firefighting measures and construction traffic (dust suppression/ wheel washing areas) and records how the Project seeks to minimise its demand for water. No temporary concrete batching facilities are proposed by the Project.
Ongoing Engagement	
Acknowledgment of future attendance at the project inception meeting on 30 April 2025 to discuss the consultation feedback.	**Application Document 5.8.19 Statement of Common Ground – Anglian Water** sets out the engagement activities which have taken place between the Applicant and AWS.

Associated British Ports (ABP) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
ABP Humber would like to participate in any planned workshops as the nature of the proposed works will potentially impact the River Ouse commercial vessel movements, local businesses, as well as leisure users.	ABP have been consulted throughout the pre application process. Application Document 5.8.10 Statement of Common Ground – Associated British Ports sets out the engagement activities which have taken place between the Applicant and ABP.
ABP are the Statutory and Competent Harbour Authority for the River Ouse as far as 100m south of Skelton Bridge and the Port of Goole.	National Grid note this feedback and consulted ABP as a prescribed consultee being the statutory undertaker holding the role of Statutory and Competent Harbour Authority.
We anticipate that the works will effect users within our jurisdiction and Navigational Risk Assessments may be required.	ABP have been consulted throughout the pre application process to ensure that the Project was developed to take into account users within the jurisdiction of ABP. Application Document 6.14.6 Navigational Risk Assessment sets out how the Project interacts with

Associated British Ports (ABP) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	users of the River Ouse and ABP have been consulted on the content.

Bassetlaw District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Bassetlaw District Council is a consultee in the NSIP process. Therefore, the Local Planning Authority has consulted their normal consultees on the submitted PEIR report and Bassetlaw District Council will provide comments for the expected detail and considerations in the Environmental Statement. A summary of responses of consultees and additional Officer comments is included for consideration as follows:	National Grid note this feedback.
Paragraph 2.4 of the PEIR identifies the relevant local plans for the project. The Bassetlaw Local Plan is correctly referenced. However, the district's development plan also includes a number of neighbourhood plans, many of which cover the project corridor. We would request that these are also referenced in 2.4. A full list of neighbourhood plans is available on the Council's website All neighbourhood plans | Bassetlaw District Council.	Neighbourhood Plans have been referenced as requested within the Environmental Statement **Application Document 6.2: Environmental Statement Chapter 2: Legislation and Policy Context.**
Throughout the PEIR reference is made to various neighbourhood plans but not the Sturton Ward Neighbourhood Plan. Given that the corridor crosses the middle of the neighbourhood area this seems to be an omission.	Sturton Ward Neighbourhood Plan has been referenced within the Environmental Statement **Application Document 6.2: Environmental Statement Chapter 2: Legislation and Policy Context.**
Paragraphs 8.2.31 and 9.2.14 sets out the local policies that the PEIR has had regard to. We request that Bassetlaw Local Plan Policy ST38: Biodiversity and Geodiversity is included. Paragraph 18.2.14 lists the local policies the PEIR has had regard to relating to Health and Well-Being. 18.2.14 refers to policies within the Bassetlaw Core Strategy and the Bassetlaw Local Plan Main Modifications. Both have	Bassetlaw Local Plan Policy ST38: Biodiversity and Geodiversity has been incorporated within the Environmental Statement **Application Document 6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Ecology** and **Application Document 6.9 Environmental Statement Chapter 9: Ornithology.** The Environmental Statement has incorporated relevant policies from the Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to Health and Wellbeing as

Bassetlaw District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
been superseded by the Bassetlaw Local Plan. We ask that the relevant policies from the Local Plan replace those identified.	requested within **Application Document 6.18: Environmental Statement Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing.**
Similarly, 18.2.14 lists policies from the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan and its review and the Treswell and Cottam Neighbourhood Plan and the subsequent submission draft. We request that 18.2.14 only refers to policies in the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan review and the Treswell with Cottam Neighbourhood Plan review.	The requests have been reflected within **Application Document 6.18: Environmental Statement Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing.**
Paragraph 19.2.14 refers to the Sustainability Appraisal of the Bassetlaw Local Plan. We suggest this should be the Main Modifications, August 2023 not the Publication Version Second Addendum, May 2022.	The requests have been reflected within **Application Document 6.19: Environmental Statement Chapter 19 Climate Change.**
Chapter 6 Landscape Via East Midlands has provided comments for Nottinghamshire County Council and Bassetlaw District Council. Their comments acknowledge that there is an overlap in the PEIR for the following chapters, Chapter 4 – Description of the project, Chapter 6 – Landscape, Chapter 7 – Visual, Volume 4 – Photomontages, Chapter 20 – Substations and associated works, Chapter 21 – Cumulative effects S.42 consultation plan series. A copy of Via East Midlands comments have been attached to this letter.	National Grid notes this comment and has responded to these points within the Nottinghamshire County Council response below.
Chapter 8 Ecology and Ornithology	
On-site Habitats Significant consideration has already been given to the proposed route and this appears to have ensured that high distinctiveness and other particularly notable habitats have been avoided. Where habitats are to be lost, it is expected these will be compensated using the principles of Biodiversity Net Gain as is suggested in the existing literature surrounding the project.	National Grid welcome the feedback that significant consideration has been given to the proposed route and this appears to have ensured that high distinctiveness and other particularly notable habitats have been avoided in the Projects design. The design process has taken account of existing biodiversity, the natural environment and, where practicable, seeks to reduce impacts on areas of ecological sensitivity, through avoidance or mitigation.

Bassetlaw District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8: Ecology of the Environmental Statement (ES) assesses the effects on important ecological receptors (which includes grasslands, wetlands, woodlands and hedgerows). Proposed mitigation and good practice measures relating to ecology are provided in **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice**, **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** and **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan**. The Project proposes to deliver a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), with potential for wider environmental and societal benefits, on a voluntary basis. Detail on the Project's approach to voluntary BNG is provided in **Application Document 7.20 Design Development Report - 2025** and **Application Document 7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report.** The report contains a record of compensation habitats but these are not included in the voluntary delivery of 10% BNG.
Protected Species As detailed in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), a variety of taxa have been recorded as present/potentially present within the site. It is stated that staff will be trained on basic ecological mitigation, but it is expected that more broadly timing of works in certain areas will be given consideration and works will follow a robust Construction Environmental Management Plan, with Ecological Clerks of Works on hand throughout the project. Whilst the PEIR mentions some data is still being gathered, it is hoped mitigation for the operational phase such as line marking will be used wherever possible to reduce the risk of bird collisions.	Through routeing, siting and design development, National Grid has sought to reduce, as far as practicable, impacts on biodiversity and in particular protected and notable habitats and species. Potential direct and indirect impacts on relevant important ecological features have been assessed within the Environmental Statement presented within **Application Document 6.8: Chapter 8 Ecology** and **Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9 Ornithology.** Any necessary mitigation, including requirements for line marking, the employment of an Ecological Clerk of Works and the timing of works has been detailed within the Environmental Statement, with mitigation secured within **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice**, **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** and **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management**

Bassetlaw District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	Plan. Mitigation measures secured include the provision of an Ecological Clerks of Works at required periods of construction. Any works that could impact protected species will be carried out under the relevant Natural England licence(s).
Protected Sites It is expected the application will make a full assessment of the proposals potential to impact upon protected sites although it is clear the chosen route avoids direct land take, there may be indirect impacts and impacts upon functionally linked land.	A full assessment of the ppotential of the Project to impact upon protected ecological sites, including any indirect impacts (including impacts upon functionally linked land) has been prepared and presented within **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology** and **Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9: Ornithology** submitted with the Application. **Application Document 5.2 Habitats Regulations Assessment Report** details whether the Project is likely to have a significant effect on areas that have been designated for nature and conservation purposes under the Habitats Regulations.
The applicants have indicated in the preliminary information they intend to achieve a Biodiversity Net Gain with the proposals. Bassetlaw District Council would appreciate as much information as is available at the application pertaining to BNG to allow input into the proposals.	Officers at Bassetlaw District Council have been consulted throughout the pre application process on the approach to BNG. **Application Document 7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report** has been submitted with the Application alongside a Statement of Common Ground in **Application Document 5.8.5 Statement of Common Ground - Bassetlaw District Council** which details engagement with Bassetlaw District Council.
Bassetlaw District Council have no objections to the proposed route or associated works highlighted thus far in relation to ecology and this NSIP. The ecological works and considerations appear to be comprehensive and there is an expectation that the mitigation and compensation will continue in this vein	National Grid welcome this feedback.
Trees	
At this stage the maps provided can only provide a rough indication of where the proposed route is going to be. From what I can see there is no direct conflict with trees in Conservation Areas or subject to Tree Preservation Orders.	**Application Document 7.14 Arboricultural Impact Assessment** has been submitted with the Application in line with Appendix 8.C of the Scoping Report. Following detailed design, site specific Arboricultural Method Statements (AMSs) will be produced for pre-

Bassetlaw District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
All trees are a material consideration throughout the planning process, therefore, I would expect greater details to be supplied at the full application stage in the form of an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and subsequently an Arboricultural Method Statement for areas where impact to trees may be unavoidable.	commencement and construction stages and will include Tree Protection Plans.
Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage	
The District Conservation Officer lists that the proposed villages are distanced away from the development: • Misterton [approx. 0.8km away from development area] • Gringley on the Hill [approx. 0.5km away from development area] • North/South Wheatley [approx. 1.1km away from development area] • Sturton-le-Steeple [approx. 0.2km away from development area] • North Leverton Windmill [approx. 1.3m away from development area] • South Leverton [approx. 0.5km away from development area] • Treswell [approx. 0.7km away from development area] • East Drayton [approx. 0.5km away from development area] • Darlton [approx. 0.3km away from development area] The settlements listed above contain a varied range of designated heritage assets, conservation areas and a range of buildings which are regarded as non-designated heritage assets. The development of the proposed electricity transmission line within the immediate proximity of the villages will undoubtedly impose some degree of impact upon the setting of the heritage assets contained within the village. The extent of this impact is presently unknown, but is likely to be considerable and in some instances, severe. In order to make an informed assessment of the scheme's impact, Conservation would require further information at the full application phase, such as a comprehensive landscape impact assessment.	**Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage** provides a comprehensive impact assessment of cultural heritage assets that may be impacted by the Project. This includes changes to designated and non-designated heritage assets within their village settings, and conservation areas. These matters were discussed with the Conservation Officer at Bassetlaw District Council via a virtual meeting in February 2026 when the results of the impact assessment on designated built heritage assets within the villages, which were scoped into the assessment, were reported. The assessment in **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage** has identified likely significant effects to built heritage assets in South Wheatley; Sturton le Steeple; North Leverton Windmill and Darlton. A landscape impact assessment is presented in **Application Document 6.6 Chapter 6 Landscape**.

Bassetlaw District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Consultee notes that comments on archaeology will be provided by Nottinghamshire County Council on behalf of Bassetlaw District Council.	National Grid notes this comment and has responded to these comments within the Nottinghamshire County Council response below.
Chapter 13 Agriculture and Soils	
Noted that a full Agricultural land Survey within the PEIR has not been carried out. It is also acknowledged that the whole scheme would see the permanent removal of 92.61 ha, of which 99.9 percent is considered likely to comprise BMV land and would have a significant adverse effect in relation to the permanent removal of BMV land from agricultural use.	The PEIR presented a preliminary assessment relative to the stage of the Project at that time. An assessment of the Project's impact on Best and Most Versatile land has been prepared and presented in **Application Document 6.13: Environmental Statement Chapter 13: Agriculture and Soil.** Due to ongoing design refinement the indicative figures provided at PEIR have been updated as the Project has progressed and the revised design requires 3.11 ha for the new-build pylon footings across the route with 61.09 % situated in BMV land. An additional 45.35 ha is also required for environmental/ecological mitigation (including areas for veteran tree compensation, mitigation planting, BNG mitigation and flood compensation) of which 70.29 % is mapped as BMV land. It is therefore considered that the permanent removal of 48.46 ha, of which 69.70 % is mapped as comprising BMV land, would have a significant effect in relation to the permanent removal of BMV land from agricultural use.
It is noted that the provisional Agricultural land Classification (ALC) mapping shows that the study area comprises extensive areas of Best and Most Versatile land such as Grade 2 land, as well as some Grade 1 land within the draft Order Limits between Route Sections 1 and 8. South of the Chesterfield Canal (Route Sections 9, 10, and 11) the land is predominately mapped as Grade 3 land. However further soil surveys have not established if this is grade 3a (the best and most versatile agriculture land) or 3b. The Environmental Statement should	An assessment of the Project's impact on Best and Most Versatile land has been prepared and presented in **Application Document 6.13: Environmental Statement Chapter 13: Agriculture and Soil** submitted with the Application. The assessment sets out the baseline, utilising detailed Agricultural Land Classification survey data and mapping. This survey data has confirmed the extent of each grade and includes a differentiation between Grades 3a and 3b as requested, with the full survey results available in **Application Document 6.13.A2 Appendix 13.2 Agricultural Land**

Bassetlaw District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
provide a robust consideration of this matter and all land should be surveyed with a discussion on the cumulative impact of the loss of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land within Bassetlaw.	**Classification Survey Report**. The Environmental Statement on Chapter 13 provides a robust consideration of this matter.
Chapter 14 Traffic and Transport Consultee notes that comments will be provided by Nottinghamshire County Council.	National Grid notes this comment and has responded to these points within the Nottinghamshire County Council response below.
Chapter 15 Air Quality and Noise and Vibration	
The potential effects of the proposal on noise and vibration include potential noise and vibration impacts from construction activities, increased road traffic and vibration during the construction phase, in additional to noise and vibration predicted from the operational phase and general maintenance. The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) submitted identifies and assesses these effects, and concludes that with the implementation of mitigation measures, impacts on the NSRs identified within the study area are predicted to be not significant. The assessment was based on the worst-case scenarios, so it is likely that any actual impact will be less.	The Assessment presented in **Application Document 6. 16 Environmental Statement Chapter 16 – Noise and Vibration** confirms that, with control and management measures incorporated into the works, no residual significant adverse noise or vibration effects are expected from the construction or operational phases of the Project.
The proposed embedded measures, and control and management measures (including BPM) should be incorporated into the finalised Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and Environmental Statement when submitted, with any updates and any additional mitigation measures if identified as the planning/design phase develops.	The proposed embedded measures, and control and management measures (including Best Practical Means) have been incorporated into **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice** and **Application Document 7.7 Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan** submitted with the Application with all updates and additional mitigation measures identified.
The PEIR makes mention to a further detailed assessment of construction noise and vibration and operational noise effects, the Environmental Health Department will review this information when the Environmental Statement is submitted and may recommend certain working hours for certain construction activities accordingly.	National Grid note the feedback.

Bassetlaw District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
A Construction Dust Methodology and Assessment has also been submitted to support the proposal; with the implementation of mitigation measures identified, the effect from dust generating activities during the construction phase is predicted to be not significant. These mitigation measures (including BPM) should be incorporated into the finalised Code of Construction Practice when submitted.	These mitigation measures have been incorporated in **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice.**
Additionally, ensure effective steps are incorporated into the CoCP for the construction phase to prevent and manage the deposition of mud, dust and other materials on the adjoining public highway caused by associated vehicles. Any accidental deposition of dust, slurry, mud or any other material from the site, on the public highway shall be removed immediately by the developer.	**Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** provides details of specific mitigation measures that will be deployed, for example: • Wheel washing facilities will be provided at each of the compounds and intermittently along construction access tracks. Road sweepers will be rapidly deployed on public roads where necessary to prevent mud deposits and associated excessive dust. Dry sweeping of large areas will be avoided. • Vehicles carrying materials entering and leaving sites will be covered to prevent escape of materials during transport. • On-site construction access tracks will be inspected for integrity and any necessary repairs to the surface will be instigated as soon as reasonably practicable. • Hard surfaced haul routes will be installed where possible and regularly damped down with fixed or mobile sprinkler systems, or mobile water bowsers, and regularly cleaned. • An adequate area of hard surfaced road will be provided between the wheel wash facility and the site exit, wherever site size and layout permits. • Access gates will be located at least 10 m from receptors where possible.
Contaminated Land	The Application is supported by **Application Document 6.12.A2 Preliminary Contamination Risk Assessment** which presents a

Bassetlaw District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
The route may have a history of contaminative land use, raising concerns about existing land contamination. A thorough investigation into the extent of contamination, including soil and groundwater testing, may be necessary. Appropriate remediation plans must be developed to ensure the site is safe for its intended use.	review of current and historical land use within the defined Study Area to identify potential sources of contamination and inform development of a Conceptual Site Model. The document includes a qualitative Tier 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment in accordance with the guidance provided in Land Contamination Risk Management (Environment Agency).
Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism	
Chapter 17 deals with the population and deprivation, employment and economic activity, community facilities, businesses, recreation and tourism assets, recreational routes and public rights of way (PRoW), recreational land and open space. A consultation response considering public rights of way will be included in Nottinghamshire County Council's response.	National Grid notes this feedback.
The Employment and Skills Manager within Growth & Economic Prosperity at Bassetlaw District Council has provided comments on the scheme and these are attached to the consultation response. These comments recommend to optimise opportunities the following should be considered: • Local Hiring Strategy: Establish local recruitment targets and structured workforce development programs. • Skills Development Framework: Partner with local education providers to deliver accredited training aligned with project needs while building trainer competence. • CITB Client-Based Approach: Require contractors to integrate training commitments into project delivery. • Supply Chain Engagement: Introduce procurement requirements that prioritise local SMEs and businesses. • Employment Displacement Mitigation: Develop targeted transition programs for affected workers in impacted sectors.	During ongoing engagement with Bassetlaw District Council discussion was held on labour supply, noting the local skills mix and potential for the Project to draw on the local workforce. This matter was addressed by National Grid confirming that it is anticipated that approximatly 20% of the workforce will be sourced locally. Training opportunities, highlighting potential upskilling and employment pathways for local residents, is addressed through a the commitment to the production of a Skills, Supply Chain, and Employment Plan prior to construction. This engagement is detailed further within Table 17.6 of **Application Document 6.17 Chapter 17: Socio Economics Recreation and Tourism.**

Bassetlaw District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
• Labour Market Planning: Implement workforce forecasting to ensure local skills match future project demands	
High Marnham substation	
It is noted that a future planning application will consider the High Marnham Substation. There is a further 400 kV substation proposed within a currently pending planning application site to support a proposed battery energy storage system with associated Infrastructure and works. Full details can be viewed under planning reference 24/01138/FUL.	Following statutory consultation on the Project in 2025, a decision was taken to remove the proposed 400kV High Marnham Substation and associated works from the Project. A separate planning application for the 400kV High Marnham Substation was submitted by National Grid in November 2025 to Bassetlaw District Council which has now been approved. **Application Document 6.21 Chapter 21 Inter Project Cumulative Effects** includes the granted planning application 24/01138/FUL for Crabtree Lane Energy within the assessment of potential for cumulative effects.
The PEIR does not make reference to the hazardous substance consent issued for the proposed storage of a maximum of 4.9 tonnes of Hydrogen at the former High Marnham Power Station Fledborough Road. This was granted consent on 17th February 2025 under planning reference 23/00748/HAZ and as such the land contains a Health and Safety consultation zone which may impact the proposal.	The interaction with 23/00748/HAZ is limited to a shared access at Fledborough road and as such this hazardous substance consent is not considered further in the Environmental Assessment. National Grid is consulting the site owner regarding the major hazard site in line with the HSE's advice. Further information on High Marnham Substation is available in **Application Document 5.11 Interrelationship Document"**
Response includes the feedback from East Drayton Parish Council and South Leverton Parish Council, which is summarised in separate Table below. Confirms that Beckingham-Cum-Saundby Parish Council has no comments to make on the proposal.	The feedback presented is responded to by National Grid in separate response tables for each Parish Council below.

Blacktoft Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Further to the recent parish council meeting held Monday 17 March 2025 and further to various other items of correspondence. Blacktoft Parish Council has the following concerns regarding highway safety issues.	As part of the pre-application process National Grid has engaged with the local highways teams at East Riding of Yorkshire Council and National Highways to understand and gain information on their road networks in this area of the Project. This information has been used to

Blacktoft Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
The new line of pylons will cross a large area of Blacktoft Parish – Oxmardyke through Blacktoft, Staddlethorpe and Yokefleet, directly affecting Faxfleet Lane/Tongue Lane and Staddlethorpe Broad Lane. Approximately 14 new pylons. Greenoak Lane at the western edge of the parish will not necessarily be so impacted as the other two lanes, but it will be used for the Yokefleet pylons. All the lanes in the parish are linked – Bellasize Lane (north) and Blacktoft Lane (south) and all are the only access roads for the whole of the parish – whether private, agricultural or business use, the parish council has concerns regarding maintenance and safety.	inform and guide the drafting of **Application Document 7.4: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** (OCTMP) that accompanies the Application. The OCTMP provides details about the proposed construction access strategy that has been developed to manage the impact of construction vehicles on the Public Highway and sensitive receptors in this location, through the use of a combination of suitable Local Road Network connections from the Strategic Road Network, and the provision of a temporary haul road for access along the proposed alignment in the Blacktoft area. The OCTMP highlights restrictions to reduce impacts to other road users from construction traffic related to the Project and sets out measures for the maintenance and upkeep of the public highway. Passing places, lane widening and surface upgrades are proposed along Staddlethorpe Broad Lane and Tongue Lane to enable safe and well maintained local road network during the construction of the project with both roads providing access for construction traffic to the strategic haul road. As part of the application, the Applicant has produced a Highway Safety Assessment, which is appended to **Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment**. The Applicant has also submitted **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan**, which include a range of mitigation measures, to ensure the safety of pedestrian, cyclists and other road users. **Application Document 6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport** includes the assessment of the potential impacts of the Project including changes in traffic flow, delays, road safety and impact on walking, cycling and horse-riding modes on the roads along the Primary Access Routes located in the Local Road Network with suitable mitigation proposed to ensure safety of local road users.

Blacktoft Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	Bellasize Lane (north) and Blacktoft Lane are not proposed for construction access. The haul road crosses Blacktoft Lane safely with suitable visibility splays designed and crossing protection will be provided over the road to ensure safe use during construction activities.
For many years Blacktoft Parish Council has requested the lanes in the parish be maintained to a better standard. As they are now, there is subsidence, poor road surfaces and potholes, especially Faxfleet Lane/Tongue Lane, Staddlethorpe Broad Lane and Greenoak Lane. The northern length of Tongue Lane from the B1230 to the tileworks was improved some years ago with several pull-ins to accommodate the H.G.V.'s and increased traffic for the tile works. Unfortunately, despite numerous requests the southern section of the lane has not been improved to a good standard.	National Grid note the comments in respect of the current standard of the road surfaces in this location. Consultation has taken place with East Riding of Yorkshire Council highways officers to determine acceptable usage levels for this section of the local road network. This detail is presented within **Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment** with mitigation presented within **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan.**
The rail crossing at Oxmardyke is not the best. Visibility for traffic coming either way over the crossing is poor with some vehicles not being seen from one side to the other. There is a similar situation at the western edge of the parish at Greenoak Crossings. The parish council would like NATIONAL GRID to give these two rail crossings some consideration regarding ease of access and safety.	National Grid has given the rail crossing at Tongue Lane consideration regarding ease of access and safety. A visibility splay survey has been undertaken to inform the Transport Assessment and where results fell short of DMRB standards, appropriate mitigation measures have been identified and discussed with local authority highway officers. Passing places, lane widening and surface upgrades are proposed at the Tongue Lane railway crossing within the Order Limits. Greenoak Crossing falls outside of the Order Limits of the Project.
There are plans for Faxfleet Lane/Tongue Lane for a depot for the pylon scheme with a pull out next to the tileworks entrance/exit. This is already a busy entrance/exit. Used by H.G.V.'s, private, deliveries and business vehicles, and deliveries. An extra entrance/exit creating even more traffic hazards and wear and tear on the highway. This section of the lane to the tileworks entrance is fortunate and has a few well-used pull-ins. However, the section of the lane (the southern section into Faxfleet) that has not been maintained to a high standard	As part of the pre-application process National Grid has engaged with the local highways teams at East Riding of Yorkshire Council and National Highways to understand and gain information on their road networks in this area of the Project. This information has been used to inform and guide the drafting of **Application Document 7.4: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** (OCTMP) that accompanies the Application.

Blacktoft Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
has no pull-ins. It is a narrow lane and very busy. Not only used by residents but by agriculture, a Faxfleet based wedding venue and – unfortunately – mis-guided satnav H.G.V.'s and then the extra vehicles used for the pylon scheme. Access at the junction of Faxfleet Lane/Tongue Lane with the main B1230 can be dangerous and with extra traffic for the pylon scheme will prove to be more dangerous. Staddlethorpe Broad Lane will be impacted with the new pylon scheme, and, at present, it is unsafe, especially with potholes. The lane is used by residents, agriculture, H.G.V.'s, deliveries and businesses. More vehicular movements during the pylon construction period will wreak havoc on the road surface making it more dangerous and inconvenient for everyone else not necessarily involved with the pylons. Greenoak Lane will not have the new pylons crossing over it BUT it will be used more by everyone avoiding the other two lanes in the parish. This lane is particularly used extensively by residents, agriculture, deliveries and businesses for access to and from the neighbouring parish of Laxton. This lane at present is suffering from subsidence. Areas of the line of subsidence can throw a vehicle. If the vehicle is in the wrong place at the wrong time, it could easily end up in the deep drainage dykes either side of the lane. The lane needs to be extensively repaired.	Along Faxfleet Lane/Tongue Lane and Staddlethorpe Broad Lane passing places, lane widening and surface upgrades are proposed to ensure safety is maintained to all users during construction of the Project. Road widening at the junction of Faxfleet Lane/Tongue Lane with the main B1230 has been proposed to improve visibility and highway safety during construction. Greenoak Lane falls outside of the Order Limits of the application for Development Consent.
We all live in the real world, and we all have budgets to manage, and we all know how budgets can be cut. It would be easy to say, "Could you please CONSIDER repairing the lanes in Blacktoft parish? This repair and improvement work in the parish needs to be done BEFORE any construction on the pylon scheme commences and not just considered and sidelined. To leave it until AFTER the event would not be an expeditious use of anyone's budget. There will no doubt be damage to the repaired lanes during the pylon scheme construction period, but this could be factored into the budget and remedial work carried out when the scheme is complete.	National Grid welcomes the feedback of Blacktoft Parish Council. National Grid has committed to a number of works along the local roads within Blacktoft that will be utilised for construction access; notably along Faxfleet Lane/Tongue Lane and Staddlethorpe Broad Lane where passing places, lane widening and surface upgrades are proposed to ensure safety is maintained to all users during construction of the Project. Road widening at the junction of Faxfleet Lane/Tongue Lane with the main B1230 is proposed to improve visibility and highway safety during construction. Such works will be carried out in advance of construction to ensure safety during the

Blacktoft Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
In summary, Blacktoft Parish Council would very much like to see NATIONAL GRID facilitate all necessary repair work and the siting of pull-ins carried out before any pylon scheme work commences. The Clerk to the Parish Council is more than happy to meet up with representatives from NATIONAL GRID to 'walk through' the parish, looking at all aspects of its concerns.	construction period. A commitment to undertake pre and post construction dilapidation surveys has been made within the Application, secured within **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice.**

Canal and River Trust Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
The Trust are landowner and Navigation Authority for both the Stainforth & Keadby Canal and the Chesterfield Canal. The waterways are included within the development boundary of the project, and we understand are proposed to be crossed by the new cable route. The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) documentation also indicates that a temporary bridge may be required across the Chesterfield Canal. The Trust are also Navigation Authority for the River Trent. We have land ownership interests in the River Trent to the east of High Marnham substation and also includes part of a watercourse at Fledborough. These areas lie in close proximity to the proposed substation works highlighted on the plans for Route Section 11.	National Grid notes this feedback.
The Stainforth & Keadby and Chesterfield Canals both run on an almost east-west alignment across the line of the proposed overhead power line. As landowner/ operator of the canals the Trust wish to see any potential impacts on the canal and its users fully identified and addressed within any future Environmental Statement.	Potential impacts on the Stainforth and Keadby and Chesterfield Canals and the users are considered fully and are identified and addressed within the following chapters of **Application Document 6.0 Environmental Statement:** • **Application Documents= 6.6: Landscape,** • **Application Document 6.8: Ecology,** • **Application Document 6.9: Ornithology,** • **Application Document 6.10: Cultural Heritage** • **Application Document 6.11: Water Environment,**

Canal and River Trust Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	• **Application Document 6.14 Traffic and Transport** • **Application Document 6.17 Socio – Economics Recreation and Tourism**.
Landscape and Visual	
A unique attraction of our waterways are based on its visual amenity value, in addition to its significance as a heritage and wildlife corridor and as a sustainable transport route. It is essential that the amenity value of our canals are protected and that no development takes place that may adversely affect the experience of waterway users. The canal towpaths provide a popular route for leisure and recreation, and provide a public right of way and cycle route.	Potential impacts on the Stainforth & Keadby and Chesterfield Canals visual amenity value and its significance as a heritage and wildlife asset are considered in **Application Document 6.0 Environmental Statement:** • **Application Document 6.6 Landscape** • **Application Document 6.7 Chapter 7 Visual** • **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology** • **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage,** The canal towpaths use for leisure and recreation; public right of way and cycle route is considered within **Application Document 6.17 Chapter 17 Socio – Economics Recreation and Tourism.**
The documents provided confirm that the proposed crossings of both of our canals would be above ground. An above ground installation would cross our network in two locations, which will carry both long-term landscape/visual impacts and disturbance implications to facilitate construction. The submitted PEIR documentation, within Chapter 6, does make clear that, as a result of this, there is the potential for significant construction and, particularly, operational effects on the landscapes in both route sections due to direct impacts on landscape elements and features, as well as indirect effects on their overall composition and character.	The proposed crossings of the canal network in two locations are considered within **Application Document 6.6 Landscape** and **Application Document 6.7 Chapter 7 Visual.** Assessment has concluded that during construction, potential impact could arise at the canal crossings from the construction lighting, particularly during the winter months, if night working was required. The Stainforth and Keadby canal lies within the Trent Levels: Flat open remote farmland landscape character area. The landscape is considered to be of high value and medium susceptibility to a new 400 kV overhead line with a negligible (not significant) adverse effect during construction and a minor adverse (not significant effect) during operation. Viewpoints C-03a and C-03b represent views from the Stainforth and Keadby Canal with wirelines provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 3) Route Section**

Canal and River Trust Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	C. The visual assessment provided in **Application Document 6.7 Chapter 7 Visual** acknowledges a localised moderate adverse (significant) effect during construction and operation. The Chesterfield Canal forms the boundary of Regional Landscape Character Type (RLCT) 2b: Planned and Drained Fens and Carrlands and RLCT4a: Unwooded Vales character areas, whereby moderate and major adverse (significant) effects are predicted during both construction, and operation at a distance of less than 1 km of the proposed overhead line. Viewpoints E-06a and E-06b represent views from the Chesterfield Canal with wirelines provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E**. The visual assessment provided in **Application Document 6.7 Chapter 7 Visual** acknowledges a localised major adverse (significant) effect during construction and Year 1 of operation. Mitigation planting is proposed along the Chesterfield Canal which would reduce the effects to moderate adverse (significant) by Year 15 of operation. Information on mitigation planting is presented in **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.**
As highlighted in our previous response, the nature of the landscape next to our waterways is flat, with limited tree cover, which would limit the opportunity to adopt certain parts of the Holford Rules concerning cable routing. For example, rule 4 of the Holford Rules requires above ground cable routes to choose tree and hill backgrounds, whilst rule 5 seeks cable routes to prefer open valleys with woods to limit the apparent scale and height of new cable routes. The landscape next both canals would not allow for the adoption of either of these rules.	The Holford Rules are guiding principles and do not 'require'. They have been adhered to as far as able, given the landscape of the study area. Further information is presented within **Application Document 6.6 Landscape** and **Application Document 6.7 Chapter 7 Visual.**
Consideration should be given with the supporting Environmental Report specifically as to the visual impact of new cable crossings of our network where the local landscape does not provide for easy visual mitigation of the works. The PEIR documentation does not identify specific mitigation for the crossings of our network, and we	Mitigation for visual receptors on and adjacent to canal has been considered in the assessment and proposals outlined in **Application Document 6.7 Chapter 7 Visual** and **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.** Mitigation planting has been proposed adjacent to the Chesterfield Canal to

Canal and River Trust Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
strongly believe that specific mitigation measures should be identified, especially next to the Chesterfield canal, to ensure that the visual impact on the landscape in this location is visually acceptable. The potential for undergrounding works should be considered as one option.	reduce the visual effects of views of the proposed overhead line, as shown in the photomontage for viewpoint E-06a presented in **Application Document 7.16 Photomontages**. Photomontages have been provided at Year 1 and Year 15 to show the effect planting would have on this location. It is acknowledged in **Application Document 6.7 Chapter 7 Visual** that a localised moderate adverse (significant) effect would remain, as the planting would not only screen the proposed overhead line, but would also enclose the longer distance views. Planting has been limited to a short section of the canal to retain open views elsewhere along its length, where the proposed overhead line would not be as prominent. The potential for localised undergrounding has been considered as part of the Project's design. National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-5 makes clear that “the Government’s position that overhead lines should be the strong starting presumption for electricity networks developments in general, this presumption is reversed when proposed developments will cross part of a nationally designated landscape (i.e. National Parks, The Broads, or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty)”. EN-5 also confirms that widespread and significant adverse landscape and/or visual impacts in other locations may also justify the use of undergrounding. National Grid has a statutory duty to develop proposals that are economic and efficient. No widespread and significant adverse landscape and/or visual impacts have been assessed in this location, significant effects are limited to a short stretch of the canal. This conclusion has helped inform the design progression to route overhead.
Canal users would pass the position of new crossings at a relatively low speed, and would be susceptible to changes to the local landscape. We request that the Visual Impact Assessments to be submitted in support of the proposals should include an assessment of the proposed changes to the landscape at both canal crossing locations. With respect to the Visual Assessment, we request that our	**Application Document 6.7 Chapter 7: Visual** provides the assessment of effects on users of the canal within the Study Area. Viewpoints from the canals have been identified and are presented alongside wirelines in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Viewpoint Assessment** (Part 3 for the Stainforth and Keadby Canal and Part 5 for the Chesterfield Canal). The assessment considers effects both

Canal and River Trust Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
canals (notably at the position of any proposed crossing) should be included as viewpoints within the associated assessment. We note that Chapter 7 of the PEIR does identify viewpoints from our canals, which is considered appropriate (paras 7.5.44 & 7.5.61). The construction of a new power line could impact upon vegetation and trees, which could impact outward views from our network. We advise that full details of this should be provided alongside any future Environmental Statement, so that the impact to the wider landscape can be fully assessed. This would be pertinent for any vegetation removal that might be necessary to construct the proposed temporary construction access bridge across the Chesterfield Canal.	during construction and operation including the use of temporary bridges for construction access routes.
Should any lighting be proposed alongside the network, then more clarity should be provided with regards to the location of lighting and potential impact on our waterways as part of the assessment. This would be pertinent in proximity to our network, as nighttime lighting could dazzle or confuse boaters in some situations.	An assessment of night-time lighting is included in **Application Document 6.6.A3 Appendix 6.3 Landscape Baseline and Assessment** and **Application Document 6.7.A3 Viewpoint Assessment** (Part 3 for the Stainforth and Keadby Canal and Part 5 for the Chesterfield Canal), although given the temporary nature of the works which may require night-time lighting, this does not result in significant landscape or visual effects in its own right. Measures relevant to the control and management of impacts during construction have been included within **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice** and **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments**.
Ecology and Biodiversity (including comments on Ornithology)	
Both the Chesterfield and Stainforth & Keadby Canals offer a potential habitat for waterborne species, potentially including amphibians, mammals (including otter), fish and waterborne plants. Our review of the previously submitted Scoping Documentation in 2003 indicates that the Environmental Report will be supported with a study of biodiversity and habitats, and that the canals are to be included in the study boundary.	Both the Chesterfield and Stainforth and Keadby Canals have been assessed in respect of biodiversity and habitat including for waterborne species, mammals (including otter), fish and waterborne plants. **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8: Ecology** and **Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9: Ornithology** provides the assessment findings.

Canal and River Trust Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
A section of the Chesterfield Canal is a designated Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Although the canal is designated primarily for aquatic wildlife, it is also important as a flight line for birds and bats. Therefore, it must be ensured that any cable crossings have measures in place that reduce the chance of cable strikes by birds and bats.	Potential effects on Chesterfield Canal SSSI have been assessed in section 8.9 of **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology**. The assessment provides details of any impacts to habitats in proximity to the Chesterfield Canal SSSI and mitigation measures that will be carried out to prevent residual significant effects on the SSSI. Effects in relation to birds using the canal as a flight line are provided in **Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9 Ornithology**. Measures that will be carried out to protect designated sites, and habitats are detailed in **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** and **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice**.
Although table 9.1 within chapter 9 of the PEIR documentation refers to the potential for mitigation, we note that whilst table 9.12 highlights that the adoption of close-parallel and synchronised overhead line design will be used on some sections of the project to minimise bird strike risks, this is not listed as a proposed option for the Chesterfield Canal. We do question whether this could be utilised in this location as well, given the potential use of the waterway route by birds and bats. Alternative mitigation should be identified within the Environmental Statement as applicable, should this not be considered possible.	A continuation of paralleling with the existing line cannot be adopted at this location as this would affect a greater number of sites of ecological importance, including Chesterfield Canal Wildlife Site, Mother Drain, Misterton SSSI. Detailed design considerations are set out in **Application Document 5.9 Design Development Report.** **Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9 Ornithology** provides detail on measures considered to mitigate effects at the Chesterfield Canal and also surrounding areas identified as potentially sensitive for birds.
We note table 8.22 identifies that there is a temporary direct risk of habitat loss and disturbance associated with the construction access route and working area next to the Chesterfield Canal. The removal of vegetation and shading of the canal to facilitate the temporary construction access bridge crossing could have a significant impact on the ecology of the canal and SSSI. Full details of this impact and potential mitigation should be provided within the final Environmental Statement to inform the application.	An assessment of effects on Chesterfield Canal SSSI and proposed mitigation is provided within **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology.** This includes crossing the canal using a clear-span bridge to protect the channel, banks and associated vegetation. No notable macrophyte species were recorded at the proposed bridge location. This shading may slightly reduce the channel macrophyte cover, but should not be detrimental to the number of species present within the area. Pre-construction survey will be carried out to check for the presence of notable plants and appropriate mitigation such as avoidance, translocation, or reseeding applied.

Canal and River Trust Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Should piling works be proposed for any pylons, we wish to highlight that such works can result in disturbance from vibration. As a result, we believe the impact should be included as part of the overall assessment. Table 8.14 within Chapter 8 of the PEIR suggests that the impact of vibrational impacts on bats will be considered in the main Environmental Report. We request that impacts on waterborne species, including fish, should also be considered, with specific attention given to the impact of piling operations.	Impacts of vibration from piling on aquatic receptors including fish are assessed in **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology.** The residual effect has been assessed as not significant with embedded mitigation secured through **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** and **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice**. Any piling activities would use non-percussive piling techniques where practical to limit disturbance, which would assist in allowing sounds to increase gradually, allowing fish in the immediate vicinity to swim away. **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** contains specific measures relating to potential impacts from underwater noise from potential percussive piling activities and requires that noise from such activities will be controlled to be below the level at which the onset of behavioural disturbance in sensitive fish species would occur.
Cultural Heritage Whilst table 10.1 suggests that the PEIR report will explore impact on our canals as a non-designated heritage asset, we cannot find reference to this within section 10.7. We believe that impacts on the setting of our canals as a heritage asset should be considered within any final Environmental Report.	The canal network is considered a non-designated heritage asset and a feature of the historic landscape. There would be no permanent, physical impacts to the canals but potential impacts from temporary and permanent changes to their setting is considered in Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage.
Measures to protect the Canal and River Trent during and post construction	
We understand that piling works may be necessary for any new pylon support structures. Appropriate details should be provided to ensure that piling works will not result in vibrational impacts that could adversely impact the structural integrity of our network. This is pertinent on the Stainforth & Keadby Canal, where our records show that the canal is supported by an embankment in this location, which could be vulnerable to the impact of vibrations from nearby piling operations. The PEIR Documentation highlights that construction	**Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice** and **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** provide steps to remove the risk of damage to consultee's assets from plant and machinery (compaction and vibration during the construction phase) including any haul and access roads and crossings. **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** includes measures relating to potential damage to buildings and structures from

Canal and River Trust Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
compounds and a 'stringing' position are proposed to be sited alongside the Stainforth & Keadby Canal, which has the potential to impact the embankment in this location. Crossing protection works, dependant on what these entail, could also pose a risk.	construction vibration. It also includes measures which require the Main Works Contractor(s) to prepare detailed construction noise and vibration assessments and determine specific mitigation measures. With regards to vibration, this would include the use of alternative methods (i.e. the use of non-vibratory methods) or reducing energy to limit the level of vibration. Prior to construction a Noise and Vibration Management Plan will be prepared, substantially based upon **Application Document 7.7 Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan** which sets out the good practice construction practices (known as best practicable means (BPM)) in relation to noise and vibration) to be followed by the Project. The proposed location of the stringing positions, crossing protection and construction panel access to the crossing protection are illustrated on **Application Document 6.4.F3 Figure 4.3 Temporary Construction Works. Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice** and **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** provide steps to remove the risk of damage to consultee's assets.
Sheet 11 of the Draft Orders Limit Plan shows an access track next to the Chesterfield Canal highlighted in red (linking Shaw Road to the main site). We presume this is to be used for construction access. There is a risk that loading from plant and heavy machinery here could increase the risks of land slips towards the canal. We request that details on ground conditions, canal edge protection and the size of plant to be utilised is provided to ascertain whether the track is suitable.	This is a maintenance access route to Pylons 4AF177 – 4AF 184 and mitigation planting access. This matter has been scoped out of the Environmental Assessment as agreed, due to the low levels of generated traffic movements during these stages of the Project's lifecycle. Maintenance traffic will be infrequent, planned and managed to minimise disruption. Plant and heavy machinery will not be used along these routes. Traffic impacts during operation and maintenance have been excluded on the basis that operational and maintenance movements (foot patrols, light vehicles, occasional HGVs) are expected to be well below the threshold of a 30% increase, or 10% increase on sensitive links, over existing flows and would not give rise to significant effects. Operational and maintenance activity would require a limited workforce, with infrequent access required to ensure

Canal and River Trust Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	the operational Project is appropriately surveyed, assessed, and maintained.
We also wish to advise that a culvert is present under the canal in this location**.** Any works to construct the temporary bridge would need to be designed to avoid damage to the culvert, which could otherwise result in long term damage to the canal. We request that this matter is addressed in the Environmental Report.	The location of the temporary bridge has moved to the west of that presented at statutory consultation. The temporary construction haul road has been designed to lie to the west of the proposed alignment. All construction works for the temporary bridge will be designed and carried out to avoid damage to the culvert. Appropriate mitigation is secured through **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice.**
The Trust is keen to ensure that risks of pollution or other adverse impact on our waterways during and post construction is prevented. Consideration should be given towards measures to limit the risk of contamination towards the canals from wind blow, seepage or spillage during the course of development operations in proximity. We anticipate that appropriate mitigation measures could be identified as part of a Construction Management Plan, where details may potentially be reserved through requirements within a future DCO.	Appropriate mitigation measures to limit the risk of contamination towards the canals from wind blow, seepage or spillage during the course of development operations in proximity have been identified and will be secured within the application for development consent within **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice.**
Works proposed next to the River Trent include an indicative access route for construction (associated with the dismantling of an existing overhead line**).** It is imperative that details are provided to ensure that vibrations and loading from construction vehicles do not adversely impact the structure of the river bank, which in the worst case scenario could increase the risks of landslips to the river. The Environmental Statement should identify appropriate controls for this.	Following the close of statutory consultation the works associated with the High Marnham substation have been removed from the Project and the Order Limits have been reduced, removing interactions with the River Trent. Measures and controls to limit the risk of impacts on the integrity of river banks and existing flood defences are included in **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice** and **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments.**
We understand that no direct discharge of water is proposed to our network or to the River Trent. Should any discharge be proposed, then we request that this is detailed alongside any future application, and that the Environmental Statement assesses the impact of this on	National Grid note this feedback and confirm that no discharges are proposed to the canal network, nor the River Trent. The potential for the Project to impact on flood risk from a wide range of sources is assessed within **Application Document 7.13 Flood Risk**

Canal and River Trust Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
potential flood risk associated with our network. Please note that the Trust is not a land drainage authority, and our explicit consent would be required for any such works.	**Assessment and Application Document 6.11 ES Chapter 11 Water Environment.**
Indicative construction access across the Chesterfield Canal	
Figure 4.3 (Temporary Constructed Works) from the PEIR documentation shows a construction access route crossing the Chesterfield Canal. No existing bridge is present in this location, and we understand that a new bridge will be required in this location during the construction phase. It is vital that any new temporary bridge, if proposed, is of adequate size to accommodate boat and pedestrian traffic below. The clearance should take account of the clearance provided at bridges upstream and downstream, and should also provide at least 2.7m headroom for the towpath. Clarity on this should be provided during the future application submission. We request that details with regards to the method of installation and the impact of any loading from the structure on the canal should be provided so as to ensure that impacts of loading on the canal structure can be fully assessed and controlled. There is a risk that excessive loading could damage the canal structure, which could increase the future risk of leakages or canal breaches.	A temporary bridge is proposed in this location. The bridge will be clear span, and the foundations would be placed clear of the main channel of the watercourse, where feasible. Once the foundations are in place, the temporary bridge would be fitted. Although the installation method would depend on the type of bridge being installed, a typical bridge would be delivered in sections. Each bridge component would be assembled on-site and lifted into position by suitable construction machinery. With the bridge in position, decking panels would be lifted and fixed into position. An illustrative design for a temporary bridge is shown on **Application Document 2.12 Typical Design Drawings - Illustrative Bridge Details for Watercourse Crossings Sheet 16 of 19**, and the location of the proposed temporary bridge crossings are detailed in **Application Document 6.4.A2 Appendix 4.2 Indicative Bridge and Culvert Schedule**. National Grid note the feedback in regard to provision of at least 2.7 m headroom for towpath. Final design work for temporary bridge crossings is not yet complete, National Grid will continue discussions with CRT on this point and provide design updates when these are available.
Measures to limit any closures of our waterways to navigable traffic	
The PEIR documentation identifies that closure of our Waterways may be required to facilitate construction works (e.g. Chapter 14, table 14.1). Any closure of the canal to facilitate construction would need to be designed to ensure that impacts on boat traffic are appropriately managed. The Stainforth & Keadby Canal is a freight waterway, which	**Application Document 7.22 Navigational Risk Assessment** has been submitted and identifies the anticipated project impacts on the Stainforth and Keadby Canal and the Chesterfield Canal along with a number of risk controls. Access over the Stainforth and Keadby canal will use existing crossings, temporary closure of the Stainforth and Keadby Canal may

Canal and River Trust Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
allows for the passage of both commercial and leisure craft. The Chesterfield Canal is used by leisure craft. Closure of either canal to facilitate construction would sever their connection to the River Trent, which could have a significant impact on users.	be required for the installation of crossing protection.Temporary closure of the Chesterfield Canal may be required to enable the installation of a temporary bridge crossing and crossing protection. Discussion with the Canal and River Trust on this topic remains ongoing.
Boat users often plan routes several months in advance, and any unexpected closure could have significant economic impact upon our users, such as hire companies, with potentially significant economic consequences.	Temporary closures of the Chesterfield Canal and Stainforth and Keadby Canal may be required to enable the installation of a temporary bridge crossing and scaffold protection. Discussion with the Canal and River Trust on this topic remains ongoing. National Grid is aware of the need to provide as much notice as reasonably practicable notice to the Canal and River Trust of the need to close the canal and will continue discussions on this topic.
Consideration would be needed to ensure that any closures are planned to limit disruption to users. Any closures would need to be co-ordinated with the Trust and applied for via the Trust's Code of Practice, which stipulates specific winter stoppage dates and notice periods.	Ongoing discussions regarding the need for closures have taken place during the pre-application stage of the Project. A Statement of Common Ground is provided as **Application Document 5.8.9 – Canal and River Trust**.
Impact on traffic can be minimised if works can be co-ordinated to only occur during night time hours. Should it be demonstrated that this is not possible, then to minimise disruption to craft, work would need to occur during the winter stoppage season, for which a long notice period is required to allow for boat users to plan ahead in advance for any closure. We request that the final Environmental Statement should include information about how the impact on boat users can be minimised.	The Environmental Statement provides information on the potential impact on boat users within **Application Document 6.17 Chapter 17: Socio Economics recreation and Tourism. A Navigational Risk Assessment (Application Document 7.22) has also been prepared. Together,** these documents set out how impact on users of the canal can be minimised.
The Trust would welcome the opportunity to review the content of any proposed DCO wording in relation to any planned closures if proposed. This may assist in ensuring that details are agreed prior to any future submission.	National Grid has engaged with the Trust during the pre-application stage of the Project, matters addressing closure have been discussed as part of **Application Document 6.17 Chapter 17: Socio Economics recreation and Tourism** and **Application Document 14.6: Navigational Risk Assessment,** with a Statement of Common

Canal and River Trust Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	Ground provided as **Application Document 5.8.9 – Canal and River Trust**. National Grid is aware of the need to provide as much notice as reasonably practicable notice to the Canal and River Trust of the need to close the canal and will continue discussions on this topic.
Use of our waterways for freight transport	
The Stainforth & Keadby Canal and the River Trent (which lies in proximity to the High Marnham project) are freight waterways capable of handling freight traffic. Opportunities may exist for the carriage of construction associated traffic to the site via waterborne craft, which could help reduce the need for carriage by road. This could help to reduce road miles and help improve the sustainability of the proposal. Table 14.1 within PEIR chapter 14 states that "no opportunities to utilise water-borne or rail transportation have been identified". Although noted, this terminology is vague, and we would recommend that this is expanded within any final Environmental Report to identify whether any potential use of alternative modes of transportation has been fully considered, and reasons as to why it has been discounted. We believe this is necessary to ensure that this option can be fully ruled out.	The Project has considered sustainable transport modes. In terms of the Stainforth and Keadby Canal at the point of meeting the working areas (the line of route of the pylons) at Ealand, there are 4 pylons the canal could serve, 4AF122-125. The volumes needed for that would not be considerable, therefore, procuring the services for 4 80tonne barges is not commercially viable; largely as the source of the materials (in GB) would still require transportation by road to the Keadby wharf for loading. If the source was from farther afield, or abroad, it could come by sea and the River Trent, but would require being transhipped over the lock at Keadby/Trent to the wharf on the canal. Double handling in the former, triple handling in the latter. The wharf at Keadby is of a scale which can not accommodate more than two or three HGVs at a time (which would need to be reversed in and/or out of its junction with the B1392, in itself a risk). Depending on the vessel used to bring materials in, if by sea via the Trent, it may (or may not) be able to access the canal via the lock, but that would probably still mean it would need to be transhipped to a canal barge, which would require a landside crane (assuming the barge wouldn't have one). If it can't access the canal via the lock, it would need to be unloaded Trent-side and brought across the B1392 somehow to the canal wharf. This is unnecessarily complicated, with safety risks as well as detrimental commercial implications. Assuming the access at Keadby issues are overcome, the next challenge; the offloading point where the canal meets the areas of work at Ealand. Obstacles there include:

Canal and River Trust Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	• No wharf-like infrastructure – large cranes would be needed, ground investigations to ascertain if it could take a crane loading, impact on the environment (BNG specifically) • Drains either side of the canal (South Soak and North Soak) • Railway line to the north – difficult/unlikely to get permission from Network Rail to over sail their asset • Public Right Of Way to the south – would need to be diverted For these reasons it is not considered viable for the Project to utilise the canal for construction associated traffic.
Other socio-economic impacts	
Impact on moorings • On the Chesterfield canal, Wooden Beck visitor moorings lie in close proximity to the proposed location of the cable crossing and construction access crossing. Temporary or permanent closure of these during development could impact upon the local visitor economy. Should the cable cross over the moorings themselves, then it is unlikely that boaters will choose to moor below, which could significantly impact their value to the local economy. • We request that any final location of the cable should seek to avoid any impact on these moorings through this area. Submitted details should show the location of the cable relative to any individual mooring locations so that the full impact can be fully understood. It would also be useful if it could be confirmed where the moorings are located in relation to any temporary bridge that may be required for construction access works.	Wooden Beck Visitor Moorings were added to the baseline in **Application Document 6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism** following this feedback. The impact of the Project on the receptor has been assessed. The closest visitor moorings on the Chesterfield Canal at Wooden Beck are outside of the Order Limits, the Project does therefore not cross the moorings. Construction of the Project will not require closure of the Wooden Beck visitor moorings.

