



# Longfield Solar Farm

PINS Ref: EN010118

Consultation Report Appendices

Appendices J-1 to J-5

Document Reference: EN010118/APP/5.11

Version 1

February 2022

Longfield Solar Energy Farm Ltd

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure)  
Regulations 2009

## Table of Contents

Appendix J-1: Regard had to statutory consultation responses from consultees under s42(1)(a) .....	1
Appendix J-2: Regard had to statutory consultation responses from consultees under s42(1)(b) .....	135
Appendix J-3: Regard had to statutory consultation responses from consultees under s42(1)(d) .....	289
Appendix J-4: Regard had to statutory consultation responses from consultees under s47 .....	301
Appendix J-5: Regard had to statutory consultation responses from additional targeted consultation .....	636
References .....	717

## List of abbreviations

<b>Term</b>	<b>Abbreviation</b>
Above Ground Level	AGL
Agricultural Land Classification	ALC
Air Quality Management Areas	AQMAs
Alternative Sites Assessment	ASA
APFP Regulations	Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009
Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	AONB
'As Low As Reasonably Practicable'	ALARP
Balance of Solar Systems	BoSS
Basic Noise Level	BNL
Battery Energy Storage System	BESS
Battery Safety Management Plan	BSMP
Best and Most Versatile	BMV
Best Practicable Means	BPM
Biodiversity Action Plan	BAP
Biodiversity Net Gain	BNG
Braintree District Council	BDC
British Standard	BS
Campaign to Protect Rural England	CPRE
Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management	CIEEM
Chelmsford City Council	CCC
Chelmsford North East Bypass	CNEB
Community Benefit Fund	CBF
Construction Environmental Management Plan	CEMP
Construction Resource Management Plan	CRMP
Construction Traffic Management Plan	CTMP
Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design	CPTED
Critical Drainage Area	CDA
Decibels	dB
Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan	DEMP
Decommissioning Resource Management Plan	DRMP
Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy	BEIS
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs	DEFRA
Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities	DLUHC
Department of Energy and Climate Change	DECC

Development Consent Order	DCO
Direct Current	DC
District Level Licensing	DDL
Environmental Impact Assessment	EIA
Environment Agency	EA
Environmental Statement	ES
Essex County Council	ECC
European Protected Species	EPS
European Union	EU
Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan	FCTMP
Full Time Employment	FTE
Geographical Information System	GIS
Great Britain	GB
Great Crested Newt	GCN
Greenhouse Gas	GHG
Gross Value Added	GVA
Ground Investigations	GI
Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	GLVIA
Habitat Regulations Assessment	HRA
Hectares	Ha
Health and Safety Executive	HSE
Heavy Duty Vehicles	HDV
Heavy Goods Vehicles	HGVs
Historical Environmental Record	HER
Homes and Communities Agency	HCA
Horizontal Directional Drilling	HDD
Institute of Air Quality Management	IAQM
Interim Advice Note	IAN
Joint Emergency Services	JESIP
Interoperability Principles	
Joint Nature Conservation Committee	JNCC
Kilovolt	kV
Kilometres	Km
A-weighted, sound level exceeded for 10% of the measurement period.	LA10
A-weighted, sound level exceeded for 90% of the measurement period.	LA90
A-weighted, equivalent sound level over the measurement period.	LAeq
A-weighted, maximum sound level over the measurement period, measured on 'fast' response	LAFmax
Local Air Quality Management	LAQM
Landscape Character Area	LCA
Landscape Character Type	LCT
Landscape Environment Management Plan	LEMP

Landscape Visual Impact Assessment	LVIA
Lead Local Flood Authority	LLFA
Light detection and ranging	LiDAR
Local Geological Sites	LGS
Local Landscape Character Areas	LLCA
Local Wildlife Site	LoWS
Lowest Observable Adverse Effect Level	LOAEL
Mineral Infrastructure Impact Assessment	MIIA
Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government	MHCLG
National Character Area	NCA
National electricity transmission system	NETS
National Infrastructure Commission	NIC
National Grid Electricity System Operator	NGESO
National Nature Reserve	NNR
National Planning Policy Framework	NPPF
National Planning Policy Guidance	NPPG
National Policy Statement	NPS
Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project	NSIP
Natural England	NE
Noise Impact Assessment	NIA
Non Motorised Users	NMUs
Non Technical Summary	NTS
No Observed Effect Level	NOEL
Office for National Statistics	ONS
Ordnance Survey	OS
Outline Battery Safety Management Plan	OBSMP
Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan	CEMP
Outline Environmental Management Plan	OEMP
Outline Design Principles	ODP
Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan	OLEMP
Overhead Lines	OHL
Parish Council	PC
Photovoltaic	PV
Planning Act 2008	PA 2008
Planning Inspectorate	PINS
Planning Policy Statement	PPS
Point of Connection	POC
Preliminary Environmental Information Report	PEIR
Proposed Development Area	PDA

Public Rights of Way	PROW
Radial Distributor Road	RDR
Registered Park and Garden	RPG
Representative Viewpoint	RV
Residential Visual Amenity Assessment	RVAA
Right of Way Improvement Plans	ROWIP
Scheduled Monument	SM
Secretary of State	SoS
Section 42	S42
Section 43	S43
Section 44	S44
Section 46	S46
Section 47	S47
Section 48	S48
Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level	SOAEL
Site of Special Scientific Interest	SSSI
Soil Resource Management Plan	SRMP
Special Area of Conservation	SAC
Special Protection Area	SPA
Statement of Community Consultation	SoCC
Statement of Common Ground	SoCG
Strategic Flood Risk Assessment	SFRA
Suitably Qualified and Experienced Personnel	SQEP
Supplementary Planning Document	SPD
Sustainable Drainage Strategy	SuDS
Transport Assessment	TA
Tree Protection Order	TPO
Viewpoints	VP
Water Framework Directive	WFD
Written Scheme of Investigation	WSI
Zone of Theoretical Visibility	ZTV

## Appendix J-1: Regard had to statutory consultation responses from consultees under s42(1)(a)

**Table J-1.1** below sets out responses to the statutory consultation from consultees under s42(1)(a) of PA 2008 and the regard had to them by the Applicant. It should be read in conjunction with Section 7.2 of the **Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]**.

