



SUNNICA ENERGY FARM

EN010106

8.18 Draft Statement of Common Ground with Suffolk Wildlife Trust

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010



Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Examination Procedure) Rules 2010**

Sunnica Energy Farm

Draft Statement of Common Ground with Suffolk Wildlife Trust

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	EN010106
Document Reference	EN010106/APP/8.18
Author	Sunnica Energy Farm Project Team

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 00	11/11/2022	Deadline 2 submission
Rev 01	16/12/2022	Deadline 4 submission
Rev 02	30/01/2023	Deadline 6 submission

Table of contents

Chapter	Pages
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose of this document	1
1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground	2
1.3 Terminology	2
2 Record of Engagement	2
3 Issues	5
3.1 Matters Agreed	5
3.2 Matters Under Discussion	12
3.3 Matters Not Agreed	19

Table of Tables

Table 1: Record of Engagement.....	2
Table 2: Matters agreed.....	5
Table 3: Matters under discussion.....	12
Table 4: Matters not agreed.....	19

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared in respect of the application for the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm Development Consent Order ("the Application") made by Sunnica Limited ("Sunnica") to the Secretary of State for the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy ("Secretary of State") for a Development Consent Order ("the Order") under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 ("PA 2008").
- 1.1.2 The Order, if granted, would authorise Sunnica to construct, operate (including maintain) and decommission a ground mounted solar farm across Sunnica East Site A, Sunnica East Site B and Sunnica West Site A. The Scheme includes the following key components:
- a. Solar PV modules;
 - b. PV module mounting structures;
 - c. Inverters;
 - d. Transformers;
 - e. Switchgear;
 - f. Onsite cabling (including high and low voltage cabling) and cabling between the Sites and to the Burwell National Grid Substation;
 - g. One or more BESS (expected to be formed of lithium ion batteries storing electrical energy) on Sunnica East Site A, Sunnica East Site B, and Sunnica West Site A;
 - h. An electrical compound comprising a substation and control building (Sunnica East Site A, Sunnica East Site B, and Sunnica West Site A only);
 - i. Office/warehouse (Sunnica East Site A and Sunnica East Site B only)
 - j. Fencing and security measures;
 - k. Drainage;
 - l. Internal access roads and car parking;
 - m. Landscaping including habitat creation areas; and
 - n. Construction laydown areas.
- 1.1.3 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the Application documents. All documents are available in the deposit locations and/or the Planning Inspectorate website.
- 1.1.4 This SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority (ExA) where agreement has been reached between the parties to it, and where agreement has

not yet been reached. SoCGs are an established means in the planning process of allowing all parties to identify and so focus on specific issues that may need to be addressed during the examination.

1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared by (1) Sunnica as the Applicant and (2) Suffolk Wildlife Trust.
- 1.2.2 Sunnica is a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) incorporated in December 2013 to construct, operate, and decommission the Sunnica Energy Farm.
- 1.2.3 Suffolk Wildlife Trust is an interested party to the Examination of the Application.
- 1.2.4 Collectively Sunnica and Suffolk Wildlife Trust are referred to as ‘the parties’.

1.3 Terminology

- 1.3.1 In the tables in the Issues chapter of this SoCG:
- a. “Agreed” indicates where the issue has been resolved.
 - b. “Not Agreed” indicates a final position of the parties that is not agreed, and
 - c. “Under discussion” indicates where these points are the subject of on-going discussion wherever possible to resolve, or refine, the extent of disagreement between the parties.
- 1.3.2 It can be taken that any matters not specifically referred to in the Issues chapter of this SoCG are not of material interest or relevance to Suffolk Wildlife Trust’s representations and therefore have not been considered in this document. It is recognised however that engagement between both parties will need to continue due to their joint interest in matters arising from the Scheme.

2 Record of Engagement

- 2.1.1 A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between Sunnica, and Suffolk Wildlife Trust is outlined in **Table 1**. There has been email correspondence between the parties to discuss the sharing of information, arrangement of meetings and for them to comment on draft documentation, but this table reflects the key meetings and emails of note that have taken place between the parties.