Canal and River Trust Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Fishing rights The Trust is aware of existing fishing rights on the Chesterfield Canal, which could be impacted by the works. Additional clarity on the impact of works on access for fishing activities would be welcome so that we can assess the impact on this activity.	Impacts on blue infrastructure and water-based spaces used for recreational activities are assessed in **Application Document 6.17 Chapter 17 Socio-economic, recreation and tourism**. Included in the assessment are designated fishing areas. The closure of an approximately 11 km stretch of the Chesterfield Canal is programmed for the Winter works period and is therefore assessed as being approximately three months in duration. The impact on angling is temporary in nature. Recreationally equivalent angling opportunities remain available elsewhere along the stretch, and there would be no permanent change to the canal's functionality as an angling resource. The magnitude of impact on the angling function of this section of canal is assessed as small. Overall, this results in a temporary minor adverse effect, which is not significant.
Impact on Marnham Ski Club Marnham Ski Club benefit from access to the River Trent to the south of Marnham Sub Station, in proximity to the proposed substation works. It is not clear from the plans whether the works will potentially impact the access to and operation of the Ski Club on the River Trent. To provide clarity, we request that any future application fully clarifies the potential impact to this operation.	The Project would need to connect to a new 400 kV substation at High Marnham in Nottinghamshire (part of a project called 'Brinsworth to High Marnham'). Planning permission for the new substation is being obtained under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 with separate public consultation having been held for the planning application, which was approved by Bassetlaw District Council on 23 June 2026. As a result, we have removed High Marnham substation and associated works from our proposals for North Humber to High Marnham. No impact to the potential operation of the Marnham Ski Club is proposed through this Project.
Protective provisions Due to the proximity of works to our network, including works above the waterways, we consider that Protective Provisions will be necessary for the protection of the Trust during the construction, operation and any decommissioning stages of the development. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further with the applicant during the development of their initial Development Consent Order. To assist with the applicant's drafting, we can provide a set of 'standard' draft protective provisions for the Trust, which can be used	Constructive engagement has taken place between National Grid and CRT in respect of the required protective provisions. Agreement on the provisions will be set out within **Application Document 5.8.9 Statement of Common Ground – Canal and River Trust**.

Canal and River Trust Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
as a basis to work from and tailor to suit this development. We would seek to reach agreement on the provisions at the earliest possible opportunity. Please contact myself on the details below should you wish to discuss this further.	
Other comments	
Our consent as Landowner and Navigation Authority may be required for the installation of new cable crossing below or above the Chesterfield and/or Stainforth & Keadby Canal.	National Grid notes this feedback.
Please note that the Canal & River Trust is a statutory undertaker which has specific duties to protect the waterways. Accordingly, it is likely that we will resist the use of compulsory powers which may affect our undertakings. Accordingly, we require that the acquisition of any rights over the River Ouse should be secured by agreement.	National Grid notes this feedback.
The proposals include works in close proximity to the Trust's waterways. In our capacity as landowner, we wish to advise that the applicant/landowner would likely be required to comply with the Trust's 'Code of Practice for Works affecting the Canal & River Trust'. The applicant/developer is advised to contact the Canal & River Trust's Works Engineering Team via switchboard on 0303 040 4040 should they have any questions or require further information upon the Code.	National Grid has consulted with the Canal and River Trust through the pre-application stage and has through consultation obtained the Trust's 'Code of Practice for Works affecting the Canal & River Trust'.
Consent from the Trust's Utilities Team would also be required to ensure agreement is reached for any new cable crossing of our network. Our Utilities Team can also be contacted via switchboard on 0303 040 4040.	National Grid notes this feedback.
Consultation with the Chesterfield Canal Trust One of the Canal & River Trust's charitable objectives is to promote, facilitate, undertake and assist in for public benefit, the restoration and improvement of inland waterways. In 1997 the Chesterfield Canal	National Grid notes this feedback. The Chesterfield Canal Trust have worked to restore the derelict canal to the west of Worksop. Future restoration of the Chesterfield Canal would take place a significant

Canal and River Trust Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Trust were incorporated to promote the full restoration and appropriate development of the Chesterfield Canal. We therefore suggest that this organisation should also be included within any consultations on the proposals.	distance to the west of the Project (west of Kiveton) and it is not considered that the Project would impact future restoration plans.

Dunham on Trent with Ragnall, Darlton and Fledborough Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
The Council are ok with the new proposed route, however, the Council wish for the proposed solar battery/substation at the Marnham end to be rotated 90% as per our previous comments and that it is screened and camouflaged as much as possible.	The substation and associated works does not form part of the Project for which the DCO Application is submitted. Planning permission for the new substation has been obtained from Bassetlaw District Council under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The planning application for the 400 kV High Marnham Substation (25/01302/FUL) was submitted by National Grid in November 2025 to Bassetlaw District Council and received approval in June. Separate public consultation was held for the project. The new substation did not form part of the proposals for North Humber to High Marnham during non-statutory consultation, but the decision was made to include within the statutory consultation for the Project. This approach allowed National Grid to demonstrate that the Project could be delivered and that it could connect to the national transmission network. All feedback about the substation was shared with the substation project teams for consideration as part of their design development, and further progress has been made to ensure the relevant permissions are in place.
However, we do not understand why you say **"We do not currently have a record of a consultation response from your organisation"** Dunham Parish Council has met several times with you and in the first round, in sept 2024 it sent the below reply. However, its latest reply is above.	During the 8 week statutory consultation period, the Project's communications team contacted stakeholders who had not responded by 6 weeks as a polite reminder that we would appreciate their feedback. The Project was aware of the feedback provided at earlier stages in the project and this was reported within the Non Statutory Consultation Report presented at Statutory Consultation.

East Drayton Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Regarding the section of route through East Drayton Parish, pylons 4AF239 to 4AF242. This section of the route is along the high point between Church Lane Farm and Mill House. The Parish Council request that the route be moved slightly west to between Field Farm and Mill House or preferably to the west of Field Farm. This section of land is lower and would reduce the visible impact of the pylons on the conservation village of East Drayton. It would impact on fewer residents especially when it is considered that in wet or damp weather the cables "sing". This would have a detrimental effect on the mental health of residents and walkers in the vicinity. It must also be considered that the noise from the cables would cause distress to horses in livery at the farms on this route. This could result in horses being removed from these liveries with a resulting financial impact on those businesses.	National Grid acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the potential effects of the Project on nearby residents of East Drayton, users of the local public rights of way network and equestrian businesses. National Grid notes the Parish Council's view that the suggested design changes would result in fewer impacts. The relative effects of alternative design options have been considered through the routing and design development process, taking account of environmental, technical, engineering and land use constraints. National Grid is satisfied that the proposed design represents an appropriate balance of these considerations. National Grid has considered the two design change requests submitted by East Drayton Parish Council; Option one being to move pylons 4AF239 to 4AF242 slightly west to between Field Farm and Mill House and Option 2 being to move pylons 4AF239 to 4AF242 to the west of Field Farm. Both options would result in an overall increase in pylon heights, with uneven and large spans increasing technical complexity and leading to an increase in visual impacts to properties on Reford Road. Potential effects on residential amenity, recreation and public rights of way users have been assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment process and presented within **Application Document 6.7 Chapter 7 Visual**. The assessment has considered the likely effects of the Project during both construction and operation and identifies appropriate mitigation where required. With regards to operational noise, the likely operation effects of the overhead line including those associated weather conditions have been and presented within **Application Document 6.16 Chapter 16 Noise and Vibration**. The proposed overhead line near East Drayton is the quietest available conductor type (triple araucaria) and is designed to operate with low levels of corona discharge and associated noise, even during wet conditions. National Grid has not identified evidence to indicate that the operation of the overhead line would result in significant adverse effects on equestrian activities, the

East Drayton Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	viability of local livery businesses or the continued use of public rights of way. The assessment is presented in **Application Document 6.17 Chapter 17 Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism.** National Grid therefore considers that the likely effects of the Project have been appropriately assessed and that the proposed design offers the appropriate balance between considerations.
The Parish Council requests that this request for a slight route alteration be taken extremely seriously in light of the points.	National Grid take all requests for design alterations into account when carrying out routeing and siting for the Project. Consideration of this request is evidenced within Table 8.11 of the **Application Document 5.1 Consultation Report**.

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Consultee notes that Route Sections 1-5 are within the East Riding of Yorkshire Authority Area.	As presented at statutory consultation Route Sections 1-5 were within the East Riding of Yorkshire Council Authority Area. The Application has been submitted with refined Routes Sections A-F. All of Route Section A and the north of Route Section B is within the administrative boundary of East Riding of Yorkshire Authority Area.
Landscape and Visual	
The preliminary assessment of Potentially Significant Landscape and Visual Effects, within the PEIR Chapters 6 and 7, appears to be appropriate. It correctly identifies the relevant receptors and whether or not they are likely to be subject to Significant Effects. This forms a suitable basis for carrying forward to the LVIA..	National Grid welcomes this feedback and the extended engagement which has taken place with ERYC on the landscape and visual elements of the Project during the pre-application stage.
Viewpoints	
There are no viewpoints, around the Creyke Beck area sub-stations, listed in the **PEIR Volume 3: Appendix 7.2 Proposed Viewpoints February 2025.** These are covered by separate assessments.	The new substation at Creyke Beck did not form part of National Grid's proposals for the Project during non-statutory consultation, but the decision was made to include the substation within the statutory consultation for the Project. This approach allowed National Grid to demonstrate that the Project can be delivered and that it can connect

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	to the national transmission network. Since then, National Grid has shared all feedback about the substation with the substation project team for consideration as part of their design development, and further progress has been made to ensure the relevant permissions are in place. As you will be aware a planning application for the 400 kV Birkhill Wood Substation (25/01898/STPLF), was granted planning permission by East Riding of Yorkshire Council in February 2026 subject to conditions. As a result, National Grid has removed the Birkhill Wood substation and associated works from its proposals for the Project with assessments amended accordingly.
Viewpoint locations are well-selected to cover the route geographically and to represent an appropriate range of receptors. Micro-siting, to avoid foreground clutter, may be useful at some viewpoints e.g. 2.3, 3.2, 3.4	National Grid welcomes this feedback. Engagement has continued with ERYC landscape and visual experts on viewpoints selected and assessed in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment.** Foreground clutter has been avoided where practicable do to so.
Many of the viewpoints are from some distance to the side of the line corridors. The greatest visual effects of a parallel line routeing configuration are from within or close to the routeing corridor. Consideration should be given to adding viewpoints from public highways or rights of way which have views along corridors, for example: • West and/or east of VP2.3, near Rowley Cottage or Dale Road respectively • Ellerker Rd / Ings Lane, west of Broomfleet	Detailed comments on viewpoints locations were received from stakeholders as part of the landscape and visual technical working group. Suggestions for new viewpoint locations were taken forward with viewpoints added for the assessment. Assessment methodology including viewpoint locations have been agreed with ERYC during pre-application discussions. Viewpoint locations have been agreed with each stakeholder as referenced in the relevant Statements of Common Ground. Viewpoints are presented in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment.** In respect of this specific comment, viewpoints were added at Socken Wood (viewpoint A-07) to show the effect of being directly under the proposed overhead line, on Dale Road (viewpoint A-09) close to the proposed overhead line near the top of the escarpment and Ings Lane (viewpoint A-21) close to the proposed line swap.
VP 1.1 ~ 2.7 are located within the ERYC-designated Important Landscape Area	Where viewpoints are located within the Important Landscape Area, this has been acknowledged in the viewpoint assessment presented

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
(ILA). Vp3.1 and 3.2 are located close the ILA. Although the ILA is noted within the PIER Ch 7 Visual report, this designation is not noted in any of the 'Value of the View' statements within App7.2. This contrasts with the Isle of Axholme ASHLI in Route Section 7. This should be carefully reviewed by the applicant to ensure that the Value associated with the ILA is fully captured.	in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 1) Route Section A**. This has fed into the judgements on the value of views presented, although the presence of the existing 4ZQ 400 kV overhead line moderates the value in many of the locations. A review has been undertaken to ensure consistency with viewpoints within the Isle of Axholme ASHLI.
VP2.3 could be used to look both south-east and south-west	VP2.3 (now VP A-08 and VP-08b) now includes viewpoints in both directions and is presented in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment** and **Application Document 7.16 Photomontages**.
VP2.6 should be micro-sited to provide the most relevant visual information, now that the design has been established.	Viewpoint locations have been agreed with each stakeholder as referenced in the relevant Statements of Common Ground. VP2.6 (now VP A-15) was retained as it is the first location with a longer distance view for people using the Yorkshire Wolds way from the east. It shows the proposed overhead line parallel with the existing 400 kV overhead line, but also shows the longer distance views towards the Humber Estuary. Additional viewpoint A-33 was added to show the effects for people travelling from the west towards Woo Dale. Viewpoints are presented in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 1) Route Section A**.
VP3.1: a viewpoint closer to line (e.g. near 493177, 429070) would likely be more informative.	VP3.1 (now VP A-17) was relocated as requested further along Cave Road. This viewpoint is presented in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 1) Route Section A** and **Application Document 7.16 Photomontages**.
VP3.8: subject to the hedge height at the time of photography, a view south/southeast from the footpath near VP3.2 would be more informative than this view	VP3.8 (now VP A-20) was retained to show the screening effect of the hedgerow. VP A-19 provides the views from the footpath close to VP3.2 (now VP A-18). These viewpoints are presented in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 1) Route Section A**.

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Highway Safety	
There are two main elements to this development from a Local Highway Authority point of view, the construction haulage routes and the construction access points Given the site area of the development, the haulage route has been split into 22 areas for assessment, It is necessary to carry out pre-construction dilapidation surveys on the above roads that are not classified A or B roads, these should be undertaken in liaison with ERYC Area Engineers. Following completion of the works a post-construction dilapidation survey is also required to be undertaken.	A commitment has been made within the Application to undertake dilapidation surveys prior, during and following construction taking place. Further details are provided within **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan.**
With regard to the construction access points, 43 have been identified within the East Riding of Yorkshire Council Authority boundary. The Councils Highways Officer has advised that the majority of these accesses are acceptable however without mitigation the below accesses would not be acceptable in terms of highway safety impact. • BM-004 – Risby Road (Dunflat Road), Little Weighton (National Speed Limit (NSL)) –restricted visibility due to hedge • BM-005 – Little Weighton Road, Skidby (NSL) – Existing visibility restricted • BM-006 – Little Weighton Road, Skidby (NSL) - Existing visibility restricted • BM-007 – Rowley Road, Little Weighton(50mph) – Existing approach side visibility restricted • BM-013 – Ellerker Road, Brantingham - restricted visibility due to hedge • BM-018 – Cave Road (Brough Road, Ellerker (NSL) – Existing departure side visibility restricted • BM-019 - Sands Lane, Ellerker (NSL) – Existing departure side visibility severely restricted	As part of project design and ongoing discussions with ERYC Highways Officers, and Area Engineers agreement has been made on the suitability of the access points required. A visibility splay survey was undertaken and where results fell short of standards as set out in relevant Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) documents, appropriate mitigation measures have been identified and embedded into the Project's design. A Statement of Common Ground is submitted as **Application Document 5.8.6 – East Riding of Yorkshire Council** with the principles of bellmouth locations and bellmouth indicative construction design agreed between parties following discussion over the pre-application period. The Applicant has produced a Highway Safety Assessment, for which a summary is included within **Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment**. Following the conclusion of the desktop assessment it was deemed appropriate to carry out a more concentrated study, which reviewed key collision hotspots. A programme of site inspections was undertaken to supplement the desktop assessment and verify site conditions. The inspections identified a number of existing constraints, varying visibility standards, high traffic flows, periodic congestion and location-

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
• BM -020 - Sands Lane, Ellerker (NSL) – Existing approach side visibility severely restricted • BM-026 – Ings Lane, Ellerker (NSL) – Existing approach side visibility severely restricted • BM-027 – Main Street, Broomfleet (NSL) – restricted visibility due to hedge on both sides • BM-031 - Sleights Lane, Broomfleet (NSL) – Approach side visibility restricted due to the horizontal alignment of the road • BM-032 - Sleights Lane, Broomfleet (NSL) – Departure side visibility restricted due to the horizontal alignment of the road • BM-035 - Tounge Lane, Flaxfleet (NSL) - Approach side visibility restricted due to the horizontal alignment of the road • BM-040- Main Street, Ousefleet (30mph) – Approach side visibility restricted due to hedging • BM-041 - Main Street, Ousefleet (30mph) – Departure side visibility restricted due to hedging	specific operational characteristics. Where appropriate, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce safety risks and support the safe operation of the highway network throughout the construction and operational phases of the Project. The assessment summarised that construction traffic associated with the Project is not predicted to result in a material deterioration in highway safety conditions and would not give rise to highway safety impacts. The methodology for the Highway Safety Assessment was shared with each Local Highway Authority in the Project area, including East Riding of Yorkshire. East Riding have confirmed no issues with the approach, as detailed in the **Application Document 5.9.6 Statement of Common Ground - East Riding of Yorkshire**
It is unclear which bellmouths are to be access points or crossing points only and therefore additional information should be provided. It should also be noted that the construction details including dimensions have not yet been submitted and therefore only the principle of the access points not identified above are considered acceptable.	Bellmouth locations, access and crossing points and numbers have been discussed over an extended period during the pre application stage, with additional information provided. ERYC is content in principle with the locations of the bellmouths, subject to final design details and the Project factoring in their comments on coordination of works which will be covered by **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan.** The locations of the bellmouths are considered to be suitable, subject to final design details and subject to appropriate phasing/construction programming. Agreement on these matters is set out in **Application Document 5.8.6 Statement of Common Ground – East Riding of Yorkshire Council.**
The above assessment of the haulage route and passing places are based on the trip figures identified within the Traffic chapter of the	The assessment of the haulage route and passing places is based on the most recent survey findings for trip figures as identified within

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Environmental Statement and therefore should these figures alter significantly in the future revised assessment would be required.	**Application Document 6.14 Chapter 14 Traffic and Transport** and **Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment.**
A Transport Assessment for the development should be produced and where it is anticipated that any junction that is significantly impacted, this should be assessed. Typically, this would be any junction that is impact by more than 30 two-way movements in any one hour.	A Transport Assessment has been produced **Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment** and provides analysis of any junction expected to experience a significant impact.
The above is an assessment of the local highway network during the construction phase only. It is anticipated that once complete the maintenance and operational trips will be very low, however this should be covered within the Transport Assessment.	**Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment** includes details of operational and maintenance traffic movements.
Countryside Access	
Definitions and Terminology The PEIR refers to 'stopping up' concerning some Public Rights Of Ways (PROWs). In 17.7.26 the terms 'manage' and 'stop up' would seem to indicate temporary closures however, the term 'stopping up' is understood to mean the extinguishment of access rights, and therefore the permanent closure of a public right of way. Clarification of the definition of the term 'stopping up' is therefore required along with confirmation on which PROWs are proposed to be closed permanently. The suggested (and accepted) terminology is as follows. • 'Stopping up,' is the extinguishment of access rights, or permanent closure of a PROW. • 'Temporary closure,' is the closure of a PROW for weeks/months for the duration of planned works, with the provision of a temporary diversion/alternative route, where feasible. • 'Diversion,' a permanent diversion of a PROW, via application to the Definitive Map team	In the PEIR, the term "Manage / Stop Up" was used to suggest light management measures, such as signage or active oversight. However, during a meeting with ERYC Public Rights of Way (PRoW) officers, it was noted that "Stop Up" is commonly interpreted within PRoW terminology as indicating permanent closure, which was not the intended meaning. As a result, National Grid has revised the terminology to "Manage / Access Control" to better reflect the intended approach. No PRoW are being permenantly closed in the Application.

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
• 'PROW Management' would indicate a PROW remaining open, but with active management of users, for example, the use of safety signs, banksmen to request users pause to allow vehicles to pass, or vehicles/machinery pausing to allow users to pass.	
PROW status Section 17.21 of the PEIR lists the affected PROWs (using their new reference numbers), and lists several as National Trail, but many do not hold this status (High Hunsley Circuit, Peatlands Way, and the Trans Pennine Trail and more). It is important that the applicant fully understands the nature of these routes and the status they hold. The Yorkshire Wolds Way and the King Charles III England Coast Path are the only National Trails within the East Riding of Yorkshire, designated as such for their nationally significant, landscape value, and externally funded by Natural England. Other named routes are known as 'Promoted Routes' and although these may be partially grant-funded at times, and are important leisure routes, they do not hold the same status as National Trails	The feedback was noted by the Project team and the status and nature of these routes has been actioned and incorporated into assessments (including the PEIR) accordingly.
References Within section 17.5.37 of the PEIR, the applicant has assigned each PROW a reference number to use in place of their full name and description. Each PROW has a reference number, already used within PROW and Definitive Map records and by ERYC and partners. Using these references (or combining the two) would seem more sensible than introducing additional references. PROW reference numbers can be found using the interactive PROW map on www.walkingtheriding.co.uk and clicking on the relevant PROW. For example, Ellerker Public Footpath No.02 is ELLEF02.	The feedback has been noted and, as suggested, the definitive map reference has been used to ensure consistency across suite of Application documents

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
PRoW Management Plan The report refers to the impact the development will have on PROWs but does not indicate the applicant will produce a Public Rights of Way Management Plan. Officers feel a PROW management plan is essential. The project may have minimal impact on individual PROWs, but with over 20 PROWs affected, including a National Trail, promoted routes, and one PROW potentially being permanently extinguished, the cumulative impact will have a significant negative impact on the network. This could be mitigated by creating a community fund earmarked for local access improvements driven by Parish Councils as part of your local community projects funding.	A PROW Management Plan has been prepared and is presented within **Application Document 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan.** The impact of the Project on PRoW users has been assessed and presented within Application Document 6.17 Chapter 17: Socio-economic, recreation and tourism. The Project has, since statutory consultation, consulted on the community benefit fund, to understand what is important to stakeholders, and where funding could deliver long-lasting benefits, including through community grant schemes and investment in community groups or via regional partnerships. Any funding would be available after the Project is granted development consent and construction work has started. The community benefit fund on North Humber to High Marnham could be in the region of around £18 million. The project team is reviewing feedback and will continue to engage with ERYC in this respect. It should also be noted that no PRoW will be permanently extinguished, with only temporary closures expected with appropriate diversions provided where possible.
PROW Management Plan, authored in liaison with ERYC PROW officers, will enable officers to • Set out expectations for remedial works following the completion of the works and temporary diversions.• Advise on the suitability of temporary and permanent diversion routes, their surfaces, and their widths. • Manage the cumulative impact of temporary closures by coordinating consecutive rather than overlapping closures where possible. • Advise on permitted surface changes where access/construction routes lie along a PROW.	A PROW Management Plan has been prepared and is presented within **Application Document 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan**. The Applicant is committed to working closely with PROW officers to avoid inappropriate works, materials, safety signage, or poor visibility presenting a hazard to PROW users, and measures are secured within **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice.** Extensive engagement has been carried out with East Riding of Yorkshire Council relating to PRoWs, covering discussion on closures, management measures and diversions, which is presented

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
• Advise on H&S considerations for PROW management using banksmen and signage. The applicant should work closely with PROW officers to avoid inappropriate works, materials, safety signage, or poor visibility, presenting a hazard to PROW users.	within **Application Document 5.9.6 Statement of Common Ground - East Riding of Yorkshire.**
Permanent closure of PROW The report refers to the permanent closure of a PROW for the Birkhill Wood Access. ERYC's PROW Team would strenuously object to the permanent closure of any PROW. The applicant should instead work with officers to identify a suitable diversion route that will maintain and potentially improve the network in that area.	As ERYC will be aware the Birkhill Wood substation has, since statutory consultation, been granted planning consent via planning application 25/01898/STPLF. As a result, National Grid has removed the Birkhill Wood substation and associated works from the description of the Project. There are no permanent closures of PROW within the Application.
National Trail Officers feel that the impact of the development on the Yorkshire Wolds Way National Trail has been hugely underestimated. National Trails are long-distance trails designated by the government for their high landscape value, and all meet a series of standards that set them apart from other promoted routes. National Trails highlight the UK's most scenic and unique landscapes and are high-profile tourist destinations, also providing valuable recreational resources for communities along the trails. The Yorkshire Wolds Way boasts breathtaking scenery and viewpoints, and a development such as this could harm the landscape value of the affected stretches. Beautiful viewpoints form the focus of many short routes taking in the National Trail and provide ideal locations for users to take in the scenery and enjoy peaceful moments within the local countryside. This is a valuable resource for any community and brings positive impacts to health and wellbeing. This could be lost if the very landscape the trail is highlighting is developed in this way.	Where possible, National Grid has sought to route the new overhead line in close parallel to existing overhead line, thereby keeping transmission infrastructure together and reducing the potential for adverse visual, environmental, and socio-economic impacts. The Project crosses the National Trail next to the existing overhead line, which already affects views. Effects would only be on a very limited section of footpath and in a location where vegetation would help screen closer proximity views. A sequential assessment is provided within the LVIA to show how localised the effects of the Project will be, this includes photos from along the footpath. Further details provided within **Application Document 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan**.
Representatives of the application have been keen to point out that the section of the Yorkshire Wolds Way within the development area	At the time of submission of the Application the development area falls outside the proposed AONB boundary. The position has been

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
falls outside of the proposed AONB boundary, and therefore, any related considerations are not needed. Officers would like to clarify that the AONB boundary has not yet been confirmed, and the Yorkshire Wolds Way Partnership (Natural England, NYMNPA, North Yorks Council, ERYC, and the Joint Local Access Forum for Hull and the East Riding) have been consulted on the proposed boundary and raised concerns. The partnership has proposed an extended boundary that would take in a corridor along the National Trail, including areas of the southern Wolds, and the development area. The applicant should not consider the proposed AONB boundary a foregone conclusion until all consultations are complete and the final boundary is confirmed.	continually monitored though the pre-application stages of the project to support routeing and siting studies and assessments. An assessment of views from the Yorkshire Wolds Way are represented by a number of viewpoints presented in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessmen**t.
Representatives of the application have also been keen to confirm that pylons already lie across the Yorkshire Wolds Way and therefore, a second parallel line of pylons would have negligible impact, also pointing out that burying cables could have more impact on habitats. This may be correct in the short term, but the long-term impact on the landscape views would be positive. Officers feel that this resigned approach to impacts on the National Trail falls short of our responsibilities under planning policy, to seek not only maintain PROWs, but also to improve them. We feel, therefore that it would be more appropriate to seek solutions to reduce impacts on the National Trail, including through the burial of lines through the affected area.	National Grid has carefully considered the feedback received during the stage one non-statutory consultation in 2023, statutory consultation, the alternatives available, and other factors including our duties and obligations. These duties include balancing the need to be economic and efficient, which includes keeping costs down in the interests of the bill-paying consumers, with a duty to have regard to preserving amenity, which includes the natural environment, cultural heritage, landscape and visual quality. National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-5 makes it clear that the Government expects overhead lines to be appropriate in most instances, although it recognises that there may be, at particularly sensitive locations such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), potential adverse landscape and visual impacts of an overhead line which may make it unacceptable in planning terms, taking account of the specific local environment and context. Consideration was given to the use of underground cables throughout, including through the Yorkshire Wolds on the assumption that the area could be designated as an AONB. Underground cable options were considered across the Yorkshire Wolds because the initial ‘Area of Search’ for the AONB covered the

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	entirety of the Wolds within the study area. When the provisional 'Candidate Area' for the proposed AONB was announced, indicating that designation within the study area was unlikely, it was considered that a policy compliant overhead line could be developed within the study area through the Yorkshire Wolds. In addition to this, undergrounding cables in this area would require cable sealing end compounds, which would bring new concerns of siting this infrastructure in an Important Landscape Area. These reasons, together with the level of technical challenges associated with the constructability and deliverability of undergrounding cables in certain locations, such as the Brantingham Dale area, mean that an overhead line is proposed. Further information on alternatives considered is presented within **Application Document 6.3 Chapter 3 Main Alternatives Considered**. A sequential assessment has been prepared in the landscape and visual assessments to illustrate how localised the effects of the Project will be, this includes photos from along the footpath presented within **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessme**nt. A detailed assessment for the Yorkshire Wolds Way is provided **in Application Document 6.7.A4 Appendix 7.4 Visual Baseline and Assessment.** **Application Document 6.7 Chapter 7 Visual** confirms there would be a minor adverse (not significant) effect at Year 1 and 15, although it is noted that there would be a moderate adverse (significant) localised effect whilst receptors pass under the proposed overhead line at Woo Dale. The impacts of the Project on PRoWs, access routes and recreational routes, including the Yorkshire Wolds Way National Trail and community connectivity and severance are assessed in **Application Document 6.17 Socio Economic Recreation and Tourism**. The assessment concludes that the Yorkshire Wolds Way would not experience any significant effects.

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Nature Conservation We would request that removal of vegetation is always limited to that absolutely necessary, is retained as far into the project programme as possible and removed within appropriate seasons in accordance with ecological checks/working methods included in the Draft OCoCP.	Vegetation removal will be limited as far as practicable and will be carried out in accordance with the working methods secured within **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice**, **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** and **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan** submitted as part of the application for development consent.
Access tracks are described as 4m wide (8m with passing places), with soil storage and drainage would be typical swath of 12m (section 4.5.27). Pylon working areas are typically 60x60 for suspension or 70x70m square for tension pylons, but we are pleased to understand that these areas will be modified where possible to avoid impact on important features. In the event that access tracks within woodland habitat are unavoidable we would request the use of track mat panels to minimise soil disturbance. We welcome the commitment to use temporary bridges on water courses with culverts used in respect to ditches only and would encourage the use of temporary bridges where ditch habitat is of high value and/or impacts on protected species can be avoided/reduced.	**Application Document 7.5 Outline Soil Management Plan** confirms that where required, trackway will be used if vehicle access is necessary over unstripped soils, and the access could result in irreversible compaction/rutting. Where watercourses are to be crossed by construction traffic, measures to be applied include the use of temporary culverts or temporary clear spanned bridges (or suitably assessed and approved alternatives). Where required, sensitive watercourses, for example those designated as main rivers, those with Water Framework Directive (WFD) status, or those that are inhabited by protected species would be crossed using clear span bridges or suitably assessed and approved alternatives.
We welcome that the temporary scaffolding and nets installed as crossing protection prior to stringing of conductors to protect assets such as roads, railways, and distribution network overhead lines will be extended to include hedgerows where possible (section 4.5.37)	National Grid welcomes this feedback.
Section 4.7 notes that routine maintenance and repair will require vegetation management with interlocking track mat panels used for access. Refurbishment works would require temporary access tracks, a small compound and potentially scaffolding to protect roads and other features during the work. Decommissioning has been scoped out of the assessment (section 4.8).	National Grid confirms that this detail remains valid within the Application.

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Ecology Chapter 8	
Section 8.4.8 confirms that all surveys are not yet complete but will be included in the ES. We would note that Table 8.3 lists surveys done and in progress. We note that the list covers all anticipated surveys but gives no indication of where specific species/habitat surveys are being undertaken	Survey areas have been detailed in species and habitat specific appendices of **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology.** • **Application Document 6.8.A3 Appendix 8.3 Habitat Survey Report;** • **Application Document 6.8.A4 Appendix 8.4 Botanical Report;** • **Application Document 6.8.A5 Appendix 8.5 Badger Report (Confidential);** • **Application Document 6.8.A6 Appendix 8.6 Otter and Water Vole Report;** • **Application Document 6.8.A7 Appendix 8.7 Bat Roost Report;** • **Application Document 6.8.A8 Appendix 8.8 Bat Activity Report;** • **Application Document 6.8.A9 Appendix 8.9 Hazel Dormouse Report;** • **Application Document 6.8.A10 Appendix 8.10 Aquatic Ecology Report** • **Application Document 6.8.A12 Appendix 8.12 Great Crested Newt Report - Nottinghamshire**
It is noted that Figure 8.3 Phase 1 Habitat Survey Map includes broad habitats recorded to date (February-October 2024) with further surveys ongoing where habitats of potential interest identified. It is noted that Table 8.24 importance/value of ecological features will be updated as survey are completed (section 8.4.37).	More detailed botanical surveys (including National Vegetation Classification (NVC) surveys, where appropriate) were carried out in Summer 2025. These surveys targeted affected locations within the Order Limits where the Phase 1 habitat survey identified habitat as being particularly species diverse and/or sensitive and/or a type restricted in the UK/region. This included areas of grassland and woodland. The importance of relevant ecological features can be found in 8.6 Baseline Conditions of **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology**.

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Current assessments are based on the vegetation clearance assumptions described in Chapter 4 (8.4.38-39). We welcome the commitment in section 8.4.40 to retain vegetation in certain areas, where this would avoid a potentially significant effect and the use of suitably sized stand-off distances to protect important habitat features during construction, including woodland, watercourses, and hedgerows, where practicable.	National Grid has retained this commitment as part of the Application. The effects on ecological features, including these habitats, can be found in 8.7 Potential Effects of **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology**.
Designated Sites The report lists all designated sites within the study area (Table 8.8). Those within the East Riding Area (Routes 1-5, in part) which are potential impacts (within the DOL) or close proximity (50m) are listed. We agree with the sites identified but would request that the presence of 'protected hedgerows' is also considered in respect to the potential for crossing protection to be provided where such hedgerows would otherwise be removed.	A desk based review has been carried out of Phase 1 habitat survey data and aerial imaging in affected locations within the Order Limits to identify hedges as being particularly species diverse and/or more than 30 years old, and potentially important under The Hedgerows Regulations 1997. Vegetation clearance is required to ensure the Project can be safely constructed and operated. Vegetation clearance generally falls into four categories: removed, affected managed, potentially affected, and not affected. These are shown on **Application Document 2.13 Trees and Important Hedgerows to be Removed or Managed Plans** and have been assessed within the relevant chapters of this ES. The effects on ecological features, including hedgerows, can be found in 8.7 Potential Effects of **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology**.
Ancient Woodland and Priority Habitats It is noted that no areas of ancient woodland as recorded on the ancient woodland inventory intersect the draft Order limits with areas within 30/32m being subject to appropriate standoff. We welcome the surveys currently being undertaken to establish if wooded areas affected by the proposals support ancient woodland features, and to identify veteran trees up to 30m from the DOL. Some veteran trees identified to date are listed in Table 8.9 but the corresponding Figure 8.5 Arboricultural Survey Results does not appear to have been provided. 11 veteran trees have been identified to date within Route sections 1-5 and we would encourage all such trees to be retained.	Woodland with characteristics of ancient woodland, but not on the ancient woodland inventory, are discussed in **Application Document 6.8.A4 Appendix 8.4 Botanical Report**. The effects on ecological features, including hedgerows, can be found in 8.7 Potential Effects of **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology**. 37 veteran trees and one veteran tree group have been identified within the arboricultural study area (Order Limits plus 30 m) during arboricultural surveys, details of which are reported in **Application Document 7.14 Arboricultural Impact Assessment** and associated Appendix E Veteran Tree Assessment Methodology .. No veteran trees require removal to facilitate the Project based upon the overhead line alignment shown in **Application Document 2.4**

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	Works Plans. However, in the event flexibility of the LoD are used to the south in its location, veteran tree T4 (a common oak, *Quercus rober*), may require removal in order to construct a safe and reliable power grid. This tree is located in the East Riding of Yorkshire and should removal of T4 be required, commitment to a replacement planting ratio of 30:1 is set out in **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments,** this measure has been agreed with Natural England and East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
Priority habitats identified within the DOL (Table 8.10) include deciduous woodland (route sections 1, 2 and 3), lowland calcareous grassland (route section 2), reedbeds (route section 3) and coastal saltmarsh and mudflats (route section 4). We would request that impacts on any priority habitats are avoided with mitigation and/or compensation provided if this is not possible. We would also request that opportunities to provide habitat enhancements within the route sections include these habitat types (refer to mitigation/BNG sections below). We welcome that section 8.5.26 recognises that many hedgerows will also be Priority Habitat with the intention for important hedgerows to be identified through the ongoing site surveys.	Through routeing, siting and detailed design, National Grid has sought to reduce, as far as practicable, potential impacts on biodiversity including priority grassland, wetland, woodland, and hedgerow habitats. The design process has taken account of existing biodiversity, the natural environment and, where practicable, seeks to reduce impacts on areas of ecological sensitivity, through avoidance or mitigation (including reinstatement and habitat creation). **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8: Ecology** of the Environmental Statement (ES) assesses the effects on important ecological receptors (which includes grasslands, wetlands, woodlands and hedgerows). This assessment has been informed by a desk study and a suite of ecological surveys. Proposed mitigation and good practice measures relating to ecology are provided in **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice**, **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** and **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan**. This includes mitigation planting areas which are proposed across the Project Order Limits.
Phase 1 habitat survey and protected/notable/INN species Habitat survey is noted as ongoing with phase 1 results to date shown in Figure 8.3. Further detailed habitat surveys are to be undertaken (section 8.5.27) including NVC surveys dependant on the phase 1	As part of the preparation of the Environmental Statement for the Project, a suite of ecological surveys has been undertaken. More detailed botanical surveys (including National Vegetation Classification (NVC) surveys, where appropriate) were carried out in

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
results. The location of these surveys is not included. We would request at a minimum all priority habitats, woodlands, hedgerows and semi-improved grasslands are subject to further survey with poor SI considered dependant on timing of the initial phase 1 survey.	Summer 2025. These surveys targeted affected locations within the Order Limits where the Phase 1 habitat survey identified habitat as being particularly species diverse and/or sensitive and/or a type restricted in the UK/region. This included areas of grassland and woodland where appropriate and are presented in **Application Document 6.8.A4 Appendix 8.4 Botanical Report**.
Table 8.11 to 8.15 include summary of baseline details for protected/notable/INN species including desk study and survey where undertaken to date. It notes that targeted surveys will be undertaken where suitable habitats are identified. We welcome the range and scope of the proposed surveys which appear appropriate. We would suggest terrestrial invertebrates and reptiles for Brantingham Dale and support terrestrial invertebrates at the Humber Estuary.	The working areas have been adjusted to avoid the Humber Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI, therefore only ornithological surveys have been necessary here, and effects are assessed within **Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9 Ornithology.** Areas of woodland in the Brantingham area will be oversailed by the proposed overhead line resulting in temporary habitat loss and disturbance, with the permanent loss of some trees. The siting of pylons will also involve some tree loss. However, this will open up some areas of woodland, potentially increasing the suitability of the habitat in the long term for reptiles and certain invertebrates, with the surrounding woodland retained. Large areas of this woodland are plantations, with evidence of repeated clear felling and replanting in recent years. Areas of woodland planting to mitigate for the losses within Brantingham Dale have been included as additional mitigation measures as part of the Project; these are detailed in **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.** Records and survey observations, along with the majority of the route being of suboptimal habitat for reptiles, suggest that they are unlikely to be present in large numbers and that standard reptile mitigation measures would be appropriate to avoid harm to reptiles present. Records did not suggest that protected invertebrate species are present within Brantingham. The majority of the route is suboptimal habitat for invertebrates, with more suitable habitat areas being less affected by the required works, such as the restringing of existing pylons by Keadby power station. Surveys have not been carried out in these areas to support

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	the ecology assessment. Working areas have been adjusted to avoid being sited within Brantingham Dale SSSI, however some trees will be affected due to oversailing. This may be of benefit to the calcareous grasslands present for which the SSSI is primarily designated. Some previous scrub management is known to have been carried out, under consent, inside the SSSI to improve the condition of the calcareous grassland. This may also be of benefit for invertebrates. Measures that will be carried out to protect reptiles during construction are detailed in **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments**.
Surveys ongoing in targeted locations include flora/fungi, terrestrial invertebrates, reptiles, GCN (eDNA of ponds within 250m of DOL), bats (GLTA and activity transects), otter and water vole, badger, SPI (incidental sightings), targeted fish surveys, INNS (sightings during other surveys).	**Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8: Ecology** outlines the baseline ecological conditions within the study area, determined through desk study and a suite of ecological surveys. Detailed methods and results of the surveys that have been carried out are found in the following appendices: • **Application Document 6.8.A3 Appendix 8.3 Habitat Survey Report;** • **Application Document 6.8.A4 Appendix 8.4 Botanical Report;** • **Application Document 6.8.A5 Appendix 8.5 Badger Report (Confidential);** • **Application Document 6.8.A6 Appendix 8.6 Otter and Water Vole Report;** • **Application Document 6.8.A7 Appendix 8.7 Bat Roost Report;** • **Application Document 6.8.A8 Appendix 8.8 Bat Activity Report;** • **Application Document 6.8.A9 Appendix 8.9 Hazel Dormouse Report; and** • **Application Document 6.8.A10 Appendix 8.10 Aquatic Ecology Report.**

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	• **Application Document 6.8.A12 Appendix 8.12 Great Crested Newt Report - Nottinghamshire.**
Preliminary assessment of effects (section 8.7) Significant effects identified to date (Table 8.22, 8.23 and 8.24) acknowledged to be subject to the results of on-going surveys are summarised below. This preliminary assessment takes into account the embedded, control and management and additional mitigation measures set out in section 8.6	Responses below.
• Humber Estuary designated sites. Potentially significant effects have been identified during construction dependant on the crossing method used. We welcome the consideration of non-standard methods to avoid habitat damage.	The construction method at the River Ouse taken forward by the Project avoids habitat damage. Table 8.19 of **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8: Ecology** provides the assessment of residual effects on designated sites with no significant effects on the Humber Estuary designated sites. Table 9.21 of **Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9: Ornithology** provides the assessment of residual effects on statutory designated sites. This identifies no significant effects on the Humber Estuary designated sites with respect to their qualifying features of ornithological interest.
• Brantingham Dale SSSI. Potentially significant effects have been identified during construction dependant on the micro siting of the tower working area. We would encourage avoidance of any adverse impacts in respect to calcareous grassland and would support the inclusion of enhancements in respect to this high value habitat. Any opportunities to extend this habitat type should be explored.	No significant effects on Brantingham Dale SSSI have been identified. Some vegetation along part of the edge of Brantingham Dale SSSI will be affected and managed as part of the Project. New trees will be planted in proposed mitigation planting areas, outside the SSSI, which are shown in **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.** These areas have been chosen with a view to extend existing woodland areas and/or provide links between existing areas of woodland. The minimal tree loss inside the SSSI may create conditions more suitable for grassland and other ground flora to establish or improve, including the calcareous grassland for which the SSSI is primarily designated. Some previous scrub management is known to have been carried out, under consent, inside the SSSI to improve the condition of the calcareous grassland.

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
• Jillywood Lane LWS. Although significant effects have not been identified the confidence is stated as low with potential encroachment at eastern end dependant on micro siting and towards the west due to works on third party assets. The site consists of a strip of broadleaved semi-natural woodland which forms a habitat corridor linking known areas of ancient woodland. We would support routing and methods which avoid loss of trees and degradation of ground flora (bluebell recorded). An indicative mitigation planting area is identified at the western end of Jillywood Lane. Opportunities to extend this area would be beneficial considering potential tree loss associated with the adjacent A164 crossing.	Direct habitat loss and disturbance will be experienced at Jillywood Lane LWS should the lateral LoD be used in this area. At the eastern end this equates to approximately 0.07ha, and 0.15ha at the western end. The existing design avoids this loss. Due to possible external factors, for example other projects proposed in this vicinity, a commitment to avoid using the LoD in this location cannot be guaranteed, however retention of the existing design and therefore avoiding this loss will be adhered to where possible. Habitats temporarily impacted would be reinstated to their original condition (or better) post-construction excluding trees, which would be permanently lost. A proposed woodland mitigation planting area is located at the western end of Jillywood Lane LWS, as shown in **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan**.
• Brantingham Dale LWS (historic) Significant effect has been identified with the route crossing this site likely to cause habitat loss, fragmentation and disturbance. The extent of the loss of woodland is disappointing; we would request restricting tree removal as far as possible, minimising ground disturbance, retaining connectivity with scrub habitat and seeking opportunities to extend woodland cover within the immediate vicinity. The indicative mitigation planting area to the south of Cliffs Plantation is welcome. Any potential to link to Woo Dale LWS (historic) would be encouraged. Small area of indicative mitigation planting adjacent to pylon 4ZQ78 is noted to be SI neutral grassland (Phase 1 habitat plan) and should be retained as such with enhancement and extension, if possible rather than planting.	Permanent loss of trees and fragmentation of the woodland canopy would occur where reinstatement is not possible due to the operational requirements of the proposed overhead line. New trees will be planted in proposed mitigation planting areas, outside the Historic LWS, which are shown in **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan**. These areas have been chosen with a view to extend existing woodland areas and/or provide links between existing areas of woodland. The closest indicative mitigation planting area to pylon 4ZQ78 is immediately south of Woodale woodland (another historic LWS), in an area that was recorded to be poor semi-improved grassland during further detailed survey (rather than semi-improved neutral grassland). The proposal here is to extend tree planting next to the existing woodland. Three other blocks of woodland are proposed southwest of Cliffs Plantation (a candidate LWS), north of 4ZQ75 in areas consisting of poor semi-improved grassland and arable fields. The proposal here is to extend the woodland south and improve links

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	with woodland along Ellerker Wold Land and Bilkshill Plantation to the east.
• Broomfleet Pits LWS Significant effects are not anticipated with potential to avoid vegetation loss depending on final design. We request opportunities to extend wetland and associated habitats in this area are considered.	No direct effects will occur on Broomfleet Pits LWS as it lies outside of the order limits. Indirect effects will be mitigated through measures secured within **Application Document 7.2 Code of Construction Practice.**
• Woodland The potential for significant effects on woodland habitat has been identified although low confidence with habitat surveys ongoing and extent of clearance not finalised. Any loss of woodland is disappointing considering the low occurrence of this habitat within the East Riding. We support the retention of areas below overhead lines as scrub with glades within woodland generally considered beneficial to overall biodiversity but opportunities to extend impacted woodlands away from the lines should be sought to maintain the overall tall canopy tree cover. For example, indicative mitigation planting area associated with Socken Wood which is understood to be based on historic map records and to lesser extent woodland south of Ellerker and east of Yokefleet Drain.	All habitat removal will be kept to a minimum, including woodland where practicable. Appropriate stand-off distances have been applied to woodland areas to avoid direct effects where practicable. Vegetation temporarily impacted will be reinstated to original condition (or better) post-construction, with the exception of trees that need to be removed due to the operational requirements of the proposed overhead line. New trees will be planted in proposed mitigation planting areas which are shown in **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.**
• Neutral grassland – semi improved The potential for temporary loss and disturbance of the is habitat type is not anticipated to be significant with habitat surveys on going. With semi-improved grassland habitats being relatively rare in areas dominated by arable and intensive agriculture we would encourage opportunities for reinstating such habitats to better condition and creating more species rich sward where improved grassland is temporarily impacted.	National Grid confirms that habitats temporarily impacted will be reinstated to their original condition (or better) post-construction through mitigation measures secured within the Application.
• Hedgerows The potential for significant effects on hedgerow habitat has been identified with moderate confidence with habitat surveys ongoing and extent of clearance not finalised. We	Temporary direct loss and disturbance of hedgerow habitat may occur to facilitate construction works, e.g. construction access routes and visibility splays, road widening, stringing positions, scaffolding, and undergrounding third-party assets. Existing gaps in hedgerows

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
welcome the reinstatement of hedgerows and would encourage all hedgerow replanting to be undertaken with an appropriate species rich shrub mix.	will be used where practicable. Sections of hedgerow that require temporary removal to facilitate construction of the Project will be reinstated post-construction to the same (or improved) condition. For example, species-poor gappy hedgerows would be replaced with intact species-rich hedgerows where practicable.
• Parkland/scattered trees The potential for significant effects on trees both permanent and temporary have been identified with low confidence with arboricultural surveys ongoing and extent of clearance not finalised. We welcome the proposed protection of retained trees and request replacement planting should exceed losses in number/tree canopy, every effort should be made to avoid significant trees (mature and veteran trees) and alternatives to felling considered where appropriate (e.g. monoliths, coppicing).	Loss and management of trees (not part of woodlands or hedgerows) may be required to facilitate construction access (including bellmouths and visibility splays) and other temporary works, including scaffolding and stringing works. Permanent loss of trees would occur where reinstatement is not possible due to the operational requirements of the proposed overhead line and could be required to facilitate the construction of watercourse crossings and road widening/passing places. New trees will be planted in proposed mitigation planting areas which are shown in **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan. Application Document 7.14 Arboricultural Impact Assessment** contains details on the impacts to trees and tree loss arising from the Project
• Open water (ponds) Potential impacts upon these habitats is not considered significant with a commitment to retain and buffer ponds, though surveys are still ongoing. We would request consideration to creation of new ponds where absent and/or wetlands and supporting habitats where water bodies exist such as Broomfleet.	The creation of new ponds in some of the mitigation areas will be considered. There is the potential for loss of at least one pond as part of the design due to working areas overlapping with their location, such as for pylons. The Project has started the process of an application to Natural England for a District Level Licence (DLL) to cover any potential impacts on GCN and ensure legal compliance for the Project. If successful, then assessment for this species will not be needed within the Environmental Statement as they would be fully mitigated for, as part of the DLL and can therefore be scoped out of the detailed assessment.s accordingly.
• Running water The potential for significant effects on water courses both permanent and temporary have been identified with	The Project will utilise existing watercourse crossing points as far as practicable. Where required, sensitive watercourses, for example,

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
low confidence with surveys ongoing. We would request that reinstatement works aim to enhance the condition of affected watercourses with opportunities sought to undertake habitat creation works within riparian zones and/or in channel where appropriate.	those designated as main rivers, those with WFD status, or those that are inhabited by protected species such as water voles, would be crossed using clear span bridges or suitably assessed and approved alternatives. The undergrounding of third-party assets would be carried out using trenchless techniques when crossing sensitive watercourses. Opportunities to improve the condition of impacted watercourse corridors will be considered, including as part of the BNG assessment
• Lowland calcareous grassland Temporary impacts identified but not considered significant with stringing areas reduced but confidence low with working areas impacting and surveys on going. Considering value of this habitat we would request every effort is made to avoid impacts and encourage opportunities to extend this habitat type within the immediate vicinity of the works.	National Grid confirm that every effort has been made to limit the impact on this habitat. The potential temporary loss of/damage to calcareous grassland would be limited to a narrow strip of this habitat that would be crossed by a construction access road. Suitable measures would be taken to ensure that the unaffected areas of calcareous grassland are protected during construction. Turfs and soil would be suitably removed, stored separately, and reinstated post-construction. Supplementary seeding would be carried out if necessary, with suitable aftercare and monitoring undertaken. These measures will be outlined in **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.** The minimal tree management inside the SSSI may create conditions suitable for grassland and other ground flora to establish or improve, including the calcareous grassland for which the SSSI is primarily designated. Some previous scrub management is known to have been carried out, under consent, inside the SSSI to improve the condition of the calcareous grassland.
• •Coastal saltmarsh and mudflats The potential for significant temporary effects (habitat loss, fragmentation and disturbance) have been identified with low confidence with surveys ongoing and access/crossing methods not finalised. We understand that innovative crossing methods are being considered and would encourage use of non-standard methods to avoid impacts on these priority habitat types.	The construction method at the River Ouse taken forward by the Project avoids habitat damage of coastal saltmarsh and mudflats through the use of drones and helicopters.

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
• Protected and notable species Generally, impacts have not yet been assessed as surveys have not been completed. We would encourage avoidance where possible with translocation where appropriate, and best practice precautionary working methods throughout with habitat enhancements sought during reinstatement. Where assessment has been undertaken effects have been found not significant with low or moderate confidence with final package of mitigation and control measures to be decided for reptiles, GCN, badger, species of principle importance (SPI), aquatic macroinvertebrates and aquatic macrophytes). Assessments in respect to some impacts has been provided for otter and water vole which anticipate significant effects in respect to permanent and temporary habitat loss, though confidence is low as surveys are ongoing and worse case has been assumed.	National Grid notes this feedback and confirms agreement with the approach being requested. An assessment of effects on relevant important ecological features, including protected species, is provided in Section 8.9 of **Application 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology**.
To date the presence of great crested newts has been confirmed within route section 1 only with further survey in 2025 for route sections 2, 3, 4 and 5 to cover ponds within 250m. We note the intention for the project to utilise District Level Licensing in respect to potential impacts. The DOL predominantly runs through green zones with occasional amber zones in close proximity but no red zones such that the DLL approach within East Riding would be appropriate but encourage ongoing discussions described with NE to establish whether the scheme is available. We would request the use of risk avoidance measures alongside the DLL scheme as best practise although acknowledged not to be mandatory.	National Grid has engaged with Natural England and is in the process of applying for a great crested newt District Level License to cover the Project for counties that are currently within the District Level Licence scheme. This includes East Riding of Yorkshire.
Three categories of mitigation are proposed, embedded measures (section 8.6.2-4), control and management measures (Appendix 4.1 Draft Outline code of Construction Practice) (section 8.6.5-6) and additional mitigation measures (section 8.6.8). The embedded measures in relation to ecology are listed. We welcome these measures and encourage project refinement, final design and	National Grid note this feedback.

