

**Appendix D  
PAC Consultation Data**

**PAC Feedback Form  
Scottish Surfing Federation (Online Form)**

Submitted Date	First name:	Surname:	Organisation (if relevant):	Address:	Postcode:	Email:	Tel number:	Are you a landowner who may be directly affected by this proposal?	Are you a maritime organisation or work in fisheries who is directly affected by this proposal?	How supportive are you of SP Energy Networks developing new infrastructure in your area that will enable the achievement of Net Zero targets?	Do you support the proposals for the converter station?	Tell us your thoughts about the proposed converter station:
04/02/2022 19:34:39	Andy	Bennetts	Scottish Surfing Federation	45 Long Cram	EH41 4NS	[REDACTED]	01620823973	No	No	Supportive	Yes	It's pretty big!



Do you have any comments about the proposed location of the converter station?	Thinking about the proposals, are there any additional considerations or feedback you would like to share:	Do you support the proposals for the offshore marine cable route?	Tell us your thoughts about the offshore marine cable route proposal:	Thinking about the proposals for the offshore marine cable, are there any additional considerations or feedback you would like to share:	Do you support the proposals for the onshore cable route?	Tell us your thoughts about the onshore cable proposal:	Thinking about the proposal for the onshore cable route, are there any additional considerations or feedback you would like to share:	Tell us how you found out about this consultation	How would you like to be kept informed about his proposal?
No	None	Yes	My main concern as a surfer is the landfall of the cables and if this will impact the well used surfing beach at Thorntonloch. I want to see exactly where the cable is intended to come on shore but your fancy 3D graphics on the web site get in the way of clarity. It would be useful to have a download link of pdf's showing the proposals and the exact landfall and cable route.	None	Yes	Concerns about landfall as mentioned already.	No	Online	Email

**PAC Consultee Meeting Minutes  
Scottish Surfing Federation  
Nature.Scot**

## **Duffy, Claire (Power Systems)**

---

**From:** Jonathan Spink [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 February 2022 16:40  
**To:** Duffy, Claire (Power Systems); Hughes, Barry (PS) ([REDACTED]); WALLACE, SAMANTHA  
**Cc:** Ross Laird; Richard Hunter; Cody Edwards  
**Subject:** EXTERNAL:Eastern Link Consultation meeting 17/02/2022

Hi all,

Just a quick email to summarise the meeting with Andy Bennetts.

Overall, I think that went very well and Mr Bennetts was satisfied with the team's engagement and answers. If [@Duffy, Claire \(Power Systems\)](#) could send me the redline map used in the meeting, I can get that to Mr Bennetts as he requested.

### **Eastern Link Consultation meeting 17/02/2022**

#### Attendees

Andy Bennetts – Scottish Surfing Association  
Claire Duffy – Scottish Power Energy Networks  
Barry Hughes – Scottish Power Energy Networks  
Jonathan Spink – Grayling

#### Summary

After a brief opening where JS, CD and BH explained their roles in the project, AB went on to ask the following questions:

AB: Asked how SPEN will you connect the cables to the landfall site, and if horizontal drilling will be used at Thorntonloch Beach to minimise impact?

CD: CD shared a map and showed AB where the cables would land. She said SPEN chose the location to have the option to drill underneath the railway and road using a horizontal drill in one go. She mentioned it may possibly need a second drill out to sea, saying it would be a similar project to NnG.

AB: Went on to ask if there would be any disruption to surfing. AB explained the rocks shown on the map at landfall did not impact surfing but asked if the drill itself would impact surfing.

CD: CD said there could most likely be some construction impact, ie vehicles on the road, machinery on the beach. She said the impacts to the surfers would more likely be felt onshore than on the beach itself.

BH: Reiterated CD's initial comments about the horizontal drill, saying there is the potential for a second drill. He did say the design would not be known until they had contractors submit the final proposal.