Table 1: Record of Engagement

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
24.06.2019	Ecology Workshop with Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Wildlife Trust Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire (BCN), East Cambridgeshire District Council (ECDC), Natural	Key topics included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update from Sunnica on the changes to the Scheme since EIA Scoping • Summary of ecological baseline to date • Review and discussion of key ecological constraints and consideration of

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
	England, Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC), West Suffolk District Council (WSDC) and Suffolk County Council (SCC).	approaches for avoidance, mitigation and enhancement
04.12.2019	Ecology Workshop with Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Wildlife Trust BCN, ECDC, Natural England, CCC, WSDC and SCC.	Key topics included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback received during non-statutory consultation • Ecology surveys • Biodiversity net gain • Decommissioning • Details of lighting
26.03.2021	Ecology Workshop with Wildlife Trust BCN, RSPB, Natural England, Suffolk Wildlife Trust, WSDC, CCC, ECDC and SCC.	Key topics included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheme update and programme • Overview of Stone Curlew population and distribution. • Provision of offsetting habitat for Stone Curlew. • Management of arable flora and creation of new habitats.
04.05.2022	Meeting between Sunnica Ltd, RSPB, Natural England, Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Wildlife Trust BCN, CCC and WSDC	Sunnica Ecology Working Group meeting to discuss recent changes to the Scheme, ecology surveys, key DCO documents, key points raised in Relevant Representations, vision and ambitions for the Scheme, Stone Curlew, local impact reports and SoCGs.
13.07.2022	Meeting between Suffolk Wildlife Trust, RSPB, Wildlife Trust BCN (on behalf of ECDC), Natural England, CCC and WSDC	Ecology working group meeting in relation to aspects such as the change application, SoCGs, Biodiversity Net Gain, Green Infrastructure and arable flora.
25.10.2022	Meeting between Sunnica Ltd and Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Key issues raised in the Suffolk Wildlife Trust Relevant Representations and the content of the SoCG were discussed.
02.11.2022	Email from Suffolk Wildlife Trust to Sunnica Ltd	The reviewed SoCG was sent through.
07.11.2022	Email from Sunnica Ltd to Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Minor amendments made to the SoCG.
09.11.2022	Emails between Sunnica Ltd and Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Final amendments to the SoCG before the Deadline 2 submission.
05.12.2022	Meeting between Sunnica Ltd and Suffolk Wildlife Trust	SoCG positions were discussed.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
19.01.2023	Meeting between Sunnica Ltd and Suffolk Wildlife Trust	SoCG positions were discussed.

2.1.2 It is agreed that this is an accurate record of the key meetings and consultation undertaken between (1) Sunnica and (2) Suffolk Wildlife Trust in relation to the issues addressed in this SoCG as at the date of this SoCG.

2.1.3 The issues and matters highlighted in **Table 2** to **Table 4** summarise the key issues that have been in discussion between the two parties.

3 Issues

3.1 Matters Agreed

3.1.1 **Table 2** below details the matters agreed with Suffolk Wildlife Trust.

Table 2: Matters agreed

Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters	Description of Suffolk Wildlife Trust concerns	SWT Level of concern	Status of discussions & outlook for resolution
Assessment	Designated Sites	Impacts to Chippenham Fen and Snailwell Poor's Fen SSSI and the Fenland SAC, as well as Snailwell Meadows SSSI.	Insufficient evidence that construction and operation of solar array at W01, W02 and cable corridor close to this cluster of designated fenland sites will not have significant adverse impacts on these sites, their designated features, and/or associated species assemblages	High	The removal of the PV panels from West Site B [REP3A-037] means that Chippenham Fen Ramsar site and Fenland SAC and Snailwell Meadows SSSI are now all just over 1km from the nearest solar arrays.
	Designated Sites	Impacts to County Wildlife Sites (CWS) and Local Nature Reserves (LNR).	Potential for cable crossing through Havacre Meadows and Deal Nook CWS to have adverse impacts on the site. Any deterioration in condition of CWS will adversely affect biodiversity and wildlife, and the contribution of CWS to maintaining ecological connectivity and acting as steppingstones for nature through the landscape. SWT would like habitats and features of CWS within the	Medium	Horizontal Directional Drilling is being proposed at this location with entry and exit pits set back from the boundary of the CWS to increase confidence that this receptor will not be adversely impacted. CWSs were indicated as retained and enhanced ecological features on the landscape masterplan in updates to the OLEMP at Deadline 3 [REP3-012] . The OLEMP incorporates management measures for the CWSs within the Scheme boundary. In the case of Havacre Meadows and Deal Nook CWS (and the River Kennet), through which a cable needs to pass, this is mitigated by the cable

Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters	Description of Suffolk Wildlife Trust concerns	SWT Level of concern	Status of discussions & outlook for resolution
			<p>scheme boundary to be prioritized for enhancement through the creation and implementation of management plans.</p>		<p>being installed by horizontal directional drilling with entry and exit pits set back at least 30m from the CWS.</p> <p>It is very unusual to have to fall back on open-cut once horizontal directional drilling has been decided on. The latter decision takes into account a range of factors including soil, underlying geology and hydrology and has to be fit for purpose with respect to the EIA. To add further reassurance, the contractor will undertake a site specific risk assessment based on the soils and geology and develop and tailor the drilling method appropriately for the conditions, thereby further reduce the risk of failure. This was added to the CEMP at Deadline 5 [REP5-044].</p> <p>In terms of Bentonite leak and contamination of water and, or groundwater, the undertaking of a frac-out risk assessment is stipulated, which is standard practice.</p>
	Designated Sites	Impacts to Stone Curlew and land functionally linked to the Breckland SPA.	Appropriateness of operational areas for stone-curlew nesting (disturbance).	High	Agreed on 8 December 2022.

Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters	Description of Suffolk Wildlife Trust concerns	SWT Level of concern	Status of discussions & outlook for resolution
	Aquatic invertebrates	Impacts to invertebrates which lay their eggs in water, including several nationally rare species.	<p>There is some evidence in the scientific literature as well as anecdotal evidence that flying insects that lay their eggs in water can be attracted to and lay their eggs on solar panels.</p> <p>There is insufficient evidence at present to inform a reasonable assessment of the likely scale of any impact of this effect at a population level on the affected invertebrate populations of Chippenham Fen and Snailwell Poor's Fen SSSI and the Fenland SAC, as well as Snailwell Meadows SSSI, but there is the potential for this to be significant.</p> <p>The solar array at W01 is of particular concern, and we note the joint Local Impact Report submitted by East Cambridgeshire District Council, West Suffolk Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and Suffolk County Council calls for all of the arrays in Sunnica West B to be removed as part of a precautionary approach to impacts on these designated sites and in view of the emerging Nature Recovery</p>	Medium	<p>The Applicant provided a technical note in relation to aquatic invertebrates at Deadline 2 [REP2-038].</p> <p>This matter was agreed to be resolved in a meeting on 5 December 2022 as a result of the removal of Sunnica West Site B.</p> <p>Additionally, monitoring will be undertaken of those aquatic macroinvertebrate taxa potentially at risk from being attracted to solar panels from waterbodies and watercourses within the Order limits. This would enable remedial measures to be undertaken.</p>

Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters	Description of Suffolk Wildlife Trust concerns	SWT Level of concern	Status of discussions & outlook for resolution
			<p>Network in East Cambridgeshire and ambitions to expand and connect wetland habitats in this area.</p> <p>If the Applicant suggests mitigation to prevent flying insects in existing wetland sites from reaching the solar panels at W01 and W02 by screening, we are concerned this will limit the effectiveness of work to restore and re-connect wetlands and associated habitat in this area, as mobile species should be permitted to colonise newly restored areas.</p>		
	Connectivity and nature recovery	Impacts on ecological connectivity in the wider landscape within which the scheme would be located.	<p>The potential for barrier effects from the construction and fencing of solar array areas to impinge on the movement of wildlife through the landscape between high value habitats and designated sites.</p> <p>Impacts on the potential for restoration and recovery of habitat in the area between Chippenham Fen and Snailwell Meadows and along the valley of the River Snail, contributing to emerging Nature Recovery Networks in</p>	Medium	<p>The Applicant considers that the detail on these design elements for the different habitats proposed in relation to connectivity will be provided at the detailed LEMP stage in line with the principles set out in the OLEMP [REP5-012] .</p> <p>The publication of “An interim nature recovery network for East Cambridgeshire” is welcomed by the Applicant in signposting the habitat types and detail needed for the Scheme to integrate with and support the nature recovery network with respect to both East Cambridgeshire and West Suffolk.</p> <p>SWT welcomes the inclusion of gaps in the perimeter security fencing to allow wildlife</p>

Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters	Description of Suffolk Wildlife Trust concerns	SWT Level of concern	Status of discussions & outlook for resolution
			<p>East Cambridgeshire and West Suffolk.</p>		<p>including badgers and hares to move through the fence.</p>
	Water environment	Impacts on chalk streams and other freshwater ecosystems.	<p>Lack of evidence to inform the assessment of likely impacts on chalk streams and other freshwater ecosystems, for example detailed hydrological investigations to assess impacts of cable crossings.</p> <p>Insufficient setback between Lee Brook and solar arrays in E03 and E05.</p> <p>Insufficient Biodiversity Net Gain for rivers and watercourses is indicated by the BNG report.</p> <p>Potential for restoration and enhancement of watercourses and floodplains as part of the emerging Nature Recovery Network has received insufficient consideration in the location of the solar arrays adjacent to natural watercourses including the River Snail, River Kennett and Lee Brook, and in the design of ecological mitigation and enhancement measures for the scheme.</p>	Medium	<p>SWT considers that further surveys and investigation needed to inform assessment of impacts on chalk streams and other freshwater ecosystems.</p> <p>It also considers that biodiversity net gain (BNG) design for rivers and watercourses should aim to deliver a minimum 10% BNG for these ecological features.</p> <p>SWT considers that the potential for solar array location and setbacks combined with opportunities to restore and enhance watercourses and floodplains should be explored as part of the design of the scheme's ecological mitigation and enhancements.</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that further surveys and investigation have been undertaken to inform assessment of impacts on chalk streams and other freshwater ecosystems which were reported through a new BNG report using V3.1 of the Defra metric submitted to Examination at Deadline 5 [REP5-049].</p> <p>Detail on the design elements for the different habitats proposed in relation to connectivity will be provided at the detailed LEMP stage.</p> <p>Additionally, it is agreed with SWT that the cessation of arable husbandry will have significant benefits to both local and downstream watercourses including no more pesticide or fertilizer applications or crop irrigation.</p>

Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters	Description of Suffolk Wildlife Trust concerns	SWT Level of concern	Status of discussions & outlook for resolution
	Cable route	Impacts of cabling route through area ECO4.	Potential for hydrological impacts from cabling on adjacent fen habitats (Fenland SAC / Chippenham Fen Ramsar / Chippenham Fen & Snailwell Poor's Fen SSSI)	Medium	<p>SWT considers that detailed hydrological is investigation needed to assess potential for impacts.</p> <p>Whilst not specifically secured in CEMP but as a consequence of the depth parameters that have been set, the cable trench for Grid Connection Route B, as for all cables, is anticipated to be above the water table and will not affect groundwater flow. If groundwater were to reach the level of the trench, permeable backfill material will not impede groundwater flow across the trench, and the cable pipe itself is small compared to the extent of the aquifer. There will be no significant impediment to groundwater flow and, if any where present, peat will be left unaltered.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that this information has been provided in the application documentation. The HRA was updated at Deadline 3 [REP3-010] to account for stakeholder and ExA comments on impacts to the Fen. A further update was made at Deadline 5 [REP5-106].</p> <p>The presence of the cable through ECO4 does not present any future impediment to the creation of wetland habitat here to connect neighbouring wetlands as part of the nature recovery network. This what was proposed had the West Site B remained in the Scheme with solar arrays.</p>
Mitigation and monitoring	Decommissioning	Uncertainty surrounding the decommissioning of the site and the retention of	Potential for adverse effects on habitats and species during decommissioning.	High	A Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) [REP5-009] will be in place to manage ecological effects in the decommissioning period.

Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters	Description of Suffolk Wildlife Trust concerns	SWT Level of concern	Status of discussions & outlook for resolution
		<p>the created habitats in perpetuity, also creates doubts about the long-term retention of any benefits resulting from the scheme's proposed enhancements for wildlife and biodiversity.</p>	<p>Proposed retention of mitigation habitats and BNG habitats for the lifetime of the development only increases the potential for loss of these habitats following decommissioning and the loss of any long-term benefit to biodiversity or contribution to nature recovery from habitat creation and enhancement in these areas.</p> <p>It is the view of Suffolk Wildlife Trust and The Wildlife Trusts nationally that ecological mitigation, and Biodiversity Net Gain should be secured in perpetuity.</p>		<p>The Ecology Advisory Group will have a key role to play in ensuring that biodiversity gain is achieved thereby ensuring that this will be conserved beyond the 40 years.</p> <p>The Scheme will respond to the requirements as set out in the implementation of the Environment Bill with respect to biodiversity net gain.</p>

3.2 Matters Under Discussion

3.2.1 **Table 3** below details the matters under discussion with Suffolk Wildlife Trust.

Table 3: Matters under discussion

Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion	Description of Suffolk Wildlife Trust concerns	SWT Level of concern	Status of discussions & outlook for resolution
Assessment	Biodiversity Net Gain	An updated calculation of Biodiversity Net Gain is to be provided by the Applicant, using the latest Biodiversity Net Gain metric 3.1.	<p>BNG report is incomplete and inadequate to assess the BNG the scheme can be expected to deliver. Specific issues include but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase 1 survey used to assess existing habitat baseline is not adequate. UK Habs classification and methodology should be used. Habitat creation/ enhancement for mitigation can only count toward No Net Loss and must be presented separately from that counted towards gains beyond NNL. Predicted BNG for rivers and ditches is only 1%. This should be increased to 10% minimum through design and delivery of 	Medium	<p>SWT considers that the preparation of the BNG report should follow Defra guidance provided alongside V3.1 of the Biodiversity Metric¹, and adhere to CIEEM Good practice principles².</p> <p>A full copy of the metric tool spreadsheet that has been used in the BNG assessment has been provided.</p> <p>GIS data used in the BNG assessment and plan has been provided to evidence the full review and recalculation.</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that a new BNG report using V3.1 of the Defra metric has been prepared and was submitted to Examination at Deadline 5 [REP5-048] [REP5-049]. The Applicant has provided this information to SWT along with the associated calculations which SWT are reviewing and will be discussed at a workshop on 31 January 2023.</p> <p>The Applicant has recognised from the outset that there is a need to both integrate species enhancement as part of the Defra metric for BNG, e.g. grassland insects and other invertebrates benefiting from grassland</p>

¹ The Biodiversity Metric 3.1 - JP039 [REDACTED]

² Biodiversity Net Gain | CIEEM

Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion	Description of Suffolk Wildlife Trust concerns	SWT Level of concern	Status of discussions & outlook for resolution
			restoration and enhancement measures.		habitats, and incorporate enhancement for specific species or groups of species into the Scheme which are independent of the Defra BNG assessment, e.g. Badger and a significant increase in foraging resources, and specific bird species including Skylark, the latter having grassland areas managed specifically for this and other ground nesting species.
Assessment	Designated Sites	Impacts to Stone Curlew and land functionally linked to the Breckland SPA.	<p>Insufficient evidence that current proposed offsetting measures (mitigation) will be adequate to eliminate any residual adverse impact on nesting stone curlews on land functionally linked to the Breckland SPA.</p> <p>Disturbance impacts on mitigation areas due to public access, and the proximity of built development.</p>	High	<p>The observations and data collected over the three years of Stone Curlew surveys has demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – In any given year, only a proportion of the Order limits and surrounding area is suitable for Stone Curlew, which is likely to influence the number of pairs present; – Stone Curlew nest sites are dependent on what a field is being used for in a given year, e.g. a field may be used for 2 years but not the next due to the farmer moving pigs onto that plot some Sunnica parcels, e.g. E12 and ECO3 contain a number of fields which support a number of different crops/other uses in any given year and therefore, at a field scale can appear to be supporting nesting Stone Curlew for a number of years. – Stone Curlew are successfully nesting within the Order limits, despite the presence of existing footpaths, residential properties and roads.

Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion	Description of Suffolk Wildlife Trust concerns	SWT Level of concern	Status of discussions & outlook for resolution
					<p>The landscape in the Order limits and its environs supports a small sub-population of the wider Breckland population and is limited by the proportion of available habitat for Stone Curlew to use in any given year. It is on this basis that the mitigation for Stone Curlew has been developed optimal habitat for both nesting and foraging in immediate surrounds (reduces predation risks and expenditure of energy) in areas currently used by Stone Curlew (no risk to nesting being curtailed by farming practices), all of which is sustained for a 40 year period. Stone Curlew plots have been located and will be managed to minimise disturbance. However, and importantly, by retaining Stone Curlew within the Order limits and designing offsetting areas to coincide with where nesting has previously occurred, the Applicant is confident that Stone Curlew will not be susceptible to disturbance from existing sources, i.e. the individuals are already using these areas with existing disturbance presence.</p> <p>Where necessary, more than one ECoW will provide technical direction as required.</p> <p>Monitoring Stone Curlew nesting will include potentially suitable nesting habitat within 500m of the Scheme (including offsetting areas). This recognises that Stone Curlews will not necessarily choose to nest in offsetting areas, thereby providing greater confidence in the observed impacts of the Scheme on overall Stone Curlew nesting numbers and</p>

Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion	Description of Suffolk Wildlife Trust concerns	SWT Level of concern	Status of discussions & outlook for resolution
					<p>informing any remedial actions that might be needed.</p> <p>Monitoring data would be communicated to the Ecology Advisory Group which, given the sensitive nature of the data, would decide if it should be disseminated any further, e.g. to the county bird club/naturalists' society and researchers.</p> <p>SWT are seeking the view of RSPB on this matter.</p>
Assessment	Protected species	Impacts to wintering birds, breeding birds, bats and badgers.	Surveys and monitoring for these protected species groups is incomplete and not sufficient to inform a full assessment of likely impacts. SWT would like to see monitoring expanded to provide sufficient evidence to support assessments of the likely impacts to these receptors from the scheme	Medium	<p>SWT considers that additional surveys / more comprehensive monitoring is required for these species groups to assess likely impacts and inform approach to avoidance, mitigation where indicated, in line with the mitigation hierarchy.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the surveys were all up to date at the point of submission of the Environmental Statement. Given the delay in the start of the Examination, Phase 1 Habitat and flora surveys were used to determine if there had been any significant change in land use, habitat composition, etc. and therefore, any likely changes in the ecology baseline presented in the Environmental Statement. It was concluded from these data that there were not, and so no further surveys were necessary during the Examination process.</p> <p>Irrespective of this, as secured through the Framework CEMP, pre-commencement surveys will be undertaken for all relevant</p>

Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion	Description of Suffolk Wildlife Trust concerns	SWT Level of concern	Status of discussions & outlook for resolution
					<p>ecological receptors. This will inform detailed design and the finalised CEMP.</p> <p>SWT raised a question following ISH2 about evidence that grassland habitat creation will provide sufficient mitigation for nesting skylarks displaced from the areas of the solar arrays. This will be discussed at a workshop on 31 January 2023.</p>
Assessment	Arable flora	Impacts to arable flora and the unique Brecks plant communities.	<p>Insufficient evidence from surveys to understand the full impacts of the Scheme on arable flora and Brecks plant communities.</p> <p>Insufficient detail on proposed mitigation for any loss of these habitats and communities to provide confidence that there will not be any residual adverse impacts.</p>	Medium	<p>SWT considers that more detail is required on mitigation measures, including management for mitigation areas and mechanisms for securing these.</p> <p>Further surveys and evidence have been obtained by the Applicant which confirm that there will be no likely impacts on these features. This was reported along with the updated biodiversity net gain (BNG) calculation at Deadline 5.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises concerns regarding the conservation of rare arable weeds. In addition to the areas of fields set aside specifically for these plants and associated insects and other invertebrates, field margins will be managed to create conditions suitable for arable weeds, details of which will be included in the next version of the Outline LEMP.</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplans were updated at Deadline 5 [REP5-054] [REP5-061 to REP5-064].</p>

Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion	Description of Suffolk Wildlife Trust concerns	SWT Level of concern	Status of discussions & outlook for resolution
Mitigation and monitoring	Habitat creation	The Applicant's assessment of the likelihood of significant effects from the Scheme is highly dependent on the success of the habitat creation within the mitigation areas, as well as the successful creation of species rich grassland and field margins for arable flora within the solar arrays.	Insufficient detail has been provided of proposed habitat establishment and management processes and mechanisms for securing and maintaining habitats in good condition to provide confidence in the success of habitat creation in mitigation areas.	High	Mechanisms for creating and, or maintaining and securing habitats for the duration of the Scheme need to be agreed along with details of monitoring for habitats and species. Detailed establishment and management plans for the different habitats proposed in the mitigation areas will be provided at the detailed LEMP stage, however, the principles for this are set out in the Outline LEMP [REP5-012] .
	Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)	The level of detail of the Framework CEMP is not sufficient.	CEMP needs to provide sufficient detailed of precautionary working methods for avoiding impacts on ecological features during the construction phase of development. Please see Local Impact Report for more detailed comments from Local Authorities on the requirements for the CEMP.	Medium	A detailed CEMP will be provided at the detailed CEMP stage covering precautionary working methods for avoiding impacts on ecological features during the construction phase of development, however, the principles for this are set out in the Framework CEMP [REP5-044] .
	Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP)	Lack of detail within the Outline LEMP. The full LEMP should be produced early in order to	Lack of detail of proposed habitat establishment and management processes and mechanisms.	High	There is a need for the full LEMP to incorporate flexibility for management to be modified in response to monitoring of delivery, i.e. adaptive management plans for the different habitats and mitigation and enhancement areas within the Scheme.

Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion	Description of Suffolk Wildlife Trust concerns	SWT Level of concern	Status of discussions & outlook for resolution
		inform the inspectors decision			<p>A governance framework will be established to steer this process and take evidence-based decisions informed by expert advice.</p> <p>The Ecological Advisory Group will perform this role, among other important functions related to the monitoring and auditing of delivery of the scheme's ecological mitigation and enhancement measures.</p> <p>This was reflected in updates to the OLEMP at Deadline 3 [REP3-012]. A further update to the OLEMP was made at Deadline 5 [REP5-014].</p>
	Monitoring and Evaluation	For there to be greater certainty as to the effectiveness of mitigation and enhancement measures it will be necessary for more detailed monitoring of ecological impacts to take place than is currently proposed.	Lack of sufficient ecological monitoring at all stages of the development, construction operation, and decommissioning of the scheme has the potential to result in adverse ecological impacts and/or reduced ecological gains.	High	Detailed monitoring for the different habitats and species proposed in the mitigation areas will be provided at the detailed LEMP stage in line with the commitment set out in the OLEMP. This monitoring will inform adaptive management of mitigation and enhancement areas, in particular for the ecological features mentioned above. This will be through the Ecology Advisory Group.

3.3 Matters Not Agreed

3.3.1 **Table 4** below details the matters not agreed with Suffolk Wildlife Trust.

Table 4: Matters not agreed

Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Not Agreed
None	None	Matters under discussion in Section 3.2 (table 3) will be placed here if unresolved.