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
implementation in accordance with these measures. We acknowledge design is limited by other constraints with a number of measures noted to be 'where possible' and 'as far as practicable' but would encourage ecological issues to be considered at all times.	
The control and management measures included in Appendix 4.1 Draft Outline code of Construction Practice relevant to ecological issues are listed in section 8.6.6. The outline code appears to be comprehensive, containing most of the standard best practice working measures that would be expected. Notes in respect to particular measures include: • GG08: we would request all hedgerows to be reinstated to better quality e.g species rich, with trees where possible and improved condition. • B07: we would request that this measure covering working methods in respect to reptiles should be expanded to cover amphibians, including GCN (see previous section). Reference to a CEMP (section 8.6.7) to include updating the baseline findings with pre-construction surveys is supported along with the use of reasonable avoidance measures in respect to badger setts and bat roosts if identified. As noted previously we would request that this is extended to include RAMS for great crested newts	Existing gaps in hedgerows will be used where practicable. Sections of hedgerow that require temporary removal to facilitate construction of the Project will be reinstated post-construction to the same (or improved) condition. For example, species-poor gappy hedgerows would be replaced with intact species-rich hedgerows where practicable. National Grid is in the process of applying for a great crested newt District Level Licence to cover the Project for counties that are currently within the District Level License scheme. This includes East Riding of Yorkshire.
Reference to a LEMP (GG03) as part of DOCoCP, however, a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan maybe more appropriate to support the commitment to ensuring that the enhancements are achieved with monitoring in place to identify and allow for amendments to management practices where aims and objectives are not being met.	Habitat Management and Monitoring Plans are a specific BNG requirement, for significant biodiversity enhancements under current statutory BNG requirements. As Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) will not become a statutory requirement for NSIPs until November 2026, National Grid is voluntarily committing to achieve at least 10% BNG in line with its corporate environmental commitments and emerging government policy. **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan** provides a similar level of information to a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan and will provide details on habitat reinstatement and creation, after care and

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	monitoring secured through **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order**.
Section 8.6.8 in respect to additional mitigation measures notes that the requirement for these has not yet been identified. We would note that the potential for significant effects has been identified although not confirmed for a variety of ecological receptors. If confirmed following completion of surveys and or scheme design, we would support the provision of additional mitigation to minimise such impacts as far as is possible.	Additional mitigation measures to minimise impacts as far as is possible have been provided with woodland planting adjacent to Socken Wood to provide mitigation for trees lost and woodland planting at Woodale to provide mitigation for tree loss on the edge of the Wolds.
Biodiversity Net Gain (Chapter 8 sections 8.4.47 – 8.4.49 and Enhancement sections 8.6.9- 8.6.112) We welcome National Grid's commitment to 10% Net Gain in environmental value including, as a minimum, 10% BNG across all its construction projects, including this Project, in line with the Environment Act 2021. With information to be submitted with the DCO application (section 8.4)	The Project proposes to deliver a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), with potential for wider environmental and societal benefits, on a voluntary basis. Detail on the Project's approach to voluntary BNG is provided in **Application Document 7.20 Design Development Report - 2025** and **Application Document 7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report** and is secured through **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order**.
We understand that the definition of temporary impacts will be based upon the BNG standard good practice and User Guides such that impacts will be regarded as permanent if they cannot be reinstated to the same habitat type and condition within a two-year period. This is welcomed as capturing impacts of the scheme which may otherwise be regarded as 'temporary', reducing the baseline value upon which the project should aim to achieve a 10% uplift.	The Project proposes to deliver a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), with potential for wider environmental and societal benefits, on a voluntary basis. Detail on the Project's approach to voluntary BNG is provided in **Application Document 7.20 Design Development Report - 2025** and **Application Document 7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report.** The Project's commitment to BNG is secured by requirement in **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order**. The assessment presented in **Application Document 7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report** uses the BNG metric 1.0.4 for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, in line with the DEFRA consultation response which states: "Defra will amend the BNG metric user guide to reflect that NSIPs typically have longer timescales for temporary impacts than TCPA development. There is an existing rule that allows habitats which are temporarily impacted

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	and then restored to their previous habitat and condition within 2 years to be counted as retained – for NSIPs, this will be extended to 5 years for habitats of low and very low distinctiveness. This incentivises developers to use the least ecologically valuable habitats for temporary impacts. As set out above, reinstated habitats do not count as significant and do not need to be secured." Temporary impacts will be classified as a 5 year impact (impacted and restored within 5 years) for low and very low distinctiveness habitats.
Section 8.6.9 states National Grid will 'look to implement' habitat enhancement and creation through delivery of BNG and notes 'where possible' BNG will be delivered through partnerships seeking to provide wider community benefits. This commitment and proposed partnerships are encouraged and supported. It is noted that section 8.6.12 states that National Grid are already in discussions with landowners and national conservation/environmental organisations which again is welcome, however, it is noted that a preference has been indicated for larger projects which although within the East Riding may not be within close proximity of the scheme. We would like to see the scheme support local habitat restoration with creation/enhancements within the vicinity of the scheme which benefit the impacted areas being considered first prior to projects at some distance from it albeit within East Riding. This may include enhancements beyond the redline boundary, such as gapping up a number of hedgerows associated with a particular field or landholding along with those impacted by the works, in agreement with the landowner.	
We would suggest areas around existing sites of value (Birkhill Wood, Brantingham Dale, Broomfleet Pits, Humber Esturay) and adjacent to higher value habitats such (woodlands, calcareous and other neutral grasslands) are considered. Opportunities to restore habitat links, creating, widening or extending habitat corridors within the local area	National Grid welcomes the suggestions from ERYC. Further consultation with ERYC has taken place to understand the emerging LRNS and how the Projects approach to BNG delivery could work towards aims and priorities within the LRNS. The Project proposes to deliver a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), with

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
would be supported (ditches, watercourses and hedgerows). This would accord with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy with the route crosses two areas, Brantingham Dale (The Wolds) and the Humber Estuary which form core areas within the emerging plan.	potential for wider environmental and societal benefits, on a voluntary basis. Detail on the Project's approach to voluntary BNG is provided in **Application Document 7.20 Design Development Report - 2025** and **Application Document 7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report** The Project's commitment to BNG is secured by requirement in **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order**.
Habitat creation/enhancement should incorporate appropriate native species within grassland and wildflower seed mixes and potential to utilise green hay from local species rich sites should be considered along with translocation from project areas to be impacted. Potential species for hedgerows, woodlands and trees are provided at the end of this response.	Information relating to proposed planting is provided in **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan**
Currently Figure 4.1 Proposed Project Design includes a limited number of areas indicated to provide indicative mitigation planting. We do not consider that the extent of these areas is adequate and would request a wider range of enhancements is provided throughout the route corridor. Chapter 4 section 2.1.8 states that the ES will provide details of the proposed landscape planting strategy, with landscape mitigation plans and proposed monitoring. However, we would suggest that a more extensive scheme than currently indicated should be provided. It is acknowledged that landowner agreement would be required but, these may be the landowners already involved in respect to the works and/or access routes. We would encourage these to be sought as a priority to promote local mitigation/enhancement particularly where this would give gains within the emerging LNRS and accord with the strategies included within the East Riding Landscape Character Assessment (notes provided at the end of this response).	A Landscape Assessment is presented in **Application Document 6.6 Chapter 6 Landscape** and a visual assessment is presented as **Application Document 6.7 Chapter 7 Visual** undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The assessments set out the potential landscape effects and identifiy areas for mitigation planting to reduce visual impacts to local receptors. **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management** includes details regarding the planting proposals. The Environmental Statement sets out how the Project has applied the mitigation hierarchy, the requirements of the relevant NPSs and any other legal and regularly requirements. Whilst National Grid acknowledge that compensation and enhancement is part of the mitigation hierarchy, EN-1 and EN-5 do not require that all residual effects must be compensated for. The residual effects that remain following the application of the mitigation hierarchy therefore fall to the planning balance in accordance with the EN-1 and EN-5 policy framework, including the further Critical National Priority assumption in Section 4.2 of EN-1.

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Habitat Regulations Assessment (Chapter 8 sections 8.4.50 – 8.4.51) We agree with the requirement for the project to be assessed under the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 (amended the 2017). A preliminary Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) stage 1 report is provided in Appendix 8.2 HRA Preliminary Stage 1 Report with a full assessment to be submitted with the DCO application.	National Grid welcomes this feedback.
We agree with the impact pathways considered within the Stage 1 report and the LSEs which have been identified for further assessment as the design is finalised and relevant surveys completed.	National Grid welcomes this feedback.
Ornithology (Chapter 9)	
The above have varied confidence with surveys ongoing (Volume 3: Appendix 9.1 Ornithological baseline report includes a summary of data to date). The report states that final project design and mitigation package is still in development and will be finalised once surveys complete for consideration in the ES. The principal embedded mitigation is in respect to avoidance with the line in close parallel to the existing but it is understood that potential mitigation includes the use of line markers, habitat management, timing of works (potential conflict of breeding and overwintering) and noise abatement. We would encourage the use of such measures to minimise any confirmed effects.	**Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9 Ornithology** considers potential impact pathways and their effects during the construction and operational phase of the Project on birds. Bird surveys have been undertaken across the route between 2022-2026 (inclusive) to determine an accurate baseline value, the scope of which has been agreed with Natural England and Local Authorities. The potential for bird avian collision risk during the operational phase of the Project has been also been assessed. Detailed methods and results of the surveys that have been carried out are found in the following supporting documents to **Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9 Ornithology:** • **Application Document 6.9.A2 Appendix 9.2 Ornithology Baseline Report;** • **Application Document 6.9.A3 Appendix 9.3 Flight Activity Assessment;** • **Application Document 6.9.A4 Appendix 9.4 Confidential Ornithology Baseline Report; and**

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	• **Application Document 5.2 Habitats Regulations Assessment Report.** The findings of these assessments have been agreed with Natural England. Any adverse impacts identified have been minimised as far as possible through embedded design measures, where practicable. Additional mitigation is proposed where the baseline indicates it is required, including The following key measures: • Where practicable, timing of vegetation clearance and construction activity to avoid destruction of nest, eggs, young and adult breeding birds, and to avoid disturbance effects on nesting birds that are listed on Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act; • Localised timing of works, where practicable, to avoid significant disturbance impacts on locations where significant numbers of qualifying species of the Humber Estuary Ramsar, SPA and SSSI have been shown to occur regularly; • The above measures to be overseen by a full time Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) for the duration of the construction phase of the Project; • Noise control and abatement measures and visual screening of works during the construction phase of the Project, at locations where this is required to minimise adverse effects of visual and noise disturbance on sensitive species that cannot be completely avoided through Project Design or other avoidance measures; • Provision of barn owl nest sites, in the form of nest boxes, on a like for like basis, where the effects of direct losses of nest sites and/or noise and visual disturbance cannot be avoided. This will be preceded by nest checks by a suitably qualified ecologist in possession of a Natural England survey licence and soft blocking of any affected sites;

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	• Use of bird diverters on sections of overhead line where the baseline data indicate potential for significant avian collision events to occur; • Provision of alternative foraging habitat managed for key Humber Estuary species to offset any potentially significant displacement of birds from regular foraging areas during construction, and to offset potential permanent losses of habitat for the duration of the operational phase of the Project All mitigation measures are set out within the following Application Documents; • **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice, Application;** • **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments; and** • **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.**
Proposed Birkhill Wood Substation (Chapter 20)	
National Grid intend to submit a separate full planning application to East Riding of Yorkshire Council for the new Birkhill Wood Substation, currently anticipated May 2025. To ensure that the Project as a whole has been assessed a summary has been included within Chapters 6 to 19 of the PEIR which brings together the assessment of the Proposed Substation Works with the Proposed Overhead Line. The same approach to mitigation measures (embedded; control and management measures; and additional) has been applied including the Draft Outline Code of Construction Practice (Appendix 4). It is stated that the need for additional mitigation will be reviewed as the assessment progresses and the preliminary design develops further, and where required these will be set out in the Environmental Statement (ES). We would request the same approach to protection of important features (ancient/veteran trees identified within the	Following statutory consultation on the Project in 2025, a decision was taken to remove the proposed 400 kV Birkhill Wood Substation and associated works from the Project. A separate planning application for the 400 kV Birkhill Wood Substation (25/01898/STPLF), was submitted to East Riding of Yorkshire Council and has subsequently been approved in 2026. **Application Document 5.11 Interrelationship Document** provides further detail on the interrelationships between the projects.

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
redline), use of precautionary working methods and provision of mitigation/enhancement as discussed for the wider scheme. The provision of an appropriate standoff from Birkhill Woodland is noted but this misses a potential opportunity to bring this area into semi-natural habitat which could form part of the enhancements/BNG. We would encourage the project to contribute to habitat restoration within the wider area as good practice and as part of BNG commitment.	
Trees	
A Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) indicates that the Arboricultural surveys are ongoing and vegetation not finalised and this was confirmed at a thematic meeting with the National Grid team including their Arboricultural Consultant and this information will be shown on plans submitted as part of the application for the DCO and addressed within the relevant chapters of the ES with any vegetation within the draft Order Limits potentially being removed dependant on the final line. Therefore, the specific arboricultural impacts of the scheme have not been illustrated as this time and we request that removal of trees is always limited to that which is absolutely necessary.	**Application Document 7.14 Arboricultural Impact Assessment** provides detail on any tree loss predicted to arise from the Project. Tree loss has been avoided where practicable with mitigation provided where loss has taken place.
The PEIR at the present time broadly outlines identified woodlands located along the preferred route that have the potential to be impacted on significantly by the construction and operational effects of the preferred route. These direct impacts on the woodlands are to include tree removals at Socken Wood, Brantingham Dale, Birkhill wood comprising both ancient seminatural woodland and ancient replanted woodland. Potentially an area of woodland between Blacktoft Drain and Bellasize Drain and potential for removals at Broomfleet.	**Application Document 7.14 Arboricultural Impact Assessment** provides detail on any tree loss arising from the Project. Tree loss has been avoided where practicable with mitigation provided where loss tree loss is predicted. **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan** includes features such as areas of new woodland, with an aim to enhance biodiversity and to benefit relevant local communities. Woodland with characteristics of ancient woodland, but not on the ancient woodland inventory, is discussed in **Application Document 6.8.A4 Appendix 8.4 Botanical Report**. The effects on ecological features, including hedgerows, can be found in 8.7 Potential Effects

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	of **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology**. No trees will be lost in Birkhill wood.
The East Riding of Yorkshire has potentially one of the lowest woodland coverages in the country and the loss of woodlands should be avoided, and if required and unavoidable should be mitigated and compensated locally. The PEIR gives a broad overview of where mitigation planting might be located in section 6.1.167. Additional mitigation comprises measures over and above any embedded and standard mitigation measures, for which assessment within this PEIR has identified a requirement to further reduce significant environmental effects. 6.1.168 As a result of the preliminary assessment, and as defined in section 7.7, the following additional mitigation measures are required: • Proposed woodland planting adjacent to Socken Wood to provide mitigation for trees lost. • Proposed woodland planting at Woodale to provide mitigation for tree loss on the edge of the Wolds.	The loss of woodland has been avoided where practicable in the Project design through the implementation of the mitigation hierarchy**.** Trees that will be impacted are shown in **Application Document 2.13 Trees and Important Hedgerows to be Removed or Managed Plans. Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan** includes features such as areas of new woodland, with an aim to enhance biodiversity and to benefit relevant local communities where loss has been unavoidable.
An assessment of any potential impact the development may have should be assessed through a Tree Survey identifying any constrains such as tree preservation orders, conservation areas, ancient & veteran trees and woodlands, an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and a Tree Protection Plan (TPP) in accordance with British Standard 5837 – 2012 ‘Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction Recommendations’. This information should determine tree root protection areas (RPA's) and tree protection measures, and mitigation for any tree losses and the retention of categories A and B. The development should also be supported by mitigation planting with 2:1 replacements.	An assessment of any potential impact the Project may have has been assessed within **Application Document 7.14 Arboricultural Impact Assessment** identifying any constrains such as tree preservation orders, conservation areas, ancient & veteran trees and woodlands, Following detailed design site specific Arboricultural Method Statements (AMSs) with Tree Protection Plans (TPPs) will be produced for relevant pre-commencement and construction phases of the Project. This is in accordance with British Standard 5837 – 2012 ‘Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction Recommendations’. This information will determine tree Root Protection Areas (RPA's) and tree protection measures. Mitigation planting ratios have been agreed with the local authority illustrated in **Application Document 5.8.6 Statement of Common Ground – East Riding of Yorkshire Council**.

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
The restatement of hedgerow planting for removed planting for access routes. Where the works require the removal of sections of hedgerow. New planting should contain native, woody species of local provenance. Consideration should be given to the removal of trees and the protection of trees for visibility splays, access to the site for compounds/towers, temporary working areas and mitigation planting and restatement of tree/hedgerow planting on completion of the construction works.	Existing gaps in hedgerows will be used where practicable. Sections of hedgerow that require temporary removal to facilitate construction of the Project will be reinstated post-construction to the same (or improved) condition. For example, species-poor gappy hedgerows would be replaced with intact species-rich hedgerows where practicable. Measures would be applied as secured within **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments.**
Environmental Control A robust and detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for the construction phase of the development would be welcomed, which specifies the measures to be taken to prevent adverse impact on amenity for the nearest sensitive receptors, from noise, vibration, dust and odour. The CEMP (or an associated document) should also detail the measures to be implemented to prevent adverse impacts from construction on local air quality. An agreement on proposed operating hours is recommended, along with a procedure for prior notice of planned out-of-hours working if required. It is also recommended that a procedure is developed to report, investigate, risk-assess and remediate any land contamination which is discovered prior to or during the construction phase. A community liaison role would be welcomed, with clear contact details for residents to report any concerns or complaints associated with the construction phase.	**Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice** contains the detail as requested: • Measures to be taken to prevent adverse impact on amenity for the nearest sensitive receptors, from noise, vibration, dust and odour. • The proposed operating hours and a procedure for prior notice of planned out-of-hours working if required. • A procedure to report, investigate, risk-assess and remediate any land contamination which is discovered prior to or during the construction phase; and • Details of the community liaison role.
Building Conservation	
The PEIR sets out the methodology used, the datasets that have informed the preliminary assessment, the baseline conditions and any mitigations. It also outlines preliminary cultural heritage residual significant effects that could result from the Proposed Overhead Line. There are three identified mitigations relevant to the impact on the	This concern was discussed and clarified in a virtual meeting with the Conservation Officer at East Riding of Yorkshire Council in January 2026. The methodology in this chapter does not conflate significance of effect with the effect on heritage significance (value). These are separate issues.

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
designated and non-designated heritage assets. They are listed as the following: Sensitive routeing and siting to develop the draft overhead line alignment, siting of substations and draft Order Limits Close parallel sections - River Ouse crossing Concern is raised with the choice of wording within the Preliminary Assessment. For each route section the document sets out the number of assets (as well as identifying them) that are likely to be subject to 'significant effects'. It would appear from reading the document that 'significant effects' actually refers to the effects on the significance of the identified assets. The choice of wording has the potential to alter the interpretation of the assessment set out within the document. As such, it is recommended that the terminology relating to the impact on the heritage assets is reviewed for clarity, and to more closely follow the definition of significance in the NPPF.	The heritage significance (value) of an asset is defined in section in **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage**, using the terminology set out in NPS EN-1 and the NPPF. **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage** chapter assesses impacts to heritage assets deriving from change to their heritage interests and heritage significance (value). A resulting significance of effect is then assessed, including likely significant effects for the purposes of The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. A separate Statement of Harm using the terms of the NPPF is presented as an appendix in **Application Document 5.5 Planning Statement**, and it discusses the level of harm to relevant designated heritage assets.
The Preliminary Assessment section of the PEIR outlines the potential effects of the proposed development, specific to each route section. On the presumption that 'significant effects' relates to impact on significance, The Council's Building Conservation Officer is in agreement with the observations and assessments for each of the route sections that fall within the East Riding of Yorkshire boundary. Whilst harm has been identified in relation to a number of assets and their setting, they are satisfied that the impact would not amount to substantial harm. It is clear that relevant steps have been taken to consider the appropriate mitigations and to reduce the level of harm caused by the proposed development.	In this assessment, the significance of effect is not considered to be the same as the effect on an asset's heritage significance. The methodology for this assessment and the distinction between these two terms is explained in **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage**. Significance of effect is the resultant effect when the impact magnitude is weighted against the heritage significance (value) of the heritage asset. Notwithstanding the above, the Building Conservation Officer's general agreement with the level of impacts presented in the preliminary assessment is noted. The Council's agreement with the preliminary assessments, and that the level of impact to heritage assets within their local authority area would not amount to substantial harm and that appropriate mitigation to reduce harm has been included, is noted.

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
The proposed development has the potential to result in harm to the significance of a number of heritage assets. However, the level of this harm would be less than substantial in all cases, and it would have a very negligible to low impact on their significance. It is considered that this has been accurately represented within the relevant chapters of the supporting PEIR document. As such, no objections are raised at this stage but we emphasise the importance of the implementation of the relevant mitigations set out within the supporting information.	The Council's comments are noted.
Archaeology	
The PEIR Chapter on Cultural Heritage includes information on the methodologies and assessment criteria that will be used in order to adequately assess the impact that the development would have on the archaeological resource. The Councils archaeological advisors, Humber Historic Environment Record have advised that clarification is sought on whether the installation of the new pylons and overhead lines will effectively 'sterilise' the ground and mean that the significance etc of archaeological remains won't be able to be reassessed as a later date. Other ground impacts of the scheme will also need to be included in the assessment, this could include details such as compounds, swales etc. To ensure that there is as much information as possible and in order to allow an informed decision on the impact that the scheme would have on archaeological resources, it is advised that a programme of trial trenching should be undertaken prior to the submission of the DCO application.	As stated in Table 10.10 of **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage**, it is assumed the construction of the Project would result in permanent physical impacts on heritage assets located within pylon footprints, and these areas have been archaeologically evaluated to confirm the value of heritage assets that may be present, and the results submitted as **Application Document 6.10.A8 Appendix 10.8 Archaeological Trial Trench Report**. Further trial trenching, undertaken post-consent and secured through Requirement within **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order**, **Application Document 7.9 Outline Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation, Application Document 7.10 Cultural Heritage Management Plan** and commitments in **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments.** **Application Document 7.9 Outline Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation** may be undertaken at pylon locations following changes during detailed design. The Applicant confirms that the installation and presence of the proposed overhead line will not preclude access to and 'sterilise' the ground beneath. Access to the ground beneath the proposed overhead line will still be possible, should this be required, to reassess the heritage value of archaeological remains. Potential impacts arising from other ground impacts, including compounds etc., are included in **Application**

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage. Archaeological evaluation, including trial trenching, has been carried out to inform the design process, the impact assessment, and mitigation proposals. The trial trenching was carried out in accordance with a scope of work agreed with the Archaeological Advisors to the relevant local planning authorities, and the results of the trial trenching are presented in **Application Document 6.10.A8 Appendix 10.8 Archaeological Trial Trench Report**.
Drainage Comments	
An appropriate Flood Risk Assessment will need to be provided to address any required flood mitigation methods required. The majority of the works are for overhead power lines, however there may be some land drainage issues during construction that should be considered. The site lies within ERYC and Internal drainage board areas therefore developer will need to consult the interested parties regarding any consenting works required and agree discharge rates for any proposed surface water runoff. Which will be limited to greenfield runoff of 1.4l/s/ha. If discharging to a main river the Environment Agency will be required to consent and approve any proposed discharge. All parties should be consulted when proposing any watercourse crossing methodology, horizontal directional drilling should be considered as the preferred option. All sites should be surveyed for existing land drainage systems and ensure that any works would not impact on existing drainage systems. Access should also be considered for future maintenance and inspections of existing watercourses. Any hardstanding or impermeable areas should be positively drained with full details to be submitted and approved by the East Riding of Yorkshire Council and Internal Drainage Boards.	National Grid notes this feedback and confirms that **Application Document 7.13 Flood Risk Assessment** has been submitted with the Application. Land drainage during construction has been considered as part of the assessment of potential environmental effects presented within **Application Document 6.11 Chapter 11 Water Environment.** National Grid has engaged with the appropriate internal drainage boards regarding the discharge rates for any proposed surface water runoff. **Application Document 7.13 Flood Risk Assessment** includes an appended Framework Construction Surface Water Management Plan (CSWMP). There are multiple main rivers and ordinary watercourses within the Order Limits. The proposed watercourse crossings for construction access are detailed in **Application Document 6.4.A2 Appendix 4.2 Bridge and Culvert Schedule** and the third-party works in **Application Document 6.4.A4 Appendix 6.4 Third Party Crossing Schedule**. The selection of crossing methods factored in location-specific constraints, WFD status and main river designation and flood risk sensitivity, and also has taken stakeholder feedback into consideration. The use of existing crossings has been adopted where practicable to avoid new impacts. All watercourse crossing designs would follow the control and management measures set out

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	in **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice** and **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments**. In addition, the haul roads would be put in place in accordance with conditions set out within the consents and permits from the relevant authorities (Environment Agency for main rivers) or in accordance with the protective provisions for drainage authorities for works to ordinary watercourses, including IDB drains, as required).
Public Health No comments have been received from the Councils Public Health Team. Should comments be received from this department these will be forwarded across to your team.	National Grid notes this advice.

Environment Agency (EA) Consultation Feedback[1]	National Grid Response
Overall, we are generally satisfied with the content of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) to reasonably inform us of the likely significant environmental effects to be considered. However, as this project progresses there are areas which need to be resolved before the Development Consent Order (DCO) submission Our main key issues are listed below, and further detailed comments are listed in Appendix A. General comments can be found in appendix B.	The design of the Project has developed to ensure that this has taken into account input from the Environment Agency. A **Statement of Common Ground** is provided at **Application Document 5.8.1 – Environment Agency** which addresses the key issues and details set out within the feedback.
Water Framework Directive (WFD) & Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)	
WFD mitigation measures are one of the key assessments used when considering impacts and enhancement opportunities both within or outside of Biodiversity Net Gain and we would like to see the production of a WFD Screening, Scoping and Impact Assessment. Further information is available at: Nationally Significant Infrastructure	To ensure that the Secretary of State and Environment Agency can determine the Application in accordance with The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017, an assessment of the potential impacts of the Project on bodies of water, including the achievement of environmental objectives, has

[1] Due to the technical nature of the content provided in the Appendices this response is to the key issues listed in the feedback only. The Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and the Environment Agency provides the most up to date information on the technical details agreed and further agreements between the parties.

Environment Agency (EA) Consultation Feedback[1]	National Grid Response
Projects: Advice on the Water Framework Directive - GOV.UK A Biodiversity Net Gain report detailing measures should also be prepared for submission alongside the ES.	been undertaken and recorded in **Application Document 7.11 Water Framework Directive Assessment**. This assessment has been prepared with reference to the specific objectives set for relevant waterbodies within the Humber River Basin District River Management Plan (RBMP). **Application Document 7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report** has been submitted with the application.
Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)	
The FRA and underpinning modelling has not been provided for this project at this time. Thus several statements in the documentation received cannot be verified until we see this information.	A Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared and is provided within **Application Document 7.13 Flood Risk Assessment** which will provide the information sought by the Environment Agency in the verification of statements within the application documents.
Culverting	
Regarding options for crossing the water courses. We recommended that the projects culverting strategy is discussed with us as soon as possible. The water crossing hierarchy will need to be applied. When it comes to water crossings the installation of a temporary clear-span bridge crossings is environmentally the option preferred we would oppose the culverting of any water courses option potential impact on flood risk and protected species. we would oppose the culverting of any watercourses. This is in line with the Environment Agency's policy regarding culverts. We will only grant a permit for a culvert if there is no reasonably practical alternative, and if the detrimental effects would be sufficiently minor that a more costly alternative would not be justified or there are reasons of overriding public/economic interest. The effects of proposed crossings on hydrology, geomorphology and biodiversity need to be considered. If this is progressed the hydrology of culvert installation and how this relates to flood risk will need to be modelled.	As requested, the Project's culverting strategy has been discussed with the EA during pre-application discussions. **Application Document 5.8.1 Statement of Common Ground – Environment Agency** provides details on the engagement activities regarding the crossing of water courses along the route's alignment. The Project has applied the water crossing hierarchy, seeking to utilise existing bridges and culverts in order to avoid physical disturbance, impacts on flow regimes and pollution risks. Large or sensitive watercourses, for example those designated as a main river, and WFD water bodies, will be crossed by the temporary haul road using temporary clear span bridges to avoid in-channel works and associated effects. For those crossings where there will be a culvert, there are no reasonably practicable alternatives and the WFD assessment **Application Document 7.11 Water Framework Directive Assessment** has demonstrated that there will be no prejudice to compliance with the requirements of the associated Regulations, nor non compliance with any other legislation. Where no reasonably practical alternative is available to culverting, a suite of control and management measures are secured within **Application Document 7.3 Register of**

Environment Agency (EA) Consultation Feedback[1]	National Grid Response
	Environmental Actions and Commitments. Several measures are included to reduce effects on the hydromorphology of watercourses to be crossed by the Project and to manage site drainage and existing land drainage systems (including agricultural drainage) during construction and operation (and maintenance) of the Project.
Protective Provisions	
Any requests to disapply any permits or consents should be sent to us in writing as soon as possible to allow us sufficient time to consider them (minimum 6 months). Depending on the outcome this will have implications on the content of the DCO.	National Grid has noted this feedback.

Equality and Human Rights Commission Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
The Commission does not have the resources to respond to all consultations, and it is not our practice to respond to consultations on local plans or infrastructure projects unless they raise a clear or significant equality or human rights concern.	National Grid notes this feedback.
Local and other public authorities have obligations under the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) in the Equality Act 2010 to consider the effect of their policies and decisions on people sharing particular protected characteristics. We provide advice for public authorities on how to apply the PSED, which is an on-going legal obligation and must be complied with as part of the planning process. Thus, the PSED is the mechanism through which public authorities involved in the planning process should consider the potential for planning proposals to have an impact on equality for different groups of people. To assist, you will find our technical guidance at: www.equalityhumanrights.com Our Work > Publications library > Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty: England	National Grid notes this feedback.

Exolum Pipeline System Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Thank you for your consultation on the proposed development of North Humber to High Marnham. This representation is submitted on behalf of Exolum Pipeline System Limited in respect of the above referenced DCO project. We can confirm that our client's apparatus has been identified as being either within or in close proximity to the proposed scheme as indicated in the attached plans.	National Grid notes the presence of existing Exolum infrastructure within or in the vicinity of the Project, as reflected in the Exolum plans.
Exolum's external solicitors, VWV, require an undertaking to cover costs for discussing protective provisions. Exolum requires protective provisions to be agreed upon with the Promoter to ensure that its apparatus is adequately protected and can continue to operate safely.	The required undertaking has been entered into to enable ongoing discussions by and on behalf of National Grid and Exolum on the required protective provisions.
We trust that these considerations and any future representations will be taken into account as part of your consultation and the Examination process, and we look forward to concluding the necessary agreements.	Thank you for your feedback, representations have been taken into account as part of the Project's design.

Forestry Commission Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
As the Governments forestry experts, we endeavour to provide as much relevant information to enable the project to reduce any impact on irreplaceable habitat such as Ancient semi natural woodland as well as other woodland. There are no ancient woodlands within the proposed order area, however we note both Birkhill Wood and Dogholes Wood Ancient woodlands are both in close proximity, especially Birkhill Wood which is within 50m of a construction compound.	National grid notes this feedback and can confirm that the assessment provided within Application Document 6.8: Chapter 8 Ecology has included both Birkhill Wood and Dogholes Wood Ancient woodlands. Following design changes, Birkhill Wood ancient replanted woodland lies approximately 0.11 km from the Order Limits and Dogholes Wood approximately13 m from the Order Limits.
Ancient Woodland: Ancient woodlands are an irreplaceable habitat. They have great value because they have a long history of woodland cover, being continuously wooded since at least 1600AD with many features remaining undisturbed. This applies equally to Ancient Semi Natural	No mapped Ancient Woodland has been identified within the Order Limits. The areas of ancient woodland that are present within the study area are shown on **Application Document 6.8.F2 Figure 8.2 Nature Conservation Non-Statutory Designated Sites and Priority Habitat within 2 km.**

Forestry Commission Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Woodland (ASNW) and Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS). Section 5.4.32 of EN-1 – The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy states: "*Applicants should include measures to mitigate fully the direct and indirect effects of development on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees or other irreplaceable habitats during both the construction and operational phases"* Section 5.4.53 goes on to state: "*The Secretary of State should not grant development consent for any development that would result in the loss or deterioration of any irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland, and ancient and veteran trees unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists"* We would particularly refer you to further technical information set out in Natural England and Forestry Commission's Standing Advice on Ancient Woodland – plus supporting Assessment Guide and "Keepers of Time" – Ancient and Native Woodland and Trees Policy in England. There is a need to consider both the direct and indirect impacts resulting from construction. Direct impacts can include, but are not limited to, damaging or compacting soil, damaging functional habitat connections and changing the woodland ecosystem by removing the woodland edge or thinning trees. Indirect impacts can also include increasing the amount of dust, light, air or soil pollution.	Habitat surveys have identified areas of woodland inside the Order Limits, which are not currently part of the Ancient Woodland Inventory but which exhibit attributes of ancient woodland, such as shown on historic mapping, and presence of ancient woodland indicator species. Woodland with characteristics of ancient woodland, but not on the ancient woodland inventory, are discussed in **Application Document 6.8.A4 Appendix 8.4 Botanical Report**. The effects on ecological features, including hedgerows, can be found in 8.7 Potential Effects of **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology**. Potential direct and indirect impacts resulting from construction have been considered when assessing any potential effects on ancient and woodland with characteristics of ancient woodland. This includes any loss of the woodland, damage or compaction of soil, severance or damage of functional habitat connections and changing the woodland ecosystem by removing the woodland edge or thinning trees, dust and other pollution.
We would expect to see a detailed assessment of any impacts to the ancient woodland, including details of measures to be taken to reduce and mitigate any effect. Protection measures include taking care not to cut tree roots (e.g., by trenching) or causing soil compaction around trees (e.g., through vehicle movements or stacking heavy equipment) or contamination from poisons (e.g., site stored fuel or chemicals) and fencing off these areas to prevent unintended incursions into the root	No mapped Ancient Woodland has been identified within the order limits. Detailed assessment of any impacts to the areas of woodland inside the Order Limits, which are not currently part of the Ancient Woodland Inventory but which exhibit attributes of ancient woodland, such as shown on historic mapping, and presence of ancient woodland indicator species, including details of measures to be taken to reduce and mitigate any effect has been provided within

Forestry Commission Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
protection zone as well as dust prevention measures to reduce any potential impact of dust pollution. Also a lighting strategy to ensure that any lighting does not illuminate the ancient woodlands.	**Application Document 6.8: Chapter 8 Ecology, Application Document 7.2 Code of Construction Practice** and **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments.** **Lighting Strategy…**
Due to the irreplaceable nature of ancient woodland, most temporary effects will result in irreplaceable damage.	No mapped Ancient Woodland has been identified within the Order Limits.
The Standing Advice states that proposals should have a buffer zone of at least 15m from the boundary of ancient woodlands, it also states that where assessment shows impacts are likely to extend beyond this distance, it is likely that a bigger buffer zone will be needed. For example, where the effect of air pollution from development that can result from a significant increase in traffic or dust from construction.	Minimum 15 m buffers will be retained around all areas of ancient woodland. Although there is one area of ancient woodland located within 15 m of the Order Limits (part of Tong's Wood), the construction works will maintain a 15 m buffer from the woodland edge. Mitigation secured within **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** would be applied.
Ancient & Veteran Trees	
We note the documents state that 17 veteran trees have currently been identified within the route area. Ancient and veteran trees can be individual trees or groups of trees within wood pastures, historic parkland, hedgerows, orchards, parks or other areas. They are often found outside ancient woodlands. They are also irreplaceable habitats and should be assessed in the same way as Ancient woodland for direct and indirect impacts.	There are no ancient or veteran trees recorded within or up to 50 m from the Order Limits, shown in the Woodland Trust Ancient Tree Inventory.37 veteran trees and one veteran tree group have been recorded through arboricultural surveys up to February 2026 within a 30 m study area of the Order Limits are recorded and assessed in **Application Document 7.14 Arboricultural Impact Assessment** and summarised in Table 4.4 of **Application Document 6.8.A3 Appendix 8.3 Habitat Survey Report.**
For ancient or veteran trees, the buffer zone should be at least 15 times larger than the diameter of the tree. The buffer zone should be 5 metres from the edge of the tree's canopy if that area is larger than 15 times the tree's diameter. This will create a minimum root protection area.	The Standing Advice for calculating buffer zones (synonymous with Root Protection Areas) for veteran trees has been applied and is detailed within the **Application Document 7.14 Arboricultural Impact Assessment.** An assessment of any potential impact the Project may have has been assessed through a Tree Survey identifying any constraints such as tree preservation orders, conservation areas, ancient and veteran trees and woodlands. This

Forestry Commission Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	information has determined tree root protection areas, tree protection measures, and mitigation for any tree losses.
Buffer zones	
Buffer zones can protect ancient woodland and individual ancient and veteran trees and provide valuable habitat for woodland wildlife such as feeding bats and birds. The size and type of buffer zone should vary depending on the scale and type of development and is likely to need to be larger in areas that are less densely wooded for example. Where possible, buffer zones should contribute to wider ecological networks and be part of the green infrastructure of the area. They should consist of semi-natural habitats such as including woodland, scrub, heathland and wetland.	An assessment of any potential impact the development may have has been assessed through a Tree Survey identifying any constraints such as tree preservation orders, conservation areas, ancient and veteran trees and woodlands. **Application Document 7.14 Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (AIA) has been submitted with the Application. This information has determined tree root protection areas (RPA's), tree protection measures, and mitigation for any tree losses. Minimum 15 m buffers from construction works will be retained around all areas of ancient woodland. Although there is one area of ancient woodland located within 15 m of the Order Limits (part of Tong's Wood), the construction works will maintain a 15 m buffer from the woodland edge.
Priority Habitat	
We note there are a few areas of mixed deciduous woodland both within the route area and adjacent to it. Mixed Deciduous woodlands are on the National Forest Inventory and the Priority Habitat Inventory (England). They were recognized under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan as being the most threatened, requiring conservation action. The UK Biodiversity Action Plan has now been superseded but this priority status remains under the Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act 2006. (NERC) Sect 40 "Duty to conserve and enhance biodiversity" and Sect 41 – "List of habitats and species of principle importance in England". Section 5.11.27 of EN-1 of the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy states:	An assessment of effects the development may have on areas of Priority Woodland both within the Order Limits and the study area is provided in **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology**. **Application Document 7.14 Arboricultural Impact Assessment** has been submitted with the Application. This information has determined tree root protection areas, tree protection measures, and mitigation for any tree losses.

Forestry Commission Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
"*Existing trees and woodlands should be retained wherever possible…….The applicant should assess the impacts on, and loss of, all trees and woodlands within the project boundary and develop mitigation measures to minimise adverse impacts and any risk of net deforestation as a result of the scheme. Mitigation may include, but is not limited to, the use of buffers to enhance resilience, improvements to connectivity and improved woodland management. Where woodland loss is unavoidable, compensation schemes will be required, and the long term management and maintenance of newly planted trees should be secured".* Fragmentation is one of the greatest threats to mixed deciduous woodland. Woodlands can suffer loss or deterioration from nearby development through loss of connectivity, damage to soils, roots and vegetation and changes to drainage and air pollution from an increase in traffic or dust, particularly during the construction phase of a development.	
Net Deforestation and Tree Planting	
It is expected that there will be a thorough assessment of any loss of all trees within the project boundary and the development of mitigation measures to minimise any risk of net deforestation because of the scheme. Hedgerows, individual trees and woodlands within a development site should also be considered in terms of their overall connectivity between woodlands affected by the development. With the Government aspiration to increase tree and canopy cover to 16.5% of land area in England by 2050, The Forestry Commission is seeking to ensure that tree planting is a consideration in every development not just as compensation for loss. However, there are a number of issues that need to be considered when proposing significant planting schemes:	A thorough assessment of any loss of trees within the Order Limits and the development of mitigation measures to minimise any risk of net deforestation because of the Project has been carried out and presented within **Application Document 7.14 Arboricultural Impact Assessments.**

Forestry Commission Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
The species and provenance of new trees and woodland needs to be considered to ensure a resilient treescape which can cope with the full implications of a changing climate. The biosecurity of all planting stock also needs to be considered to avoid the introduction of pests and diseases, particularly in areas where there are ancient woodlands.	
Plans should also be in place to ensure the long term management and maintenance of new and existing woodland, perhaps by creation of a UK Forestry Standard compliant management plan, with access also needing to be considered for future management. We are pleased to note these planned areas for newly created woodland are adjacent to existing woodland so will be creating good habitat links. It is important that woodland creation is not just used as screening at strategic locations and ensures habitat connectivity throughout the landscape. Particularly in areas adjacent to existing woodland, which will help to make woodlands more resilient and to benefit biodiversity across the whole landscape.	Details of the proposed management of tree planting areas are included within **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan**
We note plans do include some mitigation planting areas, including adjacent to Socken Wood. We are pleased to note these planned areas for newly created woodland are adjacent to existing woodland so will be creating good habitat links. It is important that woodland creation is not just used as screening at strategic locations and ensures habitat connectivity throughout the landscape. Particularly in areas adjacent to existing woodland, which will help to make woodlands more resilient and to benefit biodiversity across the whole landscape. Ideally we would like to see woodland creation to be carried out in 5ha blocks or that connecting planting with existing woodlands, should create blocks of at least 5ha. Newly planted woodland could also be used as a buffer between the development and existing ancient woodlands.	Mitigation planting areas are proposed across the Project; these are shown in **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan**. These areas have been chosen with a view to extend existing habitats, for example woodland areas, and/or provide links between existing areas of habitat.

Girton Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Village of Girton Concerns: Construction work noise/disruption – sound carried across the water.	The effects of construction noise have been assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment process submitted within **Application Document 6.16 Chapter 16 Noise and Vibration**. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction of the Project and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Specifically, **Application Document 7.7 Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan** has been prepared to secure appropriate mitigation in respect of construction noise. No impacts arising from noise / disruption on the village of Girton were assessed as arising from the Project in the ES, including consideration of sound carried across the water to Girton, which is located over 3km from proposed construction works associated with the project.
Toll Bridge at Dunham on Trent – capacity. What is the preferred route for traffic? Would it be along A1133? If so, this would be a concern.	As part of the pre-application process National Grid has engaged with the relevant authorities, their highways teams and National Highways to understand and gain information on their road networks. This information has been used to inform and guide the drafting of **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** (CTMP). The Outline CTMP provides details about the proposed construction access strategy that has been developed to manage the impact of construction vehicles on the Public Highway and sensitive receptors, using a combination of more suitable Local Road Network connections from the Strategic Road Network, and a temporary construction haul road for access along the proposed alignment. The Outline CTMP will highlight any restrictions, including capacity on any bridges, to reduce impacts to other road users from construction traffic related to the Project. The A57 is a primary access route within the Outline CTMP with traffic counts having been undertaken, at locations agreed with the highway authority, to provide an appropriate baseline against which construction traffic effects have been assessed.

Girton Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	The A1133 does not form part of the primary access routes for the Project.
Girton is a flood area – always looking at ways to help the cause of the village to seek solutions for flood alleviation/protection.	The village of Girton falls outside of the Order Limits of the Project some 5 km to the south east. No impacts to flooding on the village of Girton were assessed as arising from the Project in the Environmental Statement.
Trent Vale Trail is a route that runs up along the River Trent → Fledborough – project completion end of March 2025.	Trent Valley *Trail* lies outside of the study area, it does not intersect with the Order Limits, and is not impacted by the Project. It is therefore not assessed in the Environmental Statement or considered in **Application Document 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan**.
Future concern would be around The OneEarth Solar Farm at South Clifton → A57 and the impact as a close neighbour.	The Project has proactively engaged and will continue to do so, with neighbouring developers and land interests in relation to potential interface matters and any cumulative construction considerations. The Environmental Statement has assessed the cumulative impacts of the Project within **Application Document 6.21 Chapter 21 - Inter-project Cumulative Effects**. **Application Document 5.11 Interrelationship Report** provides detail on how the Projects interfaces with third party developments.
Light pollution from the security lighting on substations.	The Application does not contain any substation development.

Goole Field Internal Drainage Board Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Shiregroup represents several Drainage Boards and has no comments to the above consultation, as the works are not within the areas covered by the following Drainage Boards: Ancholme IDB, Goole and Airmyn IDB, Goole Fields DDB, Selby Area IDB & Scunthorpe & Gainsborough WMB.	National Grid notes this feedback that the works are not within the areas covered by the following Drainage Boards: Ancholme IDB, Goole and Airmyn IDB, Goole Fields DDB, Selby Area IDB & Scunthorpe & Gainsborough WMB.

Health and Safety Executive Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
According to HSE's records, the proposed North Humber to High Marnham project components as specified in the North Humber to High Marnham Section 42 Scoping Report, Volume 3, dated August 2023, Figure 1.1 Location Plan, document ref 1.1, Rev 0 sheets 1 of 3, 2 of 30 and 3 of 3, drawing title 'Location Plan', does appear to cross the Consultation Zones of several Major Accident Hazard (MAH) sites and MAH pipelines. Please see the list attached in Appendix 1 a (MAH sites) & b (MAH pipelines).	National Grid notes this feedback. National Grid has consulted with the relevant site operators during the pre-application phase and will continue to engage with the relevant operators throughout the consent process and post-consent during detailed design and construction.
The Applicant should also make the necessary approaches to the relevant MAH pipeline operators (see Appendix 1 b). There are three particular reasons for this: i. the pipeline operator may have a legal interest in developments in the vicinity of the pipeline. This may restrict developments within a certain proximity of the pipeline. ii. the standards to which the pipeline is designed and operated may restrict major traffic routes within a certain proximity of the pipeline. Consequently, there may be a need for the operator to modify the pipeline or its operation if the development proceeds. iii. to establish the necessary measures required to alter/upgrade the pipeline to appropriate standards.	National Grid has made necessary approaches to the relevant MAH pipeline operators to agree suitable protective measures and will continue to engage with the relevant operators throughout the consent process and post-consent during detailed design and construction.
HSE's Land Use Planning advice [HSE: Land use planning - HSE's land use planning methodology] is dependent on the location of areas where people may be present within HSE's land-use planning zones. Based on the information in North Humber to High Marnham Section 42 Scoping Report, Volume 3, dated August 2023 it is unlikely that HSE would advise against the development. Please note that the advice is based on HSE's existing policy for providing land-use planning advice and the information which has been provided. HSE's advice in response to a subsequent planning application may differ should HSE's policy or the scope of the	National Grid notes this feedback.

Health and Safety Executive Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
development change by the time the Development Consent Order application is submitted	
Would the Hazardous Substance Consent be needed? It is not clear whether the Applicant has considered the hazard classification of any chemicals that are proposed to be present at the development. Hazard classification is relevant to the potential for accidents. For example, hazardous substances planning consent is required to store or use any of the Categories of Substances or Named Hazardous Substances set out in Schedule 1 of The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 as amended, if those hazardous substances will be present on, over or under the land at or above the controlled quantities. There is an addition rule in the Schedule for below-threshold substances. If hazardous substances planning consent is required, please consult the relevant Hazardous Substance Authority (usually the Local Planning Authority) on the application	It is considered that the Project does not require Hazardous Substance Consent as it does not involve the presence of hazardous substances at or above controlled quantities for any hazard group. The Main Works Contractor is legally required to adhere to all Health and Safety Executive (HSE) requirements in relation to hazardous substances. Potentially hazardous materials used or encountered during construction (e.g., paints, solvents, sealants, fuel etc) would be safely and securely stored including use of secondary containment where appropriate (to avoid contaminating other material and waste streams). National Grid would adopt good construction and management practices to ensure waste is minimised as far as possible and that the storage, transport and eventual disposal of any waste have limited environmental effects. The management and collection of waste arisings would be carried out under the requirements of the UK waste regulatory regime. The Main Works Contractor would produce a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) prior to construction.
Consideration of Risk Assessments: Regulation 5(4) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 requires the assessment of significant effects to include, where relevant, the expected significant effects arising from the proposed development's vulnerability to major accidents. HSE's role on NSIPs is summarised in the following Advice Note 11 Annex on the Planning Inspectorate's website - Annex G – The Health and Safety Executive. This document includes consideration of risk assessments on page 3.	The Project's proposed high-voltage electricity transmission infrastructure would not itself constitute a COMAH establishment and is therefore not expected to be subject to the requirements of the Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) Regulations 2015. National Grid undertakes regular design reviews as part of the project development. The process of managing and assessing the changes put forward from consultation feedback also get assessed by a number of disciplines with different focus and as such risk and hazards are assessed as part of National Grids standard design procedures which are designed and developed to consider our obligations under statute and guidance from bodies such as HSE.

Health and Safety Executive Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Explosives sites Explosives Inspectorate has no comment to make as HSE would not view the overhead power lines as a 'protected place'. However, Explosive inspectorate would want to be consulted regarding the placement of the contractor's cabins during the construction phase, particularly in the vicinity of Hunsdale farm.	There are no compounds proposed in the vicinity of Hunsdale Farm (HU12 2DB postcode). The closest compound is located approximately 930 m away, to the south-west.
Please send any further communication on this project directly to the HSE's designated e-mail account for NSIP applications at nsip.applications@hse.gov.uk .	National Grid notes this feedback.

Historic England Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
National Grid Electricity Transmission is proposing to reinforce the electricity transmission network between the north of England and the Midlands by building a new 400 kilovolt (kV) electricity transmission connection between two proposed substations at Birkhill Wood and High Marnham. We have engaged constructively with National Grid and AECOM meeting most recently on the 5 March 2025 to look at the latest route mapping.	National Grid note this feedback and welcome the ongoing constructive engagement between Historic England and National Grid throughout the pre- application process.
We note the proximity of the preferred route to the scheduled, listed and registered park assets at Risby Hall and the scheduled site at Ousefleet but understand the constraints on any other alignments. The overhead route through the Isle of Axholme will inevitably impact upon the character of this important historic landscape, particularly in the vicinity of Crowle and at Beltoft where there will be considerable visibility and perhaps the greatest sense of containment from cumulative impacts of overhead lines, again we understand the constraints of servicing lines and the limited other route options.	This feedback is welcomed and noted. The constraints which have been taken into consideration during the design of the Project are set out within **Application Document 7.20 - 2025 Design Development Report, Application Document 5.9 Design Development Report and Application Document 5.10 Design Approach Document**. With the benefit of the constructive pre-application engagement with Historic England, which is reported in section 10.8 of **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage**, changes have been made to the alignment of the overhead line to minimise impacts to heritage assets. Further to this, the Project has been designed, where

Historic England Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	feasible, to be parallel or close parallel with existing overhead lines to reduce the spread of infrastructure in views. As noted by Historic England, consideration was given during the pre-application consultations to impacts on the scheduled monument of Risby Jacobean gardens, hall and medieval settlement remains (NHLE 1018600), but constraints on other alignments are such that likely significant effects are predicted. National Grid welcomes recognition by Historic England that, within the Isle of Axeholme Area of Special Historic Landscape Interest, the overhead line has been close paralleled with the existing overhead line, as much as feasible, to minimise setting change. As reported in section 10.8 of **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage**, post mitigation, minor adverse effects have been assessed for the Isle of Axholme Area of Historic Landscape.
We welcome the positive response of National Grid to our advice and in particular the measures to minimise visual impacts upon key heritage receptors notably the ruins of the Church of St South Wheatley and North Leverton Windmill. The line taken in proximity to Whimpton deserted medieval village will have impact upon significance but again the route taken appears on balance across heritage assets and other constraints to be the most reasonable.	The guidance of Historic England during pre-application consultations has been taken into account in progressing the design of the Project so as to minimise, so far as feasible, visual impacts upon key heritage receptors, including the ruins of the Church of St Helen South Wheatley and North Leverton Windmill. Measures included making some changes to the route of the proposed overhead line. Although the assessment in **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage** predicts significant effects for both assets during the Project's operational phase, resulting from change to their setting, and also predicts a significant effect for Whimpton Moor medieval village and moated site, the residual effects assessment reflects the balance referred to by historic England.
Overall, the routing as proposed has it appears sought to minimise heritage setting impacts as far as possible within the given constraints, the impacts remaining are for the decision maker to weigh against the public benefits of the scheme including its timely delivery to address network needs.	National Grid notes this feedback.

Historic England Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
As the construction planning of the scheme progresses the impact of access works and compounds will become clearer and can be explored further along side micro siting opportunities and other refinements.	Ongoing constructive engagement has taken place between National Grid and Historic England during the pre application stage of the Project. Historic England has been consulted on the location and design of works and compounds, and micro siting and refinements have been made where achievable. Measures to protect the historic environment are set out in **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, Application Document 7.9 Outline Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation** and **Application Document 7.10 Cultural Heritage Management Plan**, secured by Requirement in **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order**. A Statement of Common Ground between National Grid and Historic England is submitted as **Application Document 5.8.2 – Historic England**.
We look forwards to continued engagement as field work and survey is undertaken. Prioritisation of areas of greatest archaeological uncertainty or sensitivity, alongside sites with the greatest engineering complexity or least flexibility will assist in de-risking the project further.	National Grid welcomes this feedback. Archaeological fieldwork surveys carried out for the Project have prioritised areas of greatest archaeological uncertainty or sensitivity, and sites with the greatest engineering complexity or least design flexibility. This has reduced the Project risk and avoided or reduced impacts to archaeological remains. The results of the relevant fieldwork surveys are submitted as **Application Document 6.10.A6 Appendix 10.6 Geophysical Survey Report** and **Application Document 6.10.A8 Appendix 10.8 Archaeological Trial Trench Report.** Measures to protect the historic environment are secured by Requirement in **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order** and are set out in **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, Application Document 7.9 Outline Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation** and **Application Document 7.10 Cultural Heritage Management Plan**.

