Copeland Borough Councils response to the North West Coast Connections.

LEAD OFFICER: John Groves
REPORT AUTHOR: Denice Gallen

Summary and Recommendation:
Members will note that NWCC have recently undertaken a consultation into the proposed route corridors for the upgrading of the National Grid network to support the new nuclear power station.

Recommendation: Members note the Councils response.

1. **Background**

2. The proposed National Grid development will provide a connection for the new nuclear power station at Moorside. The existing Electricity North West system serving west Cumbria has insufficient capacity; therefore National Grid proposes to reinforce the network to provide the necessary connections. The introduction of new 400kV overhead lines could provide potential opportunities for inward investment which could have positive local economic effects in the long term.

3. All members were invited to a briefing delivered by National Grid on September 03rd 2014 at the beginning of the current consultation. Information was provided about the proposals and options which available for consideration. Details were provided of the various consultation events held across the Borough between September and the end of October. Advice was also provided as to an extensive mail drop to residential addresses across the Borough.

4. A draft consultation response and explanatory report was issued to all members on 27th October with request for response by 5th November 2014. A copy of the response and the explanatory report are appended.

5. The report was then amended to reflect the comments expressed by Members and the attached response was approved by the Executive at the meeting on the 25th November. The Consultation closed on the 28th November 2014.

Copeland borough council
Proud of our past. Energised for our future.

Copeland Borough Council
The Copeland Centre,
Catherine Street, Whitehaven,
Cumbria CA28 7SJ

tel: 0845 054 8600
fax: 01946 59 83 03
email: info@copeland.gov.uk
web: www.copeland.gov.uk

North West Coast Connections (NWCC) Project – Response to National Grid's Route Corridors Consultation (Stage 2) November 2014

Copeland Borough Council has been working closely with the National Grid over the past 5 years developing and progressing the North West Coast Connections project. The Council has welcomed the open and transparent nature, adopted by National Grid, in the pre consultation period. National Grid have designed an effective platform for engaging all affected Local Authorities and invited stake holders with a potential interest in the project to be involved in pre-consultation discussion and briefings. This pre engagement activity has allowed the Council the opportunity to help shape this consultation and the Council Officers the opportunity to apprise the National Grid of concerns and issues that needed to be addressed. The Council believes that this has enabled a more effective consultation and the Council would urge other NSIP developers to adopt a similar approach.

1.0 Overall Comments

1.1 The Proposed National Grid development will provide a connection for the new nuclear power station at Moorside to the North of Sellafield. The Council recognises the significance of these projects both locally from a social economic regeneration perspective and from a national perspective in securing the nation's electricity supply. With this is mind the Council is supportive of development that will enhance the economic stability of the local area and the electricity supply nationally. However it is vital that these projects are designed and developed with the local communities needs as an intrinsic part of the process balancing the national benefits against the local social, environmental, visual and financial impacts.

1.2 Within the Copeland area there are a number of key considerations which predicate the Councils reasoning for choosing a particular route corridor against an alternative route, these include:

- The protection and enhancement of the boroughs landscape, cultural and historic features and their settings in particular the protection of St Bees Heritage Coast.
- Insuring the potential for economic growth and development within the borough, with particular reference to areas such as section A which has the potential to stifle the growth of Whitehaven town to the east.
- To insure the proposed development where possible rationalises the existing wire scape to reduce the negative cumulative visual impact on local settlements, communities and

enhances the potential gains and overall acceptability of the project to the local community, this is an important consideration is section A of the consultation.

- The potential for future proofing the grid to allow economic development and providing enhancements to existing security of electricity supply in the more rural southern region in Section E of the project.
- Maximising the community benefit to the area through the implementation of an economic strategy that seeks to invest in the local supply chain.

2.0 Background

2.1 The following report provides Copeland Borough Council's response to National Grid's Route Corridors Consultation (Stage 2). Comments are focussed on the emerging preferred route corridor within Copeland and other route options where they are considered to be preferable or more consideration is required. It is recognised that there are many different factors that need to be taken into account in assessing potential route options, the Councils response has been informed through the technical experts assessment of the Route Corridor Study (RCS), see appendix 1 for a summary of key issues raised, focusing on the following key issues:

- Landscape and Visual issues
- Ecology and biodiversity issues
- Cultural Heritage issues
- Socio-economic issues
- Traffic and Transport
- Growth

2.2 The current consultation seeks to identify 'route corridors' and as such they will be subject to detailed data gathering and assessment to identify specific impacts and mitigation that is required. With this in mind the views expressed may therefore be subject to change and refinement when further detailed information is available.