**Table J-1.1 Regard had to statutory consultation responses from consultees under s42(1)(a)**

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Air quality</b>	We note that section 14.2, identifies and proposes measures to address the potential impacts and effects of the Scheme on Air Quality during construction, operation, and decommissioning. Ecological receptors sensitive to air quality have been assessed following Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) guidance. For this Scheme there are potential minor adverse impacts from dust / air pollution on ecological receptors however with the embedded avoidance/mitigation it is deemed to not be significant.	Natural England	Air quality impacts have been assessed in full and have been detailed in <b>Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (ES) - Air Quality [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . The potential impact of the Scheme on local air quality will be determined at sensitive (human and ecological) receptors identified in the vicinity of the Order limits and has been assessed as not significant. This comprises sensitive receptors within 350m of the Order limits, within 50m of roads expected to be affected by	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	<p>We would like to understand why this site was selected and which other sites were considered. The reason for this request is that the site does not appear to meet many of the preferred criteria for locating a utility-scale solar PV installation. It does not appear to be an effective use of this good quality, food producing land and the scope and scale of the installation is likely to disrupt local wildlife (as discussed further below) during the construction, operation and deconstruction phases over a period of at least 40 years.</p>	<p>Boreham Parish Council</p>	<p>the construction phase traffic, and up to 500m from the site access points.</p> <p>The Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant. Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm.</p> <p>This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that is capable of producing a large amount of electricity.</p>	<p>N</p>



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area. The Solar Farm Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase and the</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>Scheme becomes less financially viable).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ecological constraints – Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs), SSSI's, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li><li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li><li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li><li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li> <li>• Settlements;</li> <li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li> <li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar photovoltaic (PV);</li> <li>• Green Belt; and</li> <li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 agricultural land classification (ALC).</li> </ul> <p>The search was used to identify contiguous potential developable areas of around or greater than 300ha with the ability to accommodate a large scale solar scheme.</p> <p>Further to the high level constraints identified above, further search criteria were applied at a local level, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topography – the Site needs to be flat or gently south facing</li> </ul>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>slopes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field Shape and Pattern – fields need to be large and of regular shape;</li> <li>• Number of landowners – ideally a small number of landowners;</li> <li>• Landscape and Visual – aiming to locate the Site out of landscape designations, with a high degree of existing vegetation for natural screening, limited long distance views;</li> <li>• Residential Amenity – checking for proximity to settlements;</li> <li>• Heritage – proximity to Listed Buildings and other designations such as Scheduled Monuments, and presence of below ground archaeology;</li> <li>• Ecology – avoid or minimise proximity to designated areas within or close to the Site;</li> <li>• Flood Risk – seek to locate the Site in Flood Zone 1, and reduce intrusion into zones 2 and 3;</li> <li>• Public Rights of Way (PROW) – seek to either minimise effects upon receptors using PROW or seek opportunities to provide</li> </ul>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			connectivity; and • Access – ease of access for construction and decommissioning stages to be considered. The Order limits are situated within the optimal 5km of the Bulls Lodge Substation and provides a developable area with the ability to accommodate a large scale solar scheme. It was deemed a suitable option to move forwards with an application for the Scheme.	
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	Reduce the overall size of the proposed solar farm. The current 1.7 square mile area is too large for a single installation and will disrupt wildlife over too great an area.	Boreham Parish Council	Chapter 11 of the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> provides an analysis of the economic viability of large-scale solar generation as a future contributor to a low-carbon Great Britain (GB) electricity supply system in comparison to alternate technologies; and an analysis of why the Scheme will be most beneficial to the achievement of government’s aims if it is consented to the scale proposed. Solar power reduces the market price of electricity by displacing more expensive forms of generation from the cost stack.	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>This delivers benefits for electricity consumers. Due to technological advances, power generated by solar plants is already at or below grid parity cost in Great Britain. Solar power is economically attractive in Great Britain against many other forms of conventional and renewable generation. Size remains important and maximising the generating capacity of schemes improves their economic efficiency, so bringing power to market at the lowest cost possible. Larger solar schemes deliver more quickly and at a lower unit cost than multiple independent schemes which make up the same total capacity, bringing forward carbon reduction and economic benefits in line with government policy; The Scheme proposes a substantial infrastructure asset, which if consented will deliver large amounts of cheap, low-carbon electricity both during and beyond the critical 2020s timeframe. Maximising the capacity of generation in the resource-rich,</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			accessible and technically deliverable proposed location, represents a significant and economically rational step forwards in the fight against the global climate emergency. The Applicant has assessed the impacts of delivering a scheme of this scale through the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>	
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	There are many more suitable sites for solar farms in Essex and the South East of England. It appears that no other sites are under consideration and evaluation. Instead of that, it seems that the only reasons for this particular site being considered is because the grid runs through it and it is being supported by a willing land-owner. These reasons are not sufficient to outweigh the significant disadvantages of the scheme in this location or the failure to seek alternative, more suitable sites.	Hatfield Peverel Parish Council	The Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant. Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that is capable of producing a large amount of electricity.</p> <p>Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>The Solar Farm Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location</p>	