Water Management Consortium Consultation Feedback (Lindsey Marsh IDB, Isle of Axholme & North Nottinghamshire IDB, Trent Valley IDB, Doncaster East IDB)	National Grid Response
Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the above project. I would advise that the Isle of Axholme & North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board have no particular objections in principle to the proposal. However, in general terms the Board would wish to offer the following initial comment:	National Grid welcome that no particular objections in principle are made to the proposal.
Sections of the proposed overhead lines pass through the Isle of Axholme & North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board area and will interact with Board maintained watercourses as well as riparian watercourses that sit within the Board's area. The Board's Byelaws will apply to Board maintained watercourses and powers under the Land Drainage Act (1991) to these and any riparian watercourses impacted. The likely interactions will be:	National Grid note that the Project principally affects the district of the Isle of Axholme and North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board (IOA IDB) and the Trent Valley (TV IDB). National Grid propose to disapply byelaws made under the Land Drainage Act 1991 as set out in **Application Document 3.1. Draft Development Consent Order.**
Proximity of pylons and any other structures such as substations and compounds in close proximity to watercourses. Essentially the Board would be looking for a minimum stand-off between pylons and the top bank of any Board maintained watercourse of 9m. The Board would also require clearance of min 10m+SWD above these watercourses and this distance should take into account any sag or sway on the cables.	National Grid notes the consenting requirements for any construction works within 9 m of IDB maintained drains or watercourses, under the relevant drainage legislation and byelaws. National Grid has advised the IDB that there are currently no instances where proposed pylon legs are located within 9 m of an IDB-maintained watercourse (noting this is subject to the Project's Limits of Deviation). However, National Grid acknowledges that there are locations where the 9 m stand-off may be encroached upon by other elements of the Project, particularly in relation to pylon foundations, undergrounding of utilities, culvert installations and haul road crossings. National Grid will continue to engage WMC regarding these interactions and will seek any necessary approvals through the appropriate consenting processes as detailed design progresses and agreed where possible through **Application Document 5.8.12 Statement of Common Ground - Water Management Consortium Including Isle of Axholme & North Nottinghamshire IDBs**.

Water Management Consortium Consultation Feedback (Lindsey Marsh IDB, Isle of Axholme & North Nottinghamshire IDB, Trent Valley IDB, Doncaster East IDB)	National Grid Response
The overhead cables should be arranged in such a way that there are no working restrictions placed upon the Board when carrying out its statutory duties.	National Grid note this feedback. Discussions regarding the need for and content of protective provisions is ongoing and addressed within **Application Document 5.8.12 Statement of Common Ground - Water Management Consortium Including Isle of Axholme & North Nottinghamshire IDBs**.
Accommodation works during construction such as the installation of culverts, compounds, all roads or any other infrastructure that may impact upon watercourses in the area.	Embedded measures are those that are intrinsic to and built into the design of the Project; these are listed in **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments**. Embedded measures of relevance include: • Where possible the design of the temporary haul roads has sought to utilise existing bridges and culverts in order to avoid physical disturbance, impacts on flow regimes and pollution risks. • Large or sensitive watercourses, for example those designated as main river, and those with WFD status, will be crossed by the temporary haul road using temporary clear span bridges to avoid in-channel works and associated effects. • Surface water runoff from construction sites, including haul roads and compounds, as well as from any permanent areas of new imp
This list is not exhaustive and further comment will be made as the application progresses and the scheme develops. The Board have already had some pre-application conversations with the applicant and it is anticipated that this dialogue will continue throughout the process. We look forward to further communications as the scheme progresses.	National Grid welcomes the constructive engagement which has taken place to date. **Application Document 5.8.12 Statement of Common Ground - Water Management Consortium Including Isle of Axholme & North Nottinghamshire IDBs** provides detail on matters progressed through the preapplication process.

Laneham Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Laneham Parish Council responded to the first round of consultation. Local people were upset with how close it was coming to the village, however, the new proposed route, the parish council are happy with as it moves the pylons away from the village.	National Grid notes Laneham Parish Council's comments in respect of the corridor decision made by the Project.

Lincolnshire County Council Feedback	Consultation Feedback
National Grid Electricity Transmission – Statutory Consultation on North Humber to High Marnham Overhead Transmission Line and Associated Substations Thank you for consulting Lincolnshire County Council (the Council) as part of the statutory consultation for the above proposal. Following a review of the consultation documents, this representation provides a summary of the Council's comments/views on the proposal. Given the nature and extent of the Council's comments, it is not possible for these to be expressed using the format of the National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) consultation feedback form. The Council notes that the proposal is for an upgrade to the electricity transmission system between two new substations near Cottingham (north of Hull) and High Marnham (in Nottinghamshire). This would include the construction and operation of a new 400kV overhead electricity transmission line over a distance of 90km between the two proposed substations, Birkhill Wood 400kV Substation and High Marnham 400kV Substation, together with associated works. The proposal, which forms part of 'The Great Grid Upgrade' scheme, would also include the replacement and realignment of several other sections of overhead lines. Consent for the upgraded electricity transmission system would be sought through one application to the Planning Inspectorate for a Development Consent Order (DCO).	National Grid note the preference to not use the feedback form provided due to the nature and extent of feedback provided.
The two proposed substations would require planning permission from East Riding of Yorkshire Council and Bassetlaw District Council	This is correct. Following statutory consultation on the Project in 2025, a decision was taken to remove both the proposed 400 kV Birkhill

Lincolnshire County Council Feedback	Consultation Feedback
respectively under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. They have only been included within this statutory consultation to demonstrate that the project can connect to the national transmission network.	Wood Substation and 400 kV High Marnham Substation and associated works from the Project. Separate planning applications for the 400 kV Birkhill Wood Substation (25/01898/STPLF), and 400 kV High Marnham Substation (25/01302/FUL) were submitted by National Grid in July and November 2025 to the local planning authorities of East Riding of Yorkshire Council and Bassetlaw District Council respectively. East Riding of Yorkshire Council granted planning permission for the 400kV Birkhill Wood Substation on 27 February 2026. Bassetlaw District Council granted planning permission for the 400kV High Marnham Substation on 23 June 2026. Alongside these planning applications, National Grid published a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) for acquisition of the land, to enable the delivery of each of the substations. Negotiations with land owners to acquire by agreement are still ongoing, and the CPO is forecast to be confirmed in late 2026. A full description of the design evolution of the Project is provided in **Application Document 5.9 Design Development Report**.
Cultural Heritage Study Area The Council welcomes the inclusion of built heritage and historic landscape matters in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) however, we have reservations about the proposed 1km study area for all heritage assets, even with selective extension for higher-graded assets. This approach is unlikely to capture the full extent of potential effects on setting, particularly in low-lying or elevated rural areas where infrastructure of over 50m in height may be visible at distances of up to 10km.	The study areas for cultural heritage are presented in **Application Document 6.10.F1 Designated Heritage Assets within Study Areas**; and **Application Document 6.10.F2 Non-designated Heritage Assets within 1 km Study Area**. The cultural heritage assessment in **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage** sets out and provides justification for the three different study areas that, together, ensure that the assessment identifies and assesses all likely significant cultural heritage effects. A summary is provided below. A 1 km study area from the Order Limits has been used to collect data on non-designated archaeological assets, comprising buried and above-ground archaeological remains, plus information on archaeological investigations, including desk-based assessments and fieldwork surveys. These contextual data contributed to the understanding of archaeological baseline conditions reported in

Lincolnshire County Council Feedback	Consultation Feedback
	Application Document 6.10.A2 Appendix 10.2 Cultural Heritage Baseline Report. The data captured within the 1 km study area from the Order Limits is considered sufficient to identify known archaeological remains within, or in proximity to, the Order Limits and to inform the likelihood of encountering previously unknown archaeological remains. As such, it is appropriate for assessing likely significant effects to buried archaeological remains. A 1 km study area from the lateral Limits of Deviation (LoD) of the proposed overhead line has been used to assess likely significant effects to designated and non-designated heritage assets as a result of changes to their setting. This study area, which is measured from the LoD for the proposed overhead line rather than the Order Limits, recognises that potential significant effects from setting change are more likely to arise from the operational presence of the Project's permanent infrastructure, comprising the proposed pylons and overhead line. Measuring from the LoD for the proposed overhead line ensures that a worst-case level of change to setting is assessed. Significant effects from setting change to heritage assets beyond the 1 km study area from the LoD of the proposed overhead line are less likely due to the distance involved. However, for heritage assets of the highest sensitivity and value (i.e., World Heritage Sites, Grade I and II* listed buildings, Registered Battlefields, Grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens (RPG), scheduled monuments, and conservation areas containing a notable concentration of highly designated assets), there is a greater potential for change owing to their greater sensitivity and as their setting can extend over a larger area. In recognition of this, a wider study area of 3 km from the lateral LoD of the proposed overhead line is used to assess likely significant effects to heritage assets of the highest value.
The Council recommends maintaining a minimum 5km study area for all designated heritage assets and a 3km study area for non-designated heritage assets, in line with best practice and comparable	The Project design has evolved since the preliminary assessment, such that no impacts are predicted in relation to heritage assets within Lincolnshire County Council's jurisdiction. The Project has been

Lincolnshire County Council Feedback	Consultation Feedback
Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) schemes. The Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) should be ground-truthed through fieldwork and used to inform, rather than determine, the study area. The Council would welcome discussion on the selection of viewpoints, especially for assets whose significance is informed by long views, historical relationships, or associations with key landscape features.	informed by the consultations and engagements which have taken place, and since then relevant statutory bodies including Historic England and cultural heritage advisors to the local authorities which the Project passes through, have agreed the study areas and view point areas. The study areas for the cultural heritage assessment recognises the different types of heritage assets and predicted impacts. The ZTV illustrated in **Application Document 6.7.F2 Figure 7.2 Zone of Theoretical Visibility**, has helped inform the study areas, but the setting assessment carried out as part of **Application Document 6.10.A2 Appendix 10.2 Cultural Heritage Baseline Report**, has determined the assessment scope. No significant effects for heritage assets within the authority's area are predicted. The only asset within Lincolnshire County Council's jurisdiction that now falls within the study area for identifying potential effects to heritage assets is the Grade II* listed No. 49 Gate and Railings (NHLE: 1359419) in East Sockwith Conservation Area Located in Route Section E, approximately 2.95 km east of the LoD for the proposed overhead line. No impacts to that asset or the conservation area are predicted. Viewpoints from heritage assets are not required to support the application. Viewpoint locations have been agreed with the cultural heritage advisors to the LPAs that the proposed overhead line passes through, and with Historic England.
Historic Landscape and Heritage Considerations in Local Policy The Council supports the use of Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) datasets in the assessment and recommends that this is complemented by additional local sources. These include the Greater Lincolnshire Historic Farmsteads Character Statement (2015) which provides key evidence on the typology, spatial organisation, and historic development of farmsteads and other rural building groups. It is particularly relevant where traditional building clusters contribute to historic settlement form and land use patterns. The Historic Character of the County of Lincolnshire (2022) report would also inform the	National Grid welcomes this feedback. The Project design has evolved since the preliminary assessment. The proposed overhead line is no longer within the unitary authority area of LCC and significant effects upon the historic landscape character are not predicted. As such, the recommended sources provided by the council have not been needed to inform the cultural heritage assessment.

Lincolnshire County Council Feedback	Consultation Feedback
characterisation of rural areas, where historic features overlap with landscape sensitivity. While not a policy document, its findings may support identification of sensitive receptors or valued landscapes.	
The Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record (HER) and adjacent HERs (e.g. North Lincolnshire) should be consulted to inform the cultural heritage baseline, including data on non-designated assets not captured by national datasets. Local Heritage Lists held by district authorities should also be reviewed.	HER data maintained by the LPAs through which the proposed overhead line passes through, plus a 1 km study area from the Order Limits has been consulted and has informed the desk-based assessment presented in **Application Document 6.10.A2 Appendix 10.2 Cultural Heritage Baseline Report**. The Lincolnshire County Council area does not fall within the defined study area for assessment of HER data on non-designated assets.
Relevant Local and Neighbourhood Plans should also inform the assessment of local heritage sensitivities. These include (but are not limited to) the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, and Neighbourhood Plans for Saxilby with Ingleby, Sturton by Stow, Beckingham, Clayworth, and North Wheatley.	The Project design has evolved since the preliminary assessment. Significant effects upon heritage assets within the authority area are not predicted. As such, the policy documents cited by the council are no longer relevant to the cultural heritage assessment.
Setting of Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets The proposed corridor has potential to affect the setting of a range of heritage assets, including Grade I and II listed churches, scheduled monuments, conservation areas and non designated heritage assets that contribute to the rural historic environment. In line with 3 Historic England advice, the Council notes that effects falling below EIA thresholds may still cause harm to significance and must be clearly articulated in the Environmental Statement (ES). Setting should be assessed using Historic England's GPA3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (2017). This includes the kinetic experience of moving through landscapes, seasonal variation, and intervisibility between assets and landscape features.	Potential impacts from the proposed overhead line, arising from change to setting, has been assessed in **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage.** The assessment has been informed by Historic England's guidance on setting (Historic England, 2017) and includes, where relevant, impacts to intervisibility and how the experience of an asset may be affected as one moves through the landscape. A Statement of Harm is presented in **Application Document 5.5 Planning Statement** and discusses the level of harm to heritage assets.
Non-designated heritage assets such as historic farmsteads, workers' cottages, and other traditional rural building groups are also sensitive to erosion of setting and group value. These should be proportionately	The Project design has evolved since the preliminary assessment and the study area for non-designated built heritage assets (defined in **Application Document 6.10.A2 Appendix 10.2 Cultural Heritage**

Lincolnshire County Council Feedback	Consultation Feedback
assessed in the baseline and clearly distinguished from the treatment of designated assets.	**Baseline Report** as 1 km from the Limit of Deviation for the proposed overhead line) does not now fall within Lincolnshire County Council's boundary and non-designated heritage assets within the authority's area will not be affected.
The ES should distinguish between cumulative effects (from interaction with other projects) and combined or interrelated effects (arising within this project, e.g. where pylons or haul roads affect the same receptor or a particular group of heritage assets such as farmsteads). Integrated assessment with Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and landscape characterisation will be key where overlapping effects are likely	A distinction has been made between cumulative effects (from interaction with other projects) and combined or interrelated effects (arising within the Project) and are reported in **Application Document 6.20 Chapter 20 Intra-project Cumulative Effects** and **6.21 Chapter 21 Inter-project Cumulative Effects**.
Conservation Areas Several Conservation Areas lie along or close to the proposed route, including Saxilby, Torksey, Gringley on the Hill, Epworth, Belton, and Fledborough. These areas often derive significance from their relationship with the surrounding rural landscape, historic views, and the experience of approaching or moving through the area. The Council recommends that Conservation Areas are properly assessed in terms of their setting, visual and experiential attributes, and intervisibility with proposed infrastructure.	Conservation Areas within the agreed 1km and 3km study areas have been assessed accordingly with the results presented in **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage**.
The assessment approach should ensure this is undertaken in line with Historic England's GPA3 and other relevant frameworks, and that cumulative and interrelated impacts (e.g. with listed buildings or historic landscapes) are fully considered. Views along key approaches and across open countryside are particularly vulnerable and should not be discounted prematurely.	The assessment approach has been informed by Historic England's guidance on setting (Historic England, 2017) and includes consideration of cumulative and interrelated impacts to heritage assets,
Mitigation The Council supports the emphasis in the PEIR on iterative design and the potential for mitigation through route refinement and design response. For heritage and historic landscape receptors, we	Environmental appraisal has been an integral part of the Project design from the outset, which has meant that the Project has been able to avoid environmentally sensitive features as far as reasonably practicable. National Grid has also embedded measures into the

Lincolnshire County Council Feedback	Consultation Feedback
recommend that mitigation principles be guided by early engagement with specialist advice and, where appropriate, by locally specific character evidence. In areas of elevated or low-lying heritage sensitivity - such as the Isle of Axholme or the setting of the Hall Garth moated site at Ousefleet - consideration should also be given to measures such as route realignment, reduced structure height, or underground cabling.	design of the Project to avoid or reduce significant effects that may otherwise be experienced during construction and operation of the Project. Embedded measures are those that are intrinsic to and built into the design of the Project; these are presented in **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments**. Embedded measures of relevance to the cultural heritage assessment to minimise setting change include: • The Project has been designed, where feasible, to be parallel or close parallel with existing overhead lines to reduce the spread of infrastructure in views, • The route has been realigned where feasible, to preserve or minimise change to the settings of heritage assets, • Where feasible, mitigation planting has been designed to reduce the visibility of the Project from within settlements. Mitigation proposals for buried archaeological remains that cannot be avoided and/ or may not merit preservation in situ include a programme of archaeological recording in advance of construction, post-excavation assessment, publication and archiving. These measures have been agreed with the archaeological advisor to the local planning authority and are secured in **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order, Application Document 7.9 Outline Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation** and **Application Document 7.10 Cultural Heritage Management Plan.**
The Council encourages integration with landscape and visual strategies where these can support a heritage-led approach to siting and design. Landscape and Visual Impact The Council recognises that existing westerly views from Lincolnshire already include 400kV overhead lines, with the new line proposed to be located several kms beyond them. However, considering the proximity of Lincolnshire to the draft Order Limits and the substantial	National Grid notes this feedback. Significant landscape effects have been identified for a number of landscape character areas and the direct and indirect effects of the Project on character is presented in **Application Document 6.6 Chapter 6 Landscape**. Policy S53: Design and Amenity has been reviewed. This policy is related more to developments within settlements, new buildings in terms of densities, form and materials, and movement including accessibility, connected travel networks, parking and servicing.

Lincolnshire County Council Feedback	Consultation Feedback
scale of the proposal, there is potential for the project to indirectly impact on the wider landscape character and/or setting in Lincolnshire, particularly in respect of cumulative landscape impacts and impacts on visual amenity in low-lying or elevated areas. The Council welcomes the inclusion of Policy S62 (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Areas of Great Landscape Value) within the regional and local policy section of Chapters 6 and 7 of the PEIR. The Council suggests that Policy S53 (Design and Amenity) is also relevant in relation to visual amenity and important local views.	Although there are some elements on the policy relating to nature which are perhaps more relevant in terms of retention of existing natural features and biodiversity net gain, overall the policy does not appear to be relevant for the type of development proposed in terms of visual amenity. Where neighbourhood plans are available which refer to specific important views from a settlement these have been considered as identified in **Application Document 6.7.A1 Appendix 7.1 Regional and Local Planning Policy**.
The Council supports the use of National Character Areas within the baseline assessment for landscape impacts. The identification and assessment of potential impacts on two Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) located in close proximity to the Lincolnshire boundary (i.e. Laughton Woods and Scotton Common AGLV, and Northeast and East of Gainsborough AGLV) is welcomed. The Council generally agrees that impacts on views from these two AGLVs would not be significant given the intervening distance (approximately 6.2km and 7km respectively), and the presence of existing overhead lines and the former Burton on Trent Power Station.	National Grid notes this feedback.
Cumulative Effects The applicant's approach to the assessment of cumulative effects in Chapter 21 of the PEIR is welcomed. The Stage 1 assessment zone of influence (ZOI) is considered sufficient in extent to capture relevant projects within the Lincolnshire geographical boundary. The assessment includes a review of planning applications and the development plan in Lincolnshire, as well as other projects which are currently proposed through the DCO process (e.g. Gate Burton, West Burton, and One Earth solar schemes).	National Grid welcomes this feedback.
The Council supports the inclusion of the Cottam and Tillbridge solar schemes as part of the future baseline in the topic chapters but, requests that this is kept under regular review in case the construction	Existing and planned third party developments have been regularly reviewed in order to identify any new developments that qualifies for inclusion which may have a cumulative impact. A short list of projects

Lincolnshire County Council Feedback	Consultation Feedback
and operational dates of these projects are delayed meaning that they would need to be considered as part of the assessment of cumulative effects instead. The Council advises that the short list of projects should also be kept under regular review as the proposal progresses in order to identify any new developments that come forward which may have a cumulative impact.	has been included in **Application Document 6.21.F2 Environmental Statement Figure 21.2 - Cumulative Short List of Other Developments**
The Council would expect the ES to contain a specific chapter on the assessment of cumulative effects covering both intra and inter project effects. In addition to setting out the approach and methodology, this chapter should clearly identify other relevant projects and the potential for cumulative effects, any existing environmental problems relating to areas of particular environmental importance likely to be affected, or the use of natural resources. It should also provide an assessment of the significance of the potential cumulative effects identified, likely duration of the effects (including phasing details) and mitigation measures.	Assessments of intra- and inter-project cumulative effects on important ecological features are presented in **Application Document 6.20 Chapter 20 Intra-project Cumulative Effects** and **Application Document 6.21 Chapter 21 Inter-project Cumulative Effects**.
The Council welcomes the opportunity to continue working with NGET in developing its proposals and provide technical feedback and engagement at appropriate times, based on the above. If you require any further clarification or assistance on this matter..	National Grid welcomes this feedback.

Marine Management Organisation Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Legislation and planning policy context The consultee would expect to see consideration of marine plan policies if there are any activities occurring below MHWS which require a licence. The MMO requests that all policies are reviewed within a table to show compliance. This must be produced as the Secretary of State must use the Northeast Marine Plan when making planning decisions for the sea, coast, estuaries and tidal waters, as well as developments that impacts these areas, such as infrastructure. The Northeast Marine Plan policies can be accessed	National Grid notes this feedback and confirms that there are no activities occurring below MHWS which require a licence. Accordingly, consideration of marine plan policies has not therefore taken place.

Marine Management Organisation Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
using Explore Marine Plans: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/explore-marine-plans	
Description of the project The MMO has reviewed section 4.9.51 which details how the new overhead line would be installed above the River Ouse/Humber Estuary. In order to install the conductors, lightweight ropes will need to be laid out and lifted into position on the new pylons either side of the river. These ropes will need to be carried across the river, by using boats to draw the ropes across the river, whereby access would be needed to the water's edge for a period of a few weeks, the detail of which has not yet been determined, nor a worst-case scenario presented.	Following statutory consultation, alternative river crossing methodologies were considered. The Project will now use an alternative method of conductor stringing, using drone or helicopter. This method removes the requirement to access the water's edge. No activities will occur below MHWS. This was confirmed in engagement with the MMO in August 2025**. Application Document 6.3 Main Alternatives Considered** provides detail on the decision to progress with this method of stringing.
An alternative method for conductor stringing would be carrying ropes across the river using drones or helicopter thus removing the need for riverside working areas from the final DCO application.	National Grid has confirmed to the MMO that the alternative method for conductor stringing, carrying ropes across the river using drones or helicopter thus removing the need for riverside working areas from the Application, has been taken forward by the Project.
The consultee requests that the chapter is updated with a worst-case scenario methodology for all crossings below MHWS.	National Grid notes this feedback and confirms that there are no activities occurring below MHWS which require a licence.
Landscape and Visual	
The MMO requests that 'Seascape' be included within this chapter. The Applicant should consider how the project may affect the marine character of the area and discuss the possibility of adverse impacts	The Marine Management Organisation character areas end at the confluence of the River Trent and the River Ouse. From there the Project would be seen in the context of the existing 400 kV overhead line as it crosses the River Ouse and therefore would be of no consequence for seascape character. Therefore, seascape is scoped out and not considered within **Application Document 6.6 Chapter 6 Landscape** of the Environmental Statement.
The MMO defers to the statutory advice provided by Natural England or the Local Planning Authority regarding the potential impacts to the landscape/seascape that may occur because of the Project.	National Grid notes this feedback and that the MMO has deferred to Natural England and the Local Planning Authorities regarding the

Marine Management Organisation Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	potential impacts to the landscape/seascape that may occur because of the Project.
The MMO will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as DML conditions.	Through on going engagement the MMO have confirmed that the Project does not require a deemed marine licence (DML).
Ecology	
The MMO would expect an assessment of marine receptors, intertidal ecology and fish ecology, which is based on the worst-case scenario of cable stringing across the river crossings and activities occurring below MHWS.	Aquatic ecology has been assessed within **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology** of the Environmental Statement. No works will take place inside the River Ouse, or on its banks. The proposed overhead line will be installed over the River using a helicopter or drones.
The MMO notes that temporary direct habitat loss and temporary disturbance and fragmentation of the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation ("SAC")/Special Protected Area ("SPA")/Ramsar/Site of Special Scientific Interest ("SSSI"), Brantingham Dale SSSI and Chesterfield Canal SSSI will occur. No permanent habitat loss is now predicted for these designated sites. The MMO queries whether this includes consideration of activities occurring below MHWS	National Grid notes this feedback and confirms that there are no activities occurring below MHWS for assessment to take consideration of.
The MMO would welcome further engagement with the Applicant on its consideration of marine ecological impacts.	Further constructive engagement between the Applicant and the MMO took place during the pre-application stage of the Project as requested and the Applicant confirmed that no activities would be taking place below MHWS.
Ornithology	
The MMO defers to Natural England regarding the potential impacts to intertidal ornithology and will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as DML conditions.	National Grid notes this feedback and that the MMO has deferred to Natural England regarding the potential impacts to intertidal ornithology.

Marine Management Organisation Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Cultural Heritage	
The MMO defers to Historic England regarding the potential impacts to intertidal archaeology that may occur. The MMO will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as DML conditions.	National Grid notes this feedback and that the MMO has deferred to Historic England regarding the potential impacts to intertidal archaeology that may occur.
Water Environment	
The MMO notes that there is the potential for direct physical disturbance to the channel form or flow regime of the River Ouse associated with the temporary Jetties proposed for conductor stringing. The chapter details that several watercourses be crossed for temporary access via four new culverts and that 'these works would result in localised channel bed/bank modifications causing disruption to flow regimes and effects on hydromorphology and water quality.' The Applicant has stated that 'the potential for direct physical disturbance will be assessed in full as part of the ES.' The MMO would welcome further consultation on this prior to the ES being submitted.	As confirmed with the MMO during pre application engagement, the potential for direct physical disturbance to the channel form or flow regime of the River Ouse associated with the temporary Jetties proposed for conductor stringing has been removed from the Project with an alternative stringing methodology being taken forward in the Application as described in **Application Document 6.4 Project Description.**
The Chapter discusses the temporary effect of water quality during construction as 'negligible and effects not significant.' The environmental quality standards directive list (Environment Agency ("EA") 2016) should be considered when undertaking an assessment. To be able to be compliant with this, the properties of all the chemicals (products) and their component substances used for construction should be known to, and approved by the regulator. The MMO recommends that a chemical risk assessment ("CRA") be undertaken and shared.	No in channel works are taking place and so there is no requirement for a CRA to be carried out.
The MMO welcomes that a 'full assessment will be presented within the ES, including refining the assigned value (sensitivity) to receptors (for example, watercourses and floodplains) where necessary based on the findings of all data collected, as well as the magnitude of	National Grid notes this feedback and considers that the level of detail presented at statutory consultation was proportionate to the stage of the Project at that time.

Marine Management Organisation Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
effects (change in the baseline conditions). The criteria will consider the scale/extent of the predicted change and the nature and duration of the effect. The factors will be combined to give an overall significance of effect with reference to a matrix.' However, the MMO considers that significance of effect/impact magnitudes should be detailed at this stage.	
The MMO requests signposting to where Invasive Non-Native Species ("INNS") has been considered from activities below MHWS.	There are no activities taking place below MHWS.
Noise and Vibration	
Although the use of vessels may be proposed, there is no preliminary estimate of the number of vessels that may be required during construction, nor the details of how possible jetties will be constructed. The impact pathways for underwater sound associated with the Project should be considered.	**Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** contains specific measures relating to potential impacts from underwater noise from potential percussive piling activities, and requires that noise from such activities will be controlled to be below the level at which the onset of behavioural disturbance in sensitive fish species would occur.
The MMO recommends that the Applicant includes the impact of underwater noise on marine receptors when conducting their cumulative impact assessment.	**Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** contains specific measures relating to potential impacts from underwater noise from potential percussive piling activities and requires that noise from such activities will be controlled to be below the level at which the onset of behavioural disturbance in sensitive fish species would occur.
Socioeconomics, recreation and tourism	
Section 4.4 of Volume 1, Chapter 4 Description of the project, provides a general description of the of the proposed overhead line. The MMO notes that a 50 metre (m) height is presented.	**Application Document 6.4 Chapter 4 Project Description** confirms the overhead line would comprise conductors supported by pylons. A typical pylon operating at 400 kV is approximately 50-60m in height. A typical span distance between pylons is approximately 350 m. In broad terms, there are typically three pylons for every kilometre of overhead line.

Marine Management Organisation Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
The MMO notes the Applicant has referred to the use of in-river jetties, platforms and boats, in the meeting held on 03 March 2025. The MMO requests signposting to the relevant areas of the PEIR where jetties and platforms have been considered. The MMO requests clarification on the activities that may occur below MHWS.	Following statutory consultation, a decision was made to remove the jetties and platforms from the Project. National Grid confirmed with the MMO that no activities will occur below MHWS.
The MMO advises that the MCA is consulted at the earliest opportunity to ensure that potential impacts to navigation safety are appropriately mitigated.	National Grid has consulted with the MCA. **Application Document 14.6 Navigational Risk Assessment** has been submitted with the Application to ensure navigation safety has been considered appropriately by the Project.
Other comments	
The MMO notes that currently there is no DML. The MMO has requested that the Applicant presents a worst-case scenario for cable stringing across the river crossings. If activities are required below MHWS, no exemptions are sought, and there were to be a DML, the MMO would require early sight to provide comment.	The MMO has confirmed during pre application engagement that the Application does not require a DML due to the nature of the works not being below MHWS.
Further clarification is needed regarding the River Ouse crossing, specifically the worst-case scenario methodology for cable stringing over the river.	The Applicant provided the MMO with the river crossing methodology and it was confirmed that no works would be taking place below MHWS.
The MMO acknowledges that the Applicant intends to refine the Project; however, the worst-case scenario should be defined at this stage to allow for a thorough assessment of potential impacts.	Appropriate assessment of potential impacts has been carried out for the Project based on the refined Project design.
Conclusion The MMO welcomes the progress made to date on the North Humber to High Marnham Project. However, the MMO requires the points raised in this response to be addressed before the Environmental Statement is submitted. If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me using the details provided below.	National Grid welcomes this feedback.

Maritime and Coastguard Agency Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
The MCA has an interest in the works associated with the marine environment, and the potential impact on the safety of navigation, access to ports, harbours and marinas and any impact on our search and rescue obligations. The MCA would expect the impact of works in, on or over the marine environment to be subject to the appropriate consents under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 before carrying out any marine licensable works.	National Grid notes this feedback No marine licensable works form part of the Project.
At this stage it is not clear whether the proposed works over watercourses will impact any navigable waters and advice should be sought from the Marine Management Organisation. This is particularly important where work may interfere with other marine users, impact emergency access, or reduce air clearance for vessels transiting the site. The study area crosses the catchment of numerous watercourses within the Humber River Basin, including the River Ouse, River Thorne, the North and South Soak Drains, and the River Idle. These waterways have several attributes that could be affected by the project, in terms of navigation and impact on other marine users.	National Grid has engaged with the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and obtained the relevant advice in respect of the proposed works and any impact on navigable waters. **Application Document 14.6 Navigational Risk Assessment** has been submitted with the Application to ensure navigation safety has been considered appropriately by the Project.
The MCA would expect the impact of the project on other users of the rivers and waterways to be considered as the project progresses. Currently the Draft Outline Code of Construction Practice (DOCCP) does not make any specific reference to potential impacts to river users for works on or over navigable rivers. For example, the method in Section 4.9.52 of the PEIR mentions “the use of boats to draw the ropes across the river” for the River Ouse overhead cable crossing which could have implications for vessel users but is not assessed in the DOCCP.	The impact of the Project on other users of the rivers and waterways has been considered through the pre-application design process. **Application Document 14.6 Navigational Risk Assessment** provides detail on any impacts to river users with appropriate mitigation presented. The use of boats to draw the ropes across the river for the River Ouse overhead cable crossing has been removed from the Project with an alternative conductor stringing method being taken forward which removes works from the river. A description of the Project is within **Application Document 6.4 Chapter 4 - Description of the Project.**
It is our understanding that the location of the crossing over the River Ouse falls within the jurisdiction of ABP Humber as Statutory Harbour Authority (SHA). They are therefore responsible for maintaining the	National Grid has engaged with ABP as Statutory Harbour Authority (SHA) throughout the pre-application stage of the Project.

Maritime and Coastguard Agency Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
safety of navigation during the construction and the operational phase of the project.	**Application Document 5.8.10 Statement of Common Ground – Associated British Ports** is submitted with the Application.
The overhead cable will also cross other waterways. The PEIR details several river crossings and several temporary bridges over the Chesterfield Canal and the Market Weighton Canal; The MCA would therefore expect the relevant navigation authority (in this case The Canals and Rivers Trust and the Inland Waterways Association) to be consulted as the project progress, with regards to overhead clearances and any works/vessels proposed in the watercourse. Furthermore, the permanent bridge proposed as part of the works over the Stainforth and Keadby Canal would need to be consulted on with Sheffield and South Yorks Navigation who are the local navigation authority.	National Grid has consulted and held constructive engagement with The Canals and Rivers Trust, the Inland Waterways Association and the Sheffield and South Yorks Navigation and will continue with this engagement. **Application Document 14.6 Navigational Risk Assessment** has been submitted with the Application to ensure navigation safety has been considered appropriately by the Project
We would point the developers in the direction of the Port Marine Safety Code (PMSC) and its Guide to Good Practice. They will need to liaise and consult with the SHA and develop a robust Marine Safety Management System for the project under this code.	National Grid notes this feedback. The findings of **Application Document 14.6 Navigational Risk Assessment** has confirmed that, as the Project does not comprise marine works or activities with the potential to affect navigational safety, the preparation of a Marine Safety Management System is not considered proportionate.
It would be helpful for the applicant to confirm any works for river crossings which will take place below the Mean High Water Spring to establish which, if any, fall under the marine licensing regime. It is likely on this occasion that the impact on other marine users can be addressed through suitably worded conditions at the formal marine licence application stage.	There are no activities taking place below Mean High Water Springs.

Met Office Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
National Grid consulted with the Met Office on the 17 July 2026 after it came to the Project's attention they had not been notified of the statutory consultation in 2025. The Met Office responded on the 21 July 2026.	
Thanks for consulting the Met Office. The proposed towers would be between 18-53km from our weather radar at Ingham. There is potential that the towers would be detected by the radar but any impact on services such as weather forecasts and warnings derived from the radar data will be limited. Therefore, we have no comments on the proposal and do not need to be consulted further.	National Grid notes the Met Office comments and that they do not need to be consulted further.

Mining Remediation Authority Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Further to the notification received from the applicant on 18th February 2025 seeking the views of the Coal Authority on the above, I have checked the site location plan against the information held by the Coal Authority and can confirm that the proposed development site lies in the Development Low Risk Area. On this basis, the Planning team at the Coal Authority have no comments to make. As this development lies in the Development Low Risk Area, you do not need to consult us any further as we will not be issuing any more responses.	National Grid notes the Mining Remediation Authorities comments.

Ministry of Defence Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Thank you for consulting the Ministry of Defence (MOD), under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008, on National Grid's preparation of an application for a Development Consent Order application, for the construction, operation and decommissioning of a high voltage electricity transmission line over a distance of approximately 90 kilometres. The Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) Safeguarding Team represents the MOD as a consultee in UK planning and energy consenting systems to ensure that development does not compromise or degrade the operation of defence sites such	National Grid note the capacity in which the DIO are responding

Ministry of Defence Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
as aerodromes, explosives storage sites, air weapon ranges, and technical sites or training resources such as the Military Low Flying System. The above statutory pre-application has been submitted to obtain prescribed consultee views and Feedback.	
The proposed development area occupies the statutory technical safeguarding zones that surround the East 1 Wide Area Multilateration (WAM) Network which contributes to aviation safety by feeding into the air traffic management system in eastern England. The proposed development area also falls within an area where military low flying activity is undertaken.	National Grid note the interactions between the Project and statutory technical safeguarding zones and acknowledges that it falls within an area where military low flying activity is undertaken.
Technical Site Safeguarding Zones Technical safeguarding zones define areas surrounding radars, radio transmitter/ receiver sites and other types of technical installations supporting operational defence or national security requirements within which the heights of development, materials used in construction and introduction of sources of electro-magnetic fields are regulated. Based upon the information provided, part of the preferred route for the transmission line occupies the technical safeguarding zone in place to protect receivers and microwave links that form part of the East 1 WAM Network, which consists of nodes and connecting pathways, providing air traffic control for air navigation services. Parts of the proposed development partly occupies technical safeguarding zones in which the MOD must be consulted on any development or change of land use. It is understood that the proposed pylons and multiple powerlines typically reach a height of 50m or greater, where circumstances in the landscape dictate.	This advice has been noted by National Grid. Information has been received by National Grid from MOD to allow the identification of interactions. This has allowed National Grid to provide further technical information to MOD for which feedback is awaited.
The WAM microwave link affected by this proposed development, is the link connecting Clarborough (OS 474208, 383837) and RAF Waddington (OS 498025, 365248). Based on the information available and the initial safeguarding assessments undertaken, it has been identified that the proximity of the proposed routing comprising	Information sent by the MOD has allowed National Grid to provide the MOD with relevant project information to allow assessment of potential impacts upon the WAM microwave link. Discussions are on-going.

Ministry of Defence Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
of proposed pylons and multiple powerlines, (As per National Grid Drawing Reference: NHHM-NG-ENG-PLN-0022 Sheet 3: between new lattice pylons 4AF220 and 4AF226), may physically impact upon the effective operation of the East 1 WAM network. The MOD therefore has concerns with pylons (up to 50m in height) and powerlines occupying the East 1 WAM Network safeguarding zone between Clarborough and RAF Waddington.	
In addition, it is possible that the deployment of cranes, high reaching plant equipment or temporal structures that may be used during the construction and decommissioning phases of the proposed development may cause an obstruction to the effective operation of the East 1 WAM Network (not just the link between Clarborough and RAF Waddington). This will need to be addressed in the preparation of any application for the proposed scheme, and the MOD will have a requirement for a construction management plan to be submitted prior to construction and decommissioning works being undertaken.	National Grid acknowledges the potential for construction equipment to cause obstruction to the effective operation of the East 1 WAM Network. National Grid are actively working with the MOD to resolve this issue. National Grid are continuing discussions with the MOD on this topic to understand the need for any requirements.
Military Low Flying Training The proposed route for the proposed electricity transmission network route will occupy military Low Flying Area's 06 (LFA 06) and 11 (LFA 11). Within these areas military aircraft may conduct low level flight training in which fixed wing military aircraft may fly at heights of 250 feet (76.2 metres) above terrain features. The addition of a development featuring tall or narrow profile structures such as electricity transmission towers in this locality has the potential to introduce a physical obstruction to low flying aircraft operating in the area.	National Grid note this advice.
To enable a detailed assessment of the development to be undertaken, details of the locations and height of each electricity transmission tower and associated cable will be needed.	This advice is noted. National Grid has provided MOD with details of the locations and heights of each pylon to allow assessment by the MOD to be undertaken. Following receipt of MOD feedback on the proposed overhead line infrastructure, National Grid has shared further technical assessment including information on conductor height with MOD and is awaiting a response.

Ministry of Defence Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
The MOD will need to assess any structures, including the use of cranes, piling rigs or other tall plant or equipment to implement development, with a maximum height of, or exceeding, a height of 50m above ground level to ensure there is no physical obstacle to low flying aircraft. In some cases, impacts may be addressed through the use of aviation safety lighting and the provision of data for charting.	This feedback is noted. National Grid has provided MOD with details of the locations and heights of permanent infrastructure as part of on-going discussions to allow assessment work to take place. National Grid will provide further details to MOD on any temporary plant, equipment or structures required for the construction of the overhead line as further details become available and will ensure that the information shared for both temporary and permanent infrastructure allows for accurate charting of the information. Following initial discussions MOD have confirmed that inclusion of a requirement within the DCO on the provision of necessary information will be required. Discussions are on-going between the parties.
The MOD, therefore, has serious concerns regarding the implementation of such infrastructure in proximity to technical installations supporting operational defence or national security requirements, and is likely to object to any proposals for this scheme which would impact on aviation safety and the effective operation of the East 1 WAM Network. These issues will need to be addressed in the preparation of any application relating to this proposal.	This advice is noted. National Grid is in discussion with the MOD about interactions with the East 1 WAM Network caused by the Project.
The MOD will need to be consulted again via the above multiuser email address in order to complete the appropriate safeguarding assessments as this development progresses. I would appreciate if you could acknowledge receipt of this letter.	This advice is noted. National Grid has been providing the MOD with up to date plans and information as it becomes available and will continue to do so.
The MOD must emphasise that the advice provided within this letter is in response to the data and information detailed in the developer's document titled "North Humber to High Marnham: Notification of statutory consultation launch" dated 18th February 2025 only. Should you wish to submit further information or provide any updated proposals, the MOD will gladly review these and advise of our Safeguarding position. The MOD should be consulted, via the above multiuser email address, at any future stages.	This advice is noted. National Grid has been providing the MOD with up to date plans and information as it becomes available and will continue to do so.

National Gas Transmission Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
I refer to your email dated 18/02/2025 regarding the above proposed DCO. This is a response on behalf of National Gas PLC (NGT). Having reviewed the scoping consultation documents, NGT wishes to make the following comments regarding gas infrastructure which may be affected by proposals. NGT has 2 feeder mains located within or in proximity to the Order limits. Details of this infrastructure is as follows: • Feeder Main – FM07 – Cawood to Susworth T West • Feeder Main – FM07 – Eastoft to Keadby PS • NGT Freehold – HS221757 • NGT Freehold – HS354984 • Cathodic Protection Groundbeds/TR • Ancillary apparatus	National Grid notes the presence of existing National Gas infrastructure in the vicinity of the Project. National Grid has since further engaged with National Gas and shared detailed information relating to the proposed NHHM Project design. National Gas has provided further information relating to the pipelines and associated equipment/apparatus which have the potential to interact with the Project
Please note that NGT has existing easements for these pipelines which provides rights for ongoing access and prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings/structures, change to existing ground levels or storage of materials etc within the easement strip. You should also be aware of NGT's guidance for working in proximity to its assets, further guidance and links are available as follows. CATHODIC PROTECTION SYSTEM To ensure a high level of safety and reliability in operation, National Gas Transmission's assets are protected by a cathodic protection system. It is essential that buried steel pipework associated with the transmission and distribution of natural gas is designed, installed, commissioned and maintained to withstand the potentially harmful effects of corrosion and that the corrosion control systems employed are monitored to ensure continued effectiveness. Installations in the vicinity of National Gas Transmission's assets which may potentially interfere with the cathodic protection system must be assessed and approved by National Gas Transmission, and appropriate control measures must be put in place where required.	National Grid notes this feedback and acknowledges receipt of National Gas general guidance for working in proximity to their assets. Several crossings of the National Gas pipeline assets have been identified as part of the construction and maintenance access proposals for the Project. Suitable crossing protection designs will be developed by National Grid as required and in consultation with National Gas. National Grid will ensure that the National Gas pipelines remain accessible and will work with National Gas to coordinate Construction, Design and Management (CDM) working areas. If, during construction, a location is temporarily inaccessible, National Grid will liaise with National Gas to restore access as soon as possible or provide an alternative access. In relation to proposed permanent infrastructure, National Grid will continue to engage with National Gas and confirm the extent of the applicable easement strips for the National Gas affected pipeline assets.

National Gas Transmission Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	National Grid has carried out an electrical interference study to satisfy the requirements of this Development Consent Order (DCO). The need for control measures as a result of potential electrical interference with the affected National Gas pipeline assets, such as cathodic protection systems, will be subject to the Project's confirmed detailed design and the adherence to the relevant national standards, in consultation with National Gas.
Installations which have the potential to interfere with National Gas Transmission's Cathodic protection system include (but are not limited to): 1. High voltage cable crossings and parallelism 2. High voltage ac pylon parallelism 3. Battery Energy Storage Systems 4. Third party pipelines with cathodic protection systems 5. PV Solar arrays Further information on D.C interference can be found in UKOPA/GPG/031 Edition C Microsoft Word - UKOPA GPG 031 DC Interference Ed 1.docx Microsoft Word - UKOPA GPG 031 DC Interference Ed 1.docx (hold ctrl and click to access). Further information on A.C. interference can be found in UKOPA/GPG/027 UKOPA Good Practice Guide UKOPA Good Practice Guide (hold ctrl and click to access)	National Grid notes this feedback. National Grid has carried out an electrical interference study to satisfy the requirements of this Development Consent Order (DCO). The need for control measures as a result of potential electrical interference with the affected National Gas pipeline assets will be subject to the Project's confirmed detailed design and the adherence to the relevant national standards, in consultation with National Gas.
The safe limits for transfer voltage and impressed current that a high-pressure gas pipeline can be exposed to are outlined in T/PL/ECP/1, T/PL/ECP/2 and BS EN 50122-1. These are the safe limits for non-electrically trained personnel.	National Grid notes this feedback. National Grid has carried out an electrical interference study to satisfy the requirements of this Development Consent Order (DCO). Applicable safe limits in relation to potential electrical interference impacts on nearby metallic pipeline assets have been selected in accordance with relevant national standards and reviewed with National Grid's technical consultant.

National Gas Transmission Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	National Grid requests that National Gas shares the mentioned specifications T/PL/ECP/1 and T/PL/ECP/2 for review. National Grid will continue to engage with National Gas in relation to the electrical interference study that National Grid has carried out for the purpose of this Development Consent Order (DCO).
Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of NGT's apparatus, NGT will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights including adequate Protective Provisions. A Deed of Consent will also be required for any works proposed within the easement strip.	National Grid notes this feedback. National Grid has initiated discussions with National Gas regarding Protective Provisions. Protective provisions, in relation to works proposed in vicinity of the National Gas assets, including required notifications and consents, will be discussed with National Gas and included within the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) documentation.
Key Considerations: • NGT has a Deed of Grant of Easement for each pipeline, which prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings, or structures, change to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc. • Please be aware that written permission is required before any works commence within the NGT easement strip. Furthermore a Deed of Consent will be required prior to commencement of works within NGT's easement strip subject to approval by NGT's plant protection team. • Any large installations which may result in a large population increase in the vicinity of a high pressure gas pipeline must comply with the HSE's Land Use Planning methodology, and the HSE response should be submitted to National Gas Transmission for review • The below guidance is not exhaustive and all works in the vicinity of NGT's asset shall be subject to review and approval from NGT's	National Grid notes this feedback. National Grid has initiated discussions with National Gas regarding Protective Provisions. Protective provisions, in relation to works proposed in vicinity of the National Gas assets, including required notifications and consents, will be discussed with National Gas and included within the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) documentation. The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) responded to the Project's Section 42 consultation. The HSE advised that, based on the information it had received, "it is unlikely that HSE would advise against the development" but advised that National Grid should engage with the relevant operators. National Grid will continue to engage with National Gas to understand any restrictions and protective measures required in relation to the above.

National Gas Transmission Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
plant protection team in advance of commencement of works on site.[2]	
General Notes on Pipeline Safety You should be aware of the Health and Safety Executives guidance document HS(G) 47 "Avoiding Danger from Underground Services", and NGT's Dial Before You Dig Specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of NGT Assets. There will be additional requirements dictated by NGT's plant protection team NGT will also need to ensure that its pipelines remain accessible during and after completion of the works. Our pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres, however actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation under the supervision of a NGT representative. Ground cover above our pipelines should not be reduced or increased. If any excavations are planned within 3 metres of NGT High Pressure Pipeline or, within 10 metres of an AGI (Above Ground Installation), or if any embankment or dredging works are proposed then the actual position and depth of the pipeline must be established on site in the presence of a NGT representative. A safe working method agreed prior to any work taking place in order to minimise the risk of damage and ensure the final depth of cover does not affect the integrity of the pipeline. Below are some examples of work types that have specific restrictions when being undertaken in the vicinity of gas assets therefore consultation with NGT's Plant Protection team is essential: Demolition • Blasting • Piling and boring	National Grid notes this feedback and acknowledges receipt of National Gas general guidance for working in proximity to their assets. Several crossings of the National Gas pipeline assets have been identified as part of the construction and maintenance access proposals. Suitable crossing protection designs will be developed by National Grid as required and in consultation with National Gas. No alterations of existing tracks, proposed as maintenance accesses, are currently anticipated. National Grid will ensure that the National Gas pipelines remain accessible and will work with National Gas to coordinate Construction, Design and Management (CDM) working areas. If, during construction, a location is temporarily inaccessible, National Grid will liaise with National Gas to restore access as soon as possible or provide an alternative access. In relation to proposed permanent infrastructure, National Grid will continue to engage with National Gas and confirm the extent of the applicable easement strips for the National Gas affected pipeline assets. Any excavation works will be subject to the Project's confirmed detailed design and the completion of ground investigations. National Grid's contractors will continue the ongoing engagement with National Gas at construction stage and ensure the relevant approvals are obtained, prior to any works starting in vicinity of National Gas pipeline assets. Based on the current proposals, National Grid has not identified any proposed underground cables that would interact with the identified

[2] Standard Guidance not responded to within this Appendix but has been considered by the Project.

National Gas Transmission Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
• Deep mining • Surface mineral extraction • Landfilling • Trenchless Techniques (e.g. HDD, pipe splitting, tunnelling etc.) • Wind turbine installation - minimum separation distance of 1.5x the mast/hub height is required, and any auxiliary installations such as cable or track crossings will require a deed of consent. Solar farm installation • ▪ Tree planting schemes Traffic Crossings: • •Where existing roads cannot be used, construction traffic should ONLY cross the pipeline at agreed locations. • Permanent road crossings will require a surface load calculation, and will require a deed of consent. • The pipeline shall be protected, at the crossing points, by temporary rafts constructed at ground level. The third party shall review ground conditions, vehicle types and crossing frequencies to determine the type and construction of the raft required. The type of raft shall be agreed with NGT prior to installation No protective measures including the installation of concrete slab protection shall be installed over or near to the NGT pipeline without the prior permission of NGT • NGT will need to agree the material, the dimensions and method of installation of the proposed protective measure. • The method of installation shall be confirmed through the submission of a formal written method statement from the contractor to NGT.	National Gas pipeline assets. This will be monitored and confirmed through detailed design.

National Gas Transmission Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
• An NGT representative shall monitor any works within close proximity to the pipeline to comply with NGT specification T/SP/SSW22 New Asset Crossings: • New assets (cables/pipelines etc) may cross the pipeline at perpendicular angle to the pipeline i.e. 90 degrees. • The separation distance for a cable >33kV is 1000mm and pre and post energisation surveys may be required at National Gas Transmission's discretion. A risk assessment/method statement will need to be provided to, and accepted by National Gas Transmission prior to the deed of consent being agreed. Where a new asset is to cross over the pipeline a clearance distance of 0.6 metres between the crown of the pipeline and underside of the service should be maintained. If this cannot be achieved the service shall cross below the pipeline with a clearance distance of 0.6 metres. • A new service should not be laid parallel within an easement strip Clearance must be at least 600mm above or below the pipeline • An NGT representative shall approve and supervise any cable crossing of a pipeline. • A Deed of Consent is required for any cable crossing the easement	
Where the promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of NGT apparatus, protective provisions will be required in a form acceptable to it to be included within the DCO. NGT requests to be consulted at the earliest stages to ensure that the most appropriate protective provisions are included within the DCO application to safeguard the integrity of our apparatus and to remove the requirement for objection. Adequate access to NGT pipelines must be maintained at all times during construction and post construction to ensure the safe operation of our network.	National Grid notes this feedback. Protective provisions, in relation to asset protection, and works proposed in vicinity of the National Gas assets, including required notifications and consents, will be discussed with National Gas and included within the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) documentation. National Grid has initiated discussions with National Gas in this regard.

National Gas Transmission Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	National Grid will ensure that the National Gas pipelines remain accessible and will work with National Gas to coordinate Construction, Design and Management (CDM) working areas. If, during construction, a location is temporarily inaccessible, National Grid will liaise with National Gas to restore access as soon as possible or provide an alternative access.

National Highways Consultation Feedback[3]	National Grid Response
Technical Summary: The Applicant should provide a Transport Assessment and Construction Worker Travel Plan for review.	**Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment** is submitted with the Application, alongside **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan.** The **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** includes an outline construction workers travel planThis establishes the travel arrangements for construction workers that are required to be set out in the construction traffic management plan for each stage of the authorised development, which must be submitted to and approved by the relevant local planning authority (in consultation with the relevant highway authority) prior to the commencement of development. The construction traffic management plan for each stage must be substantially in accordance with **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan.** Updates to the Construction Workers Travel Plans will be submitted to the relevant highway authority for approval where required by the Development Consent Order or associated Requirements, as part of the Construction Traffic Management Plan.