2.3 The RCS covers the entire route. The route is broken down into sections. The sections of the development that fall within the Copeland boundary are section A, B, D and E. The Council's response is focused on these sections but also comments on the potential impacts of the proposed use of an option which includes a tunnel beneath Morecombe Bay. Our response also makes reference to possible off-shore route options in anticipation of the possibility that other stakeholders will suggest such options as a preferable solution. The southern onshore route runs through the Lake District National Park (LDNP) within Copeland. This response is a Copeland Borough Council response and will cover the whole of Copeland, both within and outside the LDNP. It is anticipated that the Lake District National Park Authority will submit their own response outlining their comments on the preferred route corridors and other options and how they affect the Park.

3.0 Offshore / Onshore review

3.1 The Council has given careful consideration to the three south options and has concluded that the RCS has provided appropriate evidence to support National Grid's preference for the Onshore South with Tunnel Group Option.

3.2 The route corridor study demonstrates that there are clear difficulties with the off shore option that must be balanced and could threaten the timely delivery of the project. These issues are mainly technical in nature and relate to the technology that would be required and the complexity of installing and maintaining a High Voltage Direct Current (HDVC) cable on the seabed.

3.3 Furthermore, the route offshore has potentially additional issues related to existing uses such as the Eskdale firing range, oil and gas pipelines, offshore wind turbines and associated cable crossings, the technical and cost implications of this option are substantial.

3.4 Although the '*Onshore South*' (all onshore) is the least costly (£0.8bn) and technically most straight forward option, it is the lowest performing group in terms of landscape and visual, ecology, cultural heritage and socio-economic activity. The Council has serious concerns about the potential for this option to have an unacceptable impact on Cumbria. Furthermore, the route corridor has a direct effect on the Lake District National Park (estimated to be approximately 18km), in addition to the nearby protected coastal areas around the Duddon Estuary and other important receptors.

3.5 The Council recognises the national level of protection afforded to the areas within the National Park. There is obvious tension between this protected status and the ability to deliver a nationally significant infrastructure project which supports national ambitions to provide an effective and resilient energy supply to the nation. The acceptance that an on-shore option is likely to be the only feasible and viable option must be based on the essential premise that the on-shore route uses all possible engineering and design solutions to ensure minimal impact and where possible to deliver improvement to landscape appearance and quality. This should include review of the scope to underground cables – where that of itself will not result in harm, and critically to ensure that existing infrastructure is removed and rationalised with a net environmental and landscape benefit

3.6 The choice between the '*Onshore South with Tunnel*' and the '*Offshore South*' is more balanced. There are clear benefits to constructing the route south entirely offshore, thus avoiding the important landscape, ecological and economic receptors through the south of Cumbria and the Morecambe Bay. However, the RCS demonstrates that there are clear difficulties with this option that must be balanced and could threaten the timely delivery of the project. These issues are mainly technical in nature and relate to the technology that would be required and the complexity of installing and maintaining a High Voltage Direct Current (HDVC) cable on the seabed.

3.7 The Council recognises that the off shore option has a range of issues and complexities. It may however remain appropriate to continue to assess feasibility to ensure that any conclusion that this is not a viable option can be robustly demonstrated. The Council notes however that no nuclear power station in the world has been connected by HVDC circuits; therefore, use of the technology in this situation is untested and may result in material additional costs and delays, to what is estimated to be the overwhelmingly most costly option at approximately £1.8bn. Furthermore, the route offshore has potentially additional issues related to existing uses such as the Eskdale firing range, oil and gas pipelines, offshore wind turbines and associated cable

crossings. The technical and cost implications of this option are substantial and it is accepted that these would be unlikely to satisfy National Grid's Principles for route development.

3.8 On this basis the Council accepts that on balance the emerging Onshore South with Tunnel Option provides the most preferable option. However, it is also accepted that the emerging preferred option presents a series of complex and challenging issues that must be overcome to ensure the route option can be delivered effectively without compromising important environmental, economic and social considerations of the route. The sanction of an initially more cost effective option should be reflected in the scale of mitigation of impact on the sensitive landscape through which the onshore route would pass.