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ecological constraints – SAC's, SPA's, SSSI's, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li><li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li><li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li><li>• Settlements;</li><li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li><li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li><li>• Green Belt; and</li><li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li></ul> <p>The search was used to identify contiguous potential developable areas of around or greater than 300ha with the ability to accommodate a large scale solar scheme.</p> <p>Further to the high level constraints identified above, further search criteria were applied at a local level, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Topography – the Site needs to</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>be flat or gently south facing slopes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field Shape and Pattern – fields need to be large and of regular shape;</li> <li>• Number of landowners – ideally a small number of landowners;</li> <li>• Landscape and Visual – aiming to locate the Site out of landscape designations, with a high degree of existing vegetation for natural screening, limited long distance views;</li> <li>• Residential Amenity – checking for proximity to settlements;</li> <li>• Heritage – proximity to Listed Buildings and other designations such as Scheduled Monuments, and presence of below ground archaeology;</li> <li>• Ecology – avoid or minimise proximity to designated areas within or close to the Site;</li> <li>• Flood Risk – seek to locate the Site in Flood Zone 1, and reduce intrusion into zones 2 and 3;</li> <li>• Public Rights of Way – seek to either minimise effects upon receptors using PROW or seek</li> </ul>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>BESS</b>	<p>The Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), substation and other site infrastructure needs to be relocated to avoid displacing rare bat species and nesting birds such as hobby, red kite and buzzard. The BESS, substation and other site infrastructure should have a treed berm around the entire installation leaving a concealed access and a further buffer of mixed native deciduous and coniferous trees planted all the way around it to form a visual screen and to reduce the noise pollution. If the location of this site infrastructure cannot be moved then greater measures need to be taken to mitigate the impacts of</p>	<p>Boreham Parish Council</p>	<p>opportunities to provide connectivity; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access – ease of access for construction and decommissioning stages to be considered.</li> </ul> <p>The Order limits are situated within the optimal 5km of the Bulls Lodge Substation and provides a developable area with the ability to accommodate a large scale solar scheme. It was deemed a suitable option to move forwards with an application for the Scheme.</p> <p>The BESS and Longfield Substation have been sited to benefit from good screening from existing mature vegetation, which is to be further enhanced. Regarding bats, roosts will be impacted by the scheme. Pre-construction surveys will be undertaken, and this will include potential roost sites. The Applicant anticipates the value of the Scheme for bats to increase substantially since existing hedges will be restored and new hedges created as part of our embedded mitigation. The reversion from</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>artificial light and noise at the site. This could possibly be accomplished by widening the additional tree buffer proposed to the north of Toppinghoehall Wood and extending the tree planting all the way around the BESS/substation installation.</p>		<p>arable to grassland high in pollen and nectar resources will create ideal conditions for invertebrates that bats prey on. Regarding birds, there will be no habitat loss or pathways (e.g. habitat loss, disturbance of habitats and pollution) which could affect breeding of the species identified in the comment. Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>BESS</b>	<p>The battery storage element when combined with sub-station equipment could be particularly intrusive in a rural setting. The information provided does not detail the size, height and visual impact of these units. And it does not explore how many units are planned. The drawing on page 8 of the consultation booklet is particularly misleading. It shows the battery storage as being half the height and very much smaller than the representation of the solar panels, a sub-station or the fencing. It is understood that these will be much larger than the panels and</p>	<p>Hatfield Peverel Parish Council</p>	<p>This comment was submitted as part of the Parish Council's non-statutory consultation response and was resubmitted in response to the statutory consultation. It should be noted the site selected for the BESS was chosen due to the natural screening provided by Toppinghoehall Wood and Lost Wood. The mature trees therein provide excellent visual screening to the north, south and east. Additional planting will be implemented to screen the BESS to the south west and will be</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	fencing and probably bigger than the switchgear housing.		allowed to mature to a substantial height.  Phase 2 of the BESS is intended to be undertaken five years after the Scheme becomes operational, to allow sufficient time for screening implanted to the south east of the BESS to mature and provide sufficient screening – this will provide a “bridge” between Toppinghoehall and Lost Woods until planting has had sufficient time to mature to a point that it provides sufficient screening. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .  Further, pursuant to a requirement of the Development Consent Order (DCO), the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline BSMP [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the Outline	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>Design Principles the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> contain controls over the BESS. This includes that the BESS will utilise an electrochemical energy storage system as well as lithium ion. The enclosures forming part of the BESS will be white or light grey or green in colour, and no component of the BESS, except for components included in Work No. 2(I) will exceed 4.5m in height above ground level (AGL) (existing levels). The BESS will incorporate fire detection and suppression measures including adequate provision for water storage to provide a minimum supply of 1,800 litres per minute for 4 hours. In the event of an emergency any firewater will be captured by automated systems within the BESS Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SuDS) design and may be reused as required. Captured firewater runoff will be analysed and treated / disposed of</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>in accordance with extant guidance for the treatment of contaminated water.</p> <p>The detailed design of the BESS is required to be approved by the relevant local planning authority and must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Design Principles [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> and the <b>Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b>. Please also see Section 10.7 and Figure 10-12 in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> for assessments of visual impact.</p>	
<b>BESS</b>	<p>The information states that the battery storage units are safe as they are protected by cooling systems and the danger of fire is negligible. It is noted that similar units in use have been in place for a very limited time compared to the anticipated lifespan of this project. It is worrying that no information is provided on action expected to contain any fire or explosion that might occur or</p>	<p>Hatfield Peverel Parish Council</p>	<p>A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have</p>	<p>N</p>