[3] This feedback is not verbatim, rather it focuses on the feedback findings and requests.

National Highways Consultation Feedback[3]	National Grid Response
The Applicant should provide a Construction Traffic Management Plan forreview, including construction traffic flows at each SRN junction for the network AM and PM peak hours.	**Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** is submitted with the Application.
The Applicant must also engage with National Highways' DBFO regarding the proposed crossings.	National Grid has engaged with National Highways on proposed crossings.
The Applicant should demonstrate to National Highways that there are no drainage, structural, boundary treatments or other constructions that would have an impact on National Highways land interests	**Application Document 4.3 Book of Reference** submitted with the Application establishes all land interests impacted by the Project, including those of National Highways. National Grid will be undertaking works which will potentially affect the drainage, structure, boundary treatments or other constructions relating to National Highways land interests. However, the Applicant can confirm these effects are not related to parts the Strategic Road Network within the project area, including the A63 and M180. National Grid will continue to engage with National Highways in the production of detailed design; and it should also be noted, **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order** contains a Protective Provision with National Highways, to ensure they are fully notified of development affecting their assets during construction.
In February 2025, National Grid Electricity Transmission [the Applicant], submitted a Preliminary Environmental Information Report [PEIR] to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the pre-application stage of the Development Consent Order [DCO] application to the Secretary of State (SoS) for the North Humber to High Marnham proposed high voltage electricity power line (referred to as the Project). Statutory Consultation of the PEIR is open until 15th April 2025. Within this Technical Memorandum [TM02] the Jacobs SYSTRA Joint Venture [JSJV], on behalf of National Highways, has reviewed the PEIR, prepared by AECOM, and would offer the following comments.	National Grid notes the response from the JSJV on behalf of National Highways.

National Highways Consultation Feedback[3]	National Grid Response
In February 2025, the JSJV reviewed the Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report. We provided comments on the suitability of the information, with observations provided in relation to the details relevant to understanding the impacts of the proposals on the Strategic Road Network [SRN]. In that review we requested the following be provided: • A Transport Assessment and Construction Worker Travel Plan. • A Construction Traffic Management Plan. • Geotechnical documentation for the trenchless crossings to National Highways, ensuring compliance with the DMRB CD 622: Managing Geotechnical Risk. • Evidence of engagement with National Highways' DBFO regarding the proposed crossings; and • Evidence of no drainage, structural, boundary treatments or other constructions that would have an impact on National Highways land interests.	**Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment** is submitted with the Application, alongside **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan.** The **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** includes an outline construction workers travel planThis establishes the travel arrangements for construction workers that are required to be set out in the construction traffic management plan for each stage of the authorised development, which must be submitted to and approved by the relevant local planning authority (in consultation with the relevant highway authority) prior to the commencement of development. The construction traffic management plan for each stage must be substantially in accordance with **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan.** National Grid can confirm there are no trenchless crossings impacting parts of the SRN (A63 and M180) in the project area. National Grid have engaged with National Highways during the pre-application stage, including detailing the interaction with the SRN, including the over sailing of the A63 and M180. Details of engagement are set out with the **Application Document 5.8.4 Statement of Common Ground – National Highways**. The Applicant will continue to engage with National Highways, including on the detailed design of the Project. National Grid will be undertaking works which will potentially affect the drainage, structure, boundary treatments or other constructions relating to National Highways land interests. However, the Applicant can confirm these effects are not related to parts the Strategic Road Network within the project area, including the A63 and M180.
Relative to the SRN, the Project will cross the A63 and M180. It is noted that the overhead power line between the Birkhill Wood Substation and the proposed High Marnham Substation is referred to as the "Proposed Overhead Line". Nonetheless, the JSJV would	National Grid confirms that there will be no works (for example surfacing, widening or the creation of passing places) involving the SRN as part of the Project.

National Highways Consultation Feedback[3]	National Grid Response
highlight that any works involving the SRN, including surfacing, widening or the creation of passing places, will need to be presented to and agreed in detail with the relevant National Highways teams.	
Approach and Methodology The PEIR provides an early evaluation of the likely significant environmental impacts of the Project, serving as a tool for consultation. Its primary aim is to enable the public, consultation bodies, and stakeholders to form an informed opinion on the potential environmental effects of the Project and offer feedback. This feedback will be used to refine the project design and address any identified environmental impacts.	Feedback has been used by National Grid to refine the Project as evidenced in this Report.
At the time of the PEIR, the design of the Project is still being finalised, with assessments of likely environmental effects ongoing and mitigation measures being integrated into the design. The full results of the EIA process will be included in an Environmental Statement [ES], which will accompany the application for development consent.	The Environmental Statement has been submitted with the Application as Volume 6 (**Application Document 6.14 Chapter 14 Traffic and Transport).**
The PEIR presents detailed findings on each environmental topic related to the Proposed Overhead Line, with a dedicated chapter for the likely significant effects of the Proposed Substation Works. The JSJV notes that preliminary assessments of the following environmental topics related to transport have been undertaken to identify the likely significant effects of the Proposed Overhead Line: • Traffic and Transport; • Air Quality; • Noise and Vibration; and • Cumulative Effects. Additionally, AECOM notes that an appraisal of the two substations and their potential environmental effects across the range of topics has been undertaken, including the ones listed above. The JSJV	**Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment** is submitted with the Application, alongside **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan**, which sets out the principles for construction worker travel. The travel arrangements for construction workers are required to be set out in the construction traffic management plan for each stage of the authorised development, which must be submitted to and approved by the relevant local planning authority (in consultation with the relevant highway authority) prior to the commencement of development. The construction traffic management plan for each stage must be substantially in accordance with **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan**

National Highways Consultation Feedback[3]	National Grid Response
would note that it is still expected that a Construction Traffic Management Plan [CTMP], Construction Worker travel Plan [CWTP] and Transport Assessment [TA] will be prepared as part of the application.	
Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport	
Overview The likely significant traffic and transport effects on the environment are assessed by AECOM in Chapter 14 of the PEIR. The impact of the Project as a whole has been assessed, including the Proposed Overhead Line and Proposed Substation Works. The effects of the following issues have been covered within Chapter 14 during the construction and operation of the Project: • Severance; • Pedestrian delay; • Non-motorised user amenity; • Fear and intimidation; • Driver delay; • Highway safety, • Hazardous loads; and • Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and Bridleways.	The likely significant traffic and transport environmental effects assessed are presented within **Application Document 6.14 Chapter 14 Traffic and Transport.** The assessment includes all the issues as listed by National Highways. Following statutory consultation on the Project in 2025, a decision was taken to remove both the proposed 400 kV Birkhill Wood Substation and 400 kV High Marnham Substation and associated works from the Project. Separate planning applications for the 400 kV Birkhill Wood Substation (25/01898/STPLF), and 400 kV High Marnham Substation (25/01302/FUL) were submitted by National Grid in July and November 2025 to the local planning authorities of East Riding of Yorkshire Council and Bassetlaw District Council, respectively. East Riding of Yorkshire Council granted planning permission for the 400kV Birkhill Wood Substation on 27 February 2026. Bassetlaw District Council granted planning permission for the 400kV High Marnham Substation on 23 June 2026. A full description of the design evolution of the Project is provided in **Application Document 5.9 Design Development Report**.
Furthermore, AECOM highlight the interrelationship between the potential effects of traffic and transport on other environmental topics, which are covered in the following chapters: • Chapter 15 Air Quality; • Chapter 16 Noise and Vibration; and • Chapter 21 Cumulative Effects. • The JSJV would consider this approach appropriate.	National Grid welcomes this feedback.

National Highways Consultation Feedback[3]	National Grid Response
Chapter 13 looks at the following: • Primary Access Routes; • Sensitive Receptors; • Collision Data • Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Impacted During Construction Phase; • Baseline Conditions; • Future Baseline; and • Preliminary Construction Effect	Chapter 14 of the PEIR presented the details listed, with **Application Document 6.14 Chapter 14 Traffic and Transport** providing the detail for the Application.
Policy AECOM has considered "National Policy Statements" (NPSs) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 within their national policy analysis as well as transport related policy. The JSJV would consider the above policy considerations to be appropriate.	National Grid welcomes this feedback.
Consultation The PEIR states that as National Highways assets could be affected by the Project, "…a meeting will be arranged to discuss any potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures". The JSJV notes that an initial meeting between National Highways and the Applicant took place on 13th February 2025. During this meeting, the Applicant presented an introduction to the Project. It was agreed that the Construction Traffic Management Plan [CTMP] would be submitted to National Highways once it was complete. It was also suggested to the Applicant that a Construction Worker Travel Plan [CWTP] should be submitted alongside the application to implement measures promoting sustainable travel practices and reducing reliance on private vehicles. Furthermore, the Applicant highlighted that the decision has been made to cross the A63 and M180 via	Ongoing engagement has taken place with National Highways. **Application Document 5.8.4 Statement of Common Ground - National Highways** provides detail on agreement with documents at the time of submission of the Application. **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** which sets out the principles for construction worker travel, has been submitted alongside the DCO. The travel arrangements for construction workers are required to be set out in the construction traffic management plan for each stage of the authorised development, which must be submitted to and approved by the relevant local planning authority (in consultation with the relevant highway authority) prior to the commencement of development. The construction traffic management plan for each stage must be substantially in accordance with **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan**

National Highways Consultation Feedback[3]	National Grid Response
overhead power lines, and that no underground trenchless methods for crossings are required.	
Construction Programme and Timings AECOM notes that, if consent for the Project is granted, construction is expected to begin in 2028 with site clearance, construction compounds, and access roads. Main construction is anticipated to continue until the operational date in 2031, with reinstatement works extending into 2033. Some advanced works, like archaeological trenching or species mitigation, may occur before the main construction period. Construction HGV traffic will access the Project site through specified bellmouths, haul roads, or a construction traffic route from the Primary Access Routes (PARs), which will connect to the nearest junction with the SRN/MRN. The JSJV would note that it is not stated within the PEIR or shown on "Figure 14.1 - Primary Access Routes" that any connections will be made with the SRN. Any proposal for access taken from the SRN should be clearly stated within the CTMP and justified relative to the requirements of Circular 01/2022; i.e., there should be a presumption against any new access (temporary or otherwise).	There are no bellmouth connections made within the SRN. Primary Access Routes connections made with the SRN and points where stringing is required across the A63 and the M180 are clearly stated within **Application Document 7.4 Outline Traffic Construction Management Plan** and are justified relative to the requirements of Circular 01/2022; i.e there should be a presumption against any new access (temporary or otherwise).
Primary Construction Traffic Route To understand the study area, the Applicant has set out the initial construction traffic routes in "Figure 4.1 Primary Access Routes" (PARs). Table 14.7 of the PEIR highlights the junction associated with each PAR, the JSJV has extracted the SRN junctions from Table 14.7 of the PEIR and presented them in Table 1. Within the CTMP, construction traffic directed though any SRN junction should be presented for the network AM and PM peak hours.	**Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** provides detail on the construction traffic directed though SRN junctions and is presented for the network AM and PM peak hours.
Existing and Future Baseline	Noted, this is correct

National Highways Consultation Feedback[3]	National Grid Response
The baseline traffic and transport situation has been presented within the PEIR. AECOM notes that the baseline assessment was informed by a combination of primary and secondary sources. These included: • Traffic flow data from Automatic Traffic Counts (ATCs), Manual Classified Link (MCL) counts, and Radar Surveys. • Identification of highway network constraints and infrastructure for pedestrians, horse riders, and cyclists using Google imagery. • Digitized Public Rights of Way (PRoW) routes from OS and Local Authority data. • Road collision data from the STATS19 database, excluding COVID lockdown years. • Public transport information from Local Authorities and Google imagery; National Cycle Routes from Sustrans. • Various scales of Ordnance Survey (OS) base mapping. • OS Address Base Plus data; and • Aerial mapping	
Within "Appendix 14.1 Traffic and Transport Baseline Conditions" it is stated that surveys were undertaken during a seven-day period from 24th June 2024 to 1st July 2024. Future baseline traffic flows have been presented for the anticipated construction year 2028. The future baseline traffic flows have been established by applying TEMPro growth factors to the 2024 baseline traffic flows, as shown in Figure 3.	National Grid notes this comment.
Subject to the anticipated impact at the SRN and the need for future capacity assessments, due to potential unsuitability of TEMPro for localised analyses, the Applicant may need to use an alternative method to verify traffic growth forecasts by comparison with actual count data trends for the relevant road section.	National Grid welcomes this feedback. The Application is supported by **Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment,** which considers the impacts of the development on access and accessibility, sustainability and the free flow of traffic. TEMPro growth is considered an adequate method for forecasting background future traffic growth. However, the assessments also take into account traffic

National Highways Consultation Feedback[3]	National Grid Response
	from identified committed developments identified by local highway authorities which provides further detail.
Furthermore, the PEIR notes that committed development traffic has not been included in the current future baseline. Again, subject to the anticipated impact at SRN, if any future capacity assessments are required, committed development traffic will need to be considered within the CTMP and any traffic impact assessments of the road network including the SRN.	If any future capacity assessments are required, committed development traffic will be considered within the CTMP. **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** are included with the Application. The final construction traffic management plan must be substantially in accordance with the outline construction traffic management plan. The relevant planning authority must consult the relevant highways authority prior to approving the final traffic management plan; the relevant highways authority being National Highways in respect of any matters relating to the SRN.
The construction traffic generation has been presented within "Appendix 14.3 Preliminary Construction Effects". The anticipated SRN impact has been extracted and presented in Table 2 for combined route section traffic. The JSJV notes that the Project has been divided into 11 route sections from Creyke Beck to High Marnham. The flows from the combined route section have been used to show the total traffic flows across the whole project. The construction peak traffic flows per day are shown; however, this does not necessarily relate to the network peak period.	The route is now split into 6 sections labelled A-F. Route plans are included as part of the application (See **Application Document 2.2 Location and Master Key Plan).** An assessment of affected road links during construction within the AM and PM peak hours is provided within **Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment (Tables 7-2 and 7-3)**.
Table 2 indicates that construction traffic has the potential to impact several SRN junctions. However, it is unclear whether the 'construction peak traffic flows per day' refer to daily flows or peak hour flows. In any case, the JSJV notes that within the CTMP, construction traffic at each SRN junction should be presented for the network AM and PM peak hours.	An assessment of affected road links during construction within the AM and PM peak hours is provided within **Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment (Tables 7-2 and 7-3)**.
Additionally, the anticipated construction period timeframe should be provided to determine if the impact will be prolonged. 6.25 Depending on the impact of construction traffic at each SRN junction, capacity assessments may be required to highlight whether there will an	Details of the construction period timeframes are provided in **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan.** An assessment of the determined worst case construction year has been provided within **Application Document**

National Highways Consultation Feedback[3]	National Grid Response
unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.	**6.14 Chapter 14 Traffic and Transport**, which includes conclusions associated with whether there will be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe.
Collision data analysis Personal Injury Collision [PIC] data from STATS 19 DfT Road Safety Data was obtained for roads along the PARs for 2020 to 2023. However, since the 2023 data is unvalidated, only data from 2020 to 2022 was used in the preliminary assessment. AECOM notes that this data will be reviewed and updated as needed during the preparation of the final Traffic and Transport ES Chapter.	The Personal Injury Collision [PIC] data from STATS 19 DfT Road Safety Data was reviewed and updated as needed during the preparation of **Application Document 6.14 Chapter 14 Traffic and Transport.** Updates include the now validated 2023 and 2024 data from the STATS 19 database.
The JSJV notes that for the SRN, PIC data should be provided for any impacted junction for the most recent five-year period, excluding 2020 and 2021 due to COVID19 travel restrictions.	The Application is supported by **Application Document 6.14 Chapter 14 Traffic and Transport** which includes 3 years of PIC data for impacted junctions and road links, exclusive of 2020 and 2021. This is considered an appropriate survey sample to enable the highway safety assessment, as explained in **Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment**.
Transport Assessment The planning application should be informed by a Transport Assessment. The JSJV acknowledges that, during the operational phase, there is likely to be a limited number of vehicle trips generated, particularly in the peak hour periods. The JSJV would reiterate, nonetheless, that given the nature and scale of development and its proximity to the SRN, the planning application should be accompanied by a TA and this should consider the impacts of the development on access and accessibility, sustainability and the free flow of traffic..	The Application is supported by **Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment,** which considers the impacts of the development on access and accessibility, sustainability and the free flow of traffic.
The impact of the development should be assessed based on relevant regional and national planning policy. In terms of the impact on the SRN, we would request that the Applicant makes reference to the following policy:	**Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment** makes reference to the policy as requested.

National Highways Consultation Feedback[3]	National Grid Response
• National Planning Policy Framework 2024; • Local Transport Note LTN 1/20, and • DfT Circular 01/2022 – Strategic Road network and the delivery of sustainable development.	
In this regard, with reference to Circular 01/2022, National Highways will require that a vision for the development be set out. The vision should describe the aims of the development in terms of transport and illustrate how the Applicant will enable a reduction in the need to travel by private car and prioritise sustainable transport opportunities, ahead of capacity enhancements. Consequently, the TA may need to consider a set of scenarios to determine the optimum design and transport infrastructure to realise this vision.	The focus of the assessment set out in **Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment** and **Application Document 6.14 Chapter 14 Traffic and Transport** is on the construction phase of the Project, and no operational impacts are expected. As such it is not considered necessary to set out the vision for the development, as this relates specifically to operational traffic, of which there will be very little in relation to the Project. A construction year of 2029 has been selected (as peak traffic year) for assessment following consideration of the construction programme as set out in **Application Document 6.4 Chapter 4 Description of the Project**. It is the peak year for the assessment of the effects of construction traffic because it would have the largest concentration of high-traffic generating construction activities. **Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment** also includes future baseline (2029) with and without construction traffic scenarios.
The Applicant should put forward clear targets and commitments to manage down the traffic impact of development and maximise accessibility to and within the sites by walking, wheeling, cycling, public transport and shared travel; hence, the Travel Plan should present suitable multi-modal (person) trip rates alongside any travel planning targets. The Transport Assessment should be prepared in line with Circular 01/2022, particularly paragraphs 47-54, and other pertinent and prevailing policy requirements.	**Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment** has been prepared in line with Circular 01/2022, paragraphs 47-54 and all other pertinent and prevailing policy requirements have been considered where appropriate.
Where an assessment indicates that the residual vehicle trip generation would have an unacceptable safety impact or the cumulative impacts on the SRN would be severe, the Applicant must	This is not considered applicable, as conclusions contained within **Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment** state that the construction traffic associated with the Project is not predicted to

National Highways Consultation Feedback[3]	National Grid Response
identify when, in relation to the occupation of the development, transport improvements will become necessary.	result in a material deterioration in highway safety conditions and would not give rise to highway safety impacts.
Construction Traffic Management Plan The JSJV notes that the construction period is estimated to last approximately four years, with the expected start in 2027 and completion by 2031. The JSJV recommends that the Applicant ensures the impact of construction traffic is clearly displayed at any affected SRN junctions.	**Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** provides detail on signage.
Due to the proposed site location being in close proximity to the SRN, the JSJV welcome the proposed preparation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan [CTMP] is submitted alongside the application. This should be provided to National Highways for review and agreement in writing prior to the commencement of construction. Construction will then be expected to proceed in accordance with the approved CTMP.	**Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Management Plan** confirms that the contractor(s) will implement a monitoring and reporting system to check compliance with the measures set out within the Outline CTMP. The contractor(s) will also be expected to monitor the number of construction vehicles between the site and the strategic road network. Deviations from the authorised routes or changes to traffic levels that are higher than the Outline CTMP assumptions will require discussion of the need for additional mitigation measures with highways authorities. Updates to the Construction Traffic Management Plan will be submitted to the relevant highway authority for approval where required by the Development Consent Order or associated Requirements.
The CTMP will need to include at least the following: • A dust management plan; • A noise management plan; • Pollution prevention measures; • Staffing numbers; • Contractor parking; • Construction traffic routes;	**Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** provides this information. The final construction traffic management plan must be substantially in accordance with the outline construction traffic management plan. The relevant planning authority must consult the relevant highways authority prior to approving the final traffic management plan; the relevant highways authority being National Highways in respect of any matters relating to the SRN.

National Highways Consultation Feedback[3]	National Grid Response
• Details of delivery arrangements (including for any abnormal loads); and • Measures to limit and manage transfer of debris onto the highway.	
The JSJV would suggest that, if an abnormal load is required, and depending on the load being moved and the route, advance warning may be required by: • The Police; • Highway authorities; and • Bridge and structure owners such as Network Rail.	National Grid welcomes this feedback. The listed third parties will be consulted in advance of abnormal loads being transported. Information on this is contained within **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan**.
The Electronic Service Delivery for Abnormal Loads (ESDAL) system can be used for route plotting. ESDAL will also: • Notify the Police, highways, and bridge authorities; • Provide advance notice of any possible route problems; and • Save vehicle details and routes for future use.	National Grid welcomes this feedback.
If ESDAL is not used, an abnormal loads movement application form will need to be completed.	National Grid welcomes this feedback.
Sufficient time must also be allowed in order to get the necessary clearances from the police, highway, and bridge authorities. For example, a Special-Order application must be completed 10 weeks before the scheduled date of the move.	National Grid welcomes this feedback.
Construction Worker Travel Plan The JSJV would note that the Construction Worker Travel Plan [CWTP] should be provided for National Highways to review. We would note where a CWTP and a TA is required, this should support the vision of what the development is seeking to achieve. Again, the JSJV would expect the Applicant to "put forward clear targets and commitments to manage down the traffic impact of development and maximise the accessibility of and within sites by walking, wheeling,	**Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment** has been submitted with the Application, alongside **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** which sets out the principles for construction worker travel. The travel arrangements for construction workers are required to be set out in the construction traffic management plan for each stage of the authorised development, which must be submitted to and approved by the relevant local planning authority (in consultation with

National Highways Consultation Feedback[3]	National Grid Response
cycling, public transport and shared travel". The Circular also states that "targets for achieving a modal shift to sustainable transport will need to be subject to sustained monitoring and management by an appointed travel plan coordinator" and that "advice on preparing and monitoring travel plans is contained in the planning practice guidance".	the relevant highway authority) prior to the commencement of development. The construction traffic management plan for each stage must be substantially in accordance with **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** The final construction traffic management plan must be substantially in accordance with the outline construction traffic management plan. The relevant planning authority must consult the relevant highways authority prior to approving the final traffic management plan; the relevant highways authority being National Highways in respect of any matters relating to the SRN.
We would expect the Travel Plan to, at least, include the following: • Firm financial commitments with regards to funding for the measures proposed; • Targets for mode shift and vehicular trip generation, which should be taken forward into the Transport Assessment; • A sustained monitoring and management strategy to confirm that vehicle trip targets are being met; and • A plan detailing the remediation process in the event that targets are not being met.	**Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** sets out the principles for construction worker movements relating to the Project. Details within Section 6 of **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** establishes the principles, objectives, targets, measures and monitoring requirements for managing construction workforce travel in a sustainable manner and follows the DfT and best practice guidance on sustainable worker travel. Updates to the Construction Workers Travel Plans will be submitted to the relevant highway authority for approval where required by the Development Consent Order or associated Requirements, as part of the Construction Traffic Management Plan.
Construction Phase **SRN Crossings** As previously mentioned, the Applicant has highlighted that the decision has been made to cross the A63 and M180 via overhead power lines, and that no underground trenchless methods for crossings are required.	National Grid can confirm there are no trenchless crossings impacting parts of the SRN (A63 and M180) in the project area.

National Highways Consultation Feedback[3]	National Grid Response
We would suggest that the Applicant engage with National Highways' Design, build, finance and operate [DBFO] roads regarding the proposed crossings and provide further details to allow National Highways to understand the type of approval that will be required and the level of protective provisions to be determined.	**Application Document 5.8.4 Statement of Common Ground – National Highways** sets out the engagement activities which have taken place between the Applicant and National Highways.
In terms of undertaking the works, if the proposed works are set away from the highway, and no traffic management is required, there will be no requirement for the completion of a NOMS (road space booking). However, subject to S.278, if work is proposed immediately adjacent to the highway, the Applicant will be required to submit a NOMS request and advise National Highways of the Traffic Management Plan.	National Grid have engaged with National Highways during the pre-application stage, including detailing the intereaction with the SRN, including the over sailing of the A63 and M180. Details of engagement are set out with the **Application Document 5.8.4 Statement of Common Ground – National Highways**. The Applicant will continue to engage with National Highways, including on the detailed design of the Project. The works directly relating the the SRN involve the oversailing of the M80 and A63. During construction, National Grid will require the construction of scaffolds to either side of both the A63 and M180, to install crossing protection, which ensure these highways will not need to temporarily closed for long period during the stringing of the overhead line. However, a short term closure wil be required to install the cross protection, and it's subsequent removal. **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** sets out how National Grid will work with highways authorities, including National Highways, during the construction of the Project to ensure disruption to the road network is reduced as much as possible. It should also be noted **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order** contains a Protective Provision with National Highways, to ensure they are fully notified of development affecting their assets during construction.
Once the works are complete, National Highways will require a copy of the final 'as built' report so it can be added to their combined services report.	National Gird can confirm the relevant parts of 'as built' drawings will be shared with National Highways, following the completion of the Project.

National Highways Consultation Feedback[3]	National Grid Response
Boundary Treatment and Drainage The JSJV would highlight that, due to the proximity to the SRN, the Project raises potential issues with regards to the National Highways assets, as changes to surface levels during construction/repair/ decommissioning work could impact on site drainage etc. could impact the SRN. Equally the stability of any changes in level will be an important matter to be demonstrated. Hence, this potential should be specifically addressed by the Applicant.	National Grid will manage surface water runoff from all construction working areas using suitable drainage systems, as detailed in the Construction Surface Water Management Plan **(Application Document Appendix B of the Flood Risk Assessment Application Document 7.13)**. The strategy has been developed to ensure there is no increase in flood risk on or off site, protecting existing drainage systems and maintaining existing flow routes wherever practicable, with any temporary modifications mitigated and reinstated following completion of the works. Implementation of the strategy would therefore prevent any impact on the SRN.
In terms of drainage, it must be demonstrated that no surface water runoff will drain to National Highways land or assets, and that there will be no connections made to National Highways drainage systems, even if one currently exists.	National Grid will manage construction runoff using a combination of sustainable drainage and pollution prevention measures including clean water cut-off ditches, swales, filter drains, settlement ponds, attenuation basins, infiltration features (where suitable), check dams and silt control measures. It is intended that no surface water runoff will drain to National Highways drainage systems.
The JSJV would add that no element of the Project should require staff or materials to use National Highways land or assets, nor should it lead to maintenance liabilities for National Highways.	National Grid can confirm there is currently no requirement for staff or materials to use National Highways land or assets in the construction of works activities within the vicinity of the SRN. The Project design includes purpose built construction access routes to these locations, accessed from the local road network. Parts of the SRN are included within the Primary Access Route for the Project, and these have been discussed with National Highways during the pre-application stage, with mapping of the route provided, as set out in **Application Document 5.8.4 Statement of Common Ground – National Highways.**
The JSJV would suggest therefore, that further information be provided with regards to the proposed boundary treatment between the M180 and M62 and the Project; particularly (but not exclusively), the information should consider:	National Grid does not consider there to be significant impacts as result of earthworks on the stability and integrity of the SRN, or the drainage requirements. National Grid will work collaboratively with National Highways to allow access to be maintained of the highways network.

National Highways Consultation Feedback[3]	National Grid Response
• The impact of earthworks on the stability and integrity of the SRN; • The impact of earthworks on drainage, and the drainage requirements needed to ensure that surface water does not flow from the application site on to the SRN; • Access for maintenance of the highway boundary is maintained; and • Boundary treatments are adequate and appropriate; particularly in regard to dazzle and distraction from opposing head lights.	National Grid can confirm there are no boundary treatments required for the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project.

NATS En-Route Safeguarding Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal. However, please be aware that this response applies specifically to the above consultation and only reflects the position of NATS (that is responsible for the management of en route air traffic) based on the information supplied at the time of this application. This letter does not provide any indication of the position of any other party, whether they be an airport, airspace user or otherwise. It remains your responsibility to ensure that all the appropriate consultees are properly consulted.	National Grid welcomes the confirmation that there is no safeguarding objection to the proposal at the time of the consultation.
If any changes are proposed to the information supplied to NATS in regard to this application which become the basis of a revised, amended or further application for approval, then as a statutory consultee NERL requires that it be further consulted on any such changes prior to any planning permission or any consent being granted.	NATS En-Route Safeguarding will continue to have the opportunity to provide feedback and make representations throughout the DCO examination process.

Natural England Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. We understand that you are consulting us under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008. We have reviewed the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and supporting documents, and have provided comments on the areas relevant to our remit based on this information. Our detailed comments are provided in Annex 1 to this letter[4]. Natural England's key concerns are listed here:	National Grid welcomes the feedback from Natural England on the areas relevant to their remit.
1- Ornithology surveys have identified significant numbers of SPA/Ramsar birds at a number of locations along the order limits. As a result, collision risk to SPA/Ramsar birds is considered a key concern which will require further assessment, consideration, and likely mitigation within the ES (NE1)	National Grid has carried out further assessment, consideration, and confirmed mitigation within **Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9 Ornithology,** supported by **Application Document 6.9.A3 Appendix 9.3 Flight Activity Assessment** in respect of collision risk to SPA/Ramsar birds. The assessment sets out in detail the levels of flight activity recorded at all VPs plus predictions of the annual number of bird passes per year and the proportion of these that are at risk of collision on the basis of their flight heights and trajectories. Relative collision risk at different locations is presented and a range of possible collision mortality estimates is provided. This is used to determine where mitigation in the form of bird diverters is likely to be required, which is presented **Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9 Ornithology** and **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments.** Such commitments would be additional to the design strategy of close parallel of new overhead line with the existing line that has been adopted, in particular across the farmland either side of the River Ouse, where numbers of Humber Estuary SPA/Ramsar qualifying species are greatest.

[4] Due to the technical nature of the content provided in the Appendices this response is to the key issues listed in the feedback only. The Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and Natural England provides the most up to date information on the technical details agreed and further agreements between the parties

Natural England Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
2- The order limits cross the Humber Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar, Brantingham Dale SSSI, Crowle Borrow Pits SSSI and Chesterfield Canal SSSI, introducing the potential for direct habitat loss/damage to these sites. As a result, direct habitat loss/damage is considered a key concern which will require further assessment, design consideration, and mitigation/compensation within the ES (NE2, NE18, NE21, NE24).	National Grid acknowledges the concern raised regarding the interaction of the Order Limits with designated ecological sites including SSSI, SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar with the potential for direct habitat loss or other effects arising from the Project. Potential effects on designated sites have been identified as a key consideration throughout the iterative design and assessment process. National Grid has sought where reasonably practicable to avoid or minimise impacts through routing, alignment refinement and embedded mitigation measures. Where interactions with designated sites cannot be entirely avoided these have been subject to detailed assessment within the Environmental Statement including consideration of direct and indirect effects during both construction and operation. The findings of the ecological assessment together with proposed mitigation, management and where necessary compensation measures intend to avoid or reduce adverse effects on the designated features and site integrity. An Assessment of residual effects on designated sites has been carried out within Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology and Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9 Ornithology. Habitat removal will be kept to a minimum across the Project including inside the SSSIs, with habitats temporarily impacted reinstated to their original condition or better post construction. There will be no direct habitat loss or damage to the following sites apart from minor vegetation potentially affected within the Humber Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI; and Chesterfield Canal SSSI. A larger area of woodland within Brantingham Dale SSSI will be affected managed as shown on **Application Document 2.13 Tree and Important Hedgrows** to be removed or managed. Tree management along the edge of part of the SSSI could potentially create more favourable conditions for grassland and other ground flora to establish or improve, including the calcareous grassland for which the SSSI is primarily designated. Some previous scrub management is known to have been carried out, under consent, inside the SSSI to improve the condition of the calcareous grassland.

Natural England Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
3- Ornithology Surveys have identified significant numbers of SPA/Ramsar birds at a number of locations along the order limits. As a result, loss/damage to Functionally Linked Land is considered a key concern which will require further assessment, consideration, and likely mitigation within the ES (NE3).	Impacts to Functionally Linked Land used by birds are assessed in Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9 Ornithology. The chapter and supporting Application Document 6.9.A2 Appendix 9.2 Ornithology Baseline Report and Application Document 6.9.A4 Appendix 9.4 Confidential Ornithology Baseline Report set out the baseline conditions with respect to the distribution and numbers of Humber Estuary SPA/Ramsar qualifying species over a wide area either side of the River Ouse, which has enabled: • Quantification of the numbers of each species potentially affected, and their distribution; • Identification of the months of the year in which these species reach peak numbers and their frequency of occurrence; • Habitat use in relation to land use (crop cover); • The assessment of the spatial scale of effects on qualifying species and the severity of the effects of habitat losses (during construction and operational phases of the Project) and disturbance/displacement of birds (during construction); The assessment described above has informed a set of mitigation strategies, that include (but are not limited to) the following: • Localised timing of some elements of the construction phase, where practicable, to reduce the potential disturbance of qualifying species by avoiding the peak months for some species; • Noise control and abatement measures and visual screening of works during the construction phase of the Project, at locations where this is required to minimise adverse effects of visual and noise disturbance on sensitive species that cannot be completely avoided through Project Design and/or timing of works; • Provision of alternative foraging habitat managed for key Humber Estuary species to offset any potentially significant displacement of birds from regular foraging areas during construction, and to offset

Natural England Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	potential permanent losses of habitat for the duration of the operational phase of the Project. • Reinstatement of habitats affected during the construction phase to as close as possible to their original condition. Since the affected habitats used by qualifying species are arable farmland, it is expected that these habitats will be fully restored to their original condition and will remain in agricultural production after the construction phase of the Project is completed. All mitigation measures are set out within the following Application Documents; • **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice, Application;** • **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments;** and • **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan**.
4- 1,643.80ha of agricultural land will be taken out of production temporarily, and 92.61ha of agricultural land will be permanently lost. At present, the ALC survey methodology is not finalised. This survey must be robust in order to adequately inform the assessment of the impact of the proposal on the Best and Most Versatile land resource (Section 5).	Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) surveys have been undertaken in line with current guidance (Defra & Welsh Government, 2025) at a density of 1 auger point per ha (or 1 auger per linear 100m) to provide a robust evidence base for the assessment of effects on agricultural land and BMV resources. This is presented within **Application Document 6.13 Chapter 13 Agriculture and Soils**. The full results from the ALC surveys are detailed in **Application Document 6.13.A2 Appendix 13.2 Agricultural Land Classification Survey Report.** The assessment presented in the Environmental Statement has considered both temporary disturbance during construction and any permanent loss of agricultural land associated with the operational development. National Grid has sought where reasonably practicable to minimise impacts on higher quality agricultural land through the iterative design process and route refinement. Measures relating to soil handling, storage, reinstatement and land restoration are detailed

Natural England Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	in **Application Document 7.5 Outline Soil Management Plan and** have also been incorporated into the construction methodology and secured through the relevant management plans within **Application Document 7.2 Code of Construction Practice**. The Environmental Statement has set out the extent and significance of likely effects on agricultural land resources, including BMV land together with proposed mitigation measures intended to reduce adverse effects and facilitate restoration of land following construction where temporary impacts occur.

Network Rail Consultation Feedback (response form)	National Grid Response
I write in respect of your consultation made under Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended). Having considered all the details of this consultation, I can confirm that Network Rail wishes to make the following comments: Network Rail is a statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining and operating the railway infrastructure as well as both its associated assets and estates. Network Rail owns, operates, maintains, and develops the main rail network. Since Network Rail aims to protect and enhance the railway infrastructure, any proposed development from a third-party developer to be built either near the railway line or which could potentially affect our specific assets and/or land interests, will need to be carefully considered.	National Grid has consulted Network Rail in accordance with Section 42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 and will continue to engage with Network Rail to share information and further progress negotiations and legal agreements (including asset protection agreements, crossing agreements, protective provisions and easements) required for the Project, including through the examination process. National Grid and its advisors are consulting with Network Rail and its advisors and will continue to do so through the examination process. It is expected that all relevant legal agreements will be agreed, including Protective Provisions.
Impact on Infrastructure Since your proposal would involve interaction with Network Rail's assets, estates, land and/or operational railway, it is strongly advised that you take into account all potential areas of concern to Network Rail, especially in your documentation for consideration at the planning stage. Therefore, it is imperative that you directly consult with Network Rail's Asset Protection team in the eastern region, to ensure that all risks to our railway infrastructure is safely managed	National Grid is consulting with Network Rail's Asset Protection team in the eastern region. Appropriate provisions will be secured within **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order** and **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** to ensure that all risks to railway infrastructure are safely managed from all construction-related activities.

Network Rail Consultation Feedback (response form)	National Grid Response
from all construction-related activities associated with your proposed development.	
Investigation and Mitigation Network Rail would have an interest in understanding the full impact of your proposed development on all our infrastructure in the vicinity. This further understanding should identify improvements and/or mitigations required to facilitate your proposed development. As such, these will need to be funded by you to ensure the safe and efficient running of our operational railway.	National Grid has directly consulted with Network Rail's Asset Protection team in the eastern region, including investigation on impacts and potential mitigation measures to ensure that all risks to railway infrastructure is safely managed from all construction-related activities associated with your proposed development.
A Basic Asset Protection Agreement or a Structures Agreement with Network Rail may be required being completed and/or agreed before you can proceed with any design or construction work-related activities of your proposed development either alongside, above and/or below Network Rail's Infrastructure. Therefore, we request that you please engage with our eastern region's Asset Protection team (AssetProtectionEastern@networkrail.co.uk).	National Grid and its advisors are consulting with Network Rail and its advisors and will continue to do so through the examination process. It is expected that all relevant legal agreements will be agreed, including Protective Provisions.
Network Rail have their own standard protective provisions for third-party development that could potentially have an impact on Network Rail's operational railways, estates, land and/or assets, and these must be included on the face of your DCO. To request a copy of our protective provisions and discuss any other documents that will need to be entered into agreement with Network Rail, it is recommended that you contact through each of their respective email addresses.	National Grid is consulting with Network Rail's Asset Protection team in the eastern region. Appropriate provisions will be secured within **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order** and **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** to ensure that all risks to railway infrastructure are safely managed from all construction-related activities.
Several legal and commercial agreements might also need to be entered, for example, method statements, connection agreements, property agreements as well as any other relevant legal and commercial agreements that are deemed necessary. Please note that this list is not exhaustive and will need to be reviewed after further details of the scheme are discussed between both parties. In addition, if you require any easements then you must to go through Network	National Grid and its advisors are consulting with Network Rail and its advisors and will continue to do so through the examination process. It is expected that all relevant legal agreements will be agreed.

Network Rail Consultation Feedback (response form)	National Grid Response
Rail's business and technical clearance processes, as well as all other relevant rail industry processes.	
Please note that Network Rail reserves the right to change its position in relation to any further information received about your proposed DCO and/or its impacts on Network Rail's operational railway, estates, land and/or assets. On another note, you should be made aware of the likely possibility that you may be held responsible for all charges and/or costs associated with Network Rail in relation to your proposed DCO.	National Grid notes Network Rail's position regarding the potential for further comments as additional information becomes available, and acknowledges the potential liability for costs associated with Network Rail's engagement with the proposed DCO. Ongoing discussions with Network Rail will continue throughout the DCO process.
Thank you again for providing Network Rail with the opportunity to comment on this Section 48 Consultation. I trust that the above comments have been made clear, however, if you do require any further information or have any other queries, then please do not hesitate to contact me.	National Grid welcomes the feedback from Network Rail.

Newark and Sherwood District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Whilst the Scheme is vast and far reaching, the amount of development within the District boundary of Newark and Sherwood only relates to the alteration of approximately 1km stretch of existing overhead power lines which are due to be amended/upgraded as a result of the works and include access tracks to them. The site lies approximately 1.2km north of the village of Weston (see Fig 1 below). The Council is in support (in principle) of schemes which seek to improve the local utility network and would contribute to the delivery of further appropriate development within the District.	National Grid welcome the feedback and agreement in principle to the need for the Project.
Policy position	
The Council's Local Development Framework (LDF) includes the Amended Core Strategy (2019) and the Allocations and Development Management DPD (2013). The latter of these documents is currently	**Application Document 6.2 Chapter 2 Legislation and Policy Context** confirms the key legislative and planning policy context relevant to the Project.

Newark and Sherwood District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
under review and has been examined in November 2024, and we are currently awaiting the Inspectors Report following the examination.	
The Council has no allocated land which has been identified through the Development Plan, for development within this area. Of note I would need to draw your attention to two NSIP solar farm developments. These are known as One Earth1 (a cross boundary scheme between NSDC, Bassetlaw and West Lindsey District Council) which is due to be submitted to PINS in Summer 2025 and GNR2 (which is solely located within NSDC boundary) which has been accepted for Examination by the Planning Inspectorate. Within the information available, One Earth is stated to connect into the High Marnham sub and therefore this is of most use to your Scheme considerations.	National Grid notes the feedback on neighbouring developments. The substation at High Marnham was included within North Humber to High Marnham proposals for statutory consultation, taking a parallel approach to consenting the substation alongside the planning application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (TCPA). Following statutory consultation, National Grid continued to review the progress made with the TCPA application, which progressed sufficiently to give confidence that the North Humber to High Marnham 400 kV overhead transmission line can be connected as intended to allow the Project to become operational in 2031. On this basis National Grid took the decision to remove the substation and the associated works within Newark and Sherwood DC from the North Humber to High Marnham Project. This removed Newark and Sherwood DC as a host local authority for the North Humber to High Marnham development consent order application. This position was confirmed to the Council in a meeting on the 5 September 2025. Assessments of intra- and inter-project cumulative effects are presented in **Application Document 6.20 Chapter 20 Intra-project Cumulative Effects** and **Application Document 6.21 Chapter 21 Inter-project Cumulative Effects**. The Project's relationships and coordination opportunities with third party developers is set out in **Application Document 5.11 Interrelationship Document.**
The Council Landscape Character Assessment SPD (2013) states this area is within the Mid Nottinghamshire Farmlands and specifically within character area MN12 which is defined as Village Farmlands which is areas of gently rolling agricultural land with a simple pattern of large arable fields and village settlements. Typically it has open views to the Trent Valley power stations and pylons and lines of trees along streams. Industrial influences are present but are localised and	National Grid note this feedback. A landscape assessment is presented within **Application Document 6.6 Chapter 6 Landscape.** The landscape assessment has been based on the East Midlands Region Landscape Character Types (RLCT), with reference to the relevant Bassetlaw Landscape Character Policy Zones, MN12 falling within RLCT 4a: Unwooded Vales.

Newark and Sherwood District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
therefore not far-reaching or dominant. We would always seek opportunities to improve the landscape quality where possible and this is advocated by the provisions in the NPPF.	
Following a review of the available information, the route within our District is considered acceptable (Route section 11 – Fledborough to High Marnham) as the existing route is not due to change from its current alignment, but there would be modifications to the existing OH line. NSDC has consulted internal colleagues for their assistance on the impact of this proposal and these comments are explained below.	As advised above, due to the removal of the High Marnham substation and the associated works from the Application the Project no longer has any works within NSDC authority area .
Environmental Health The development concerned is outside of Newark and Sherwood District Councils area. Whilst there is the potential for impacts arising from the development, no sensitive receptors within NSDC appear to be within the assessment buffer areas for either noise or air quality. As such I have no comments or objections with respect to the application.	National Grid notes this feedback with no comments or objections with respect to the Project from Environmental Health.
Conservation/Heritage Heritage assets affected Ruddings Farm – NDHA Archway farm Barn – NDHA Moor Farm Barn – NDHA Bank at Weston – NDHA Dobbin Bridge Barn – NDHA Manor Farm barn – NDHA Weir at Goosemoor Dyke - NDHA Weston • Church of All Saints Grade I (dates to the C13th with later alterations)	Due to the removal of the High Marnham substation and the associated works from the Application the Project no longer has any works within NSDC authority area. The study areas for cultural heritage are presented in **Application Document 6.10.F1 Designated Heritage Assets within Study Areas**; and **Application Document 6.10.F2 Non-designated Heritage Assets within 1 km Study Area**. The study area for all designated and non-designated cultural heritage assets is 1 km from the Order Limits. This is considered sufficient to inform on the likelihood of encountering previously unknown archaeology within the Order Limits. It also considers the likelihood of changes to the setting of heritage assets and the character of the surrounding historic landscape. While there may be a change to the setting of heritage assets outside this 1 km study area, it is considered unlikely that such changes would result in

Newark and Sherwood District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
• Moat, three fishponds, enclosures, hollow way and part of a road at Hall Yard – Scheduled Monument • Dovecote House and Adjoining Pigeoncote – Grade II • Sundial 30 metres south of Church of All Saints – Grade II • Stable and pigeoncote at Sunnyside Farm house – Grade II • ScarthingMoor House – Grade II Chapmans 1774 Map of Nottinghamshire does not identify any notable features at the development site. The Grade I listed Church of All Saints is clear to be seen on this map, as are the farms to the north of Weston on Bell Lane, which are non-designated heritage assets. Furthermore, Sanderson's map of 1835 shows the enclosure of the land in the Parishes of Weston and Normanton. Many of the field boundaries have been removed in the interim through the modernisation of farming. 20th century mapping shows very little change to the agricultural landscape other than the introduction of the electricity transfer lines in the late 1950s. The access tracks are not located on any known features of historic interest.	significant effects, except for heritage assets of the highest significance. For heritage assets of the highest significance (i.e., World Heritage Sites, Grade I and II* listed buildings, Registered Battlefields, Grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens (RPG), scheduled monuments, and conservation areas containing a notable concentration of highly designated assets), there is a greater potential for their setting to extend over a larger area and therefore a greater potential for their setting to experience change as a result of the Project. The 1 km study area distance has therefore been extended up to 3 km from the Limits of Deviation for the proposed overhead line for the purposes of this assessment, to capture assets of the highest significance where the wider landscape contributes to their heritage significance. The assessment of impact on heritage assets of the highest significance within the 3 km study area has been informed by the results of the walkover survey and setting assessment, detailed in **Application Document 6.10.A2 Appendix 10.2 Cultural Heritage Baseline Report**, and is further informed by the ZTV illustrated in **Application Document 6.7.F2 Figure 7.2 Zone of Theoretical Visibility**.
Ecology It is understood that the final design of the proposals is not yet finalised and therefore additional information will be provided at the Development Consent Order application stage. It is also acknowledged that chapter 8 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report does not include a comprehensive assessment of all potential effects due to the evolving project design which is being informed by ongoing baseline studies. Only a small section of Section 11 of the proposed route lies within the Newark and Sherwood District which comprises of three existing pylons which are proposed to be re conducted and three indicative access routes.	National Grid welcomes this feedback and understanding of the Authority being identified as a host authority during the statutory consultation process. As acknowledged within the feedback through ongoing design evolution, Newark and Sherwood District has been removed from the Order Limits of the Application and is, at application stage, a neighbouring authority.

Newark and Sherwood District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
We commend the ongoing evolution of the design which is being informed by the ecological assessments to minimise and mitigate potentially significant effects by amending the draft order limits to remove such areas from the project area as much as possible. It is our understanding that through this process it is likely that such areas falling within Newark and Sherwood District will be scoped out of the assessment.	
Assessment methodology - within the PEIR is considered within sections 8.4.1 - 8.4.5 at this stage because the detail of many elements is not fixed, a worst case scenario approach has been taken and we agree with this approach.	National Grid welcomes agreement to the approach taken.
Arboricultural survey - table 8.3 off the PEIR states that arboricultural surveys are ongoing but are largely completed and reported at figure 8.5. However, only figures 8.1-8.3 are provided for the ecology chapter and therefore we are unable to comment at this time. From a review of the latest available aerial imagery and Google Street View it appears there are only a small number of trees located within field boundary hedgerows and road verges within the draft order limits within the Newark and Sherwood district.	Due to the removal of the High Marnham substation and the associated works from the Application, woodland areas within Newark and Sherwood District have been scoped out of the assessment.
Habitats and vegetation - it is acknowledged that ecology surveys are ongoing which include extended phase one habitat survey, habitat condition assessments and further detailed national vegetation classification surveys were required. Nationally significant infrastructure projects are currently exempt from mandatory BNG and the situation may likely change in the future therefore the proposed scheme is intending to demonstrate a measurable BNG equivalent to that required by schemes that are subject to mandatory BNG which is welcomed and supported. The timescales of the project and likely timing of initial reviews for alternative routes is acknowledged, however in mind of the above it is unclear from the draft PEIR as to	Due to the removal of the High Marnham substation and the associated works from the Application, the Order Limits no longer extend to Newark and Sherwood District. As such **Application Document 7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report** does not cover NSDC's local authority boundary. This means that NSDC will not be a relevant LPA for the approval of interim and/or final BNG assessments relating to the Project. Phase 1 habitat types identified from surveys and assessments undertaken to inform the baseline data for the Project have been converted to UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) categories and used to inform the BNG assessment. The Project proposes to deliver a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), with potential for wider environmental and societal benefits, on

Newark and Sherwood District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
why UK habitat classifications were not undertaken and whether these will be used to inform BNG assessment. We would request clarification of what the Habitat Condition Assessments listed in table 8.3 and whether there are in relation to the forthcoming BNG assessment as it is unclear from the reference provided (8.38).	a voluntary basis. Detail on the Project's approach to voluntary BNG is provided in **Application Document 7.20 Design Development Report - 2025 and Application Document 7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report.** The Project's commitment to BNG is secured by requirement in **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order.**
Based on figure 8.6 it appears that the DOL within the Newark and Sherwood District has not undergone any habitat survey yet. From a review of aerial imagery it appears that these areas would comprise mostly of arable land with sections of boundary hedgerows and road with associated verges. Nevertheless, it is advised that if they are to be included within the final order limits these areas should be subject to a full habitat assessment at the optimal time of year and will be required to inform the proposed BNG assessment.	Due to the removal of the High Marnham substation and the associated works from the Application, the Order Limits no longer extend to Newark and Sherwood District. As such **Application Document 7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report** does not cover NSDC's local authority boundary. This means that NSDC will not be a relevant LPA for the approval of interim and/or final BNG assessments relating to the Project.
Hedgerow assessment table 8.3 within section 8.4.10 of the PEIR states that a detailed hedgerow survey will be undertaken on' affected locations within the draft order limits where phase one habitat survey identifies hedges as being particularly species diverse and all more than 30 years old and potentially important under the hedgerow regulations 1997'. It is suggested that all hedgerows within the DOL are also mapped in accordance with the UKhab classification system and should undergo a habitat condition assessment to inform the proposed BNG assessment.	Due to the removal of the High Marnham substation and the associated works from the Application the Order Limits no longer extend to Newark and Sherwood District. As **Application Document 7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report** does not cover NSDC's local authority boundary. This means that NSDC will not be a relevant LPA for the approval of interim and/or final BNG assessments relating to the Project.
Relevant guidance, legislation and information - Newark and Sherwood District Council adopted an interim document regarding strategic significance for biodiversity net gain assessments. NSDC note that this policy has not been included in section 2.4 regional and local policy of chapter 2 of the PEIR or listed out Section 8.2.31 of chapter 8. NSDC consider it should have been included as this is a relevant adopted document. If the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire local nature recovery strategy is not being published by the time that	Due to the removal of the High Marnham substation from the Application the Order Limits no longer extend to Newark and Sherwood District. As such the BNG assessment (**Application Document 7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report)** does not cover NSDC's local authority boundary. This means that NSDC will not be a relevant LPA for the approval of interim and/or final BNG assessments relating to the Project.

Newark and Sherwood District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
any BNG calculations relating to land falling within the Newark and Sherwood district are undertaken NSDC considered that this policy should be followed.	
Preliminary baseline conditions - the site falls within a 10 km radius of an area where there might be a future classification as a special protection area hereafter refer to as a possible potential special protection area (ppSPA) for its breeding birds specifically nightjar and woodlark interest. Because this is neither a formal designation nor a potential SPA, it is frequently missed by the usual desk study procedures and it is not listed within table 9.4 of the Chapter 9 of the PEIR.	National Grid welcomes this advice. Potential effects on the designated site are considered within **Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9 Ornithology** The ppSPA is more than 9km away from the Order Limits. This distance is considerably greater than the foraging ranges of breeding nightjar and woodlark. Therefore, there can be no impact pathways by which the Project could affect the possible qualifying features identified by the stakeholder. The ppSPA is therefore screened out in **Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9 Ornithology** not considered further in this chapter
NSDC ecology team comments Natural England have produced an advice note which details a risk based approach for developments within the ppSPA area to consider potential impacts on breeding nightjar and woodlark. In this instance the DOL are approximately 9.8 km away from the RSPB important bird area of the ppSPA and the majority of habitats in closest vicinity are arable which would be unsuitable to support these species. However for completeness and avoidance of date I would recommend that this is given consideration within the environmental statements. And it should be possible to do this succinctly because of the area and habitat types likely to be involved.	National Grid welcomes this advice. Potential effects on the designated site are considered within **Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9 Ornithology** The ppSPA is more than 9km away from the Order Limits. This distance is considerably greater than the foraging ranges of breeding nightjar and woodlark. Therefore, there can be no impact pathways by which the Project could affect the possible qualifying features identified by the stakeholder. The ppSPA is therefore screened out in **Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9 Ornithology** not considered further in this chapter
We advise that non statutory designated sites including local wildlife sites are absent from table 1.1 of technical annex 8.1 this may be due to incorrectly mapped zone of influence as the two km buffer zone shown in figure 8.2 does not encompass the entire DOL we would ask that this matter is therefore clarified. Four LWS need to be included western road verge LWS, goosemore Dyke LWS, Grassthorpe Corner LWS and Ladywood LWS. Of these the closest is Western Road verge LWS which lies adjacent to the southernmost proposed access	Due to the removal of the High Marnham substation and the associated works from the Application, the Order Limits no longer extend to Newark and Sherwood District. No direct effects or indirect effects would occur on habitats and LWSs present in this district. The LWSs identified do not fall within the 2 km study area for non-statutory locally designated sites.