3.9 The Council would also have concerns regarding the need for both circuits to go north from Moorside before entering the Sea. The impact of 2 double circuits and a large converter station in this area would cause serious cumulative negative impacts on the local area. If this option is reconsidered the Council would expect further consultation and investigation of the onshore north implications of the offshore route.

3.10 This, together with opportunities for enhanced electricity supply south of Moorside are the main reasons Copeland Borough Council supports the onshore south options. Use of the Tunnel to cross Morecambe Bay provides mitigation for the alternative route around the very sensitive and highly constrained Morecambe Bay, which would also involve going through the LDNP, by avoiding these sensitive areas.

4.0 Considering the Route Corridor Sections in Detail

4.1 The following section provides detailed comments on National Grid's emerging preferred options for the '*Onshore North Group'* and '*Onshore South with Tunnel Group*'. Should the group preference change after this consultation the Council would expect that all partners and communities would to have an additional opportunity to comment and revise overall comments accordingly.

5.0 <u>Section A – Moorside to Whitehaven</u>

5.1 The principal considerations in Section A are:

- The potential for negative impacts on growth in the area
- The protection of the St Bees Head Heritage Coast;
- Rationalisation where possible to reduce impact on the settlements and communities potential affected by the route corridor
- The coastline, and coastal plain between the Lake District fells and the coastline;
- The Lake District fells and the Lake District National Park (LDNP);
- Ecology – including effects on the River Ehen Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

5.2 **Section A1 - Moorside to Egremont**

5.3 The RCS identifies A1.1 as the emerging preferred route corridor for the Moorside to Egremont section. Copeland Borough Council generally accepts the RCS assessment for the majority of the route corridor options in Section A1, with exception to the northern element. The Council would argue that route A1.2 needs to be included for further development as it may be needed as an alternative connection point from section A2 onward north.

5.4 Copeland Borough Council have concerns regarding route A1.1 and its potential to result in adverse impacts upon St. Bees Heritage Coast, Seascape character and visual receptors through the introduction of pylons of a greater height.

5.5 Cumbria County Council and partners has produced the Cumulative Impact Assessment of Vertical Structures Study (2014) in order to assist in the assessment of cumulative impact in Cumbria and North Lancashire. The Study concludes that the landscape character areas in this section currently experience large to very large magnitude of effect from medium scale infrastructure. The area identified to the north of Section A1 is particularly prominent, located on a ridge. The pylons situated here affect the setting of St Bees Head, the settlement of Egremont, and are clearly visible to users of the A595. In views from the high ground on St Bees Head, these pylons are clearly apparent – and affect the setting of the LDNP, as viewed from the west. A number of individual wind turbines have recently been constructed in this area, which adds to the cumulative effect in this area. The construction of a line of 400kV pylons along this route will exacerbate already significant landscape and visual effects upon key landscape designations, and visual receptors.

5.6 The Council recognises that route A1.2 would involve the creation of an additional line of pylons where currently there are none, therefore the Council would stress the need for consideration to be given to the feasibility of removing both 132kV lines, should new high voltage pylons be constructed.

5.7 Should the route A1.2 need to be progressed in order to provide a suitable connection to the northern section of the route in section A2, detailed consideration should be given to siting to reduce the impact on the Egremont community. Whilst it is recognised that the need to take A1.2 forward may constraint development of the west side of Egremont it is considered that the growth impact is reduced due to the limited road access to this area and the topography.

5.8 Both the RCS and the Council's assessment of the impact of the development suggest that a number of issues will need to be addressed either through consideration of detailed routing and appropriate mitigation to ensure that the development of Route Corridor A1.1 is acceptable. Furthermore, the Councils recommendations for section A2 may result in potential grid alignment issues, which may require that route A1.2 is taken forward for further consideration.

5.9 Overall it is considered that detailed assessment of the preferred route corridor will be key to ensuring that the specific routing of overhead lines and siting of pylons is appropriate. Scoping of assessment methodology will be key to ensure that the route takes account of the

important issues and receptors in the next stage of the NWCC project, and adopts the most appropriate route, and mitigation measures. The Council supports early dialogue on the detailed routing and mitigation that will be required to ensure that the effect of the upgraded overhead line is acceptable.