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	the effect in terms of a possible pollution incident arising from any such event.		<p>been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment,</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>BESS</b>	<p>The suggested positioning of battery storage in the Fuller Street area would be entirely inappropriate. It would be difficult to access and would have a major environmental impact including a road and bridge across the Ter. This would extend the site unnecessarily into un-spoilt countryside to the north and leave the battery storage exposed. If the battery were to be situated in the middle of the site instead of Fuller Street, it would be away from roads and public access. It would thereby minimize the detrimental effect on its visual amenity. It would be a more secure location for potentially hazardous installations and mitigate the danger posed by them to the public.</p> <p>If the battery storage is placed in the Fuller Street position as indicated on the plan, the attendant cabling connections would have to cross the River Ter and 'The Essex Way'. This would negatively</p>	Hatfield Peverel Parish Council	<p>its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p> <p>This comment was submitted as part of the Parish Council's non-statutory consultation response and was resubmitted in response to the statutory consultation. The BESS is not proposed to be in this location.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>BESS</b>	<p>impact an important walking route and would be rendered objectionable to countryside walkers.</p> <p>Power generation - green or otherwise - is an industrial use. It remains to be seen whether the battery storage component is classified as green energy.</p>	Hatfield Peverel Parish Council	<p>The BESS included with the Scheme is important to maximising its benefits. There is a clear, direct relationship between the solar generation station and the electricity storage which means that there are substantial benefits to their colocation which will result in an improved contribution to low carbon UK electricity supplies when compared to either coming forward independent of the other. The colocation of those assets enables additional operational capabilities to be accessed for system benefit, supporting the view of the Applicant that electricity storage is associated development as per the Guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects. Colocation is especially beneficial for National Grid Energy System Operator (NGESO) where connections are to the transmission, rather than to the distribution network, because</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>BESS</b>	Comment, concerns made regarding potentially hazardous batteries, the end of life of the site and the desire for the site to be returned to original state, also the potential sun-glare on surrounding properties of traffic. Response to our concerns is requested.	Great and Little Leighs Parish Council	<p>the combined asset is required to meet certain planning, notification and service obligations. Further information of the benefits of collocating the BESS with solar generation is set out in section 12.5 of the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b>. The Applicant considers that lithium-ion batteries are the only viable means of delivering a BESS collocated with the Scheme.</p> <p>A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety</b></p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p><b>Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Construction</b>	There is no doubt that the construction will be disruptive. This is compounded by the fact that no real indication of how this upheaval and the effect of ongoing operations can be minimized by the final agreed location of the PVs, battery storage, substations and ancillary features.	Hatfield Peverel Parish Council	<p>to the local population would be very low.</p> <p>This comment was submitted as part of the non-statutory consultation and resubmitted during the statutory consultation. A robust construction management plan will be implemented, with due consideration to be given to the management of construction traffic both in terms of the impact of vehicle movements upon the highway network but also in terms of the potential for noise and air pollution impact. The Applicant has set out details of its approach to managing impacts from construction in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> and <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)</b> included at <b>Appendix 13B of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> included in the DCO application.</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Construction</b>	The local roads which will be used for construction and ongoing maintenance are woefully inadequate for the purpose some being very narrow in places. Large vehicles trying to pass other traffic could cause serious degradation of the byways.	Hatfield Peverel Parish Council	<p>The site will have a single point of access with traffic being routed through the site to different areas during the phases of construction. The route from Essex Regiment Way via Wheeler's Hill and Cranham Road provides the most direct route from higher order roads and will minimise disruption in the nearby villages of Boreham and Hatfield Peverel.</p> <p>Where necessary, Cranham Rd and Wheeler's Hill will be widened to allow vehicles to pass safely. More information regarding access can be found in <b>Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. A robust construction management plan will be implemented, with due consideration to be given to the management of construction traffic both in terms of the impact of vehicle movements upon the highway network but also in terms of the potential for noise and air pollution impact. The Applicant has set out details of its approach to</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Construction</b>	Essex Police would recommend that the developers consider the foreseeability of crime during the construction phase and maximise on the opportunity to design those issues out. During the planning of the construction process, Essex Police would welcome early engagement with the developer to discuss this notion.	Essex Police	managing impacts from construction in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> and <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)</b> included at <b>Appendix 13B of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> included in the <b>DCO application.</b>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>negative retrospective action whenever possible. The Applicant will ensure there is appropriate security mitigation measures to counter any assessed security risk. The <b>Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b> sets out the Applicant's approach to security in the construction phase. Site security during construction will be managed by the contractor. The site security fencing will remain in place throughout the duration of the construction period. Any storage of materials will be kept secure to prevent theft of vandalism. A safe system for accessing the materials storage areas would be implemented by the contractor. There will be designated security staff during construction who will manage the Order limits and patrol the perimeter.</p>	
<b>Construction</b>	<p>It is more efficient and effective, and better for the environment to design out crime from the outset by installing risk commensurate measures based on local</p>	Essex Police	<p>The Applicant will ensure there is appropriate security mitigation measures to counter any assessed security risk. The <b>Outline</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>and national sector relevant crime trends. Failure to do so may result in situational crime prevention measures needing to be addressed with additional cost and disruption to habitats by the retrofitting of new security measures.</p>		<p><b>Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP)</b> [EN010118/APP/7.10] sets out the Applicant's approach to security in the construction phase. Site security during construction will be managed by the contractor. The site security fencing will remain in place throughout the duration of the construction period. Any storage of materials will be kept secure to prevent theft of vandalism. A safe system for accessing the materials storage areas would be implemented by the contractor.</p> <p>There will be designated security staff during construction who will manage the Order limits and patrol the perimeter. During the operational phase, the Applicant's security approach to any assessed enhanced security risk will be proactive, harnessing up to date security threat intelligence, recognised methodologies such as Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), and ensuring effective liaison with</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Construction</b>	<p>The construction A12 widening team sees no objection to the plans presented by the Longfield Solar Farm. We will, however, seek to work closely with your team on site and continue with discussions that would allow us to work cooperatively, in particular the access to your substation (marked with a circle on the map below), as that is currently identified as a potential access route to our earthworks to the north of J19. The Longfield Solar Farm scheme is relatively close to the A12 but the schemes do not overlap the Order Limits, they do overlap on construction period and geographically for resources (workforce) as such the schemes will continue to collaborate and share information to identify any contradiction or synergies and work to resolve and implement the DCO in a seamless way to the schemes and local community.</p>	National Highways	<p>Essex Police to achieve a Security Risk ALARP setting</p> <p>The Applicant has held pre-application and scoping discussions with the local authority, ECC Highways and National Highways to discuss the routing and transport strategy for the scheme. Cumulative impacts between the construction phase of the Scheme and other committed developments / highway improvements including the A12 widening scheme have been considered as part of the <b>Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and Transport Assessment (TA) (Chapter 13 of the ES - Transport and Access). The ES and TA include details of the mitigation that will be implemented to reduce the traffic impacts of the Scheme during the construction phase. A couple of meetings have been held with National Highways / Jacobs to review potential synergies between the A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>proposals and the Scheme. Also, potential cumulative impacts during the construction phase of the Scheme and mitigation to reduce these impacts on the Strategic Road Network including the A12(T) and the Boreham Interchange have been considered. The <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, the <b>Transport Assessment [appendix 13A [EN010118/APP/6.1]]</b> and <b>Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Appendix 11C of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1])</b> include details of the mitigation that will be implemented to reduce the traffic impacts of the Scheme during the construction phase. The CTMP also includes details of how the projects will liaise on an ongoing basis during the construction phase. It is acknowledged that the construction A12 widening team sees no objection to the plans presented by the Applicant.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Consultation</b>	Having reviewed the location of the proposed development site in relation to our assets, the Canal & River Trust do not wish to make comments in relation to the proposal.	Canal and River Trust	This is noted.	N