CD: Said SPEN will be looking to submit their application in May and explained the planning process, including the second stage of the planning application. She said this part of the consultation was to get the views of the community and the potential impact works would have.

AB: Said he was satisfied that the cable landfall was out of the surfing area.

CD: Asked if most surfers used the car park at Thorntonloch Beach.

AB: Confirmed that the car park was used by surfers. He also said they used parking near a slip road on the A1 inside the red line boundary.

BH: Said SPEN would need to keep the parking in mind going forward as it would likely be impacted.

AB: Went on to ask about the development in general or impacts that may happen along the shoreline.

CD: Explained the project overall, with the area chosen for the stations, the options for landfall of cables and the geological evidence that went into making the decision for choosing a landfall location.

BH: Said there were some decisions made around the area of the converter station based on its proximity to the community. He also said the consultation was an ongoing process and that AB would have further opportunities to engage with the project team.

AB: Thanked the team for their time and asked if he could have a copy of the red line boundary map used during the meeting.

Actions

JS to send AB the red line boundary map.

Thanks!

Jonathan



Jonathan Spink  
Public Affairs  
33 Castle Street,  
Edinburgh, EH2 3DN  
[@GraylingUK](#) | [grayling.com](#)



Grayling is part of Huntsworth. Registered number: 3140273. Registered office: 8th Floor, Holborn Gate, 26 Southampton Buildings, London, England, WC2A 1AN, UK

## Eastern Link

<b>Meeting Ref:</b>	NatureScot Update Meeting	<b>Circulation:</b>	Eric Knott (NatureScot)
<b>Date:</b>	22/03/2022		Kirstie Dearing (NatureScot)
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Claire Duffy		Claire Duffy (SPEN)
<b>Approved by:</b>			Anna Clarke (RSK)
			Frank Fortune (Aecom)
			Helen Travers (Aecom)

Item	Actions	Responsibility
1	<p><b>EMFs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ EK highlighted further study carried out last year not yet on MS website. This study looks at more strategic measurements from different types of cables. Should know more later April 22.</li> <li>➤ EK to chase</li> <li>➤ CD to speak to National Grid Technical team regarding study</li> </ul>	EK CD
2	<p><b>Firth of Forth SPA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ EK highlighted the need to ensure the environmental appraisal considered both the birds features and the habitats they depend on.</li> <li>➤ Aecom confirmed this is the case</li> </ul>	Aecom
3	<p><b>Cable Spacing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Discussion regarding cable spacing and whether they would be bundled or unbundled.</li> <li>➤ CD and FF confirmed that both are potential options for the project. Both being assessment. Also potential for sections of bundled and sections of unbundled cables to be proposed as part of detailed design work.</li> </ul>	
4	<p><b>OTNR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ EK stated need for joined up thinking regarding OTNR and other stand alone project</li> <li>➤ CD to get statement from companies on OTNR and EL</li> </ul>	CD
5	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ EK queried need for overtrawl surveys. FF confirmed not being proposed for this project.</li> <li>➤ EK mentioned project under construction was affected by recent storms.</li> <li>➤ KD suggested project application could be sent directly to NatureScot when submitted to MS.</li> </ul>	



**PAC Consultee Response  
Historic Environment Scotland**



**By email to:**

[REDACTED]  
Fraser McFarlane  
Heritage Consultant  
Headland Archaeology

Longmore House  
Salisbury Place  
Edinburgh  
EH9 1SH

[REDACTED]  
T: 0131 668 6890

Our case ID: 300051025

30 March 2022

Dear Fraser McFarlane

[Eastern Link 1 HVDC cable and cable protection - Agreement of Scope of Setting for Torness Converter Station and Cables](#)

Thank you for your pre-application consultation which we received on the 4<sup>th</sup> February, 2022.

We understand that your pre-application consultation relates to a proposed converter station located immediately adjacent to the existing Dunbar Energy Recovery Facility (ERF), cable landfall compounds, and a buried cable route to connect the landfall to the Branxton substation and the proposed converter station.