5.10 From consideration of the RCS it is clear that a key form of mitigation will include maximising the rationalisation of pylons and overhead lines. This form of mitigation will be Key to reducing the residual negative impacts across a range of topics including; landscape and visual impact; ecology; cultural heritage as well as the impact on community along the emerging route corridor. The Council's assessment of the landscape and visual impact of the Route Corridor A1.1 concluded that the construction of a line of 400kV pylons will exacerbate already significant landscape and visual effects upon key landscape designations, and visual receptors. Given this there is a clear requirement in some locations to remove more than one existing line to reduce the residual negative effect on the area.

5.11 Furthermore, detailed pylon siting, screen planting, technology choice and appropriate construction management will be key to ensuring that the effects of the upgraded overhead line are acceptable.

6.0 Section A2 - Egremont to Whitehaven/Cleator Moor

6.1 The RCS identifies A2.1 as the emerging preferred route corridor for the Egremont to Whitehaven/Cleator Moor section. Copeland Borough Council objects to the preferred route as it will severely constrain the development of Whitehaven to the east.

6.2 The preferred route corridor in this section incorporates a large piece of land between the current Whitehaven boundary and Westlakes Science and Technology Park. Whilst the Council appreciates that the preferred route follows an opportunity corridor, this area contains the route of the proposed Whitehaven Eastern Relief Road and has the potential to be the general direction of growth for the town into the future.

6.3 The proposed new nuclear power station in Copeland is a nationally significant project and as such it requires a significant amount of associated development to facilitate it. Therefore the Council is challenged with ensuring there is adequate land available to allow for growth and to enable the Associated Development and to ensure that it is created in sustainable locations that will provide a legacy for the local communities.

6.4 The area within route corridor A2.1 may be of especial importance when the principle of where Associated Development for the new nuclear power station at Moorside is considered, due to its proximity to Whitehaven, the A595 for access to Moorside and the opportunity to provide additional route to Moorside, and it may play an increasingly significant role in enabling the delivery of the new power station at Moorside in the short term as well as the direction of growth for Whitehaven in the longer term.

6.5 Even though the area is currently potentially somewhat constrained, with the high pressure gas pipeline, route of the proposed Whitehaven Eastern Relief Road and existing 132kv line the

Council is currently exploring its potential, both to provide for Associated Development for the Moorside project and the longer term growth of Whitehaven, as it would appear to be a sensible option in planning terms. A section of land to the east of the A595 within option A2.1 has been proposed for housing development in the emerging local plan.

6.6 The settlement boundary on the northern edge of Whitehaven is also likely to be extended slightly to enable the Education Campus to be developed. This is an additional factor that will need to be taken into account when the detailed route alignment is considered.

6.7 Westlakes Science and Technology Park is a key strategic site located to the south east of Whitehaven and east of the preferred A1.2 route. The Councils aspiration is to provide for the growth of Whitehaven to the east which will provide stronger links between the town and this important strategic site. Providing for development to the east of Whitehaven will support the future growth and development of the science park and the town through supplying additional business space for the expanding supply chain needed to support the nuclear new build, decommissioning and emerging energy markets in the region.

6.8 Installing 400kv pylons in route corridor A2.1 could prevent this development and effectively sterilise growth in this area of Whitehaven, even if the existing 132kv pylons running through the site are removed. As such the Council strongly recommends that alternative corridors which avoid this area are explored in greater detail and that National Grid takes forward A2.3 and A2.5 as additional preferred route corridors to allow this work to take place.

6.9 Due to the complexity of socio economic issues in area A2 the National Grid has not identified a preferred route corridor based on socio economic constraints. However, the report does highlight there is potentially serious implication of the section A2.1. Including the potential to constrain the long term growth of the Science and Technology Park. The Council would also argue that the potential to constrain the development of Whitehaven to the east has not been given due consideration and weighting in selecting the preferred route.

6.10 In term of visual impact the National Grid conclude that A2.1 will result in greater impacts upon the St Bees Heritage Coast. Their rationale for preferring this route in spite of these findings is that the alternative options would result in greater impact upon local settlements, notably Bigrigg and Moor Row.

6.11 However the RCS assessments concludes that, for the area to the south of A2, the draft cumulative impact work indicates that the landscape character areas through which the route corridors run currently experience significant cumulative effects from vertical infrastructure, as do the majority of settlements in the vicinity. It also states that the pylons situated on the ridge here affect the setting of St. Bees Head, Egremont and are clearly visible to users of the A595 and that in views from the high ground on St Bees Head, these pylons are clearly apparent – and affect the setting of the Lake District National Park. The RCS concludes that Consideration should be given to undergrounding these prominent, elevated sections of the line.