Newark and Sherwood District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
route and has potential to be affected by construction traffic in the absence of mitigation.	
Habitats and vegetation - priority habitats within the DOL were identified through a desk study. As mentioned above the two km buffer displayed on figure 8.2 is incorrect and as such the ancient woodland block that forms Ladywood LWS has been missed and will require scoping into the assessment. It is acknowledged that further detailed hedgerow survey is ongoing, however hedgerows appear to be missing from the key on figure 8.3.	Due to the removal of the High Marnham substation and the associated works from the Application, the Order Limits no longer extend to Newark and Sherwood District. No direct effects or indirect effects would occur on habitats and LWSs present in this district. Lady Wood ancient woodland and LWS (adjacent to the A1) does not fall within the 2 km study area for non-statutory locally designated sites or areas of ancient woodland.
Assessment of likely significant effects on LWS Assessment of likely effects as mentioned above dependent upon the final order limits further LWS may need scoping in within the forthcoming chapter	Due to the removal of the High Marnham substation and the associated works from the Application, woodland areas within Newark and Sherwood District have been scoped out of the assessment. Only LWSs which fall within the 2 km study area for non-statutory locally designated sites are included within **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology**.
Assessment of likely significant effects on habitats It is suggested where possible that embedded buffers are incorporated to hedgerows, trees, woodlands and water courses. Further detail will be provided within the ES chapter and it is suggested the quantification of unavoidable habitat loss is presented in greater detail which should be evident within the forthcoming BNG assessment.	Through sensitive routeing and siting, National Grid has sought to avoid and reduce, as far as practicable, potential impacts on biodiversity. Environmental appraisal has been an integral part of the Project design from the outset, which has meant that the process of routeing has been able to take account of existing woodland, hedgerows and watercourses where practicable, and seeks to reduce impacts through avoidance or mitigation. Due to the removal of the High Marnham substation and the associated works from the Application, woodland areas within Newark and Sherwood District have been scoped out of the assessment as they do not fall within the Order Limits or the survey area for habitats. As such the BNG assessment (**Application Document 7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report)** does not cover NSDC's local authority boundary. This means that NSDC will not be a relevant LPA for the approval of interim and/or final BNG assessments relating to the Project.

Newark and Sherwood District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Assessment of likely significant effects on great crested newts It is unclear from table 8.3 as to which ponds were subject to further eDNA as it simply states ponds that were assessed as being potentially suitable for breeding GCN whilst it is considered likely to be ponds that scored average or above on the habitat suitability index it is suggested that this is made transparent within the forthcoming ES and any accompanying technical appendix. Alternatively, the applicant could use a Natural England rapid assessment tool to provide further evidence of potential impacts. Nevertheless, there are no ponds identified within 250 metres of the DOL that fall within the Newark and Sherwood District area.	Due to the removal of the High Marnham substation and the associated works from the Application, the Newark and Sherwood District area has been scoped out of the assessment for GCN as it does not fall within the Order Limits or the survey area for GCN.
Assessment of likely significant effects on reptiles Table 8.3 suggests that reptile surveys will only be undertaken in 2025 where there is suitable habitat present to support more than a low population of reptiles or there would be large scale permanent habitat loss. Whilst this is likely a proportionate approach NSDC would expect the Environmental Statement to provide a rationale and methodology for determining sample size and sample locations. Table 8.21 goes on to state that targeted surveys are unlikely to be required due to the dominance of arable land. This is considered to be acceptable as the habitat features likely to be utilised by reptiles such as grass snake, which are likely to be present within the DOL, would likely be mostly retained and there would be opportunities to enhance habitats for these species. However, this should be determined by further detailed survey given the nearby presence of the River Trent corridor and network of associated drains and ditches.	Due to the removal of the High Marnham substation and the associated works from the Application the Order Limits, the Order Limits and the survey area for reptiles no longer extend to Newark and Sherwood District area..
Assessment of likely significant effects on the bats NSDC considered the survey effort to be proportional and welcome to the provision of bats boxes. It is suggested that further detail is provided within TA 4.1 for contingency actions should a bat roost be identified and also for the provision requirements for compensatory	Due to the removal of the High Marnham substation and the associated works from the Application the Order Limits and the survey area for bats no longer extend to Newark and Sherwood District area.

Newark and Sherwood District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
bat boxes to fulfil mitigation requirements and additional boxes provided for enhancement.	
Assessment of likely significant effects on riparian mammals (water vole and otter) – it is noted that survey work for otter and vole is ongoing and that a targeted approach has been taken of suitable waterbodies which NSDC consider is acceptable.	Due to the removal of the High Marnham substation and the associated works from the Application the Order Limits, the Order Limits and the survey area for otter and water vole no longer extend to Newark and Sherwood District area.
Assessment of likely significant effects on birds There has been little survey effort within route section 11 to date with vantage point 17 being the closest survey point to the Newark and Sherwood district area. It is acknowledged that this is due to a combination of the initial design concept and low number of records. It is recommended that if this area is to remain within the order limits that further targeted breeding bird surveys are undertaken. It is suggested that a targeted approach is taken and would not necessarily require a full suite of surveys. As outlined above the Sherwood ppS PA has been missed from the assessment. While NSDC consider that the presence of European nightjar and woodlark within the DOL of route section 11 is highly unlikely due to the lack of suitable habitat the applicant should confirm whether any of the surveys included a desk survey to support this conclusion. This could also provide a good opportunity to identify owl roosts as barn owl have been recorded in this area. The additional mitigation outlined in Chapter 9 is predominantly focused on biodiversity net gain. NSDC advise that there should be further consideration for mitigation for farmland birds which could include features within embedded mitigation such as the provision of additional foraging resources such as beetle banks. Though it is noted that the majority of habitats within the Newark and Sherwood district area would only be temporarily disturbed.	The Order Limits have been refined since statutory consultation, and the Order Limits no longer extend into the Newark and Sherwood District. Further surveys have been completed including targeted surveys for nesting barn owl (*Tyto alba*), peregrine (*Falco peregrinus*), hobby (*Falco subbuteo*) and red kite (*Milvus milvus*), as set out in **Application Document 6.9.A2 Appendix 9.2 Ornithology Baseline Report** and **Application Document 6.9.A4 Appendix 9.4 Confidential Ornithology Baseline Report**. The desk study includes bird data from the relevant Local Records Centre and British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) coupled with a review of any location – specific records set out in the Nottinghamshire Bird Atlas (Reece *et al.*, 2019)[5]. There have been no dusk surveys specifically within this section of the Project. The survey scope was designed and targeted to the receptors likely to be affected by the Project and nightjar was not identified in this area as a key receptor for the reasons stated in the stakeholder's comment (distance from any breeding areas and general lack of suitable foraging habitat). Barn owl surveys have been carried out across the entire Project, using a combination of daytime habitat searches and, where these are inconclusive, watches of suitable nesting habitats for breeding activity at dawn and dusk.

[5] Reece, J., Crouch, C., Parking, D., du Feu. C. and Ellis, B. (2019) The Birds of Nottinghamshire. Liverpool University Press.

Newark and Sherwood District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	Mitigation measures for farmland birds are set out in **Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9 Ornithology**. Mitigation has been developed to reflect the assessments of effects supported by the full baseline. All measures proposed are set out in the following documents: • **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice, Application;** • **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments; and** • **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.**
Biodiversity Net Gain - NSDC would appreciate the chance to review the draft BNG parameters established for the assessment as the PEIR is light on these details. As highlighted above the assessment will need to consider and follow the NSDC adopted document concerning strategic significance for any assessment of land within our district. The PEIR only briefly mentions habitat condition assessments and it is unclear whether this is in relation to the proposed BNG assessment. It is assumed that the baseline size and value of individual trees within the DOL whether they are freestanding or component part of hedgerows that do not meet the UK hub definition of hedgerow within trees, will be documented either as part of an or alongside the arboricultural assessment. This ensures that all relevant trees are accounted for in the BNG assessment providing a comprehensive understanding of the site's baseline BNG value. There should be consideration of how temporary impacts such as construction compound areas, are accounted for. Given the scale of the project and opportunities for habitat creation it's our view that as a precaution these areas should be considered as lost and then compensated with new habitat creation. Any earthwork requirements	Whilst the applicant welcomes comment from NSDC and has taken on board comments around BNG, the High Marnham substation and associated works have been removed from the application and as such the Order Limits no longer extend into the Newark and Sherwood District Area. As a consequence **Application Document 7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report** does not cover NSDC's local authority boundary. This means that NSDC will not be a relevant LPA for the approval of interim and/or final BNG assessments relating to the Project.

Newark and Sherwood District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
must also be fully evaluated within the assessment in relation to retained hedgerows and trees. BNG practitioners recognise that the process can sometimes be restrictive, limiting imitative innovative habitat creation and enhancement proposals. Large scale projects like this offer opportunities for creative biodiversity improvements. While the projects voluntary commitment to achieving at least a measurable 10% BNG is appreciated, NSDC suggests that beyond this 10% gain habitat creation and management measures should not be solely driven by the aim to achieve a higher percentage gain as this could hinder innovation. In our district NSDC would potentially value proposed biodiversity measures based on their specific merits rather than the BNG percentage they generate, especially beyond the 10% gain. This approach is crucial to ensure that proposed biodiversity measures fully considered local nature conservation priorities.	
Draft outline code of construction practise Table 1.3 states at GG 03 that a landscape and ecology management plan will be produced prior to construction it is advised that an outline LEMP is provided alongside the ES chapter. GG08 states that land used temporarily will be reinstated where practicable to its pre construction condition and us. Hedgerows, fences and walls including associated earthworks and pine tree features will be reinstated to a similar style and of similar or higher quality to those that were removed, unless otherwise agreed. The loss of hedgerows will be quantified by the forthcoming BNG assessment and it is advised in line with standard BNG guidance at the same hedgerow distinctiveness type is reinstated wherever possible. This will likely require additional hedgerow creation or enhancement to achieve an overall uplift in hedgerow units. It is suggested that as the assessment progress is that more detailed species specific control and management measures are set out within the code of construction practise or mitigation is relevant.	Due to the removal of the High Marnham substation and associated works from the Application, no works take place within Newark and Sherwood District Council authority area. As such the BNG assessment (**Application Document 7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report)** does not cover NSDC's local authority boundary. This means that NSDC will not be a relevant LPA for the approval of interim and/or final BNG assessments relating to the Project. The Applicant has continued to collaborate with relevant stakeholders and interested parties throughout the pre application stage of the Project.

Newark and Sherwood District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Conclusion the design is evolving with survey work ongoing and consequently there are some gaps in the information provided you see understand and expect this at this stage of the process and we have provided feedback accordingly. NSDC trusts at the applicant will collaborate with relevant stakeholders and interested parties to improve the dco package.	Due to the removal of the High Marnham substation and associated works from the Application, no works take place within Newark and Sherwood District Council authority area. The Applicant has continued to collaborate with relevant stakeholders and interested parties throughout the pre application stage of the Project.

North Lincolnshire Council	National Grid Response
General Comments	
Thank you for your email dated 19th February 2025 giving North Lincolnshire Council (NLC) the opportunity to comment on the Statutory Consultation from National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (National Grid) in accordance with Section 42 and 47 of the Planning Act 2008 (the Act) for the North Humber to High Marnham Project. I can confirm that after consultation with our internal technical consultees that North Lincolnshire Council has the following comments to make.	National Grid welcomes the feedback received on the Project from North Lincolnshire Council.
Archaeology	
Thank you for consulting the HER on the PEIR. The Heritage Working Group of the Local authority heritage advisors met on 11 March 2025 to review the progress and results to date of the ongoing archaeological geophysical surveys along the project route. Much of the route to be surveyed through North Lincolnshire is yet to be undertaken. Wherever possible, the applicant intends to avoid impacts on cultural heritage and archaeological sites by careful design (NTS, 5.6.11). Measures to avoid damage or disturbance during construction are to be put in place (NS, 5.6.12), These measures should be set out in sufficient in a Heritage / Archaeological Mitigation Strategy submitted with the DCO application. Where	**Application Document 7.9 Outline Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation** presents the archaeological mitigation strategy that has been agreed with the Archaeological Advisors of North Lincolnshire Council. This is secured through the **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order** and commitments in **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** and details further evaluation surveys and appropriate archaeological mitigation measures.

North Lincolnshire Council	National Grid Response
avoidance is not possible, archaeological mitigation in the form of excavation and recording will be undertaken and a specification for such works should be submitted alongside the Heritage / Archaeological Mitigation Strategy with the DCO application (NTS, 5.6.13). In the meantime, the archaeological field evaluation will continue through the coming months and the emerging results will inform the Cultural Heritage and Archaeology assessment for the Environmental Statement and DCO application (NTS, 5.6 16-17).	
There is potential that the evaluation and assessment will need to extend into the Examination period due to the tight timescale.	The report setting out the results of the Stage 1 archaeological evaluation is submitted as **Application Document 6.10.A8 Appendix 10.8 Archaeological Trial Trench Report**. As agreed with the Archaeological Advisors of North Lincolnshire Council, and secured through the **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order** and **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** no stage of the authorised development can commence until an archaeological written scheme of investigation for that stage has been submitted to and approved by the relevant local planning authority. The archaeological written scheme of investigation must be substantially in accordance with **Application Document 7.9 Outline Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation** and **Application Document 7.10 Cultural Heritage Management Plan.**
The PEIR acknowledges (NTS, 5.6. 18-19) that the proposed development has the potential for significant effects on the Area of Special Historic Landscape of the Isle of Axholme (North Lincolnshire Local Plan Policy LC14). These effects should be fully assessed and evidenced through the use of photographic visualisations in the ES as set out in our response to the Scoping Report.	The impacts of the Project on the Area of Special Historic Landscape of the Isle of Axholme (North Lincolnshire Local Plan Policy LC14) are assessed in **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage**. Supporting assessment information is provided in visualisations presented in **Application Document 6.10.A3 Appendix 10.3 Cultural Heritage Visualisations**.
Conservation	
Considering the proposal, whilst there are already existing pylons,	A review has been undertaken and there are three assets within North Lincolnshire Council's administrative boundary within 500 m of the

North Lincolnshire Council	National Grid Response
windfarms, etc. in the countryside. The proposed new pylon route will have a cumulative impact on heritage assets. To assess the impact / harm on heritage assets by the proposal a recommendation would be to wireframe the existing and proposed corridor where the route passes within 500m of a listed building.	Limits of Deviation (LoD) for the overhead line, namely, the Grade II Blacksmith's Shop at Beltoft (NHLE:1083289), the Grade II listed High Melwood Farmhouse (NHLE: 1346693) and the Grade II listed Langholme Manor Farmhouse (NHLE: 1067741). The approach to viewpoints and visualisations at these three assets and throughout the rest of the proposed overhead line route relevant to this consultee was discussed with the Conservation Officer at North Lincolnshire Council via Teams meeting in February 2026 and through subsequent emails. This approach, as presented in **Application Document 6.10.A3 Appendix 10.3 Cultural Heritage Visualisations**, has been agreed. It includes viewpoints near the Grade II Blacksmith's Shop at Beltoft.
Ecology	
Protected and priority species surveys are ongoing. Habitat surveys are ongoing although largely complete. A preliminary cumulative assessment has been conducted and will inform the Environmental Impact Assessment and be report in the Environmental Statement. The HRA Preliminary Stage 1 Report indicates multiple Likely Significant Effects cannot be screened out during the construction and operation of the proposed overhead lines, including LSEs on the Humber Estuary SAC, SPA and Ramsar. HRA in-combination effects are being considered.	**Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology** details the effects on designated sites of ecological importance, protected species, and on habitats and other species identified as being of Principal Importance for the conservation of biodiversity. **Application Document 5.2 Habitats Regulations Assessment Report** details whether the Project is likely to have a significant effect on areas that have been designated for nature and conservation purposes under the Habitats Regulations and in accordance with international treaties to which the UK is a party; such designations include SACs, SPAs, and Ramsar sites. The HRA Screening Stage 1 identified potential for Likely Significant Effects (LSEs) on the Humber Estuary SPA/SAC/Ramsar site, these LSEs were thoroughly assessed in the HRA Report Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment section which concluded, with implementation of detailed mitigation measures, there were no residual adverse effects on the integrity of any European site. The HRA Report also concluded that there were no in-combination effects with other developments on the Humber Estuary SPA/SAC/Ramsar sites

North Lincolnshire Council	National Grid Response
Biodiversity Net Gain provisions to fulfil the minimum 10% uplift are welcomed, although consideration must be given to route sections 6 (partially), 7 and 8 to ensure any proposed habitat creation is appropriate for the Isle of Axholme location.	The Project proposes to deliver a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), with potential for wider environmental and societal benefits, on a voluntary basis. Detail on the Project's approach to voluntary BNG is provided in **Application Document 7.20 Design Development Report - 2025** and **Application Document 7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report.**
Highways	
The main impact on the highway network will be during the construction phase. Operational traffic movements will be minimal and therefore have been scoped out. The linear nature of the project means that construction activities will move along the length of the working area over time so work in a given area will be a shorter duration than the overall construction programme. The core working hours are anticipated to be 07:00 – 19:00 during the week and 08:00 – 17:00 at weekends and bank holidays. Therefore, construction workers will be arriving at / leaving site outside of peak construction hours.	Core working hours for construction are set out in **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order**, and are Monday to Friday, 07:00–19:00; and Saturday, Sunday and public holidays, 08:00–17:00. The core construction working hours exclude start-up and close-down activities, which would take up to one hour before and after the core construction working hours. Unless otherwise agreed with the local highway authority, no heavy goods vehicle (HGV) deliveries would be made to site outside of the hours of 06:00 to 19:00 Monday to Friday and 07:00 to 17:00 on Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays.
The initial work undertaken has identified that highway improvements, such as localised widening, passing places or surfacing upgrades will be required in some locations. The scope and specification of these works would need to be agreed in advance with North Lincolnshire Council. We have had an initial meeting regarding the project and have a further meeting set up for this month. We are keen to maintain an ongoing dialogue with the applicant as the scheme progresses, We would expect the DCO to include a requirement for a Construction Phase Traffic Management Plan.	Engagement with the Council regarding the scope of works and specifications for localised widening, passing places or surfacing upgrades has been carried out and evidenced in **Application Document 5.8.7 Statement of Common Ground - North Lincolnshire Council**. An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan is presented as **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan.** The DCO indicates that a construction traffic management plan for each stage of the authorised development must be submitted to and approved by the relevant local planning authority (in consultation with the relevant highway authority) prior to the commencement of development in that stage. The construction traffic management plan

North Lincolnshire Council	National Grid Response
	for each stage must be substantially in accordance with **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan.**
Public Right of Way	
Looking at the route section maps in the Project Background Documents, several public right of way would be crossed by the new transmission cables as it wended its way north to south across the Isle of Axholme. Should the associated works be likely to endanger or impede users while underway, the applicant might want to consider therefore if appropriate legal temporary closures or diversions are required. Once the new transmission lines are in situ. Aside from the landscapes inevitable change in appearance, the public right of way beneath or near the new pylons and transmission cables would not be affected in terms of their current alignments or continued use any more than would be from the tarmacked public road network.	The extent of interactions with public right of way across the Isle of Axeholme are presented within **Application Document 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan.** Throughout the pre application process PRoW management has been consulted with the highways authority **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice** commits that all designated PRoWs crossing the working area will be managed with access only closed for short periods while construction activities occur. Any required temporary diversions will be clearly marked at both ends with signage explaining the diversion, the duration of the diversion and a contact number for any concerns.
Landscape	
Viewpoint locations are generally well-selected to cover the route geographically and to represent an appropriate range of receptors. However, a further viewpoint would be helpful, to the southern edge of West Butterwick, where a number of Grade 2 listed buildings are sited and PRoWs cross the countryside, as this area would have views to a large part of the corridor. The other area which does not seem well represented would be settlements on the eastern side of the Trent such as Flixborough and Gunness, which also have several PRoWs.	Detailed comments on viewpoints locations were received from stakeholders as part of the landscape and visual technical working group. Suggestions for new viewpoint locations were taken forward with viewpoints added for the assessment. Viewpoint locations have been agreed with each stakeholder as referenced in the relevant Statements of Common Ground. Viewpoints are presented in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment.** In respect of this specific comment, viewpoint D-04 was added at West Butterwick as requested. Viewpoints on the eastern side of the River Trent were considered, but not taken forward due to distance from the proposed overhead line and consideration that the Project would be seen beyond existing 400 kV overhead lines so effects would not be significant.

North Lincolnshire Council	National Grid Response
Viewpoints 6.4, 7.1, 7.9 & 8.1 would benefit from having a wider view angle or looking both north and south of the point for the full impact of the corridor in their respective locations to better-represent the effects upon receptors	Additional photos have been added into **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment** to cover the wider extent of views at these viewpoints. VP6.4 is now C-01a and C-01b, VP7.1 is now D-06a and D-06b, VP7.9 is D-03a and D-03b, and VP8.1 is now D-17a and D-17b.
Micro-siting, to avoid foreground clutter, would be useful at some viewpoints e.g. 6.8, 7.6, 7.7, & 8.2	When winter photography was retaken, clutter in foregrounds was avoided where possible. In some locations, the clutter is part of the experience of the views from the road and therefore avoiding all clutter was not possible at all locations.
Viewpoint 5.5 refers to Adlingfleet as Adlington in the visual baseline.	This error has been amended. VP5.5 is now VP B-07 and is presented in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 2) Route Section B.**
Viewpoint 7.7 is of poor lighting quality making it difficult to distinguish features in the landscape.	New photography is provided for this location. VP7.7 is now VP D-14 and is presented in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 4) Route Section D.**
The preliminary assessment of Potentially Significant Landscape and Visual Effects, within the PIER Chapters 6 and 7, appears to be appropriate. It correctly identifies the relevant receptors and whether or not they are likely to be subject to Significant Effects. This forms a suitable basis for carrying forward to the LVIA.	National Grid welcomes agreement to the approach taken.

Northern Gas Networks Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
NGN has a number of gas assets in the vicinity of some of the identified “site development” locations. It is a possibility that some of these sites could be recorded as Major Accident Hazard Pipelines (MAHP), whilst other sites could contain High Pressure gas and as such there are Industry recognised restrictions associated to these installations which would effectively preclude close and certain types of development. The regulations now include “Population Density	National Grid notes the presence of existing Northern Gas Networks infrastructure in the vicinity of the Project. National Grid has since further engaged with Northern Gas Networks to share detailed interactions information and obtain pipeline information for any affected Northern Gas Networks pipeline assets.

Northern Gas Networks Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Restrictions" or limits within certain distances of some of our "HP" assets. The gas assets mentioned above form part of the Northern Gas Networks "bulk supply" High Pressure Gas Transmission" system and are registered with the HSE as Major Accident Hazard Pipelines. Any damage or disruption to these assets is likely to give rise to grave safety, environmental and security of supply issues.	National Grid notes the operator's comments regarding the potential that such pipelines may be registered as Major Accident Hazard (MAH) pipelines. The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) responded to the Project's Section 42 consultation and identified where the Project crosses the consultation zones of several Major Accident Hazard (MAH) sites and MAH pipelines. The HSE advised that, based on the information it had received, "it is unlikely that HSE would advise against the development" but advised that National Grid should engage with the relevant operators. National Grid will continue to engage with Northern Gas Networks to understand any restrictions and protective measures required in relation to the above.
NGN would expect you or anyone involved with the site (or any future developer) to take these restrictions into account and apply them as necessary in consultation with ourselves. We would be happy to discuss specific sites further or provide more details at your locations as necessary.	National Grid has initiated discussions with Northern Gas Networks regarding Protective Provisions. The proposed design has been developed to avoid direct impacts on identified gas infrastructure wherever reasonably practicable and appropriate standoff distances have been embedded within the design and construction approach. Any works will be subject to the Project's confirmed detailed design and the completion of ground investigations. National Grid's contractors will continue the ongoing engagement with Northern Gas Networks at construction stage and ensure the relevant approvals are obtained, prior to any works starting in vicinity of Northern Gas Networks pipeline assets.
If you give specific site locations, we would be happy to provide gas maps of the area which include the locations of our assets. (In terms of High Pressure gas pipelines, the routes of our MAHP's have already been lodged with members of the local Council's Planning Department)	National Grid has since further engaged with Northern Gas Networks to share detailed interactions information and obtain pipeline information for any affected Northern Gas Networks pipeline assets. National Grid will continue to engage with Northern Gas Networks and agree protective provisions.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Thank you for your correspondence dated 18th February 2025 requesting the observations of Nottinghamshire County Council on the above Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP), which is subject to a statutory pre-application consultation under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008. The County Council is a host authority under Section 42 of the Act and has several statutory responsibilities and areas of expertise that are of relevance in the assessment of energy infrastructure projects, as outlined within the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN1). This response provides comments on the content of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) in relation to the issues listed below, insofar as they relate to Nottinghamshire (i.e., Route Sections 8-11). The County Council defers to Bassetlaw District Council on any other issues. • Minerals and Waste Planning • Ecology and Ornithology • Archaeology • Built Heritage • Landscape and Visual Impact • Highways • Public Rights of Way	National Grid welcomes feedback from Nottinghamshire County Council and confirms understanding of the their remit.
Minerals and Waste Planning The County Council welcomes that the promoter recognises the importance of minerals within Chapter 12 – Geology and Hydrogeology of the PEIR. As detailed in paragraph 12.2.12, local policies, including Policy SP7 of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan (adopted March 2021), and national policy has informed the preliminary assessment. The promoter has undertaken a Preliminary Qualitative Mineral Resource Assessment (Volume 3, Appendix 12.2) to support the conclusion that potential impacts on minerals will be	The Preliminary Qualitative Mineral Resource Assessment has been updated and is informed by information provided by Nottinghamshire County Council and the Minerals Local Plan. The assessment is provided as Application Document 6.12.A3 Appendix 12.3 Qualitative Mineral Resource Assessment. The Mineral Safeguarding information received from Nottinghamshire County Council indicates that the Project does not interact with any sand and gravel safeguarded areas in Sections 10 and 11.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
scoped out. The Preliminary Qualitative Mineral Resource Assessment outlines that parts of the project fall within mineral safeguarding areas (MSA) in different authorities. For Nottinghamshire, the promoter details that only the southern part of section 8, near Misterton, falls within the MSA for sand and gravel. However, the County Council would highlight that the southern part of section 10 and eastern part of section 11, near High Marnham, also fall within the MSA for sand and gravel. The Minerals Resource assessment goes onto conclude that because sterilisation is limited to the pylon bases and operational clearance, which is a small footprint and so would sterilise small volumes of minerals, and the financial cost and environmental impacts that prior extraction and infill would create, prior extraction is not viable nor feasible. The assessment goes on to say that with there then being a clear demonstrable need for the project, the application therefore satisfies clause 3 of Policy SP7 of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan. The County Council would agree with this conclusion, though would like to ensure that mineral extraction is possible between the pylons, under the conductors, as suggested by the promoter.	The presence of overhead line infrastructure does not necessarily preclude mineral extraction beneath or between conductors. Subject to compliance with relevant safety clearances, protection of tower foundations, and an agreement with the network operator, mineral extraction activities may take place within parts of the overhead line corridor.
The assessment concludes that for Nottinghamshire, no mineral infrastructure is affected by the project. However, the County Council wish to draw the promoter's attention to two issues. Firstly, the permitted Beckingham Wellsite number 37 falls within the draft order limit within the Western Part of Section 9, with the indicative construction access route and an indicative new lattice pylon at the well site. The location of the wellsite (What3words ///ever.stacks.juggled) can be found in the delegated report for the application granted in November 2021 (application reference: 1/21/010610/CDM). As per the conditions attached to this permission, the site can continue to operate until the 31st of May 2031 with restoration required by the 23rd of September 2031, or before if the site should cease operation prior to these dates. Condition 3 requires	Following statutory consultation and further consideration of potential interactions with the Star Energy Group (Formerly IGas Energy) Beckingham 37 operational site, National Grid engaged with Star Energy Group to share detailed interactions information and obtain additional input regarding the potential impacts to the Star Energy Group's existing site. A technical resolution was found as a result of that and a design change was subsequently incorporated into the Project to minimise the level of interactions with the Beckingham Wellside number 37 site and removed from the Order Limits. Therefore we understand that the conditions are can be met. National Grid will continue to engage with Star Energy Group to assess any coordination needed in relation to the residual interactions.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
the boreholes to be plugged and the buildings, hardstanding area, plant and structures (except the pipeline) to be removed and the site restored, with a drill rig required to enable this. Condition 12 requires the land to be restored to the required standard for agricultural and amenity use, including a three-year aftercare period. The County Council would question whether these conditions could be met if the DCO was granted permission in its current form. The operator also has separate requirements under HSE and Environment Agency regulations for ongoing operational requirements and abandonment programmes. The promoter should liaise with the operator, Star Energy Ltd (Formerly IGas Energy), and the County Council to discuss this further.	
The second issue in relation to mineral sites is any potential impact on the access road to the permitted Sturton le Steeple Quarry, which is off Gainsborough Road (What3words ///crumbles.holly.whirlwind) and falls within Section 10. Near the access road to the quarry, there is a proposed environmental mitigation area and indicative new lattice pylon. Whilst this should not create a long-term issue for the quarry operation, the County Council would seek reassurance that the access road would not be impacted by the project, particularly during the construction period.	National Grid is proposing bellmouth BM-106 as part of the Project which will give access to works located to the west of Gainsborough Road, as shown on **Application Document 2.6 Access, Rights of Way and Rights of Navigation Plans** The construction of the bellmouth will require the temporary stopping up of the Gainsborough Road. This is likely to be a short term partial closure of the carriageway, with traffic management put in place to enable the construction of the bellmouth and the highway to remain open to traffic. Further details of all road closures are provided in the **Application Document 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan.** Taking account of the information provided above, it is considered that the potential future impact upon the quarry would be minimal.
Overall, in regard to minerals, the County Council agrees with the conclusions of the Preliminary Qualitative Mineral Resource Assessment that whilst there will be some sterilisation of mineral resource, there is a clear and demonstrable need for the proposal in the MSA and due to the small footprint and environment impacts, prior extraction is not feasible. The County Council though would like to seek assurance that extraction could be possible between the pylons,	The presence of overhead line infrastructure does not necessarily preclude mineral extraction beneath or between conductors. Subject to compliance with relevant safety clearances, protection of tower foundations, and an agreement with the network operator, mineral extraction activities may take place within parts of the overhead line corridor.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
under the conductors, and that the promoter has considered the impacts on Beckingham well site number 37 and access road for Sturton Le Steeple quarry.	National Grid engaged with Star Energy Group to assess the level of interaction with their operating site and a technical resolution was found as a result of that.
Waste As per the County Councils response in August 2024, there are no waste facilities that would be affected by the proposed draft order limits. The County Council believe the promoter should undertake a waste audit or waste management plan to ensure that waste generated by the project is, and can be, appropriately handled and managed as high up the waste hierarchy as possible.	**Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice** confirms that a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) will be secured as part of the Application as set out in **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments**
Chapter 8 – Ecology The Council has no specific comments at this stage, noting that further surveys will be completed in 2025, meaning that the baseline is not yet fully known. However, it is evident that the route largely affects arable farmland (of generally low ecological value and with limited potential for protected or otherwise notable species), and the mitigation measures proposed to protect species and habitats all appear appropriate at this stage. It can be expected that we will provide more comprehensive comments when the EIA has been produced, including in relation to Biodiversity Net Gain.	**Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8 Ecology** presents the assessment of effects on relevant important ecological receptors that could result from the Project.
Ornithology	
Chapter 9 – Ornithology Generally, the surveys appear to provide a good level of baseline information. However, we wish to raise concerns in relation to section 8 where the route passes down the eastern side of Gringley and Misterton Carr, an area used by wintering Whooper Swans. Paragraph 4.2.63 of Vol.3 Appendix 9.1 (Ornithology Baseline Report) states that 'Whooper swan was recorded only once in this section [section 8], from VP13, where a flock of 15 swans was recorded flying through the airspace. There	National Grid welcomes the information based on local knowledge as presented by the Nottinghamshire County Council, which was of significant use for assessment. The surveys presented at PEIR were not complete and more data to inform the assessment within the Environmental Statement has been collected. Surveys continued through the 2025/2026 winter season with a series of winter walkover surveys specifically targeting the presence of wild swans in the Misterton and Gringley area between October 2025 and March 2026 (inclusive). Additional VP surveys were carried out over the same

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
was no risk of collision for this species'. It is perhaps not surprising that only a small number of flying Whooper Swans were picked up during the VP surveys as 6 hours survey per month represents a very small window to pick up a species which can spend many hours sat in the same field grazing. We are therefore concerned that the risk to this species at this location has been significantly under-estimated, given the number of swans involved and the fact that swans are particularly prone to collisions with powerlines.	period at two VPs giving unobstructed views over Gringley and Misterton Carrs and enabling surveyors on VPs to count birds such as swans and geese on the ground to bolster the records collected from the walkover surveys. Further data was collected in November and December 2025 during efforts to track the whereabouts of pink-footed geese that roost at Hatfield Moor; these surveys involved a combination of driven and walked transects over a wide area including Misterton and Gringley Carrs, and records of wild swans were collected for this area. **Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9 Ornithology, Application Document 6.9.A2 Appendix 9.2 Baseline Ornithology Report** and **Application Document 6.9.A3 Appendix 9.3 Flight Activity Assessment** describe the baseline as defined by the full data set, with assessment of effects on this species assessed in the former document, and detailed information about flight activity presented in the latter document.
We are also concerned that no mitigation is proposed even on a precautionary basis; para 9.6.9. states that 'The preliminary assessment reported in this PEIR has not identified any requirements for additional mitigation at this stage, over and above the embedded or control and management measures identified. This will continue to be reviewed as the assessment progresses and the preliminary design develops further'. However, it is noted from para 9.2.8 that the NPS for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5), 2024 states 'applicants should consider measures to make lines more visible such as flappers and diverters…'. In this location, the Council therefore consider it essential that flappers/diverters are installed where the lines cross Gringley and Misterton Carr, not least as it will presumably be much simpler and cost effective to do so during construction, rather than at a later date once swan casualties start occurring.	Nottinghamshire County Council's advice on this matter is welcomed. National Grid's approach is to consider carefully the use of line markers where the baseline data indicate that there is a likelihood of or potential for significant collision risk, rather than to assume from the outset that they are required across the entire route of the proposed overhead line. This is largely because the use of line markers can present other challenges to the Project, perhaps the most significant of which is their potential for adverse landscape and visual effects. The surveys described above were completed in March 2026 and have informed the assessments in **Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9 Ornithology** and the requirement for line markers, commitments to which are set out in **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments**.
In addition, Gringley and Misterton Carr is also one of the few places in Nottinghamshire where Corn Buntings still occur (certainly in any numbers), a Red Listed species which has suffered an 83%	National Grid welcomes this advice and, as a result, commissioned additional species-specific surveys for corn buntings across Misterton and Gringley Carrs following the recommended method set out in

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
population decrease between 1967 and 2022. We would strongly suggest that targeted surveys for this species are carried out along the route where it crossed Gringley and Misterton Carr to allow the impacts on this species to be properly assessed, and for appropriate mitigation to be designed.	Gilbert *et al*. (1998)[6]. These surveys were completed in July 2026 and the results are reported in **Application Document 6.9 Chapter 9 Ornithology**. No operational effects are predicted. Standard measures to mitigate any construction effects (which are predicted to be not significant) are set out in the following documents: • **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice;** • **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments.**
Finally, in relation to para 9.6.6 (**Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP**) and BO2), the preferred approach should be to schedule vegetation clearance outside the bird nesting season (which generally runs from March to August inclusive) wherever possible.	National Grid notes this comment and confirms that **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice** has a commitment in line with this approach.
Archaeology	
The applicant has presented their initial assessment and outline approach to Cultural Heritage at Chapter 10 of the PEIR. Chapters 6 (Landscape), 7 (Visual) and 8 (Ecology) also contain elements relevant to potential impacts to cultural heritage. It is the Council's position that the applicant must provide sufficient desk-based research, nonintrusive survey and intrusive field evaluation to adequately assess the archaeological potential and the developmental impacts of the proposed scheme. This must then feed into an appropriate post consent Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) to reduce the impact of the development to a minimum on archaeological remains and other cultural heritage sites.	The Desk-based Assessment is presented in **Application Document 6.10.A2 Appendix 10.2 Cultural Heritage Baseline Report**. The archaeological potential has been assessed via a programme of archaeological evaluation surveys, comprising: • **Application Document 6.10.A5 Appendix 10.5 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report;** • **Application Document 6.10.A6 Appendix 10.6 Geophysical Survey Report;** • **Application Document 6.10.A7 Appendix 10.7 Geoarchaeological Desk-based Assessment;** and • **Application Document 6.10.A8 Appendix 10.8 Archaeological Trial Trench Report.**

[6] Gilbert, G., Gibbons, D.W. and Evans, J. (1998) Bird Monitoring Methods. RSPB, Sandy.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	The results of the surveys have informed the assessment of impacts in **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage** and the scope of archaeological mitigation which is secured in **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order** through **Application Document 7.9 Outline Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation** and **Application Document 7.10 Cultural Heritage Management Plan**.
The scheme comprises the installation of a 90km long 400kV electricity transmission line between Birkhill Wood Substation in Yorkshire and High Marnham in Nottinghamshire. The Nottinghamshire element starts at Misterton and runs through areas of known archaeological potential dating from at least the Neolithic to post-medieval periods and all archaeological periods in between are represented on the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record (NHER). From experience of past schemes, it is certain that currently unknown archaeological sites will also be identified through a robust programme of evaluation and assessment work. The potential impact to the archaeological resource from development work is considered significant and adverse and will result in total or partial loss when archaeological remains are encountered during development.	The archaeological potential has been assessed via a programme of archaeological evaluation surveys, comprising: • **Application Document 6.10.A5 Appendix 10.5 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report;** • **Application Document 6.10.A6 Appendix 10.6 Geophysical Survey Report;** • **Application Document 6.10.A7 Appendix 10.7 Geoarchaeological Desk-based Assessment;** and • **Application Document 6.10.A8 Appendix 10.8 Archaeological Trial Trench Report.** These surveys have identified previously unknown archaeological assets, the impact on which is assessed in **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage.**
The applicant's approach to cultural heritage is broadly agreeable as set out paragraph 10.4.12. However, the current level of information detail provided is still very general and we would expect the PEIR to contain a completed Desk-Based Assessment (DBA), completed non-intrusive surveys with a solid programme of evaluation trenching either agreed or underway.	The assessment is supported by the following appendices which include the findings and results of the desk-based assessment, non-invasive surveys, and evaluation trial trenching: • **Application Document 6.10.A2 Appendix 10.2 Cultural Heritage Baseline Report;** • **Application Document 6.10.A5 Appendix 10.5 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report;** • **Application Document 6.10.A6 Appendix 10.6 Geophysical Survey Report;**

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	• **Application Document 6.10.A7 Appendix 10.7 Geoarchaeological Desk-based Assessment;** and • **Application Document 6.10.A8 Appendix 10.8 Archaeological Trial Trench Report.**
Currently the applicant has not completed a DBA, but full programme of geophysical survey (magnetometry) has been largely completed. However this information has not been included with the PEIR.	A completed desk-based assessment is submitted as **Application Document 6.10.A2 Appendix 10.2 Cultural Heritage Baseline Report**. This collates the information from desk-based research, LiDAR and aerial photographs, geophysical survey and trial trenching.
We welcome the extent of geophysical survey already undertaken and the additional areas to be completed shortly. This will need to feed into a programme of pre-examination evaluation trenching.	The results of the geophysical survey are submitted as **Application Document 6.10.A6 Appendix 10.6 Geophysical Survey Report**. The results of the geophysical survey informed the programme of pre-examination trial trenching, the scope of which was agreed with the cultural heritage advisors to the relevant local planning authorities. The pre-examination trial trenching has identified previously unknown sites which are assessed in **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage** and trial trenching results are submitted as **Application Document 6.10.A8 Appendix 10.8 Archaeological Trial Trench Report**.
Evaluation trenching is both an informative and prospection technique and it is essential that the results of the desk-based research and non-intrusive surveys are properly tested with intrusive (trenched) evaluation to ensure that currently unknown sites are identified where the previous assessment techniques have not been successful in doing so.	Trial trenching has been carried out for the Project in agreement with the Archaeological Advisors to the relevant local planning authorities). Impacts to previously unknown sites identified by the trial trenching are assessed in **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage.**
To this end, the Council recommends that a programme of targeted trenching be undertaken prior to examination. This should include areas where the DBA and other surveys have identified areas of high archaeological potential and all areas where ground disturbance associated with the development is proposed. We envisage that this will include, but may not be limited to, the pylon bases and an	A programme of targeted trenching has been undertaken prior to examination and the results submitted as **Application Document 6.10.A8 Appendix 10.8 Archaeological Trial Trench Report**. The location of the trial trenches, which targeted pylon bases, construction compounds and construction access tracks, was agreed with the

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
appropriate buffer around them, any temporary or permanent access roads/tracks, Construction compounds, cable trenches and the substation areas. We further recommend that where the proposed pylon locations overlap with identified areas of archaeological potential, that evaluation trenching is extended to identify areas where development impacts can be reduced as far as possible	cultural heritage advisors (archaeological advisors and conservation officers) to the relevant local planning authorities.
The results of the desk-based research, non-intrusive surveys and the evaluation trenching will be necessary to properly inform the EIA chapter and for the production of an appropriate Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS). We would expect to agree an outline AMS at examination.	An archaeological mitigation report, which sets out the strategy for the recording of heritage assets that may be wholly or partially lost because of the Project has been agreed with the Archaeology Advisor to Nottinghamshire County Council and is submitted as **Application Document 7.9 Outline Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation** secured through Requirement within **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order**.
Para. 10.4.12 and 10.4.29 – we welcome the proposed assessment techniques detailed here, including trial trench evaluation. Given that this will require significant time and effort to complete, we are somewhat concerned that it will be difficult to achieve prior to submission which we believe is intended for September 2025.	A programme of targeted trenching has been undertaken prior to examination and the results submitted as **Application Document 6.10.A8 Appendix 10.8 Archaeological Trial Trench Report**. National Grid wish to clarify that at the time of statutory consultation submission of the DCO was programmed for Summer 2026 not September 2025.
Table 10.3 – This criteria list is commonly used to assign significance to heritage assets and is a reasonable starting point but is not always a reliable guide. For instance, earthworks (ridge and furrow) of local interest would be assigned low significance by this system, however if they are well preserved and the last example of their kind in the area then we would argue that elevates their significance considerably. We would seek further flexibility in this assessment of significance proposal.	The Council's comments are noted. As detailed in **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage** the value of each heritage asset is assigned a value in accordance with the criteria set out in **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage**, but regional variations, contributions to regional research agendas and individual qualities of heritage assets, including heritage interest, have also been taken into account where applicable.
Section 10.5 – Baseline Conditions - Provides a broad summary of the HER data, historic landscape and geology. It would have been beneficial to include data from the site-specific surveys that have	Updated baseline conditions, which summarise the results of the site-specific surveys, are presented in **Application Document 6.10.A2 Appendix 10.2 Cultural Heritage Baseline Report**.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
already been undertaken and the identification of areas of specific concern in terms of impact on design and layout. This could have been further refined in the later ES chapter as additional data is obtained.	
Section 10.6 – Mitigation – This section is necessarily limited and general due to a lack of site specific data. A detailed AMS will need to be agreed once the EIA assessment has been completed and submitted with the DCO application.	An archaeological mitigation strategy for the recording of heritage assets that may be wholly or partially lost because of the Project, is submitted as **Application Document 7.9 Outline Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation** and **Application Document 7.10 Cultural Heritage Management Plan** and secured through Requirement within **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order**.
Section 10.7 – Preliminary Assessment – Currently provides an initial assessment of known data, predominantly from the HER. While some of this may be acceptable, the stated assessment can only be deemed appropriate and agreeable once all of the proposed reports have been completed for the ES chapter.	The detailed assessment, presented in **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage**, has been informed by the completed archaeological surveys carried out for the Project.
Para. 10.7.9 – the potential effects and details regarding the nature of the construction impacts are very general. While we agree that everything detailed is relevant, the EIA should give significant consideration to the specific development impacts, including construction related activity and also that from other proposed activity outlined in other chapters, such as Ecology and Landscape.	Potential impacts arising from construction activities and from ecological and landscape mitigation proposals have been considered in the assessment presented in **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage.**
Conclusion The PEIR has presented a limited initial assessment of the archaeological potential and the evidential baseline of archaeological information is currently behind where we would expect it to be for the PEIR. We are aware that some survey work has already been undertaken, and it would have been beneficial to include this with the PEIR. The PEIR has presented an acceptable outline programme of assessment work which is welcomed, however the detail on the scope	Potential impacts arising from construction activities and from ecological and landscape mitigation proposals have been considered in the assessment presented in **Application Document 6.10 Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage.** The completed desk-top and fieldwork survey reports are submitted to support the application and comprise: • **Application Document 6.10.A2 Appendix 10.2 Cultural Heritage Baseline Report;**

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
of these assessments is still to be confirmed. This should be agreed at the earliest opportunity, and we are somewhat concerned that the level of assessment proposed with be difficult to complete in the current timeframe before submission. It will be important to include all development impacts in the EIA assessment, including those detailed in the other Chapters including Ecology, Landscape, etc. For instance, drainage, swales and tree planting areas must also be assessed for heritage impacts as well as direct construction impacts.	• **Application Document 6.10.A5 Appendix 10.5 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report;** • **Application Document 6.10.A6 Appendix 10.6 Geophysical Survey Report;** • **Application Document 6.10.A7 Appendix 10.7 Geoarchaeological Desk-based Assessment;** and • **Application Document 6.10.A8 Appendix 10.8 Archaeological Trial Trench Report.** All works within the Order Limits, including drainage and planting, have been considered for potential heritage impacts.
Built Heritage	
The following comments are made in relation to the built heritage aspects of the PEIR. Vol 1 Chapter 21: Cumulative Effects. It is unclear why the One Earth Solar Farm NSIP has not been included in the long list; it would appear to conform to the relevant tiering and scoping provided. This development his considerable potential for cumulative impacts to built heritage receptors in the route section 10 and 11 areas. The One Earth Solar Farm proposals are not included in the Future Baseline in Chapter 21.	One Earth Solar Farm was included in both the long and short list provided with the PEIR (development ID 354, page 8 of PEIR 21.1, Fig 21.1 page 13) and is considered within **Application Document 6.21 Inter-Project Cumulative Effects Assessment.**
Vol 1 Chapter 7: Visual. The Assessment Methodology correctly references that the GLVIA3 (Ref 1.3) indicates views often contribute to the value of heritage assets, accordingly there are a number of occasions where a heritage asset should have been identified as a viewpoint location, including the following designated heritage assets: Church of St Gregory and Manor House, Fledborough (ref:241465, 409019); viewpoint VP11.1 would be better moved to the south to the Church of St George and there should be an additional viewpoint from the west end of the viaduct ; Field Farmhouse, East Drayton (ref: 241464); Whinleys Farm House, Clarborough (ref: 241481); St	The approach to viewpoints and visualisations throughout the route of the proposed overhead line relevant to this consultee was discussed with the Conservation Officer at Nottinghamshire County Council via a virtual meeting in February 2026 and through subsequent emails. This approach, as presented in **Application Document 6.10.A3 Appendix 10.3 Cultural Heritage Visualisations**, has been agreed. It includes viewpoints at most of the locations identified and for those where no viewpoint is proposed the rationale for this has been individually discussed and agreed with the Conservation Officer.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Helen's Church South Wheatley (re:411344); Highfields Farmhouse, Walkeringham (ref:241190); Manor Farmhouse, Walkeringham (ref:241185); Pear Tree Hill Farm pigeoncote and fodder store, Beckingham (ref:241089); Viewpoint 9.5 'View from Fountains Hill' would be acceptable for the purposes of appreciating impacts on both Fountain Hill and Gringley Road Farmhouses (both grade II listed) were it closer to Gringley Road; Gringley Grange Farmhouse (ref:241122).	
Vol 1 Chapter 11: Cultural Heritage. For the most part the PEIR is sound and accurate and has included the appropriate built heritage assets. The Council agrees with the comments provided for each route section but would identify the following assets for further consideration due to likely impacts on setting: Route Section 11, the impacts on listed buildings should include detailed consideration of the Church of St George North Clifton, Church of St Gregory and Manor Farmhouse Fledborough; Fledborough viaduct (NDHA). Please note the comments regarding Chapter 7 to ensure that suitable viewpoint receptors are included and cross referenced in the cultural heritage chapter.	The approach to viewpoints and visualisations throughout the route of the proposed overhead line relevant to this consultee was discussed with the Conservation Officer at Nottinghamshire County Council via a virtual meeting in February 2026 and through subsequent emails. This approach, as presented in **Application Document 6.10.A3 Appendix 10.3 Cultural Heritage Visualisations**, has been agreed. It includes viewpoints at most of the locations identified and for those where no viewpoint is proposed the rationale for this has been individually discussed and agreed with the Conservation Officer.
Landscape and Visual Impact The Environmental Management and Design (EMD) Team at Via East Midlands have examined the information provided in the PEIR and produced the following comments on behalf of NCC. These comments follow on from previous consultation comments and should be considered in conjunction with points made earlier. These comments relate to effects within or upon Nottinghamshire only. The comments in this section cover the following chapters of the PEIR and are structured in this order: • Chapter 4 – Description of the project • Chapter 6 – Landscape • Chapter 7 – Visual	National Grid welcomes the feedback from the EMD Team at Via East Midlands acting on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
• Volume 4 – Photomontages • Chapter 20 – Substations and associated works • Chapter 21 – Cumulative effects • S.42 CONSULTATION PLAN SERIES	
General Observations As in previous rounds of consultation the applicant's team should be complimented for the thorough and comprehensive information provided which, from a Landscape and Visual Impact perspective, generally covers all aspects of the development well. Our comments therefore focus on areas within the submission where we feel things have been missed or incorrectly assessed/considered. While we may make a general summary observation of a particular element or topic, unless these comments highlight a specific point, it can be assumed that we are broadly in agreement with the applicant's assessment at this time. Given the scale of the development and limited resource available to review such a large project, we reserve the right to adjust this stance in future comments should further scrutiny identify additional issues.	National Grid welcomes the complimentary feedback and notes that comments therefore focus on areas where there may be uncertainty or no prior agreement.
Chapter 4 – Description of the project A large part of this chapter confirmed approaches previously presented. The few items we would welcome further clarification on are set out below. Mitigation Planting 4.4.36 – The chapter states, proposed mitigation planting will be introduced to replace taller vegetation that has had to be removed to comply with the new Overhead Power Line (OHPL) safe operating requirements and to mitigate potential Landscape and Visual effects. From a review of the mitigation planting proposed, there appears to be little logical implementation of these features in terms of Landscape and Visual effects where views, and in some instances the	Planting has been included to mitigate/compensate for landscape and visual effects and is detailed in **Application Document 6.6 Chapter 6 Landscape** and **Application Document 6.7 Chapter 7 Visual**. Additional details regarding planting are included in **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan.** The reasoning for each area of planting is provided in each of the relevant chapters. The majority of planting has been proposed to mitigate for vegetation loss due to construction and operation of the proposed overhead line, ensuring changes to the landscape character through loss of vegetation are minimised. Mitigation planting would have secondary benefits for habitats and locations for planting have considered connectivity with existing habitats. Mitigation planting for visual