<b>Consultation</b>	The Scheme is outside of the coal field and therefore the authority has no comment.	The Coal Authority	This is noted.	N
<b>Consultation</b>	The proposed project is for a new solar energy farm, co-located with battery storage, north east of Chelmsford and north of the A12 between Boreham and Hatfield Peverel. These areas do not fall within SGN's area of responsibility.	SGN	This has been noted and the Applicant thanks SGN for responding to the consultation.	N
<b>Consultation</b>	I can confirm that ESP Utilities Group Ltd has no gas or electricity apparatus in the vicinity of this site address and will not be affected by your proposed works.	ESP Utilities Ltd	This is noted and the Applicant thanks ESP for investigating the matter and confirming.	N
<b>Consultation</b>	Following review of the proposed information and site boundary, Network Rail has no objection to the proposals. The applicant should continue to engage with Network Rail in relation to any potential impact on Network Rai's operational railway infrastructure. I trust the above clearly sets out Network Rail's position on the planning application. Should you require any more information	Network Rail	This has been noted and we thank Network Rail for responding to the consultation. We will continue to engage with Network Rail as the application progresses and should the Scheme receive consent.	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	from Network Rail, please do not hesitate to contact me.			
<b>Consultation</b>	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	NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company	This is noted and we thank NERL for responding to the consultation.	N
<b>Consultation</b>	See the response to Question 1(b) above relating to the lack of information and as a result the inability to provide meaningful responses or draw substantive conclusions	Hatfield Peverel Parish Council	The Applicant provided a variety of consultation materials to enable people to take part in the consultation. For each consultation, the Applicant published a booklet written in an engaging and accessible style, setting out what it was possible to influence at that stage, providing accurate information that gave consultees a clear view of what was proposed, and encouraging them to react and offer their views. A copy of the booklet produced for the non-statutory consultation is included with <b>Appendix A-3 of the Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.2]</b> . A copy of the booklet produced for the statutory consultation is included in	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p><b>Appendix G-4 [EN010118/APP/5.8].</b> These were supplemented by consultation materials designed to present consultation information in other, interactive formats. At the statutory consultation, this included a virtual exhibition and webinars. Copies of consultation materials were available in alternative formats on request. The Applicant also provided a range of means for people with questions to contact it, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• attending a virtual webinar;</li> <li>• visiting our virtual public exhibition online or download the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) on our website;</li> <li>• calling our freephone enquiry line;</li> <li>• emailing the Project Team directly.</li> </ul>	
<b>Consultation</b>	As per the above listing (i)-(viii) in response to question 1(a), a great deal	Hatfield Peverel Parish Council	This comment was submitted as part of the non-statutory	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>of information will be required as to the extent, positioning, size, height, visual amenity, light pollution and noise in relation to the engineering components. It is imperative that the specifics of the solar panels, switch gear and other ancillary equipment - battery storage, cabling, security fencing and industrial lighting will be forthcoming. This pre-offering of data by the applicant/proposer is critical if the next round of consultation is to be useful or indeed credible as a consultation exercise. Information on the consultation procedures are clearly required and are awaited. They should be not merely in outline but adequately detailed.</p>		<p>consultation and resubmitted during the statutory consultation. The Applicant presented more detail information as part of the statutory consultation, including further detail of the location of specific Scheme elements. This was provided at a non-technical level in the Consultation Booklet provided at <b>Appendix G-4 of the Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.8]</b> and in more detail through Chapter 2: The Scheme of the PEIR.</p>	
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>Insufficient information has been supplied by the applicant/proposer. As a result, the Parish Council are unable to provide meaningful responses or draw substantive conclusions. The Council can merely comment in general terms as to the selection of this site and the effect of the proposal on it.</p>	<p>Hatfield Peverel Parish Council</p>	<p>This comment was submitted as part of the non-statutory consultation and resubmitted during the statutory consultation. The Applicant presented more detail information as part of the statutory consultation, including further detail of the location of specific Scheme elements. The information presented by the Applicant at statutory consultation was necessarily preliminary and</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>Parishioners' concerns and observations have been sent directly to the Longfield Team, some have been shared with the Parish Council. The Parish Council also notes that the Consultation Booklet circulated to all households is different in many sections from detailed plans presented at the exhibition and the four volumes of support documents lodged at local libraries and, as such, is based on incomplete plans and provisional information particularly on environmental issues.</p>	<p>Terling and Fairstead Parish Council</p>	<p>represented the Scheme at the time of consultation in order to provide an opportunity for feedback on the proposals to influence the Scheme as it was finalised for the Application. The Applicant believes the level of detail presented in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report and other consultation documents was appropriate in this context.</p> <p>This comment was submitted as part of the non-statutory consultation and resubmitted during the statutory consultation. All materials circulated and shared as part of the statutory consultation were consistent in terms of the information provided.</p>	N
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>You will be aware that Parishioners are also being consulted on a National Highways DCO application to widen the A12, comments on which have been requested by August 16 11.59pm.</p>	<p>Terling and Fairstead Parish Council</p>	<p>The Applicant is aware of this fact and has had significant pre-application engagement with National Highways.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Consultation</b>	The process of the application process (DCO) is generally understood by the parishioners and their ability to register as an “Interested Party” with the Planning Inspectorate when the DCO is submitted, and registration is acknowledged. It will then be an opportunity for the community to comment on the detailed DCO submission.	Terling and Fairstead Parish Council	This has been noted and the Applicant welcomes further comments by the parishioners at examination stage.	N
<b>Consultation</b>	The Parish Council, as statutory consultee, responded to the invitation by the Longfield Team for an initial consultation with a detailed list of concerns regarding their proposals. We would once again refer you to these detailed observations. Parishioners are particularly concerned about the scale of the scheme, the use of good agricultural land and the safety of the battery storage. The Consultation Booklet (upon which most Parishioners views have been based) has changed little to allay these previously submitted observations and concerns.	Terling and Fairstead Parish Council	<p>The Applicant have had full regard to consultation feedback, as set out in the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b> and this appendix.</p> <p>The Applicant that this is a site of significant size. This is why it is working very hard to ensure that the design of the site is as sensitive as it can be to the local area. Seeking local opinion and ideas on how to design this site in detail are key requirements of the statutory consultation and something the Applicant takes very seriously.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>Section 8.4 in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> explains without the development of additional solar projects, other measures will be required to fill the gap which solar will fill, effectively making it much harder for the UK to achieve Net Zero. While offshore wind makes the largest contribution to decarbonisation in most forward electricity system scenarios, solar complements offshore wind deployment. The first conclusion is therefore that the bringing forward of solar schemes such as this Scheme should be continued and progressed with determined rigour and drive, to enable their timely delivery. Secondly, that the further identification of solar schemes and other low-carbon initiatives which complement offshore wind generation should be progressed with urgency to ensure the required trajectory in reducing carbon intensity can be achieved or bettered.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>There are no alternative sites considered by the Applicant that are clearly of a lower non-Best and Most Versatile (BMV) ALC grade than the Order limits (whilst also meeting other criteria of the Applicant, as set out in <b>Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> within a reasonable distance of Bulls Lodge Substation (for which the Applicant has obtained a grid connection agreement).</p> <p>The Draft NPS EN-3 [REF-9] states that although BMV land should be avoided where possible in the development of renewable energy infrastructure, land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of site location.</p> <p>Within this context, the Applicant has sought to minimise the amount of agricultural land used within the Scheme. This includes removing land from the draft Order limits to reduce the amount of high grade</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>agricultural land within the boundary of the scheme and to avoid areas identified as having higher archaeological potential prior to the statutory consultation. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>.</p> <p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is therefore expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. Section 12.8 of <b>Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>With regards the safety of the BESS, a plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority</p>	