6.12 The RCS ecology assessment of Section A2.1 states that this route would impact on a replanted woodland on an Ancient Woodland Site with requirement to coppice or remove trees and in terms of ecology the preferred route A2.1 cannot easily be mitigated and would potentially also disrupt wildlife corridor continuity and commuting along the woodland edges.

6.13 It therefore concluded that In terms of biodiversity alternative routes which introduce additional overhead lines but avoid the woodland are preferable.

6.14 It should be noted that if A2.3 and/or A2.5 are taken forward this would require the widening of the southern end of corridor B1.2 (the preferred corridor in section B1) so that the sections continue to join together as one continuous route corridor.

7.0 Section B - Whitehaven to Aspatria

7.1 The principal considerations in Section B are:

- The coastline, and coastal plain between the Lake District fells and the coastline;
- The Lake District fells and the Lake District National Park;
- The Solway Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;
- The Historic Environment, including Hadrian's Wall and Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage Site (WHS); and
- Whitehaven, Workington, Distington, Frizington, Parton, Lowca, Moresby Parks and Arlecdon
- Important ecological sites such as Derwent and Bassenthwaite Lake Special Area of Conservation, Site of Special Scientific Interest
- Effects on the setting of heritage assets including most of the Frontiers of the Roman Empire (Hadrian's Wall) WHS and its Buffer Zone and other important heritage assets

8.0 Section B1 - Whitehaven to Stainburn/Dean

8.1 The RCS identifies B1.2 as the emerging preferred route corridor for the Whitehaven to Stainburn section. Copeland Borough Council accepts the RCS assessment of the route corridor options in Section B1, and considers that with appropriate mitigation B1.2 performs best across the range of topic areas.

8.2 It should be noted that if A2.3 and/or A2.5 are taken forward this would require the widening of the southern end of corridor B1.2 (the preferred corridor in section B1) so that the sections continue to join together as one continuous route corridor.

8.3 Both the RCS and the Council's assessment of the impact of the development suggest that a number of issues will need to be addressed either through consideration of detailed routing and appropriate mitigation to ensure that the development of Route Corridor B1.2 is acceptable.

8.4 Furthermore, detailed pylon siting, screen planting, technology choice and appropriate construction management will be key to ensuring that the effects of the upgraded overhead line are acceptable.

9.0 On shore south with tunnel area

Section D – Moorside to Silecroft

9.1 The principal considerations in Section D are:

- The coastline, and coastal plain between the Lake District fells and the coastline;
- The Lake District fells and the Lake District National Park;
- The St Bees Head Heritage Coast;
- Muncaster Fell (and registered/listed components of the Muncaster Castle estate) which extends across the coastal plain to the east of Ravenglass.

Section D1 – Moorside to Ravenglass

9.2 The RCS identifies D1.1 as the emerging preferred route corridor for the Moorside to Ravenglass section. Copeland Borough Council generally accepts that the RCS assessment of the route corridor options in Section D1 is appropriate and it considers that with appropriate mitigation D1.1 has the potential to perform best across the range of topic areas.

9.3 From a landscape and visual perspective the Council consider that despite D1.1 being the best performing overall route corridor there is potential residual negative impact on seascape and the setting of LDNP. It is further acknowledged that the existing line currently generates adverse impacts upon the National Park, therefore given that the development of an additional overhead route would exacerbate this effect, mitigation must be considered to reduce existing impacts in addition to considering the landscape and visual benefits made possible by undergrounding existing as well as the proposed line.

10.0 Section D2 - Ravenglass to Silecroft

10.1 The RCS identifies D2.1 as the emerging preferred route corridor for the Ravenglass to Silecroft section. Copeland Borough Council generally accepts that the RCS assessment of the route corridor options in Section D2 is appropriate and it considers that with appropriate mitigation D2.1 has the potential to perform best across the range of topic areas. From a landscape and visual perspective the Council consider that despite D2.1 being the best performing overall route corridor there is potential residual negative impact on seascape and the setting of LDNP. It is further acknowledged that the existing line currently generates adverse impacts upon the National Park, therefore given that the development of an additional overhead route would exacerbate this effect, mitigation must be considered to reduce existing impacts in addition to considering the landscape and visual benefits made possible by undergrounding existing as well as the proposed line. Furthermore, the Cumulative Impact Assessment of Vertical Structures Study (2014) that demonstrates that this area is already experiencing significant cumulative effects from vertical infrastructure. Therefore, any additional development is likely to be very significant.