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
perceptual qualities of the landscape, are likely to be harmed by the proposed new OHPL. It is therefore assumed proposed mitigation planting is provided as compensation for habitat loss rather than Landscape and Visual mitigation. Clarification of the purpose for each mitigation planting location is requested to assist in further evaluation of effects.	receptors has been limited to those areas where communities would benefit rather than individuals or where has been requested by a particular stakeholder to mitigate a specific effect.
Vegetation clearance assumptions 4.5.15 - 4.5.20 – This section sets out the vegetation clearance required for delivery of the project. While it is understood taller vegetation will need to be removed under the direct line of the new OHPL route within its limits of deviation, it is questioned if all lower vegetation needs to be completely cleared or whether this could be dealt with the same as the approach for affected managed, i.e.coppicing to ground level for example. Obviously access points, tracks and construction areas will need to be cleared to provide safe working spaces but areas either side of these could be left to regrow during the temporary construction period, rather than having to replant whole extents of new hedgerow, etc. These should recover more quickly and robustly than new whips, restoring more of the landscape to its original character sooner. Individual sections would need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis dependant on the quality of the vegetation and objectives to improve/enhance areas, but we'd like the applicant to consider this approach as an alternative to wholesale clearance.	**Application Document 6.4 Environmental Statement Chapter 4 Description of the Project** outlines the vegetation clearance requirements for the various elements of the Project and a commitment to retain vegetation where practicable is set out in **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Commitments and Actions.**
Installation of bell mouths and the creation of visibility splays. 4.5.21 – The need to construct safe access onto the highway is understood and accepted. Having reviewed the proposed locations for access points we would question if application of the illustrative drawing NHHM-NG-ENG-DWG-011 is required in all locations. Some of the access points where bell mouths are shown are onto tracks or public rights of way that will have very limited numbers of vehicular	**Application Document 2.12 Typical Design Drawings** includes an indicative bellmouth design to be used across the Project. **Application Document 6.4 Environmental Statement Chapter 4 Description of the Project** outlines the vegetation clearance requirements for the various elements of the Project and a commitment to retain vegetation where practicable is set out in

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
traffic using them, e.g. Retford Gate/Mill Lane (west of North Leverton windmill), and Springs Lane (west of Sturton Le Steeple). Where temporary bell mouths and visibility splays are required, it is requested that the approach set out in our comments on Vegetation clearance assumptions above to manage the vegetation rather than clear it is considered. Further comment on specific bell mouth proposals is made later in S.42 CONSULTATION PLAN SERIES review.	**Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Commitments and Actions.** National Grid will continue to engage with Nottinghamshire County Council in producing the detailed design for the Project, in it's role as local highway authority; and it should also be noted that **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order** contains a Protective Provision with Nottinghamshire County Council (as LHA), to ensure that the Council is notified of development affecting their assets during construction.
Chapter 6 – Landscape Data Sources 6.1.45 – The applicant team has referenced the East Midlands Region Landscape Character Assessment to inform Landscape Character within the development area zone of influence. It was highlighted in previous comments that assessments of Landscape Character should refer to the district level Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment, (LCA), to align with assessments for the other two districts, North Lincolnshire DC and East Riding DC. The applicant should clarify why this has not happened. Having reviewed the LCA, (https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/pqsnjkvk/bassetlawlandscapecharacter-assessment-compressed.pdf), the following policy zones are likely to be directly influenced by the proposed new OHPL route: • Idle Lowllands - IL01, IL03 • Mid Notts Farmlands - MN01, MN02, MN03, MN04, MN05, MN06, MN07, MN08, MN09, MN010 • Policy zones within the study area but not directly influenced are: • Idle Lowllands - L06 • Mid Notts Farmlands – MN11	The size and scale of the East Midlands RLCTs were considered more comparable to the North Lincolnshire and East Riding character areas; therefore, they were used for the landscape baseline, the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Areas (LCA) being much smaller. Information from the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment has been used to inform the baseline in **Application Document 6.6.A3 Appendix 6.3 Landscape Baseline and Assessment** but these are not assessed in their own right. The relevant policy zones are now listed out under the relevant RLCT in order to understand the effects A review of adopted neighbourhood plans was undertaken during the authoring of the landscape and visual chapters. These helped to inform selection of viewpoint locations and informed the descriptions of the baseline landscape and visual environment. However, the number of neighborhood plans along the route of the Project is noted to be limited so that level of information is not consistent across the study area.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
• Trent Washlands – TW20, TW21, TW23, TW24, TW25, TW44, TW45, TW46, TW47, TW49, TW50 Consideration of the information provided at a regional level has been undertaken and in general we are in agreement with the applicant. Neighbourhood Plans & Village Design Statements 6.1.51 – The chapter refers to consideration of Neighbourhood Plans & Village Design Statements as part of the process, yet this underlines the disconnect in assessment scale between use of Regional LCA and neighbourhood plans	
Construction year baseline (2028) 6.1.156 – The chapter states that other development proposals that do not currently have consent are not considered further within the PEIR. While it is understood these cannot be fully factored in at this time as consent may not be granted, it feels unwise to not have some consideration of major projects that may well get consent and are likely to be underway either before or at the same time as this development proposal. The most significant of these is the One Earth Solar Farm NSIP that is located all around the area of the proposed new High Marnham substation and has just been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for examination.	**Application Document 6.21 Chapter 21 Inter-project Cumulative Effects** presents the cumulative assessment for landscape receptors and considers other developments within the landscape and visual Zone of Influence (ZoI) including One Earth Solar Farm. The assessment has considered the contribution of the Project to the total cumulative effect created by the construction and operation of the relevant developments, including in respect of landscape effects.
Control & Management Measures 6.1.164 – LV01 – When considering mitigation planting it is requested the team refer to the respective Bassetlaw LCA species list.	As set out in **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan** where appropriate, the proposed species mixes for reinstatement planting will be selected to reflect the existing species and habitat compositions present on the site and this will be informed by the ecological surveys including tree and hedgerow surveys. In some cases, it may be inappropriate to reinstate the existing species, for example sites containing invasive plants or species at higher risk of disease. In these instances, alternative species mixes will be chosen. If difficulties arise with sourcing the proposed species mixes, alternative species will be discussed and agreed with the relevant local planning authority in

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	accordance with the DCO and REAC, which require that, prior to the commencement of the authorised development in any stage, a landscape and ecology management plan including a landscape maintenance and management plan (which must be substantially in accordance with the outline landscape and ecology management plan) shall be submitted to and approved by the relevant local planning authority.
Section 6.7 Preliminary Assessment Route section 8 - In reference to the information presented relating to the Regional LCA, we generally agree with assessment given and have no observations to make.	National Grid welcomes this feedback in agreement with the information presented.
Route section 9 – 6.1.230 Partially disagree with the statement here. In our view, at some locations that are slightly elevated, the introduction of pylons within the immediate landscape rather than being an existing distant feature associated with the cooling towers along the line of the River Trent, would alter the perception of rural tranquillity due to the connection of significant industrial infrastructure within that immediate location. The more distant industrial elements would feel zoomed in and magnified.	The initial sentence for 6.1.230 implies there would be no significant effects on landscape within Route Section 9. This was a misleading sentence as 6.1.229 clearly set out that significant effects on RLCT2b, 4a and 5b were likely. The initial sentence as 6.1.230 should have read 'Construction and operational effects on the *following* landscapes in this Route Section are unlikely to be significant'. **Application Document 6.6 Chapter 6 Landscape** provides the assessment on landscape character areas and a full assessment of each character area is provided in **Application Document 6.6.A3 Landscape Character Baseline and Assessment**. This maintains that effects on RLCT 3a, 3b and 4b would remain not significant for the reasons set out in the appendix, with significant effects identified for RLCT 2b, 4a and 5b.
Route section 10 – 6.1.236 In reference to the statement made here, the existing overhead power line running east to west between Hayton & Sturton Le Steeple is visible within this landscape for a reasonable distance north and south of the line which diminishes the statement this section is unaffected by existing OHPL. This noted, the point identified relating to 6.1.230 above would apply here as well,	The wording of 6.1.236 included additional text acknowledging existing overhead lines to the north and south of this Route Section. 'The Proposed Overhead Line would introduce a new 400 kV overhead line into a landscape that is currently unaffected by high-voltage electricity infrastructure, except at the northern and southern extents of this Route Section.' It went on to acknowledge that pylons would become a prominent feature and would lead to a noticeable

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
bringing pylons into the immediate setting and magnifying associations with more distant infrastructure.	loss of scenic quality and a diminished sense of tranquillity and rurality. **Application Document 6.6 Chapter 6 Landscape** provides the assessment on landscape character areas and a full assessment of each character area is provided in **Application Document 6.6.A3 Landscape Character Baseline and Assessment**. This has concluded there would be significant effects on landscape character for RLCT 4a and RLCT 5b for the reasons set out in the appendix.
Route section 11 - In reference to the information presented relating to the Regional LCA, we generally agree with assessment given. It is not anticipated there will be any significant Landscape effects within this route section as the area is already despoiled by numerous OHPL lines converging on the substation location.	National Grid notes this feedback.
Appendix 6.1 Landscape Assessment Methodology Apart from the statements made below we are satisfied the proposed methodology is well considered and provides a good framework for the assessment. Effect of pylons beyond 400m 2.3.7 – In relation to Table 2.1, Apparent height of 50 m structure when viewed at arm's length, this is a useful guide in gauging the likely effect of the proposed new pylons. However, we would dispute the claim that 'beyond this distance, (400m), the perceptibility of pylons approximately 50 m tall diminishes considerably'. Having tested this locally, we feel pylons would still be a significant element in the landscape at 500m+. This would diminish with distance but could still be a significant effect in a flat open landscape at 1km where their structures break the skyline.	National Grid agrees with this comment and the wording provided in **Application Document 6.6.A2 Landscape Methodology** and **Application Document 6.7.A2 Visual Methodology** has been updated. Receptors within the 5 km study areas for both landscape and visual have been assessed and effects reported accordingly.
Mitigation of Residual Effects 2.7.1 – The objectives/application of the statement made in this paragraph are unclear. Requestion for clarification	Clarification has been provided within the Environmental Statement within **Application Document 6.6 Chapter 6 Landscape**. The design

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	development of the Project is set out in **Application Document 5.9 Design Development Report.**
Appendix 6.2 Landscape Baseline Despite the use of the Regional Landscape Character Assessment, this document is a helpful resource in summarising the Landscape Baseline. We agree with the submitted assessments for the respective National Character Areas and Regional Character Landscape Types.	National Grid notes this feedback.
Chapter 7 – Visual Preliminary Assessment Assumptions and Limitations 7.4.42 – refer to comments made on Vegetation clearance assumptions under Chapter 4 above. Baseline conditions: Route section 8 – agree with the assessment provided except as noted below.	Comments addressed above and noted by National Grid.
– Proposed viewpoint locations: Five suggested locations are acceptable. We recommend the following additional viewpoints are included in the assessment: VP8.6 – North edge of Misterton village where Debdhill Road becomes Misterton Byway 1853°26'48"N 0°51'08"W ///prettiest.file.trinkets Recreational users of PRoW, campers and residents – existing OHPL 1.8km to east, proposed OHPL 1.8km to north and 1.5km to west. Angle of view - north and west VP8.7 – Cornley Road northwest of Misterton, just west of Cornley Drain crossing 53°27'19"N 0°53'13"W ///ritual.resurgent.detained Isolated residential farmsteads within the levels - proposed OHPL 1.3km to east. Angle of view – east.	Detailed comments on viewpoints locations were received from stakeholders as part of the landscape and visual technical working group. Suggestions for new viewpoint locations were taken forward with viewpoints added for the assessment. Viewpoint locations have been agreed with each stakeholder as referenced in the relevant Statements of Common Ground. Viewpoints are presented in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Parts 1 – 6) Route Sections A-F**. VP8.6 (now VP E-02) and VP8.7 (now VP E-01) have been added and baseline and assessment provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E.**
7.5.66 - General visibility	National Grid welcomes this feedback on good coverage being provided.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
We broadly agree with this statement where views are removed from existing pylons and power station infrastructure. Route section 10 – agree with the assessment provided except as noted below. 7.5.76 – Parishes. There are 33 parishes within this route section with 23 representative viewpoints. While all parishes do not have a representative viewpoint it is generally felt the selection identified provides a good coverage.	
7.5.77 Proposed viewpoint locations: The twenty-two of the twenty-three suggested locations are agreed as acceptable. We recommend VP23 is relocated to Wells farm in Fledborough Parish near the medieval village of Woodcotes, location details are given below. VP10.23 – (Alternative location) Wells farm near the medieval village of Woodcotes 53°14'09"N 0°49'36"W ///realm.stale.automatic Recreational users of PRoW and isolated farmsteads within the parish – proposed OHPL 0.7km to east, stretching north and south across view. Angle of view – north, east and south	VP10.23 (now VP F-04) was relocated as requested and the baseline for and assessment of this viewpoint is provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 6) Route Section F.**
We also recommend the following additional viewpoints are included in the assessment: VP10.24 – Cowsland farm, Grove Rd - west of South Leverton 53°19'15"N 0°51'44"W ///renovated.liberty.envoy Recreational users of PRoW and elevated isolated residential farmsteads – proposed OHPL 1km northeast and 1.3km to east, stretching north and south across view. Angle of view - north, east and south	VP10.24 (now VP E-23a and VP E-23b) was added as requested and the baseline for and assessment of this viewpoint is provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E.**
VP10.25 – N Green Rd northern part of East Drayton 53°16'11"N 0°50'15"W ///bullion.magnets.crawler Residents of East Drayton - proposed OHPL 0.7km to west. Angle of view – west	VP10.25 (now VP E-33) was added as requested and the baseline for and assessment of this viewpoint is provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E.**
VP10.25 – Askham Restricted Byway 7, east of the village on Eastcroft Lane 53°15'53"N 0°53'17"W ///barman.lobster.lavished	VP10.25 (now VP E-36) was added as requested and the baseline for and assessment of this viewpoint is provided in **Application**

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Residents of Askham and Recreational users of PRoW - proposed OHPL 2.8km to west. Angle of view – west.	**Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E.**
7.5.78 – Visual receptors This section refers to receptors that are considered to have a higher susceptibility to changes in their views as a result of the proposed OHPL. This list includes residents on the edge of Retford, and visitors to Millfield Golf Complex. Residents on the eastern edge of Retford are approx. 5km to the west and beyond the north south run of low hills. The Millfield Golf Complex is located east of the existing OHPL and approx. 4.75km from the new OHPL at its closest. It is therefore unclear why these receptors are likely to have a higher susceptibility. The Millfield Golf Complex is located east of the existing OHPL and approx. 4.75km from the new OHPL at its closest. It is therefore unclear why these receptors are likely to have a higher susceptibility.	As set out in **Application Document 6.7.A2 Appendix 7.2 Visual Methodology**, susceptibility is based on how much people would be focussed on views and not distance from the Project. For example, people engaged in recreation would have a high susceptibility as they are likely to have an interest in views, regardless of the distance to the Project. Distance comes into the assessment when considering the magnitude of change.
Route section 11 – agree with the assessment provided except as noted below Parishes: The paragraph lists thirteen parishes with only 3 representative viewpoints proposed. This is deemed as acceptable as this route section is the end of the proposed new OHPL and several of the parishes identified within the study area are beyond the terminal point. Preliminary Assessment This section provides a preliminary assessment of effects upon individual parishes and other identified receptors. We are generally in agreement with these assessments unless noted in comments below	National Grid welcomes this feedback on good coverage being provided.
Route section 8 Misterton parish – The proposed new OHPL is located to the north and west of the village as well as partially to the south at distance. This in combination with existing 2 OHPL to the east could combine to have a notable overall effect on local residents.	National Grid notes this comment. **Application Document 6.7.A4 Visual Baseline and Assessment** sets out the detailed assessment of the community area (parish) of Misterton. This has identified a major adverse (significant) effect as the Project introduces new pylons

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	into the views from the western edge of the community area, which is currently unaffected by existing pylons.
Walkeringham parish – Similar issues to Beckingham above but less intense with proposed OHPL to the west and 2 existing OHPLs to the east.	National Grid notes this comment. **Application Document 6.7.A4 Visual Baseline and Assessment** sets out the detailed assessment of the community area of Walkeringham. This has identified a moderate adverse (significant) effect as the Project introduces new pylons into the views to the west of the community area, which is currently unaffected by existing pylons, although receptors do benefit from some filtering from vegetation.
Gringley on the Hill parish – While this parish does have distant views of the existing OHPL along the Trent valley, the proposed new OHPL will pass much closer bringing pylons into the mid distance stretching across the parish. This is likely to be a notable effect.	National Grid notes this comment. **Application Document 6.7.A4 Visual Baseline and Assessment** sets out the detailed assessment of the community area of Gringley on the Hill. This has identified a moderate adverse (significant) effect as the proposed overhead line would become a prominent feature, although would appear backclothed, or seen against landform, from some locations which would reduce its prominence. The assessment also acknowledges a major adverse (significant) within 200 m of the proposed overhead line.
Users of the Trent Valley Way – we feel the assessment underestimates the extent of sequential effect along this long-distance path. We would estimate that sequential effect would be experienced for 3km of the route where it runs almost parallel to the route over Misterton Carr.	The Trent Valley Way is considered in **Application Document 6.7 Chapter 7 Visual.** It is noted since PIER stage, the route of the Trent Valley Way has been updated and no longer follows the Chesterfield Canal near Misterton Carr, but follows a route closer to the River Trent to the east of the Project. Six viewpoint locations have been used to consider the effects on sequential views along the footpath. The Project interacts with the Trent Valley Way to the north of the M180 and near Haxey Gate where it acknowledged in the visual assessment that there would be significant effects for people using the footpath in both construction and operation, although limited to areas within 500 m of the Project. In other views from the footpath, the proposed overhead line would be seen in the context of other

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	overhead lines and wind turbines and would not change the overall character of views
Users of the Chesterfield Canal – Effects will be the same as user of the Trent Valley Way.	The baseline and effects on users of the Chesterfield Canal are described in **Application Document 6.7 Chapter 7 Visual**. The assessment has identified a moderate adverse (significant) effect for users of the canal within the study area. Mitigation planting has been proposed along a section of the canal to reduce the effects for users when in closest proximity to the proposed overhead line.
Route Section 9 • • All assessments are agreed	National Grid welcomes this feedback.
Route section 10 • Sturton Le Steeple parish – We anticipate there will be notable effects in and around Sturton Le Steeple due to the major convergence of OHPL at this location. Three OHPL already exist close to the east and northeast of the village with the proposed new OHPL arriving close to the northern edge of the village before heading southwest interrupting currently views west and southwest. While the village has a long-standing association with OHPL in and around their parish the quantity and extent of impact will be magnified by the new line.	National Grid notes this comment. **Application Document 6.7.A4 Visual Baseline and Assessment** sets out the detailed assessment of the community area of Sturton le Steeple. This has identified a moderate adverse (significant) effect as the Project introduces new pylons into the views to the west of the community area, which is currently unaffected by existing pylons. Mitigation planting is proposed to the west of the village to reduce the effects on views, but even with some filtering the effect would remain significant.
• South Leverton parish - We feel the assessment in this paragraph underplays the potential level of effect as the proposed new OHPL would be on elevated ground within 1km of the village.	National Grid notes this comment. **Application Document 6.7.A4 Visual Baseline and Assessment** sets out the detailed assessment of the community area of South Leverton. This has identified a moderate adverse (significant) effect as the Project introduces new pylons into the views to the west of the community area, which is currently unaffected by existing pylons.
• Askham parish – We feel the proposed new OHPL would be visible on elevated ground and have recommended an additional viewpoint on the eastern edge of the village to help determine this.	**Application Document 6.7.A4 Visual Baseline and Assessment** sets out the detailed assessment of the community area of Askham. This has identified a minor adverse (not significant) and, although no

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	formal viewpoint location was added, considered the views from the eastern edges of the community area.
• East Drayton parish -We feel this evaluation is underplayed as the proposed new OHPL would be located in close proximity to the western and southern edges of the village with views of the line extending northward and southeast. The proximity of this new industrial feature is likely to generate a much greater visual effect.	National Grid notes this comment. **Application Document 6.7.A4 Visual Baseline and Assessment** sets out the detailed assessment of the community area of East Drayton. This has identified a major adverse (significant) effect as the Project introduces new pylons into the views to the west of the community area, which is currently unaffected by existing pylons.
• Fledborough parish – While there are limited residential receptors within this parish the effect of the proposed new OHPL is likely to be prominent for those in central part of parish where the alignment creates a wrap-around effect with the proposed new substation to the south.	National Grid notes this comment. **Application Document 6.7.A4 Visual Baseline and Assessment** sets out the detailed assessment of the community area of Fledborough. This has identified a moderate adverse (significant) effect as although views contain a number of existing overhead lines, the Project would spread the effect of infrastructure over a wider area.
• Dunham on Trent parish – We feel effects on residents in the west of this parish are likely to be increased due to the introduction of the proposed new OHPL, that will give views of OHPL to both the east and west.	Although as illustrated by VP E-37 in **Application Document 6.7.A4 Visual Baseline and Assessment**, the proposed overhead line would be visible from the western parts of the community area, residential receptors along Laneham Road would have filtered views due to vegetation within property curtilages. The more open views would be limited to road users, where views are influenced by the existing ZDA 400 kV overhead line in close proximity. The main settlement is located between the two existing ZDA and 4VE 400 kV overhead lines and pylons are a common element of views in and around this community area. Additional pylons to the west would not have a significant effect.
Route section 11 • • National Cycle Network route 647 – The applicants assessment claims the proposed new OHPL would not change the overall character of the views along this route. However, we feel the	The effects on users of National Cycle Network 647 are described in **Application Document 6.7 Chapter 7 Visual**. The assessment has identified a minor adverse (not significant) effect for users as pylons are already a prominent element within views and the Project would not fundamentally change the character of views from the cycle route.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
additional line will extend the negative sequential visual effect further westward and magnify the issue overall.	
Appendix 7.1 Visual Assessment Methodology Apart from the statements made below we are satisfied the proposed methodology is well considered and provides a good framework for the assessment. Residential Visual Amenity 1.3.4 – The approach outlined in this paragraph is welcomed. 2.3.7 – see comments made on Effect of pylons beyond 400m under Appendix 6.1 above	National Grid notes that the methodology and approach to residential visual amenity assessment is agreed.
Viewpoint selection 2.4.5 – The approach to report visual effects by jurisdiction boundaries of parishes is accepted as a reasonable method to establish a broad understanding of local residents living and moving around the study area. Considerations of Magnitude 2.5.5 – We support the points made here in that the nature of the scene needs to be taken into account. While open extensive views are likely to have a greater level of effect, it is worth considering the potential impact of a contained view where a framed pylon within moderate distance could potentially be more significant.	National Grid notes the acceptance of reporting effects by parishes. To consider other views within the parishes in addition to the viewpoints, the assessment has been undertaken through site visits and is not limited to the images provided. A full parish description, analysis and assessment with additional images is presented in **Application Document 6.7.A4 Appendix 7.4 Visual Baseline and Assessment.**
Geographical Extent of Effect 2.5.7 – Reference to GLVIA3 - Notes and Clarifications the final sentence needs to be considered carefully. 'Open views of a development from long stretches of a more frequently used section would be expected to contribute to a greater extent (and magnitude) of effect than a glimpsed view from an overgrown section with little sign of recent use'.	Frequency of use of a PROW has not been used in the assessment of visual effects. The assessment has assumed that any PROW shown on the definitive maps could be used at any time. The assessment of PROW is wrapped into the assessment on communities presented in **Application Document 6.7.A4 Appendix 7.4 Visual Baseline and Assessment.** Only National Trails and long distance recreational routes are assessment in their own right, but also do not consider frequency of use.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
We feel the last part of this sentence could be a dangerous precept if applied rashly. Just because a PROW has not been actively used for a while its relevance is not diminished. Popularity can change and overgrowth can be removed very swiftly by change in ownership or management practice.	
Appendix 7.2 Proposed Viewpoints This appendix provides a concise summary sheet for each of the representative viewpoints identified along with an image of the view and map locations. These are welcomed in aiding the overall evaluation and unless identified otherwise we are in agreement with the applicants' statements.	National Grid welcomes this feedback.
VP8.2 – Haxey Gate Inn - The angle of view only covers the north. As the proposed new OHPL wraps around this location it would be helpful to extend the view around to the west to provide views along the river giving a complete picture of the existing setting. Descriptions and evaluations for view given are agreed. Extend view angle from west through to north and update assessment.	Since the statutory consultation, the viewpoint references have been amended. The responses below provide the updated viewpoint references for pre-exisiting viewpoints and additional ones for the new viewpoints. VP 8.2 (now VP D-18a and D-18b) has been extended into two images to show the view north and west and baseline and assessment provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 4) Route Section D**.
VP8.4 – Haxey Water Tower - This elevated view provided here is facing east towards the village of Haxey. While the proposed new OHPL does run across the view in this direction, it does so at approx. 3.25km distance beyond the urban structure of the village. The line also warps around this location running across the view south, (approx. 2.9km closest distance), which is low lying tree covered farmland from this elevated vantage point. Descriptions and evaluations for view given are agreed. Either extend the view angle to include east through to south or change the view angle to south and update assessment.	VP D-16 has been added to show a more southerly view as requested, and the baseline and assessment is provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 4) Route Section D.**
VP8.5 – Chesterfield Canal –The angle of view provided is of a south-southeast orientation towards Gringley on the Hill, while we agree this is an important view to consider the line also extends north across	VP8.5 (now VP E-06a and E-06b) has been extended into two images to show a wider panorama, and baseline and assessment is provided

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Misterton Carr levels. Given the openness of this landscape, we the view angle is extended to 180º to provide a fuller representation of the wider landscape at this location. Descriptions and evaluations for view given are agreed. Extend the view angle to include north through to south and update assessment.	in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E.** Vegetation to the north side of the canal screens views to the north from the canal, so a view north is not presented.
VP9.1 – Wood Lane (Beckingham) - Descriptions and evaluations for view given are agreed. Adjust or extend the view angle to the west to consider the landscape where the proposed new OHPL passes closest to this viewpoint, approx. 1.4km. Update the assessment.	VP9.1 (now VP E-08a and E-08b) has been extended into two images as requested and a description of the baseline and assessment provided is provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E.**
VP9.2 - Gainsborough (Edge of River Trent) – The susceptibility assessment states that receptors in this location would be partaking in outdoor recreation that would not involve an appreciation of the view. We would disagree with this as most users of the riverside path would take in the river scene and open countryside beyond as part of their recreational enjoyment. However, we confirm our agreement that susceptibility levels are considered Medium due to the adjacent urban environment of Gainsborough town.	Noted. VP9.2 (now VP E-09) baseline and assessment is provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E.** Wording for susceptibility has been amended as it is agreed that there would be some appreciation of views from this location.
VP9.3 - Cave's Lane (Walkeringham) – Value of View here is evaluated as High. It's unclear how this evaluation has been reached as while the view is scenic there is nothing really notable about it and a line of wooden poles and overhead lines cross the scene. We would place the Value of the View as Medium.	VP9.3 (now VP E-05) baseline and assessment is provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E.** Wording for value has been amended to medium as suggested.
VP9.4 - Beacon Hill (Gringley on the Hill) – Disagree with the Value of View assessment. Due to its historic association and cultural reference, this view pushes into the Very High category in regard to Value of View. This is supported when cross referenced against the applicant's assessment of other views that are evaluated as having High value where they do not have the historic and cultural association or elevated, panoramic extent of view, e.g. view 9.3. VP10.3 – Missing	VP9.4 (now VP E-07) baseline and assessment is provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E.** Wording for value has been amended to very high as suggested. It should be noted that no VP10.3 was presented at PEIR stage in Appendix 7.2 Proposed Viewpoints, as noted in the introduction to the document on page 5.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
VP10.6 a-c - North Leverton Windmill – This series of images are generally poor and fail to provide a clear representation of views around the designated historic asset. While the descriptions and evaluations may be correct this is difficult to gauge given the poor images presented. Viewpoint locations should be reviewed to provide better vantage points with clearer lines of sight to the windmill that provide the landscape context needed to demonstrate the assessment made.	Viewpoint locations for the North Leverton Windmill have been reviewed with new locations added to show the windmill within the wider landscape. Photos have been retaken and provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E**. • VP E-18 represents the view towards the Project from within the windmill grounds. • VP E-19 represents the view for people arriving at the windmill on Mill Lane • VP E-20 represents a view from the east near North Leverton • VP E-21 has been added to show the wider context of the landscape around the windmill • VP E-22 is a more distant view from the edge of South Leverton • VP E-23a represents a more elevated view to the southwest of the windmill from Grove Road
VP10.7 - Retford Road (South Leverton) – The applicants assessment states the Value of View here is High. Apart from a distant glimpse of North Leverton windmill there is nothing really notable about the view, which is general open farmland with a line of wooden poles and overhead lines crossing the scene. We would place the Value of the View as Medium. It is unclear why the angle of view selected is northwest when the route of the proposed new OHPL is closer and more evident immediately west. Either extend the view angle to include west through to northwest or change the view angle to west.	VP10.7 (now VP E-22) was included to show the more distant view of the North Leverton Windmill and its wider context. The baseline and assessment is provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E.** Wording for value has been amended to medium as suggested. The view further to the left (west) is screened by a hedgerow and properties and therefore the view direction has not been amended.
VP10.8 – Grove – The image provided is looking southeast which does not match the angle of view shown on the viewpoint location map and would be a more oblique distant view towards the proposed new OHPL. Angle of view should be slightly south of east as shown	VP10.8 (now VP E-25) baseline and assessment is provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E.** The map shows the correct angle of view for the image provided. In response to this comment, a

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
on the viewpoint location map. Viewpoint image needs replacing and assessment updating.	new viewpoint has been added (VP E-24) to show the view further east as vegetation blocks the view left from this viewpoint.
VP10.10 - Town Street (Treswell) – The applicants assessment states the Value of View here is High. It's unclear how this evaluation has been reached as while the view is scenic, there is nothing really notable about it. Wooden poles and overhead lines are located close by around this viewpoint and can be seen crossing the horizon line in google earth from this location, we would place the Value of the View as Medium.	VP10.10 (now VP E-27) baseline and assessment is provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E**. It was considered that as people leave Treswell travelling west, the landscape becomes more scenic with an increase in mature vegetation and apart from more distant wood pole lines, there are few detractors, but agree, in review of other locations, that the value is medium and this has therefore been updated.
VP10.11 - Treswell Road (Rampton) – While we generally agree with the applicant's assessment here, the description notes 'No pylons are present in the view' yet fails to note the wooden poles and overhead lines prominently located to the left of the view. Description should be reviewed and updated after being cross referenced against the applicant's assessment of other similar views.	VP10.11 (now VP E-28) baseline and assessment is provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E**. A comment about the presence of wooden poles has been added to the baseline description.
VP10.12- Retford Road (Woodbeck) – The scene from this viewpoint is very similar to that experienced at VP10.10, however the applicant's evaluation comes to different rating for Value of View. We agree with the Value of View given at this viewpoint, which is Medium. While the direction of view is directly towards the proposed new OHPL, the view does open up to the south and it would be desirable to extend the field of view to include views southwest as well as west.	VP10.12 (now VP E-29) baseline and assessment is provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E**. This view has been microsited and rotated to show the view to the southwest as requested.
VP10.13 - Lambwell Road – The applicant's description of the view is agreed, however, similar to some of the other assessments it's unclear how Value of View is assessed as High, given the description provided. This evaluation should be cross referenced against the applicant's assessment of other similar views and the findings updated accordingly.	VP10.13 (now VP E-35) baseline and assessment is provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E**. Wording for value has been amended to medium as suggested.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
VP10.14 – Main Street (Stokeham) – The view presented here is facing southwest which would be a more oblique and distant view of the proposed new OHPL, which would be closest immediately west of this location approx. 1.2km. Either extend the view angle to include southwest through to west, or change the view angle to west and update assessment.	VP10.14 (now VP E-31) baseline and assessment is provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E**. This view has been rotated to show the view to the west as requested.
VP10.16 – Darlton Road (East Drayton) – While this location is important to capture any effects of the proposed new OHPL as it wraps around the village to the south, we have identified a additional viewpoint looking west within the village that would provide greater understanding of the development's effect to the west and northwest at a relatively close distance.	VP E-33 has been added within the village of East Drayton to consider views west and requested. The baseline and assessment is provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E**.
VP10.18 – A57 (Darlton) – The view presented here is facing northeast which is directly towards the proposed new OHPL, however, given the close proximity of the development as it wraps around this village, we would recommend the angle of view is extended to take in views from north, through east around to southeast. The evaluation and findings should be updated accordingly.	VP10.18 has been split into three viewpoints, VP E-38a, E-38b and E-38c as requested to show the extent of the proposed overhead line as it passes to the south of the village. The baseline and assessment is provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E**.
VP10.20 – Bole – The view presented here is facing northwest away from the proposed new OHPL which is most closely located to the southeast of the village at approx. 1.4km. Change the angle of view to southeast, then review and update the assessment.	VP10.20 (now VP E-13) has been rotated as requested and baseline and assessment are provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E**.
VP10.22 – Fledborough Beck – View presented is south-southeast when the proposed new OHPL is southwest of this location at approx. 1.2km. While the image and description for the view presented south provides a useful context to the wider surrounding scene, views to the west are open and interrupted by existing OHPL. Either extend the view angle to include west through to south or change the view angle to southwest then review and update the assessment.	VP10.22 has been split into two viewpoints, VP F-03a and F-08b to illustrate the extent requested. The baseline and assessment is provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 6) Route Section F**.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
VP10.23 – Green Lane / Far Road – The selection of this viewpoint location seems rather random being neither associated with the edge of a settlement or a PRoW. We would recommend this viewpoint is relocated to our alternative position identified earlier, at Wells farm near the medieval village of Woodcotes. This would represent recreational users of PRoW and isolated farmsteads within the parish with the proposed new OHPL approx. 0.7km to east. As the new OHPL would stretch north and south across view we recommend the angle of view includes north through east to south to give the full context of this location, close to the proposed new High Marnham substation.	VP10.23 (now VP F-04) has been relocated to the suggested location near Wells Farm. The baseline and assessment are provided in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 6) Route Section F**.
Volume 4 – Photomontages The applicant has presented three photomontages of the development within Nottinghamshire. These have been reviewed and are commented on below. Photomontage 7 View from Beacon Hill at Gringley on the Hill (Section 9, LVIA Proposed Viewpoint 9.4). The existing baseline image demonstrates the huge panoramic view available from this elevated historic landmark. On closer inspection the applicant has incorrectly identified several features evident within the scene that need correcting. A copy of the image has been marked up with corrections and appended to this response. This should be confirmed and then updated for the full submission. The visualisation provided on the second sheet clearly shows the extent of impact likely to be experienced here. While the existing view has many industrial elements visible within the wider panorama these are all distant and relatively insignificant within the wider scene, the proposed new OHPL will be much more prominent bringing pylons directly into the midground, crossing the entire view angle and then	New photomontages have been produced and are presented in **Application Document 7.16 Photomontages**. The photomontages are no longer annotated so that the labelling does not distract from the image. Labels for this viewpoint (now E-07) are included in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E** which describes the magnitude of change from the proposed overhead line. Although the proposed overhead line is closer, it is seen against landform which reduces its prominence.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
also extending away into the distance from this location northeast towards Haxey.	
Photomontage 8 View from Retford Road at North Leverton (Section 10, LVIA Proposed Viewpoint 10.6C As mentioned previously, the selection of viewpoint here is poor the scene constrained. It is felt that a better vantage point could be identified at this sort of distance to give a more representative view with more context available. This should be explored by the applicant and refreshed if possible. From the view presented in the visualisation on the section sheet, the proposed new OHPL is unlikely to have a major effect upon this view from a Landscape perspective but may be more of an issue in terms of Heritage setting.	New photomontages have been produced and are presented in **Application Document 7.16 Photomontages**. This includes updates to previous photomontages and new locations, which have been agreed with stakeholders as part of the viewpoint selection process. VP E-21 has been included as a photomontage to show the wider context of the landscape around the windmill.
Photomontage 9 View from Darlton (Section 10, LVIA Proposed Viewpoint 10.18) The existing baseline image presents a scene of open farmland with dominant industrial infrastructure evident along the horizon line. This includes the former West Burton and Cottam power stations and extensive runs of existing OHPL. While the scene already has an industrialised backdrop the visualisation on sheet two shows the effect the proposed new OHPL would have on receptors at this location, bringing pylons and associated power lines prominently into the foreground stretching across the entire scene. While the level of effect will undoubtably be strong and adverse, the distance between existing OHPL and the proposed new line ensure the two elements are not discordant in the view. Given the scale and length of new OHPL proposed, we would recommend a few additional photomontages are prepared. Suggested additions are as follows: a) Elevated views from the low hills west of the proposed new OHPL looking east. Potential locations could be viewpoint 5a/b or our	New photomontages have been produced and are presented in **Application Document 7.16 Photomontages**. This includes updates to previous photomontages and new locations which have been agreed with stakeholders as part of the viewpoint selection process. This includes an elevated location near Cowsland Farm on Grove Road (VP E-23a) and from East Drayton looking west (VP E-33). Although not all locations suggested were taken forward as photomontages, all viewpoint locations have an accompanying wireline presented in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment.**

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
additional viewpoint at Cowsland farm, Grove Rd - west of South Leverton, (see location information in comments on Chapter 7 Visual 7.5.77). b) Views from villages on the eastern edge of the low hills looking west towards the proposed new OHPL where no major industrial infrastructure is currently evident within the view. Potential locations could be viewpoints 10.10 Town Street (Treswell), 10.12 Retford Road (Woodbeck) or 10.14 Main Street (Stokeham looking west)	
Chapter 20 – Substations and associated works Overall statements made in this chapter are noted and generally accepted. Any observations or comments are given below. Preliminary Environmental Information for the Proposed Substation Works at High Marnham Landscape 20.5.7 – While the rationalisation and re-configuring of OHPL coming into the proposed new substation may lead to an overall net loss in overhead lines and pylons, this is unlikely to give any significant landscape of visual beneficial effect as there will still be numerous sets of OHPL converging on this one point. 20.5.14 – This paragraph claims; the impact of (OHPL) infrastructure is often locally mitigated by the trees and woodlands around the substation and former power station, along the disused rail line, and around the small villages. We would disagree, while there is tree cover around the proposed substation location there are just too many OHPL coming into this one location for them all to be mitigated from any particular view. While the overall quantity may be reduced visually the adverse effect remains. 20.5.21- Based on the available reviewed information at this stage, we confirm that in our opinion the proposed new High Marnham substation is unlikely to generate any substantial negative effects in relation to Landscape and Visual matters.	Following statutory consultation on the Project in 2025, a decision was taken to remove the 400 kV High Marnham Substation and associated works from the Project. A planning application for the High Marnham Substation (25/01302/FUL) was submitted by National Grid in November 2025 to Bassetlaw District Council and has subsequently been approved in 2026. Negotiations with land owners to acquire by agreement are still ongoing. A full description of the design evolution of the Project is provided in **Application Document 5.9 Design Development Report**. The assessment has not identified any beneficial effects from removal of pylons and acknowledges adverse effects for visual receptors from the presence of the proposed overhead line as illustrated by the viewpoint assessment presented in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 6) Route Section F.**

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Chapter 21 – Cumulative effects A review of this chapter was undertaken which included both a review of the long list and those projects shortlisted. We are generally in agreement with the complied short list and have only a few observations to make as set out below. From review of the long list, we would like further clarification why the following projects have not been progressed to the shortlist: EN101162 20/01405/FUL 23/00801/FUL 23/00656/FUL	The comments have been addressed in **Application Document 6.21 Inter-Project Cumulative Affects Assessment** 353 – EN010162 - Great North Road Solar Project: this omission was in error – now added to ES long/short list 261 – 20/01405/FUL - Solar Farm Tiln Lane Retford = this project has been constructed and is now operational – any remaining construction will be complete before the construction of the Project commence and therefore, it has not been included in the baseline. 323 – 23/00801/FUL – Land at High Marnham Power Station has now been added to ES long/short list 324 – 23/00656/FUL – Solar development - North of Brick Yard Road Gamston – again has been included on short list but under 21/01634/SCR (should have been listed under accepted application ref - 23/00656/FUL)
Also from review of the long list, we would like further clarification why the following project has been progressed to the shortlist: 22/01477/SCR	Although the development was not required to submit an environmental statement, which implies significant cumulative effects were not considered likely (this being a Schedule 3 screening consideration), because of the close proximity of the development to the Project, it has been screened in for assessment at Stage 3/4 on a precautionary basis
Planning application known about that do not feature on the long list: 24/01186/FUL	This application was validated after the cut-off for inclusion in the PEIR. It is included in the long list and assessed in **Application Document 6.21 Inter-Project Cumulative Affects Assessment.**
S.42 Consultation Plan Series The plan series drawings were reviewed to evaluate the level of Landscape & Visual effects from vegetation clearance practices to enable safe delivery and operation of the works. General comments on proposed vegetation clearance and construction practices are made earlier under Chapter 4. Below are comments on proposals at specific locations.	National Grid appreciate the detailed feedback provided, this has been considered as part of ongoing design development. **Application Document 6.4 Environmental Statement Chapter 4 Description of the Project** and **Application Document 2.13 Trees and Important Hedgerows to be Removed or Managed** detail the vegetation clearance requirements for the various elements of the Project and a commitment to retain vegetation where practicable is set out in

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Route section 8 - Sheet 3 - Visibility splays Cattle Rd, Misterton near pylon 4AF178. Coppice or crown lift trees on the corner rather than clear if possible. Route section 9 - Sheet 1 - Visibility splays around B1403 / Walkeringham Rd junction by pylons 4AF187 & 4AF188. Proposed clearance looks excessive, can this not be rationalised. If full clearance extent is required look to coppice than remove, (as discussed earlier), if possible. Route section 9 - Sheet 2 - Visibility splays A631, Misterton near pylon 4AF192 Coppice area within splay rather than clear if possible. Route section 9 - Sheet 4 - Bell mouth junction and Visibility splays A620, between pylons 4AF202 & 4AF203. Consider moving the proposed bell mouth junction southwest along the road further away from the bend to avoid the need to remove mature Sycamore trees prominent by the roadside where it rises up the hill. Propose coppice to ground existing mixed species hedge within splay rather than clear if possible. Route section 10 - Sheet 1 - Visibility splays Gainsborough Road, north of Sturton Le Steeple east of pylon 4AF208. Retain vegetation on lower part of bank and coppice splay area if possible Route section 10 - Sheet 2 - Visibility splays Springs Lane, west of Sturton Le Steeple near pylon 4AF215. Rationalise and minimise vegetation clearance for splay as access is onto a rural no- mettled track rather than a regular road. Coppice any splay requirements rather than clear if possible. Route section 10 - Sheet 3 - Visibility splays Retford Gate track, west of North Leverton by pylon 4AF222. Rationalise and minimise vegetation clearance for splay as access is onto a rural nonmettled track rather than a regular road. Mature Oak on north side Ashley Lane, east of the proposed bell mouth. Retain Oak tree if not needed to be cleared for line compliance and minimise impacts upon the tree from splay requirements.	**Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Commitments and Actions**.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Route section 10 - Sheet 4 - Visibility splays Forewood Lane, west of Treswell between pylons 4AF229 & 4AF230. Rationalise requirements of large splay area, coppice to ground if possible. Route section 10 - Sheet 5 - Visibility splays Ashley Lane, southwest of Treswell near pylon 4AF232 Mature Oak on north side Ashley Lane, east of the proposed bell mouth. Retain Oak tree if not needed to be cleared for line compliance and minimise impacts upon the tree from splay requirements Coppice splay requirements on hedgerow rather than clear if possible. Route section 10 – Sheet 5 - Visibility splays Retford Road, west of Woodbeck near pylon 4AF234. Protect mature Oak west of the proposed bell mouth access. Retain Oak tree if not needed to be cleared for line compliance and minimise impacts upon the tree from splay requirements. Coppice splay requirements on hedgerow rather than clear if possible. **Summary and Recommendations** Approach to clearance – As highlighted in both Chapter 4 and in the Plan Series comments, vegetation clearance should be considered carefully and minimised wherever possible. While the needs for safe construction and operational activity are paramount the loss of mature vegetation within the landscape can have a devastating effect and take decades to recover in the case of mature trees, with all the negative ecological and environmental impacts that includes.	
Chapter 6 Landscape – The applicant team have determined to use the East Midlands Regional Landscape Character Assessment rather than the local Bassetlaw LCA. This contrasts with the approach given to East Riding and North Lincs councils which have both been considered at the local level. A clear and justified reason for this approach is required.	For large linear infrastructure that can extend for many kilometres, the assessment needs to demonstrate how the route relates to regional landscape patterns, whether it introduces incongruous elements across different character areas, and the cumulative effect of infrastructure across the wider landscape. A local landscape character assessment is not well placed to address these broader relationships as it is typically focused on a relatively small geographic area. In addition, because local landscape character assessments are highly fine-grained, they can place undue emphasis on small-scale

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	variations that are not meaningful at the scale of an overhead line, while also under representing wider strategic sensitivities, such as extensive open landscapes where pylons may be highly visible. This imbalance can lead to misjudgement of the significance of landscape and visual effects within an LVIA. Furthermore, linear schemes require consistency along their entire route, which is a key challenge in LVIA. If local landscape character assessments are relied upon, different sections of the route may be assessed using varying methodologies or classifications, depending on how each local study has been prepared, resulting in a fragmented assessment approach rather than a coherent, consistent narrative of effects across the full alignment. Best practice guidance (such as GLVIA3) advocates a tiered approach to landscape character assessment, using national and regional-scale character areas to understand the broader landscape context and likely impacts, with local landscape character areas then applied to provide finer-scale detail where appropriate. The Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment (Bassetlaw District Council, 2009), describes the landscape character of the Bassetlaw District Council administrative area through a series of Policy Zones, each of which is assigned landscape management objectives such as conserve, reinforce, or restore. However, this level of detail is not consistently available across the full extent of a 5 km study area and therefore including it would not be consistent across the whole project. Policy Zones are listed under the relevant RLCT for information but are not assessed as individual receptors, as set out in **Application Document 6.6.A3 Appendix 6.3 Landscape Baseline and Assessment**.
Appendix 6.1 Landscape Methodology – This document provides useful guidance on the likely visual effects of pylons within the landscape including a scale of perceived height when viewed at arm's length. While we do not dispute the calculations, we are concerned	National Grid agrees with this comment and the relevant wording in **Application Document 6.6.A2 Landscape Methodology** and **Application Document 6.7.A2 Visual Methodology** has been

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
the applicant team feel any pylon beyond 400m distance will be perceptibly diminished within the view. From ground testing locally this does not seem to be the case and we would urge the team to re-evaluate this stance.	updated. Receptors within the 5 km study areas for both landscape and visual have been assessed and effects reported accordingly.
Chapter 7 Visual – The parish-based receptor approach is a helpful way of considering effects across a wider community within a local typical landscape type. This has on the whole identified local traits and given some good evaluations. However, the difficulty comes when considering specific views presented. Is the assessment: 1. Of that individual representative view or 2. The wider views within the parish, of which the image given is a typical example If the approach follows option 2 then the applicants' team needs to take into account features and attributes that are out of shot. This complex variable appears to have generated some discrepancies in the presented information. It is recommended that this is reviewed and clarified within the team before any further viewpoint photography and analysis is undertaken ahead of the full ES. Within the time and resource available, we have identified several additional viewpoints along the line of the new OHPL. This should not be taken as the final exhaustive list as further development of the scheme may throw up additional sensitive views that have no similar representation within the full set of images. The team should therefore continue to consider particular aspects of the scheme and where additional viewpoints may help demonstrate a point or effect. The applicants' team should update the missing conservation areas on the Viewpoint location plans and check all other designation assets are correctly identified and included.	Detailed comments on viewpoints locations were received from stakeholders as part of the landscape and visual technical working group. Suggestions for new viewpoint locations were taken forward with viewpoints added for the assessment. Viewpoint locations have been agreed with each stakeholder as referenced in the relevant Statements of Common Ground. Viewpoints are presented in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Parts 1 – 6) Route Sections A-F**. Although **Application Document 6.7.A3 Viewpoint Assessment** provides baseline photos and information about selected viewpoints within the study area, the assessment of visual effects is primarily based on site surveys with judgements made over a number of visits to each community. Figures have been updated with the missing conservation areas and the viewpoint assessment acknowledges when viewpoint locations are located within this designation, with the value of views judged accordingly.
7.2 Proposed Viewpoints – While this series of summary pages is really useful the quality of images provided at the foot of each page was variable and in quite a few cases poor with excessive contrast	A full set of winter photography was taken over 2025/2026 to ensure consistency and quality of images. This is presented in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment**. It should

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
making features within the image difficult to see. See example of submitted VP 10.11 at Rampton below in comparison with a google earth image from the same location. These images should be updated, preferably with winter views as well as summer views ensuring light contrast within the image is balanced to enable clearly discernible features. The applicants' team also need to review and agree on the relative components and detracting features that determine the Value of View in the visual assessment. There are numerous occasions within this appendix where almost identical views are given different Values of View, creating a very confused baseline. The team should undertake a cross-referencing exercise between individual views where components and context are similar to determine the agreed value in line with the guiding principles set out in the methodology. In addition to the conflicting results identified above, on quite a few occasions the selected angle of view was directed away from the proposed new OHPL. This would seem counter intuitive to us and the applicants' team should clarify why this angle has been selected if not an error. We are in favour of providing wider context to the scene, particularly as the views are being considered on a parish representative basis and have therefore recommend that wider panoramas are presented at a number of locations where the development would extend across the entire 180ºof view or where the line wraps around a specific viewpoint.	be noted the google street view images are taken at higher eye level (as the camera is mounted on top of a vehicle) and a wider field of view so images will not show the same visibility and extent as at eye level and fixed 50mm lens. Values have been checked. Although views from some locations may look the same, the value of the view takes into account other factors, for example where the viewpoint is within a local designation, which could elevate the value of the view. Directions have been updated where required, extending panoramas to two images where required to show a wider field of view.
Volume 4 Photomontages – The image quality of the photomontages is very good allowing detail analysis of the view presented, both at baseline and with the proposed new OHPL inserted. However, identification of key points within the view is significantly incorrect in Photomontage 7 and needs rectifying. (Marked up image appended). The location selected for Photomontage 8 is very poor generally and does little to help analysis of effects upon this important heritage asset. It is felt there is likely to be a more suitable viewpoint location	A new series of photomontages have been provided in **Application Document 7.16 Photomontages**. The photomontages are no longer annotated so that the labelling does not distract from the image. Labels for this viewpoint (now E-07) are included in **Application Document 6.7.A3 Appendix 7.3 Viewpoint Assessment (Part 5) Route Section E**. Winter photography was retaken in March 2026. Locations for photomontages have been agreed with each stakeholder as referenced

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
that allows the heritage asset to be seen in its wider surrounding context. This should be explored further. We have identified two further Photomontage locations that we feel would assist in evaluation of the development. Similar to the points made above on viewpoint images, this should not be considered an exhaustive list.	in the relevant Statements of Common Ground, with 33 locations being provided including an additional location for the North Leverton Windmill to replace Photomontage 8.
Highways and Transport Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) is the Local Highway Authority (LHA) for the Project within Bassetlaw, Nottinghamshire. The LHA provides its observations on the local transport patterns and issues relating to this proposal and potential impact upon the associated Local Road Network (LRN). The LHA has reviewed Chapter 14 (Vol 1) (81) Vol 2 (75) Vol 3 (137)(15)(45) of the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) and the associated supporting information (statutory consultation plans & typical design drawings) for the major replacement 400KV overland transmission line & pylons project, stretching 90km's from the Humber to the existing High Marham substation, in Bassetlaw	The Applicant notes this response
The works will be significant, but the LHA acknowledges these will be phased and disruption is likely to affect areas on a temporary, medium term basis. The works mainly affect the surrounding villages along the following designated routes once the project enters Bassetlaw from the North Lincolnshire Council border; Route Section 8 Misterton to Walkeringham, Route Section 9 Walkeringham to N Wheatley, Route Section 10 N Wheatley to Fledborough and Route Section 11 Fledborough to High Marnham. The works will predominantly affect the highway network around the villages of Misterton and Walkeringham (Route 8), Bawtry to Gringley on the Hill, Beckingham, Saunby and Bole (Route 9) N & S Wheatley, W Burton, Sturton-Le-Steeple, N & S Leverton, Treswell, Woodbeck, Retford to N Wheatley & N Leverton, Stockham, Laneham, E Drayton, Darlton, Ragnall and Fledborough (Route 10); High Marham (Route 11).	The Applicant notes this response, however for further details, **Application Document 7.4: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** should be referred to.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Construction traffic routes have been established and Primary Access Routes (PAR) developed for each Route Section (8-11) from specified compound/site accesses or 'off' across land haul routes to the existing Main Route Network (MRN) and Strategic Route Network (SRN). PAR's affecting Bassetlaw are labelled PAR 74-124, 153-155,139-147 and affect circa 61 road links. These have been selected according to shortest travel distance along higher category local road network avoiding constrained road geometry, junctions, height & weight restrictions, and precluding sensitive locations such as schools/hospitals/play areas/retirement homes – Please note there are 2 low bridges on Route Section 10 (PAR 99) that appear to have been overlooked - marked below for reference	The Applicant notes this response.
The Bassetlaw area contains several environmental weight limits, low bridges, and level crossings. Encourages early consultation with its Highway Service Partner – VIA East Midlands Ltd to limit environmental annoyance to affected villages/residents and to ensure works programmes are not hindered. Contacts tro@viaem.co.uk abnormalloads@viaem.co.uk. The LHA has already supplied the promoter/ transport consultants with the NCC 'blanket' 18 tonne environmental weight limit plan that affects the Sturton Le Steeple area.	This was discussed at regular meetings with the Nottinghamshire Highway Authority and information regarding the environmental weight limits was provided by VIA East Midlands Ltd. **Application Document 5.8.8 Statement of Common Ground - Nottinghamshire County Council** sets out the engagement activities which have taken place between the Applicant and Nottinghamshire; specifically in the section on highways matters.
Appendix 14.1 Baseline Conditions gives a description of each PAR, including the type of carriageway, character, speed limits, highway constraints, presence of street lighting, bus routes and on-carriageway parking, and pedestrian, equestrian and cycle provision. A description, location, and the sensitivity level of identified Sensitive Receptors within the study area are summarised in Table 4.1 within Appendix 14.1 and presented on Figure 14.2 Sensitive Receptors. Sensitive receptors and sensitive areas include schools, play areas, care / retirement homes, disabled parking bays, hospitals, places of worship, historic buildings as well as trafficked highways with on-road pedestrian / cycle routes.	The Applicant notes this response