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p>	
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>In due course the Parish Council will register as an Interested Party; may we please be advised when the DCO application has been confirmed acceptable by the Planning Inspectorate for progression to the Examination stage.</p>	<p>Terling and Fairstead Parish Council</p>	<p>This has been noted and the Applicant welcomes further comments by the Parish Council at examination stage. The Parish Council will be notified of this stage as part of the notification required to be given under section 56 of the Planning Act 2008.</p>	N
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>We are supportive of the detailed approach to the assessment of setting outlined in Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage, of the PEIR where it relates to both designated and non-designated built heritage assets and archaeological sites within 1km of the DCO Site.</p>	<p>Historic England</p>	<p>Both Historic England's Good Practice Advice GPA2 Managing Significance in Decision-taking in the historic Environment [REF-15] and GPA 3 The Setting of Heritage Assets [REF-16] are used throughout the <b>Environmental</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity is equally appropriately comprehensive in scope and the study area extends to 2km from the Site boundary to the north, east and west and 4km from the Site boundary to the south.</p> <p>We are satisfied that the PEIR has identified in Chapter 7 the relevant heritage assets in relation to the Site and we agree with Aecom's assessment of their significance.</p> <p>In this context it is also worth noting the good practice advice notes produced by Historic England on behalf of the Historic Environment Forum in GPA2; Managing Significance in Decision-taking in the historic Environment and GPA 3; The Setting of Heritage Assets. We recommend this guidance is both used and referenced in the full ES.</p>		<p><b>Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and referenced in Section 7.2.1.</p>	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>We are keen to see that the assessment incorporates appropriately extensive buffer zones and areas of exclusion in relation to the four grade II RPGs which have been identified as being of medium value. We recommend that the assessment includes the significance of</p>	Historic England	<p><b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> includes a full assessment of the Terling Place and Hatfield Priory Registered Parks and Gardens (RPGs) including reviews of their setting and significance.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	the Parks and Gardens and their constituent features and setting.		Paragraph 7.6.14 of the chapter discusses the presence of the New Hall and Boreham House RPGs within the study area as a result of the proposed construction road connecting the main body of the Site to Generals Lane. The paragraph goes on to discount the possibly of impact from this quarter as a result of the assets' distance from the proposed construction road.	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	We consider there needs to be a closer link between the cultural heritage and landscape/visual assessment chapters, together with a clear assessment, asset by asset.	Historic England	Close contact was maintained between the cultural heritage and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) teams throughout the assessment process. This close liaison ensured joined-up discussions on potential impacts to heritage assets and resulted in changes to the scheme design with greater setbacks in the vicinity of several assets including the Grade I Ringers Farmhouse, Grade II Little Russells, Sparrows Farmhouse, Complex of Buildings East of Sparrows Farmhouse, Barn Approximately 30 Metres East of Sparrows Farmhouse, Barn of	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>In Chapter 7, section 7.8.11 onwards, it would be helpful to group the assets with the highest level of designation together, and separately (a table would be helpful). For clarity, in Appendix 7A Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment, we would recommend that designated heritage assets are plotted on (a version of) Figs. 10-1, 10-9 and 10-10, in order to show their relationship clearly to the proposed development and wider study area, ZTV and to the selected viewpoints.</p>	Historic England	<p>Noake's Farm and several non-designated built heritage assets. This approach is reflected in <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage and Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	N
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>Despite the high level of detail provided in the PEIR, which is very welcome, we remain of the view that it is a prerequisite for the ES to demonstrate stated impacts through the use of appropriate photomontages and rendered images</p>	Historic England	<p>While the Applicant agrees that for a smaller site it would be helpful to deal with assets of high significance in a dedicated section, it was felt in this case assessing assets of all designations area by area would result in a document that would be easier to read and understand. This is therefore the approach taken in <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Close contact between the Cultural Heritage and LVIA teams throughout the assessment included discussion and choice of locations for photomontages and rendered images. Locations were chosen using both the significance of the heritage assets and the</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>potential for significant effects assessed in the PEIR. Viewpoint locations can be found in Figures 10.10 Viewpoint Locations 1, 2 and 3 of <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Viewpoints are illustrated in Figure 10.11. 1A to 10.11.57B of Chapter 10 while visualisations are illustrated in Figure 10.13.</p>	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>The PEIR confirms that no scheduled monuments would be directly affected by the proposed development. There are no scheduled monuments within the proposed application Site or within the 1km study area. There are, however, three within the wider 3km study area; Great Loyes moated site, Gubbion's Hall moated site and Hatfield Priory. Visualisations of the solar farm scheme are proposed for key viewpoints; but it is unclear how the representative viewpoints have been selected. There should be justification in support of the selection of viewpoints to assess the impact on the significance of heritage assets.</p>	Historic England	<p>An assessment of the setting of high value designated assets beyond the 1km study area was carried out to assess potential impacts and it was determined that the scheduled monuments of Great Loyes, Gubbion's Hall, and Hatfield Priory would not be subject to any impacts as a result of the Scheme. Viewpoints are shown within the LVIA Chapter towards Great Loyes (Viewpoint 20, 21, 22; Figure 10-10-1), towards Gubbion's Hall (Viewpoint 49; Figure 10-10-1) and towards Hatfield Priory (Viewpoint and Photomontage 50; Figure 10-10-2).</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>For example, there is no viewpoint selected for Great Loyes - and this needs to be justified and/or a viewpoint presented in the ES.</p> <p>We would also suggest the ZTV is extended slightly to the east because a scheduled monument (Blunts Hall Ringwork, LEN 1012098) lies just beyond the limit of the analysis. It could be potentially be impacted by the proposed development and, therefore, it should be also assessed.</p>		<p>The ZTV in the <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, Figure 10-9 incorporates both Great Loyes and Gubbion's Hall as well as the west half of Hatfield Peverel. It demonstrates no theoretical intervisibility with Gubbion's Hall or Hatfield Peverel and only minor potential intervisibility with Great Loyes.</p> <p>These were not further assessed in the ES.</p>	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>The Local Planning Authority's historic environment advisers takes the lead in advising on the identification, assessment and scope for mitigation on non-designated buried terrestrial archaeological remains. In particular, the significance and the effects of the proposals on any archaeological remains will need to be clearly articulated.</p> <p>We would advise the need for comprehensive assessment, evaluation and deposit modelling to establish the potential for buried archaeological remains across all areas of the</p>	Historic England	<p>The Local Planning Authority's historic environment advisor, Essex County Council (ECC) Place Services, was consulted and approved the scope of archaeological evaluation and mitigation for non-designated terrestrial archaeological remains. An assessment of aerial photographs and lidar data, combined with the results of a geophysical survey and trial trenching evaluation have informed the assessment of archaeological potential set out in the Desk Based</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	development which would involve ground works. This work will need to be undertaken to inform the EIA in order that the application meets the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Energy on the Historic Environment (paras 5.8.8-10).		Assessment (DBA) and informed the <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> in accordance with NPS-EN1 (paras 5.8.8-10) [REF-2].	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>We welcome the work that has been undertaken to support the application, including the Desk-Based Assessment, aerial photographic survey and also geophysical survey, as stated in Chapter 7, 7.6.17 and summarised briefly in Appendix 7A, 5.101-5.112.</p> <p>We would request that copies of the full survey reports (Geophysics, Aerial Imaging and Lidar) be included in the appendices to allow the information to be critically assessed. For example, it was stated that the magnetic background is extremely homogeneous, which can create difficulty identifying archaeological features (Appendix 7A, Section 5.101).</p> <p>This suggests that it is possible that additional archaeological remains are also present, despite the apparent lack of archaeological features recorded following the magnetometry survey.</p>	Historic England	<p>The results and final reports of all archaeological surveys carried out to support the DCO are appended to the ES, including both the aerial photograph and light detection and ranging (LiDAR) assessment and Geophysical survey as <b>Appendices 7B Aerial Investigation and Mapping Report</b> and <b>7C Geophysical Survey</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> respectively. The full methodology and results are discussed therein.</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>It was also stated that not all areas were available to be surveyed, but information is needed about the size/proportion of the site that could not be investigated. In addition, no information was included regarding the resolution of the Lidar data utilised. This information is needed as a resolution of 1m is the basic minimum for archaeological assessments, but where greater detail is required, higher resolution data is preferable. The different levels of resolution in the data and therefore the limitations need to be borne in mind when investigating the archaeological potential of the Study Area.</p> <p>It would be helpful, however, if the results of these surveys are presented in the PEIR, to enable us to assess the level of new information that has been recorded. At this stage, for example, the extent of the geophysical survey is unclear from the PEIR.</p>			