11.0 Section E – Silecroft to Lindal in Furness

11.1 The principal considerations in Section E are:

- The coastline, and coastal plain between the Lake District fells and the coastline;

- The coastline of the Duddon Estuary;
- The Lake District fells and the Lake District National Park;
- Topographical features such as Black Combe, Knott Hill, Bank End, Thornthwaite Latter Rigg, Heathwaite Fell, Great Burney and High Moor;
- The high ground that runs in a broadly north south direction down the Furness peninsula;
- The settlements of Millom, Dalton-in-Furness, Lindal in Furness, Barrow-in-Furness; and Walney Island.
- Nationally and Internationally important ecological sites – including effects on Duddon Mosses Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Site of Special Scientific Interest and National Nature Reserve (NNR); and the Duddon Estuary Special Protection Area, Ramsar site and SSSI (and Morecambe Bay SAC); and, upland sites of Subberthwaite, Blawith and Torver Low Commons SAC and Kirkby Moor Site SSSI.
- Future proofing the grid and insuring security of supply to this rural area

11.2 **Section E1 – Silecroft to Duddon**

11.3 The RCS identifies E1.1 as the emerging preferred route corridor for the Silecroft to Duddon section. Copeland Borough Council accepts the RCS assessment of the route corridor options in Section E1, and considers that with appropriate mitigation E1.1 performs best across the range of topic areas.

11.4 The main area of concern from a socio economic point of view is ensuring that the local area, and Millom in particular, benefits from an enhanced security of electricity supply. As we understand it the provision of a new 400kv route will provide enhanced potential electricity supply in south Copeland and the Council would stress that an enhanced local distribution network is provided, directly or in partnership with Electricity North West to provide, in the Millom and surrounding area, whichever route is taken forward in this section. This will ensure that the North West Coast Connections project brings direct and immediate benefit to the Millom area as well as future proofing the Grid.

11.5 The Council's assessment of the landscape and visual impact of the Route Corridor E1.1 concluded that although preferable to other options the construction of a line of 400kV pylons will exacerbate already significant landscape and visual effects upon key landscape designations such as the LDNP, and visual receptors. It is suggested that where appropriate underground routing of new line should be investigated.

11.6 Detailed siting is also required to ensure that E1.1 would not result in unacceptable adverse impacts on international, national and local designations. Careful consideration should be given to the Duddon Mosses and as such it is considered that a Habitats Regulations Assessment is likely to be required.

12.0 Conclusion

12.1 As a general principle the Council supports the use of an 'opportunity corridor' given the clear potential to rationalise the number of pylons and overhead lines in order to reduce the impact on the communities and economic receptors along the route.

12.2 However, in section A2 the Council does not agree with the preferred route corridor and would urge that the social and economic implications in this section have not been fully taken into consideration and for that reason the alternative routes should be reconsidered due to the potential for A1.1 to constrain the development of Whitehaven to the east.

12.3 The Council would also stress the need to address the security of supply in section E and the Millom area in particular. Collaborative working with Electricity North West (ENW) could ensure that the proposed development brings more direct and immediate benefit to the Millom area and maximises the local benefits of this national project.

12.4 Overall it is considered that detailed assessment of the preferred route corridor will be key to ensuring that the specific routing of overhead lines and siting and design of pylons is appropriate. Scoping of assessment methodology will be key to ensure that the route takes account of the important issues and receptors in the next stage of the NWCC project, and adopts the most appropriate route, and mitigation measures. The Council supports early dialogue on the detailed routing and mitigation that will be required to ensure that the effect of the upgraded overhead line is acceptable.

12.5 The development of route corridors has the potential to result in positive temporary economic activity effects during construction, both directly, from the workforce expenditure, and in respect of the multiplied indirect positive effects of that local expenditure within existing and new supply chains. The Council will work with partners including National Grid to maximise the opportunities and support for local businesses and labour force.

12.6 A construction and economic development strategy should be implemented that seeks to maximise the economic benefit and legacy to the local area. A central component of this will be building the key skills and training that will provide a lasting and positive skills and education legacy for local people. It is considered that this could ensure that the residual effect of construction is positive and opportunities for economic development and inward investment achieves long term positive effects.