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Also there are roads located on the highway network (LRN) where haul road crossover points are located. Appendix 14.1 also presents Baseline traffic flows from a series of Automatic Traffic Counters (ATC) surveys undertaken over a 7-day period during the weeks 24 June 2024 and 1 July 2024, (non-school holiday neutral period), on most of the roads proposed as PARs. This data was used to establish the future baseline (peak of construction activities in 2028). See 14.5.7	The Applicant notes this response
Other Baseline Conditions 14.5.20 Collision data from STATS 19 DfT Road Safety information has been analysed to identify any collision clusters on the PARs associated with each designated route using the following criteria: A: A location where there are six or more injury collisions occurring within a junction or a 100 m stretch; and B: A location with three or more fatal and/or serious collisions happening either within a junction or within a 100 m stretch. This identified accident clusters on Route Section 10 – PAR 97-99 & 105 Other primary & secondary sources of data that have been gathered and examined as part of the assessment:	The Applicant notes this response
Automatic Traffic Counts (ATCs), Manual Classified Link (MCL) counts via cameras, and Radar Surveys, were used to obtain traffic flow data for a seven-day period during the weeks commencing 24 June 2024 and 1 July 2024 for roads proposed as PARs; • Identification of constraints on the highway network (such as height and width restrictions, on-street parking, visibility constraints, or capacity issues on roads and junctions of the PARs), obtained from Google imagery of the highway network;	The Applicant notes this response

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
• Identification of pedestrian, horse-riding and cycle infrastructure provision along the PARs, obtained from Google imagery of the highway network; • PRoW routes digitised from OS and Local Authority data.; • Road collision data for the latest available five-year period (2022-2024, noting that COVID lockdown years were excluded) for all the roads and junctions on the PARs, from STATS19 database (DfT); • Public transport information for the PARs, including bus routes and bus stop information obtained from the Local Authorities websites and google imagery of the highway network; • National Cycle Routes obtained from Sustrans; • Ordnance Survey (OS) 1:10,000, 1:25,000, 1:50,000 and 1:250,000 base mapping; • OS AddressBase Plus data; and • Aerial mapping.	
Further data to be collected to inform the Environmental Statement 14.4.9 In addition to the data collected to inform the PEIR, the Traffic and Transport chapter of the ES will be informed by the following additional third-party data or surveys: • Traffic and speed surveys – on roads forming the PARs where data has not previously been collected, on roads forming alternative access routes (if required), at haul road crossover points (if required). The requirement, scope and location of the surveys will be discussed and agreed with, the Local Highway Authorities. • Information on other committed development within the study area received from relevant Planning Authorities. • Committed transport schemes along and in the vicinity of PARs; and • Further, more detailed collision data rather than using the STATS 19 data	The Applicant notes this response

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
14.4.10 Assessment Methods & Criteria (Page 18) Table 14.4 shows the Receptor Sensitivity Criteria along with 14.4.13 which is the general criteria for Magnitude of impact. 14.5.7 To estimate future travel demand and traffic growth, (Trip End Model Presentation Program) TEMPro traffic growth has been applied to 2024 traffic flows & future baseline 2028 for peak construction activity. These growth factors are derived from the National Trip End Model (NTEM) and are essential for transport planning and assessment. The Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) flows have been converted into 12 hr flows over the time period 7-19.00 by applying appropriate factors based on recorded ATC data to give a 2028 future baseline for comparison purposes, shown in Appendix 14.2. Construction traffic forecasts are based on an initial estimate of construction materials, deliveries, programme, using first principles and experience of similar projects. These are considered to provide a reasonable worst-case scenario, with the peak month of activity being assessed as set out in Appendix 14.3 Preliminary Construction Effect. It is intended any committed/consented development that that are not already included in the TEMPRo growth figures but could potentially generate additional traffic along the construction routes are assessed and included in the follow up Environmental Statement (ES), if appropriate. The HA is content with this approach, however it should be noted there is no base-line or source data to compare these forecasts against. Furthermore, the LHA has not had sight of breakdown vehicle movements for material deliveries or contractor/worker movement View our privacy notice at www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/privacy Nottinghamshire County Council, County Hall, West Bridgford, Nottingham NG2 7QP forecasts. Therefore, the LHA requests examples of how this data has been developed, so this can be sense checked/validated.	All construction traffic forecasts have been updated since the PEIR stage and are included within **Application Document 6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Traffic and Transport.**

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
The requirement for further impact assessment has been identified where the preliminary construction effects may give rise to any significant traffic and transport effects. This is based on the Institute of Environmental Management Assessment (IEMA) criteria for Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic and Movement 2023 (Ref 14.4.1 – Para 2.16). The was a recommendation made by the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State at the SCOPING OPINION stage: This assessment looks at: 1-Potential effects related to driver delay;2-Potential effects related to pedestrian, cyclist and horse-rider delay, severance, and amenity;-Potential effects related to fear and intimidation; and4-Potential effects on collisions and road safety.Rule 1: include highway links where traffic flows will increase by more than 30% (or HGV increase by more than 30%): and Rule 2: include any other particularly sensitive areas where traffic flows have increased by 10% or more. The Local Highway Network (LHN) affected in Bassetlaw is shown in Section 1.9 (Page 23 onwards) of Appendix 14.3 - Preliminary Construction Effect which sets out the forecasted increase in traffic movements during the peak activity of the project month for each PAR. These have been assessed against the assigned sensitivity of each road link. It should be noted due to the 90km length of the Project, the impact from construction traffic will be localised with each Route Section experiencing different levels of impact across the peak construction years. For example, there could be a peak of activity around Route Sections 1 and 2, but much reduced levels of activity in the other Route Sections.	The Applicant notes this response
14.7.9 The forecast increases for 12-hour HGV flows (07:00-19:00) do not exceed the 10% threshold (for sensitive roads) or 30% threshold (for non-sensitive roads) on the majority of the assessed local road links forming the PARs. Where the thresholds are exceeded, as set	The Applicant notes this response

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
out in within Appendix 14.3 Preliminary Construction Effects, these will be subject to further assessment within the follow up ES	
14.7.16 The Preliminary Assessment of the Potential Effects is set out in Table 14.10, where, using the assessment criteria set out in Table 14.6, each PAR is evaluated. 14.7.17 Effects predicted to be 'major' or 'moderate' are considered significant, whilst effects predicted to be 'minor' or 'negligible' are considered not significant. Considering the road sensitivity of the PAR, most roads shown modest impact with percentage increase in traffic flows below the 30% IEMA threshold. However, the assessment shows the following highway links require further investigation as traffic flow increase is potentially high: Route Section 8 Misterton to Walkeringham. PAR 77 (Cornley Road) PAR 78 (Carr Lane) PAR 79 (B1403 Church Street) PAR 80 (Cattle Road) Both PAR 78 (Carr Lane) and PAR 79 (B1403 Church Street) have a high sensitivity and an increase of 222 HGVs per day which is around 18 per hour. Please can the applicant confirm if this is one way HGV movement?	Full updated results of the traffic assessment are now included within **Application Document 6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Traffic and Transport.**
Route Section 9 Walkeringham to North Wheatley All below the 30% threshold increase except PAR 84 (Walkeringham Road) has 43.2% but this road is not considered sensitive, so no further assessment is proposed. Unfortunately, the HA cannot easily locate this PAR label on the plans so is unable to agree this at this stage	Full updated results of the traffic assessment are now included within **Application Document 6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Traffic and Transport.**
Route Section 10 N Wheatley to Fledborough	The Applicant notes this response

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
All forecasted traffic increases on these PAR's are below the 30% threshold.	
Route Section 11 Fledborough to High Marnham All forecasted traffic increases on these PAR's are below the 30% threshold. Note in 14.7.18 PIER Volume 1 the following links have been predicted as experiencing a significant effect, but they do not feature in the same category in Appendix 14.3 tables: PAR 74 A161 Station Rd + PAR 128 Norfolk Bank West, PAR135 Meredyke Rd West, 136 B1392 Eastoft Rd. Please can this be clearly explained by the applicant.	Full updated results of the traffic assessment are now included within **Application Document 6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Traffic and Transport.**
The preliminary assessment of the Proposed Substation Works is presented in Chapter 20 Substations and Associated Works 14.7.28 Shared receptors between the Proposed Overhead Line and Proposed Substation Works at High Marnham: A57 located north of the Proposed Substation Works; Main Street, Ragnall; Access Road to Fledborough; Polly Taylors Road; Skegby Road; Marnham Road; Tuxford Road; Normanton Road; Hawbush Road; and Fledborough Road. 14.7.29 Taking account of the embedded measures set out in Chapter 4 Description of the Project and the control and management measures as set out in Appendix 4.1 Draft Outline Code of Construction Practice (where is this?) any potential effects from the	Full updated results of the traffic assessment are now included within **Application Document 6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Traffic and Transport.** Note that the substations are no longer considered as part of the Project

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Proposed Substation Works are not likely to be significant, and, when considered together are unlikely to change the preliminary significance that is presented in this chapter.	
General notes The LHA will need to see detailed drawings showing the highway works for each primary/secondary access location or any localised widening for vehicle passing/waiting. These need to be annotated with dimensions of junction radii, widths, visibility envelopes plotted, speed limit of the road and extent of adopted public highway, the type of construction (materials), and any ancillary works such as drainage/ditches, together with any permanent or semi-permanent signs. If any footways are affected, then details of kerbing/vehicle crossing points should be shown. All primary & secondary compound accesses require vehicle tracking Vehicle Path Analysis (VPA's) for a 16m long artic HGV. The largest Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL's) need to be considered separately. Also please indicate whether the improvement works are temporary or to be retained.	As set out in the SoCG, information has been shared with the Local Highway Authority (LHA) at regular meetings and at scheduled workshops. As the Project progresses to detailed design, further information will be shared with the LHA.
Stage I Road Safety Audit (RSA) should be undertaken in accordance with HD 19/15. In principle, DMRB standards for sight stopping distances (SSD) according to speed limit will be required on A & B class roads, strategic movement routes and/or routes that primarily convey traffic from one settlement to another. In certain circumstances on quieter low speed rural roads MfS standards may be appropriate with full justification and agreement with the HA.	It has been agreed that a Highway Safety Review will be produced in place of a stage 1 RSA. **Application Document 5.8.8 Statement of Common Ground - Nottinghamshire County Council** sets out the engagement activities which have taken place between the Applicant and Nottinghamshire including this discussion point and the agreement reached. The Highway Safety Review will be included within **Application Document 7.15 Transport Assessment.**
Layout geometry of compounds, primary & secondary accesses – indicative drawing(s) NHHM-NGENG-DWG-0011 & 12 need to show more key dimensions, extent of public highway, the accurate location of any highway assets, lamp columns, signposts etc, hedges/fence-lines (retained or to be removed), VPA of longest low-loader/AIL entering exiting the site, need to be macadam surfaced and	**Application Document 2.12 Typical Design Drawings** includes an indicative bellmouth design to be used across the Project. These will be further developed throughout the course of detailed design and include additional information beyond that included in the indicative design; and will be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval via the discharge of requirements.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
independently drained for 20m's from rear of the public highway to accommodate a normal length HGV clear of the public highway.	**Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** establishes how AIL movements will managed, included a detailed Abnormal Indivisible Load strategy appended to the document.
All temporary construction sites/accesses/compounds should include proactive measures to prevent deleterious construction material and mud being transferred to the public highway i.e., wheel wash facilities integrated with the site entrance.	As detailed in **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments**, wheel washing facilities will be provided at each compound and intermittently along construction access tracks. Road sweepers will be deployed on public roads where necessary to prevent excessive dust or mud deposits.
The proposed Project appears to affect circa 38 No minor public highways (PRoW) in Bassetlaw. The promoter is advised to liaise with specialists Countryside Access Countryside.Access@nottscc.gov.uk to agree processes for temporary closures/diversions and treatment of these areas.	PRoWs have been discussed at regular meetings with the Nottinghamshire LHA and the Councils PRoW team. Temporary closures/diversions have then been the subject of further discussions. **Application Document 5.8.8 Statement of Common Ground - Nottinghamshire County Council** sets out the engagement activities which have taken place between the Applicant and Nottinghamshire; specifically the section on highways. PRoW proposed to be closed, managed and diverted are set out within **Application Document 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan.**
Mitigation Mitigation measures relevant to traffic and transport effects fall into 3 categories: embedded mitigation measures (such as optimising use of overland haulage routes, workers travelling outside the traditional peak hours, minimising impact from construction vehicles in villages using TTRO / restricted parking / traffic lights); control and management measures (Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) & Public Rights of Way Management Plan PRoW MP); and any additional mitigation measures required.	**Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan and Application Document 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan** have been produced as part of the Application. Outline Management Plans will be developed into full Management Plans and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval, via discharge of requirements
14.2.8 Paragraph 5.14.11 National Policy Statements for Energy & Electricity Networks Infrastructure (NPSs) state: 'Where mitigation is	The Applicant notes this response

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
needed, possible demand management measures must be considered. This could include identifying opportunities to: • Reduce the need to travel by consolidating trips; • Locate development in areas already accessible by active travel and public transport; • Provide opportunities for shared mobility; • Re-mode by shifting travel to a sustainable mode that is more beneficial to the network; • Retime travel outside of the known peak times; and • Reroute to use parts of the network that are less busy'	
14.6.11 & 14.6.12 discusses Control & Management measures and include a Draft Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) is provided in Appendix 4.1 Draft Outline Code of Construction Practice in Volume 3. The LHA is not sure where this is located? It is the applicant's intention to produce a series of environmental management plans prior to the commencement of the Project and the LHA supports these forms of control.	The CoCP is provided as **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice**
The LHA recommends the CTMP & PRoW MP includes management measures and controls such as: - a. Delivery Management System (DMS) and Traffic Management and Monitoring System (TMMS); Ensuring that all drivers of vehicles under the control of the applicant are made aware of the approved arrangements; The disciplinary procedures that will be exercised in the event of contraventions. b. Suitable HGV Routes; Appropriate temporary route signage and arrangements to limit movements on undesignated roads. These details are to be approved by the LHA and erected advising drivers of the vehicle routes agreed. c. HGV and LGV Timing Restrictions;	All management measures specified have been referenced in the relevant locations within **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** and **Application Document 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan**.

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
d. HGV Movement Monitoring; Rolling record of all daily vehicle movements to/from site. e. HGV Emission Standards; f. Communications Strategy; g. Road Condition Surveys; Any poor sections unsuitable for access may need repairs h. Site Access Arrangements; i. Escort, permits and traffic management for AILs; j. Interactions with pedestrians and cyclists; and k. Marshals and Site Management. l. Workforce travel plan m. Construction Method Statement n. The applicant should include a contingency paragraph in the CTMP which would allow for the LPA-HA to request the applicant/operator reviews the routing strategy and implements measures to use other permitted alternative /routes to be agreed with the LPA, if problems are being experienced. o. Provision of welfare facilities, hard surfaced & drained car parking spaces, loading & unloading areas, turning and dedicated material storage within the site. Provision of dedicated car parking spaces fitted with an EV fast charging point (minimum specification - 7w Mode 3 with Type 2 connector, 230v AC 32 Amp single phase dedicated supply)	
The detailed CTMP should include the name, telephone number, email contact information packs and out of hours details of the principal contractor etc carrying out the works. These details need to be also erected on information signs in a prominent position near the site entrance for public awareness, complaints procedures and health & safety reasons. After the construction and during the decommissioning works the HA will expect the applicant to thoroughly clean the public highway and	National Grid welcomes this feedback. TTROs have been discussed at regular meetings with the LHA. **Application Document 5.8.8 Statement of Common Ground - Nottinghamshire County Council** sets out the engagement which has taken place between the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council. The proposed TTROs are set out within **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order** and also illustrated within **Application Document 2.5 Traffic Regulation Order Plans** .

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
any road gullies for 500m either side the primary site access(es). This obligation needs to be added to the CTMP. The proposed Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTRO) are reasonable in principle subject to further and continued liaison with roadworksnorth@viaem.co.uk.	
The DCO should be developed to explicitly contain a mechanism that allows coordination of any programmed works with any existing utility works, so that the LHA can help to minimise overall environmental and operational disruption on the highway network. The LHA needs to ensure its statutory duty to secure the expeditious movement of traffic on the highway network is not compromised. Any powers to undertake works on the highway network should not fully circumvent the LHA's system to coordinate road works and powers to impose a TTRO should remain with the County Council who will carry out the necessary promotions and consultations. Speed limit reductions through villages to reduce risk to pedestrians and highway users - this needs Temporary Traffic Management Plan (TTM Plan). There should be comprehensive liaison about programme, TTRO, street works, partial or full closures and temporary activities in the highway with NCC's Highway Services Partner VIA EM Ltd streetworks@viaem.co.uk. Temporary activities in the highway | Nottinghamshire County Council	**Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order** includes the provision for all TTROs required for the construction of the Project. It should also be noted **Application Document 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order** also contains a Protective Provision with Local Highway Authorities, to ensure they are fully notified of development affecting their assets during construction. **Application Document 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** also contains a commitment to work proactively with the Local Highways Authority and coordinate with stakeholders, to ensure disruption to the highway network is reduced as much as possible.
Any ditches watercourses to be culverted – recommend liaison/communication with NCC LLFA flood.team@nottscc.gov.uk	The Applicant notes this response
It is advised the applicant contacts [redacted] – [redacted] Bassetlaw Highway Manager to sense check the proposed construction traffic routing against any known recorded environmental complaints about HGV movements in rural villages.	The Applicant notes this response
The LHA is satisfied and comfortable with the proposed HGV delivery & worker routing arrangement, using mainly Strategic Road Network	National Grid welcomes this feedback**.** Environmental weight limit areas have been discussed at regular meetings with the Highway

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
(SRN) & Main Route Network (MRN) to the proposed site accesses. Some primary and secondary accesses & PAR's are within environmental weight limit areas. These routes should be ok to use on a temporary basis, as it is believed that deliveries to a construction site will be exempt. The application is advised to contact [redacted] (Team Manager - Enabling works) [redacted] for confirmation.	Authority. **Application Document 5.8.8 Statement of Common Ground - Nottinghamshire County Council** sets out the engagement activities and the agreed approach regarding the environmental weight limit areas.
The LHA is reasonably content with the overall approach, assessment methodology and scope of work for the transport impact assessment and intended management controls for the project.	National Grid welcomes this feedback
The proposed assessments appear to be suitable in principle to support these early stages of the DCO. There are a few minor issues/discrepancies that require further clarification and these are identified above. However, the LHA accepts provision of further data and details throughout this iterative process may fully explain these issues.The LHA is committed to work collaboratively with the promoters, throughout the various milestones of the Project and looks forward to receiving further detailed information.	National Grid welcomes this feedback and has ensured ongoing engagement with the LHA as set out in **Application Document 5.8.8 Statement of Common Ground - Nottinghamshire County Council**
Public Rights of Way The Council has checked the Definitive Map for the site plan of National Grid Humber to High Marnham (Route section 8 – 11) and can confirm that there are at least 32 Public Rights of Way (PRoW) that cross the areas identified in the PEIR and associated maps. The correct legal alignment of the public right of way can be checked by carrying out an official search, contact row.landsearches@nottscc.gov.uk. Inaccuracies or misalignments of the routes on a legal diversion may result in two paths being legally recorded, generating further inaccuracies and problems. PRoW are the minor highway element of the public highway network and are afforded the same level of protection and control as the major highway network (i.e. all classes of roads in including motorways).	National Grid welcomes this feedback. Detailed proposals for temporary measures relating to PRoW are included in **Application Document 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan.** Compliance with NPPF is set out in **Application Document 5.6 Policy Compliance Document**

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
They are a material condition in the planning process and due attention should be made to the treatment of them in the application for development. They form part of the sustainable transport network that has links to healthy living, reducing carbon footprints, safe non-motorised links to local facilities, so it is important ensure that they are linked to the other networks and are of a good design that encourages safe use. Paragraph 105 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance PROW including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users. Paragraph 117 states applications should prioritise pedestrian and cycle movements and create places that are safe, secure and attractive, minimising the scope for conflicts between users and vehicles.	
There are also links with the Nottinghamshire Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2022-2026 to reduce obesity through exercise and ensure opportunities are available in the local area and for general living; and Nottinghamshire Sustainable Community Strategy 2010-2020 which is developed in conjunction with all districts to provide opportunities for safe walking and cycling links and to reduce vehicle use. Partnership working with NCC under Local Transport Plan 2011 – 2026 to promote safe nonmotorised routes, connectively and economic growth. Encouraging developers to engage fully in utilising the available PRoW network by upgrading facilities in conjunction with good design principles will help to deliver on these policies.	Detailed proposals for temporary measures relating to PRoW are included in **Application Document 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan**
It is rare that the impact on the PRoW network would provide a reason to refuse planning permission, however development can have a major impact on the quality of the route. A change in type of user or frequency as a result of the development needs to be accepted by the developer and consideration of the location, amenity and construction of the path as a result. This can all be accommodated appropriately using good design principle from the	Detailed proposals for temporary measures relating to PRoW are included in **Application Document 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan**

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
start to enhance the public willingness to use and make use of the PRoW network to achieve the policy aims of sustainable and safe transport corridors linking to the wider network, health and wellness of the local population, provision of good amenity and enjoyment.	
The developer has provided a clear map with where PRoW interact with the proposed line of pylons. Overall the developer shows good consideration and appreciation of how the development will affect PRoW in the area. It is also encouraging to see that they have been correctly included in Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport Chapter of the PIER as well as tourism. The developer has also already been in contact with the Rights of Way team to discuss the project.	National Grid welcomes this feedback. Detailed proposals for temporary measures relating to PRoW are included in **Application Document 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan**
The developer should continue to work with the Rights of Way Team on the next stages of design to ensure the following measures and conditions are met • Correct route of public rights of way It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that their application takes account of the legally recorded route and width of any public rights of way as recorded in the definitive map and statement. This may differ from the line walked on the ground and may mean there are more than one route with public access. The legal width of public rights of way may be much wider than the habitually walked or ridden width. The correct legal alignment of the public right of way can be checked by carrying out an official search, contact row.landsearches@nottscc.gov.ukThe developer should also be aware that there are 'claimed paths' in the area. These are PRoW that are going through the legal process of being added to the definitive map. Land searches can further advise with where these are and how they may affect the project. Table 1 contains the definitive map checks of the names of the Rights of Way against the ones stated in the PEIR. The developer has used	PRoWs and the list of measures and conditions have been discussed at regular meetings with the Nottinghamshire County Council Highways team and information regarding the project proposals has been shared between parties. **Application Document 5.8.8 Statement of Common Ground - Nottinghamshire County Council** sets out the engagement activities which have taken place between the Applicant and Nottinghamshire. Specifically the section on Highways which covers the PRoW proposed to be temporarily closed, diverted or managed are set out within **Application Document 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan.** • The PRoW information used in the application was sourced directly from Nottinghamshire County Council definitive map team. • Detailed proposals of temporary measures relating to PRoW are included in **Application Document 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan.** • As the project is linear in nature it has not been possible to avoid temporary closures entirely. Detailed proposals for temporary measures relating to PRoW are included in **Application Document 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan.**

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
a combination of Ordnance Survey and Local authority data. It is important to understand that there are PRoW, promoted routes, and permissive paths on Ordnance Survey maps. The PROW have legal protection and a legal line (the 'official route') that may may not be accurate on Ordnance Survey maps. The promoted routes and permissive paths need to be considered but do not fall under the same responsibility of the highway authority. You need to inform the landowner/promoter of the associated promoted routes and permissive routes. These have been noted in Table 1, but it is up to the developer to authenticate and contact the relevant party. • Protection, Mitigation and Improvements of routes Public rights of way through the site need to be integrated with the development and provided to a standard to meet the pressures caused by the development. Assessments of current condition need to be undertaken along with proposals for onsite mitigation and improvement measures. If new links across the network are created the developer must understand the difference between dedicated and permissive routes. All of the above measures need to be agreed in advance with NCC. All necessary PRoW mitigation and improvement measures onsite need to be undertaken prior to occupation to ensure public amenity is maintained. • Protection of public rights of way and users Routes must remain useable at all times during a development's construction lifecycle. This means temporary or permanent surfacing, fencing, structures, and signing need to be agreed with NCC and provided prior to the commencement of any construction and continue throughout. Access provision for walkers, cyclists and horseriders as vulnerable road users needs to be maintained. This means ensuring noise, dust, vehicle etc impacts are prevented. A detailed plan on keeping the public safe during construction will be required as well as a transport plan. Please	• Many of the additional points made relate primarily to developers proposing permanent changed to PRoW. Such changes are not proposed by the Applicant. • **Document 6.16 Chapter 16 Noise and Vibration** includes consideration of impacts upon different public rights of way (PRoW) user groups. The assessment identified potential short term effects, but these are not significant due to the transient nature of users. However, mitigation (such as localised screening) would be incorporated into the works, where feasible and appropriate, to reduce effects. This is committed to through various measures set out in **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** This is particularly pertinent for areas where there are horses, or where horses may be expected to be traversing, such as bridle paths. Where construction works would be close to areas where horses are located, or where they may be expected to regularly traverse, the contractor(s) will follow British Horse Society guidance 'Advice on construction sites and horses', as per commitment in **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments.**

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
consider that even with any closures in place it is highly likely that members of the public will try to continue to use the PRoW, so where possible a robust safety plan without a closure will reduce most problems e.g having banksmen for stopping vehicles. • Temporary obstructions and damage No materials, plant, vehicles, temporary structures or excavations of any kind should be deposited / undertaken on or adjacent to the PRoW that obstructs the PRoW whilst development takes place. Avoidable damage to PRoW must be prevented. Where this takes place repairs to original or better standard should be completed withing 24hrs unless a longer repair period is authorised by NCC. • Route alterations The development should be designed and implemented to fit in with the existing public rights of way network. With alterations being the last resort. No changes to the public right of way's legally recorded direction or width must be made without first securing appropriate temporary closures (with or without diversions) or permanent extinguishments (with or without diversions) through separate legal process. Note that there are legal mechanisms to change PRoW when it is essential to enable a development to take place. But these mechanisms have their own process and timescales and should be initiated as early as possible. It is advised that the developer contact the Countryside Access team dealing with definite map order for further clarification. • Adjacent gates Any gates provided in association with the development shall be set back from the public right of way or shall not open outwards from the site across the public right of way. • Bridges / drainage Any bridges that are on site should be assessed prior to development. Any changes/improvements should be discussed	

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
with NCC, and where appropriate the EA and IDB. Flood levels should have been assessed and local drainage issues considered. Development should not further worsen drainage issues but should seek to improve them. • Structures/ Furniture (Gates etc) Any new structure on existing RoW will requires authorisation of the highway authority and can only be made under certain criteria. • Hedges/screening Existing boundaries and hedgerows are the responsibility of the land owner to ensure they do not obstruct a PRoW. Where additional hedges/natural vegetation is proposed a lifetime management regime needs to be agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council as local Highway Authority to ensure that public access is not impeded when the vegetation screen is established or during the development or hedge/screen's lifecycle • Biodiversity Net Gain Care should be taken not to include the surface of a PRoW in any BNG of similar calculations. Any planting should take place at suitable distances from PRoW. Making sure that they do not enclose or encroach the PRoW. With particular attention to the change in surface and canopy cover as vegetation matures e.g. not planting on the very edge of the PRoW. A management regime should be agreed with NCC. • Enclosure and Proximity Pylons and working areas should be appropriately set back from PRoW. Any hedging or fencing needs to be set back and maintained to provide the full corridor width for the duration of the development. Fencing type should be checked against Rights of Way standards with NCC. Consideration should be taken to minimise enclosure effects and not make the PRoW intimidating to use.	

Nottinghamshire County Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
• Surface Surfaces of PRoW must not be disturbed or changed without prior discussion with NCC. For example: a previously grass surfaced path must not have hardstanding laid across without consent. Consideration should be taken on how traffic movement will impact the surface and appropriate measures put in place • Noise and vibration Consideration should be given the impact of construction on different user groups. Paying special attention to PRoW used by horse riders and the potential of spooking horses. The ROW Team wishes to continue its contact with the developer to ensure that the PRoW network remains safe and with minimal disruption to users.	

Office of Road and Rail Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Thank you for consulting the Office of Rail and Road (ORR) regarding the North Humber to High Marnham: Notification of statutory consultation project. The relevant teams at ORR have provided the following comments: We have looked at the proposals for the upgrade to the electricity transmission system that will run over the eleven sections shown below. Route Sections 2, 3, 8, 10 and 11 all have interfaces with the rail infrastructure. Route Section 11 appears to suggest pylons will be installed over a current rail tunnel. Where as, Route Section 8 is going to run directly between level crossings on the rail infrastructure. Network Rail will have a vested interest in all of these project interfaces with the rail infrastructure.	National Grid welcomes the feedback and acknowledges that Network Rail will have a vested interest in the Project interfaces with rail infrastructure.
The project needs to ensure that the temporary construction sites adjacent to the railway do not damage the infrastructure, especially significant structures such as tunnels. Construction activities between the two level crossings in Route Section 8 may negatively impact the	National Grid notes the concerns raised by the Office for Road and Rail in relation to the protection of rail infrastructure and the potential for blocking back at the level crossings. National Grid can confirm that the Project has been designed and assessed to avoid adverse effects

Office of Road and Rail Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
road/rail interface for pedestrian and vehicle users of the crossing. It may also create a blocking back issue over the crossing, hence increasing the safety risk at the two crossings.	on existing rail infrastructure and railway operations. **Application Documents 7.4 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** includes measures to manage construction traffic routeing vehicle movements and access arrangements in the vicinity of railway crossings. These measures are intended to ensure that construction traffic does not queue over the crossings thereby avoiding any safety risk to railway operations or highway users.
The project (you) should ensure that they (you) engage with the appropriate Network Rail Level Crossing team to ensure that any risks created by the construction activities near the crossings are managed. If any of the rail infrastructure where it interfaces with the project is electrified, i.e. has overhead power lines, for train running, discussion with Network Rail is advised to ensure that Network Rail electrical assets are not negatively impacted, and any temporary power outages etc. for construction purposes do not hinder Network Rail's ability to maintain the infrastructure.	National Grid is in consultation with Network Rail in consideration of these matters.
Also, we do not believe that there is any railway 25kV overhead line equipment in the area. However, should the new transmission line cross or run parallel to electrified railways there is a risk of inducing electrical energy into the electrified railway systems.	National Grid note this feedback.
The project (you) should contact Network Rail to find out what distance from the railway the power cables can be installed to avoid induction. If this is not possible, then Network Rail may have to introduce additional arrangements to manage induced voltages.	National Grid can confirm that the Project has engaged with Network Rail through out the pre application stage.

Sky Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Please be advised that Sky Telecommunications Services Ltd will not be affected by your proposal.	National Grid notes Sky Telecommunications Services Ltd. comments.

Sky Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Best endeavours have been made to ensure accuracy, however if you require further information, please contact us by email at nrswa@sky.com	

South Leverton Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
South Leverton Parish Council's response is as follows, which is the same it has sent to Bassetlaw Planning 25/00214/PREAPP The Council submitted the following to Bassetlaw Planning: "South Leverton Parish Council formally object to the proposed routing of pylons through the open land that separates our village from Retford, as detailed in your document library (https://www.nationalgrid.com/the-great-grid-upgrade/north-humber-high-marnham/document-library.	National Grid notes the Parish Council's objection to the Project and acknowledges the concerns raised. National Grid has sought to engage with the Parish Council throughout the consultation process and has considered the feedback received as part of the ongoing design development and assessment process. The matters raised by South Leverton Parish Council have been taken into account in the preparation of the application documents, including the Environmental Statement and supporting assessments. National Grid will continue to engage with the Parish Council throughout the examination process during which further representations can be made to the Examining Authority.
1.Environmental Impact: The proposed route would have a significant adverse impact on the local ecosystem. The installation of pylons and associated infrastructure risks disrupting local wildlife habitats, altering drainage patterns, and degrading the natural landscape. Such environmental degradation could have long-term consequences for both flora and fauna in the region.	National Grid has sought to reduce, as far as practicable, impacts on the environment through routeing and siting and an ongoing iterative design process, which has taken on board feedback at different stages of the Project. The iterative design process has sought to avoid areas of highest concern, for examples through changes to the route alignment or changes to the methods of construction. National Grid have engaged with a range of stakeholders (including Statutory Environmental Bodies and relevant Local Authorities) throughout the development of the Project's design and environmental assessment work. National Grid has provided information in the identification and assessment of likely significant effects, which is provided in the Environmental Statement (ES) that accompanies the Application. As part of the preparation of the Environmental Statement for the Project, a suite of ecological surveys has been undertaken to identify protected and notable habitats, flora and fauna within the Project

South Leverton Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	study area. The data has informed the assessment of effects on important ecological features, which is presented in **Application Document 6.8 Chapter 8: Ecology**. Around the South Leverton area, the Project will predominantly impact arable land, of relatively low ecological value. Detailed mitigation and the good practice measures that will be carried out to reduce effects on important ecological features can be found in the **Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice, Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments** and **Application Document 7.8 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan.** Embedded measures are those that are intrinsic to and built into the design of the Project to avoid or reduce effects to ecology and biodiversity. These are presented in **Application Document 7.3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments**. A mitigation planting area is proposed to the west of South Leverton, with a view to extend an area of existing woodland and improve habitat connectivity.
2.Visual Amenity and Landscape Character: The open land between South Leverton and Retford is a valued community asset, contributing to the visual and recreational appeal of the area. The presence of pylons would not only mar the scenic beauty of this rural landscape but could also adversely affect tourism and local community well-being. The degradation of landscape character is a material consideration that should not be overlooked.	National Grid acknowledges the Parish Council's concern that the open land between South Leverton and Retford is a valued community asset that contributes to the visual and recreational appeal of the area and that the introduction of overhead line infrastructure could adversely affect the scenic quality of the rural landscape, tourism and community well-being. The likely effects of the Project on landscape character and visual amenity have been assessed within the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment presented in **Application Document 6.6 Chapter 6 Landscape** and **Application Document 6.7 Chapter 7 Visual**. The assessment has considered the sensitivity and value of the receiving landscape, including the contribution of open countryside to local character and recreational experience together with the nature and extent of the proposed changes.

South Leverton Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	National Grid recognises that the assessment identifies significant adverse effects on landscape character at South Leverton. Those effects have informed the interactive routing and design process through which opportunities to avoid or reduce impacts have been considered taking account of environmental, technical engineering and land use constraints. Embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design where reasonably practical. National Grid also acknowledges that changes to the character of the landscape can influence experience of local residents and recreational users. The potential effects on recreational receptors and public rights of way have been considered within the Environmental Statement and supporting application documents. Whilst acknowledging that there will be significant adverse effects in the area of South Leverton, National Grid considers that the proposed design represents an appropriate balance between the identified need for the infrastructure and the environmental effects associated with delivery.
3.Property Values and Community Well-being: It is well documented that the proximity to large-scale infrastructure, such as high-voltage pylons, can lead to a reduction in property values. This potential devaluation poses a significant concern for local residents and property owners, undermining the economic stability of our community. Additionally, the psychological impact of such intrusive structures on the local populace should be factored into any planning considerations.	National Grid acknowledges concerns raised regarding potential effects on property values, community well-being and the perceived psychological impacts of the Project including the presence of overhead line infrastructure. Property prices are influenced by a wide range of market factors and any perceived impacts are not considered to constitute a planning matter in their own right. In relation to community well-being and perceived psychological effects these matters have been considered within the environmental statement particularly in relation to landscape and visual effects. The assessment has identified potential visual effects arising from the introduction of new infrastructure and these effects have been taken into account in the iterative design process. Mitigation measures, including routeing and siting and design refinement have been

South Leverton Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	incorporated where reasonably practical to reduce visual intrusion and integration within the landscape. National Grid recognises that some individuals may experience adverse perceptions of change arising from new infrastructure. The planning and EIA process focuses on likely significant environmental effects as defined by the relevant regulations. **Application Document 6.18 Chapter 18 Health and Wellbeing** assesses the impact of the Project on community identity, culture, resilience and influence. This includes the assessment of potential effects on health and wellbeing, including mental health, associated with changes to landscape character and visual amenity during construction and operation and maintenance, including uncertainty about the Project and perceptions of change within the local environment. The conclusions of the Health and Wellbeing assessment demonstrate that any such effects would not be significant in EIA terms taking into account embedded mitigation and the wider policy need for the Project.
4.Alternative Routes and Mitigation Measures: We believe that alternative routes, or the implementation of robust mitigation measures, should be seriously explored to reduce the adverse impacts identified above. We urge National Grid to consider these alternatives, including the possibility of rerouting through less sensitive areas or adopting design modifications that could lessen the environmental and visual impact.	National Grid notes the view that alternative routes should be considered further and that additional mitigation should be explored to reduce the suggested adverse effects. Routeing and design of the Project has been subject to an iterative optioneering process that has included the consideration of a range of alternative corridors and alignments informed by environmental, technical and engineering constraints. The selected route represents National Grid's preferred option following a balanced assessment of these factors, including consideration of environmental effects, constructability, network requirements and deliverability. At statutory consultation National Grid presented a Strategic Options Report including Needs Case which has been updated as **Application Document 7.17 Strategic Options Report Including Needs Case.** The Report identifies the consideration of different technologies to meet the Projects needs and sets out the reasoning for the overhead line option taken forward. **Application Documents 7.18 Corridor and Preliminary Routeing**

South Leverton Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	and Siting Study and **7.19 Supplementary Corridor and Routeing Report** provide detail in the routeing options considered and the reasoning for the Project's chosen corridor. A range of mitigation measures have been embedded into the design of the Project and assessed within **Application Document 6.0 Environmental Statement**. These include measures relating to route refinement, siting of infrastructure and construction management controls all of which are intended to avoid or reduce significant adverse effects were reasonably practicable. National Grid considers that the mitigation proposed is proportionate and appropriate and that it has been informed by a comprehensive assessment process. The conclusions of the Environmental Statement demonstrate that with these measures in place the residual effects of the Project are acceptable in planning terms.
Given these material considerations, we respectfully request that the planning authority reconsider the proposed route and engage in further consultation with local stakeholders. We are prepared to provide additional evidence and participate in discussions to explore viable alternatives that protect our community's environmental and economic interests.	National Grid notes that the Parish Council requests that the planning authority reconsider the proposed route and undertake further consultation with local stakeholders. We can advise that ongoing engagement has taken place throughout the pre-application process with Bassetlaw District Council and Nottinghamshire Council Officers alongside a wide range of local and statutory stakeholders. For clarity, the Project is being determined through the Development Consent Order process under the Planning Act 2008 and the decision on whether to grant development consent will be made by the relevant Secretary of State following consideration of the Examining Authority's recommendations rather than by the local planning authority. The DCO examination process provides a statutory framework for the consideration of all relevant material considerations within which interested parties including the Parish Council and local stakeholders can submit representations directly to the Examining Authority. Representations will be taken into account as part of the examination before a recommendation is made to the Secretary of State.

South Leverton Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Thank you for considering our objections. We look forward to the opportunity to work collaboratively towards a more sustainable and community-sensitive solution. However, it is meeting with your representatives in the next few days, if they have more to add, I will ensure this is passed onto you before 15th Apr.	National Grid acknowledges and welcomes the collaborative approach to engagement with the Parish Council.

Southern Gas Networks Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Southern Gas Networks Plc (“SGN”) is the Ofgem Gas Transporter for the South and South East of England. Therefore the proposed project falls outside of SGN’s area of responsibility.	National Grid notes the confirmation from Southern Gas Networks.

UK Health Security Agency Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Please note that we have replied to earlier consultations as listed below and this response should be read in conjunction with that earlier correspondence: Request for Scoping Opinion: 18/09/2023 We have considered the submitted documentation and can confirm we are satisfied with the approach taken in preparing the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). We have no further comments at this time.	National Grid notes the UK Health Security Agency’s comments and can confirm that the response to scoping has been considered.

Walkeringham Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
During the public event held in Walkeringham in March 2024 a number of issues were raised, to which we did not receive a full explanation. On behalf of residents of the parish, we would like to request a full explanation/response to the following questions:	We thank Walkeringham Parish Council for their feedback. A Non – Statutory Consultation Feedback Report (2025) was published at statutory consultation and provides responses to feedback received at both the non statutory consultation 2023 and localised consultation 2024. The matters addressed below have been updated where more recent information is available.

Walkeringham Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
1. We are told that burying the cables underground is not viable mainly due to prohibitive costs. Please could you forward a full cost comparative of costs of pylons versus laying cables underground. How much weight is given to the adverse impact to the rural character of the area and how is this assessed?	National Grid acknowledges concerns regarding the potential effects of overhead line infrastructure on the rural character of the area and the comparative use of underground cable technology. The consideration of the use of underground cables forms part of the alternatives and design development process undertaken for the Project. In assessing potential technology options National Grid has had regard to a range of factors including technical feasibility, constructability, environmental effects, operational performance, network resilience and cost. While underground cable solutions can reduce certain landscape and visual effects they can also give rise to other environmental impacts, including greater land disturbance during construction, potential effects on soils, hydrology and ecology and more complex maintenance requirements. **Application Document 6.6 chapter 6 Landscape and Application Document 6.7 Visual** includes an assessment of likely significant landscape and visual effects arising from the project. Including effects on rural character landscape receptors and visual amenity. The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with relevant guidance and takes account of the sensitivity of the receiving landscape and the magnitude of the change resulting from the Project. The conclusions of the assessment have informed the iterative design process and embedded mitigation measures. National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-5 makes it clear that the Government considers overhead lines to be appropriate and acceptable in most instances, although it recognises that that there may be, at particularly sensitive locations, potential adverse landscape and visual impacts of an overhead line that make it inconsistent with our duties and relevant planning policy. Installing underground cables is not considered to be justifiable in the context of national policy in this location.
2. It was suggested that an alternative route would be to send the cables down the river Trent. Please could you send a full explanation as to why this is not a possible/viable option.	The relevant National Policy Statement (NPS) is EN-5, which makes it clear that the Government considers overhead lines to be appropriate and acceptable in most instances. However, the Government is aware that overhead lines may not be appropriate in particularly sensitive

Walkeringham Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	areas. The process of appraising different identified options is undertaken using guidance (National Grid's Approach to Consenting). Its aim is to ensure that decisions regarding scheme design (route, location, or technology option) are based on a full understanding and balance of the technical, socio-economic, environmental, and cost implications of each option. Once all identified options have been appraised, the option or options that best meet National Grid statutory duties and obligations are selected as the preferred option or options. These duties include balancing the need to be economic and efficient, which includes keeping costs down in the interests of the bill paying consumers to whom the costs are eventually passed on to, with a duty to have regard to preserving amenity, which includes the natural environment, cultural heritage, landscape, and visual quality. A full evaluation of lifetime costs for each alternative strategic option was presented in the in the Strategic Options Report (SOR) at non statutory consultation and updated in **Application Document 7.17 Strategic Options Report Including Needs Case.**
3. There was mention of a community grant programme going forward. Please could you send an update of the programme and how to apply for the grants.	In 2025, the Government published new guidance that sets out how projects like ours can deliver a lasting positive legacy through community benefit funding. This guidance could unlock millions of pounds of funding to benefit local communities and the wider area, including £200,000 of funding for every kilometre of new overhead line built. Any funding would be available after the Project is granted development consent and construction work has started. In the meantime, National Grid has developed a community benefits survey to ask for stakeholder views on how any future funding could be spent. The community benefit fund on North Humber to High Marnham could be in the region of around £18 million. Separate to the community benefit guidance, the Government has announced plans for an electricity bill discount scheme for nearby households. This could include bill discounts of up to £2,500 over 10 years for those

Walkeringham Parish Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	living within 500 metres of a relevant project. The mechanism for delivering this funding has been secured as part of the recent Planning and Infrastructure Act. National Grid will share further details as they emerge.
4. Are the residents of Walkeringham eligible for any kind of compensation/discounts in energy bills? Again, please send details through to the Parish Council.	The Government has announced plans for an electricity bill discount scheme for nearby households. This could include bill discounts of up to £2,500 over 10 years for those living within 500 metres of National Grid's project. The mechanism for delivering this funding has been secured as part of the recent Planning and Infrastructure Act. National Grid will share further details as they emerge. We will continue to work with Government as further details of this scheme emerge.
The Parish Council would be pleased to hold another public event at Walkeringham village hall to give residents the opportunity to further understand the proposals and raise any queries and concerns as the proposed upgrade progresses.	National Grid have kept parish councils updated throughout the pre-application stage of the Project with a series of community newsletters and website updates. Requests for further information have been addressed by the NHHM external affairs team and meetings have been held when requested.

West Lindsey District Council Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Thank you for identifying West Lindsey District Council as a consultee on the Statutory Consultation under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 in relation to the above project. We have reviewed the documents and can confirm that we currently have no comments to make on the proposals.	National Grid notes the feedback from West Lindsey District Council.

Yorkshire Water Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Thank you for consulting Yorkshire Water Services (YWS) on the statutory consultation for the North Humber to High Marnham (NH2HM) grid upgrade. The proposed route passes through two council areas: East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) and North	National Grid note the role of Yorkshire Water as statutory undertaker for wastewater and water within East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) and North Lincolnshire Council (NLC).

Yorkshire Water Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Lincolnshire Council (NLC) for which YWS is the statutory undertaker for wastewater and water in full and in part, respectfully. YWS is the waste water undertaker for part of the route from the new Birkhill Wood substation to the crossing point at Peatlands Dike (Route Sections 1-5). YWS is also the appointed water (potable) undertaker for part of the route starting at the new Birkhill Wood substation and extending to Tindale Bank Road (Route Section 1-8).	
YWS clean water assets are crossed by the proposed route such as a live 14-inch and 4-inch cast iron water main, as well as a 355mm HPPE treated live water main adjacent to the A164. The exact location of apparatus on YWS statutory mapping records is indicative only; the exact position and depths can only be determined by on-site survey. Subject to appropriate asset location survey, no building or other obstruction including the storage of materials or placement of any compound are permitted within the below distances of the centreline of water mains: • Mains less than 200mm diameter - 3m • Mains 200 - 600 mm diameter - 5m • Mains above 600mm diameter - 6m	The potential interactions between the Project and the Yorkshire Water infrastructure will be the subject of protective provisions, which will be agreed and form part of the DCO.
To enable future repair works to be carried out without hindrance; any cable or duct installed parallel to a water main should not be installed directly overhead. The below minimum clearance is required: • 150mm where apparatus crosses above or below a water main for main diameters up to 250mm. • For mains of diameter greater than 250mm YWS requires a minimum clearance of 300mm where apparatus crosses above or below these water mains.	National Grid can confirm that the minimum stand off distances requested will be taken into account during the detailed design process and that appropriate separation distances and protection measures will be maintained where reasonably practicable. Discussions remain on-going to better understand these clearance requirements and agree Protective Provisions where necessary to safeguard the identified assets.
Under no circumstances should construction activity near YWS assets commence until the actual position of the Company's mains/services along the proposed route have been confirmed by trial holes.	National Grid confirms that no construction activity in proximity to existing assets will commence until their precise location has been confirmed through appropriate investigation, including trial pit

Yorkshire Water Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
	verification when necessary in consultation with the asset owner.. National Grid will update the crossing schedule throughout detailed design.
The proposed route also crosses YWS waste water assets. For example, further south at Saddlethorpe Broad Lane the route crosses an operationally critical 250mm final effluent rising main. The stand-off distances and any necessary safeguarding / protective measures for all waste water assets will need to be considered at all crossing points to be identified by the National Grid as the promoter of the scheme. YWS minimum distances from waste water assets are stated within the Yorkshire Water requirements for easements document Yorkshire Water - Sewer adoptions.	National Grid can confirm that the minimum stand off distances requested have been taken into account during the detailed design process and that appropriate separation distances and protection measures will be maintained where reasonably practicable. Discussions remain on-going in regard to this key interface including on the agreement of Protective Provisions where necessary to safeguard the identified asset.
YWS advises the NH2HM team to in the first instance identify the location of YWS assets from a desktop study of YWS statutory mapping records available at http://maps.yorkshirewater.com. A crossing schedule can then be produced indicating the need for further on-site survey and any required diversion and/or protections.	National Grid has prepared and shared with Yorkshire Water a schedule of all identified interactions between the Project and Yorkshire Water assets, including overhead line crossings, access routes, utility diversions, planting areas and temporary construction works. This will inform ongoing discussions.
Where diversion of YWS assets is necessary the project team is invited to engage with our waste water and water diversions teams at www.yorkshirewater.com/developers/sewerage/sewer-diversions/ and www.yorkshirewater.com/developers/water/water-main-diversion/. YWS welcomes engagement and asks that adequate assessment of our assets is given to minimise disruption and the need to divert assets.	Consideration of Yorkshire Water assets has carried out throughout the pre-application stage of the project. Appendix A details a history of project engagement between National Grid and Yorkshire Water and **Application Document 5.8.20 Statement of Common Ground – Yorkshire Water** has been drafted.
YWS are also the proprietor of the wastewater site located on the west side of Staddlethorpe Broad Lane, Gilberdyke. The National Grid will need to identify and advise whether the scheme is to impact YWS land.	National Grid propose to undertake highway widening on Staddlethorpe Broad Lane and this matter remains under discussion with YWS.

Yorkshire Water Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
Source Protection Zone (SPZ) The Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) notes that route section 1: Creyke Beck to Skidby crosses the Dunswell Source Protection Zone (SPZ 1-3). Route section 2 Skidby to A63 Dual Carriageway also crosses SPZ2 and SPZ3 of the same Source Protection Area. Vol. 1, Chapter 12: 'Geology and Hydrogeology' dated February 2025 of the PEIR identifies that dewatering and piling, where required, has the potential to affect groundwater quality with associated impact on sensitive receptors.	Additional assessment has been undertaken within the Groundwater Risk Assessment for the infrastructure within the SPZ1 documented in **Application Document 6.12.A4 Environmental Statement Appendix 12.4 - Qualitative Groundwater Risk Assessment.** Additional assessment has been undertaken and is presented in a Groundwater Baseline and Qualitative Groundwater Risk Assessment report. The report includes assessment of the infrastructure proposed within the identified groundwater Source Protection Zone, and concludes that potential significant effects on groundwater and groundwater receptors from the Project are not anticipated. The Application also includes commitments intended for the protection of groundwater such as restrictions on work activities within a groundwater SPZ 1 and hydrogeological risk assessments to be undertaken in any areas of trenchless crossings.
Construction methods will be subject to a groundwater risk assessment identifying where additional hydrogeological risk assessments is necessary, in-turn advising of any mitigation. YWS welcomes this approach and looks forward to further engagement to understand the means of safeguarding the Source Protections Zone.	National Grid have engaged with YWS in respect of safeguarding the Source Protection Zone. Appendix A details a history of project engagement between National Grid and Yorkshire Water **Application Document 5.8.20 Statement of Common Ground – Yorkshire Water** has been drafted.
Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) Informed by the finding of a robust crossing schedule relevant to YWS assets and the outcomes of groundwater risk assessments and any associated Hydrogeological Risk Assessments (HRA) the CEMP must detail required mitigation measure to safeguard the aforementioned. Further consultation on the mitigation and safeguarding measures should be directed to: planningconsultation@yorkshirewater.co.uk	**Application Document 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice** details required mitigation measures to safeguard YWS assets.
Ongoing consultation There remain some unknown elements of this development and from the information provided it is likely there will be interaction with YWS assets. It is therefore essential that there is ongoing engagement	Engagement with Yorkshire Water has carried out throughout the pre-application stage of the Project. Appendix A details a history of project engagement between National Grid and Yorkshire Water **Application Document 5.8.20 Statement of Common Ground – Yorkshire Water** has been drafted prior to submission as requested and will be

Yorkshire Water Consultation Feedback	National Grid Response
between YWS and the National Grid. We would recommend further discussion on the following items: • Design of the scheme to minimise interaction with YWS assets and sensitive receptors. • Where interaction is identified details of required mitigation and / or diversion to be agreed with YW S in advance of development • A Statement of Common Ground completed before the submission	completed prior to the closing of the examination, once all matters have been resolved and the protective provisions agreed.

National Grid plc
National Grid House,
Warwick Technology Park,
Gallows Hill, Warwick.
CV34 6DA United Kingdom

Registered in England and Wales
No. 4031152
nationalgrid.com