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>We also welcome the proposal to undertake trial-trenched evaluation, which will inform the baseline for the ES chapter. The extent of this evaluation work is unclear and it</p>	Historic England	<p>The archaeological trial trenching evaluation report is appended to the ES as <b>Appendix 7D Trial Trenching Report [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>would be helpful to provide more detailed information (e.g. the scope of works) in the PEIR.</p> <p>We would also recommend that statements about the palaeoenvironmental potential of the proposed development area are reassessed following the trial-trench evaluation works. It is stated in Section 7.6.19 &amp; Appendix 7A, Section 6.6. that the potential for palaeoenvironmental remains is low but it is not clear what information this is based on, or if it is based on the assessment of any samples.</p> <p>Features such as a possible moated site are noted in Table 7-4 (A71) and Section 7.8.68: there is the potential that waterlogged archaeological remains may be preserved in the ditch/moat and if present, they could be classed as being significant.</p> <p>We would advise that the scope of works (WSI) for the trial-trenched evaluation is agreed with ECC Place Services and we would also welcome the opportunity to comment on the extent of the trial-trenched evaluation.</p>		<p>Paleoenvironmental potential has been assessed following the completion of the trial trenching and it was confirmed that the 'moat' contained no waterlogged deposits with a potential to contain palaeoenvironmental remains. These are discussed in the DBA presented as <b>Appendix 7A Heritage Desk Based Assessment [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>.</p> <p>The Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for trial trenching was agreed with ECC Place Services.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>The ES will need to provide detailed information about the level of groundworks relating to the proposed solar farm, and the impact on the significance of any belowground archaeological remains should be assessed against this information. The mitigation strategy should be designed to minimise the impact, either by avoidance and/or by record.</p> <p>We would welcome the opportunity to review and comment on the overarching WSI detailing proposed mitigation works (7.9.3-7.9.4). We also expect to be consulted upon the assessment work, and the results, prior to the submission of the full application.</p>	Historic England	<p>Detailed proposal for groundworks is presented in the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and the impacts to the archaeological resource are assessed in the <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The overarching WSI will be submitted in line with the scope set out within the <b>OCEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>. Both Historic England the ECC Place Services will be consulted and the WSI approved. All efforts will be made to avoid or minimise impact to the archaeological potential.</p>	N
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>The proposed development has the potential to directly impact the historic environment, either through truncation, compaction or changes to the groundwater levels and potentially the preservation conditions of an archaeological site (Section 7.8.7).</p> <p>We are pleased to see that the impacts that changes to groundwater levels may have on the historic environment are</p>	Historic England	<p>No impacts to the archaeological resource as a result of groundwater changes are anticipated as a result of the Scheme. Potential changes to the water table are addressed within <b>Chapter 9 Water Environment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Whilst the buried cables will generate heat and warm up the ground locally</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>being considered but would recommend that issues such as pollution or changes to water quality also discuss the impacts on the historic environment.</p> <p>For example, while it is important to maintain water levels above an archaeological horizon if waterlogged archaeological remains are present, the introduction of fresh, oxygenated water can have a detrimental effect on the preservation conditions present, potentially accelerating the degradation of these vulnerable remains.</p> <p>We would also recommend that the heat emitted from the buried cables is considered in terms of the impacts that this may have on any archaeological remains present.</p>		<p>surrounding the cable, the Applicant does not expect the ground beyond the installation trenches specifically installed around the cables, and backfilled with an appropriate fill material, to experience any significant temperature increase. This effect has not been further assessed in the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>As set out in the detailed advice above, the PEIR and relevant supporting consultation documentation demonstrate a good general understanding of historic environment matters in relation to the proposed development, and outline a suitable general approach for further work to proceed.</p> <p>We do, however consider that further work would be necessary in order for the ES to be acceptable in historic</p>	Historic England	<p>Close contact between the Cultural Heritage and LVIA teams throughout the assessment included discussion and choice of locations for photomontages and rendered images. Locations were chosen using both the significance of the heritage assets and the potential for significant effects assessed in the PEIR. Viewpoint locations can be found in Figures</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>environment terms. These points are set out above but we consider that in particular, further viewpoints should be agreed and development of photomontages and rendered images produced, to support setting and LVIA analysis.</p> <p>Opportunities should be identified for Statutory Consultee input to fieldwork survey strategies and any consents required.</p> <p>Archaeological survey and evaluation fieldwork should be completed and reported on.</p>		<p>10.10 Viewpoint Locations 1, 2 and 3 of <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Viewpoints are illustrated in Figure 10.11. 1A to 10.11.57B of Chapter 10 while visualisations are illustrated in Figure 10.13.</p>	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>The Scheme has the potential to cause harm to both designated and undesignated heritage assets of national importance. There is also an opportunity to provide enhancement to assets and secure heritage benefits as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>Continuing to adequately identify the significance of assets at an early stage, and using this to evolve a baseline assessment and subsequent heritage and Environmental Statements and management plans will be critical in</p>	Historic England	<p>The <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> is in line with the requirements set out by national planning policy set out in the NPPF [EN-4], NPS-EN1 [REF-2], and NPS-EN3 [REF-9]. All known and potential cultural heritage assets which could be impacted by the Scheme have been identified, their significance has been defined, and the impacts to these assets has been assessed. Harm to significant</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>providing a strong basis for design decisions.</p> <p>This is particularly relevant in light of the NPPF (para. 189) requiring an applicant to describe the significance of any assets affected, and (paras.184 and 193) to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. There must continue to be a particular focus on using setting, landscape and archaeological approaches to analysis, and we expect to see the Scheme actively respond to historic environment concerns. This is because it is an objective of sustainable development to protect and enhance the historic environment as outlined in the NPPF (paras. 8 and 200).</p> <p>It is vital that impacts on the historic environment are adequately identified. Where there is harm to the significance of heritage assets we note the requirement to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage assets' conservation and any aspect of the proposal (NPPF para. 190), and to have clear and convincing justification for any harm (para.194).</p>		<p>assets is presented within <b>Planning Statement Appendix E: Designated Heritage Assets [EN010118/APP/7.2].</b></p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	This is essential in regard to designated heritage assets or those of equal significance.			
<b>Cumulative impacts</b>	Natural England welcomes the approach to assessing the combined and cumulative impacts of the proposed scheme set out in Chapter 15 of the Report and in Volume 2: Appendix 5A.	Natural England	This has been noted and we thank Natural England for their comments.	N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	Will associated infrastructure be removed on decommissioning and what exactly will they be i.e. access tracks, construction sites and so on?	Hatfield Peverel Parish Council	Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy</b>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	<p>Comment, concerns made regarding the desire for the site to be returned to original state.</p> <p>Comment, questions were raised who will the land be returned to post project, developer, parish or original land owners? Response to our question is requested.</p>	<p>Great and Little Leighs Parish Council</p>	<p><b>[EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p> <p>The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The land will remain with the original landowner. With regards decommissioning, there will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected</p>	