We have a number of comments to offer on the scope of the assessment. These comments relate to the historic assets to be assessed for setting impacts, the level of information available at this stage for us to give a view, and the importance of considering direct impacts. Our detailed comments on these issues are in the attached annexe below.

Detailed guidance on the application of national policy is set out in our 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment' series available online at [www.historicenvironment.scot/advice-and-support/planning-and-guidance/legislation-and-guidance/managing-change-in-the-historic-environment-guidance-notes/](http://www.historicenvironment.scot/advice-and-support/planning-and-guidance/legislation-and-guidance/managing-change-in-the-historic-environment-guidance-notes/). Technical advice is available through our Technical Conservation website at [www.englished.org](http://www.englished.org).

We hope this is helpful. Please contact us if you have any questions about this response. The officer managing this case is Sam Fox and they [REDACTED].

Yours faithfully  
**Historic Environment Scotland**  
**Background**



The Eastern Link 1 project comprises a proposed grid connection between East Lothian and [REDACTED] Eastern Link 2, also considers a grid connection from Peterhead to North Yorkshire and is considered in a separate EIA application (our reference 300046182).

We understand that the applicant proposes to split their impact assessment for Eastern Link 1 over two areas; The first EIAR considered a proposed substation at Branxton, a connecting haul road and construction compound, with a separate application submitted to the Energy Consents Unit under Section 37 of the Electricity Act 1989 (S37) for a single new tower proposed adjacent to the new substation at Branxton. A second EIAR, to which this consultation relates, is due to be submitted in the coming months for Planning Permission in Principle for the proposed converter station located immediately adjacent to the existing Dunbar Energy Recovery Facility (ERF), cable landfall compounds, and a buried cable route to connect the landfall to the Branxton substation and the proposed converter station.

## **Our Advice**

### **Indirect Impacts**

We are content with the proposed list of assets identified for setting assessment in the letter from Headland Archaeology/RSK. We have not identified any further assets that require assessment for potential effects on their setting.

However, it is difficult to be confident about the likelihood of significant effects on setting for surrounding assets given the limited information provided regarding the proposed development in the consultation letter. We would also note that the ZTV figures beyond 1km are not clear regarding the potential impacts on specific heritage assets in the wider area given the scale of mapping provided. Given this limited information, we cannot provide any detailed advice regarding specific potential setting impacts at this stage.

We consider that visualisations would be required in support of any application for the proposed development to demonstrate the effect of the proposed converter station on the setting of some of the nearby assets. Wireframes may be acceptable in the first instance to determine if further visual material is required.

If further information on the size and scale of the converter station and supporting information, such as wireframes or ZTV figures, can be provided at pre-application stage then we would be happy to provide further advice. [REDACTED]

### **Direct Impact**

The list of assets provided for consultation is focused solely on the potential effects of the proposed development on the setting of the assets listed. However, it is important to note that from the consultation there is no indication that assets will be assessed for direct impacts in your consultation, which is of concern given the location of the proposed



converter station within the Battle of Dunbar II and the location of scheduled monuments within the battlefield. It is noted that the assets within our remit identified below are also assessed for direct impacts as part of any assessment and appropriate mitigation identified if direct impacts are likely;

- Battle of Dunbar II (BTL7)
- Castledene, enclosure SW of (SM5849)
- Branxton, enclosure 350m NNW of (SM5958)
- Branxton Cottage, enclosure 300m E of (SM5890)

While it may be relatively simple to mitigate potential direct impacts on the scheduled monuments by ensuring that the cable route and any associated works avoid the legally protected scheduled areas, please note that the direct impacts on the Inventory battlefield may require considerably more involved mitigation measures.

We recommend that the applicant provide more detailed information relating to direct impacts on the battlefield and proposals for mitigation ahead of any application to both ourselves and the Local Authority archaeological advisors.

## Historic Environment Scotland