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. Section 12.8 of <b>Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms.</p>	
<b>Design</b>	<p>It is imperative that design specifications of buildings and the surrounding community are risk commensurate (i.e. correlate to a crime impact statement) and it is important that an effective and realistic level of physical security is commensurate with any identified risk. The single most important factor is that safety and security must be integrated into the normal operational ethos of the Solar farm and not seen as an encumbrance.</p>	Essex Police	<p>The Scheme, like any EDF Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP), will receive several Security Risk Management Threat Assessments during its development, construction, operation, and ultimately decommissioning phases. These Security Risk Management Threat Assessments are conducted by Suitable Qualified and Experienced Persons (SQEP) and will determine security risks. This process will in turn influence the security design specifications of all aspects of the Scheme and shape the overall security strategy; to ensure it is proportionate, and</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>effective, to mitigate and counter all security risks identified to a Low As Reasonably Practical (ALARP) setting. The security strategy for the Scheme will utilise recognised methodologies to achieve a Security Risk ALARP setting and produce security in depth for example by the application of Deter, Detect, Delay, and Respond.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises, and embraces, the symbiotic relationship between safety and security. The security arrangements to be present at site will therefore contribute to the overall safety of all who will, or may, enter the site. The security arrangements will be SQEP reviewed at identified epochs commensurate to the Security Risk rating and will further assess any changes in the Security Risk Management Threat Assessment.</p>	
<b>Design</b>	<p>This is a massive infrastructure project involving the construction and installation of large engineering</p>	<p>Hatfield Peverel Parish Council</p>	<p>This comment was submitted as part of the non-statutory</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>structures. There is scant information about the size and visual aspect of the engineering works. The positioning of the structures on the proposed site has yet to be provided. The lack of detailed information concerns the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Height and size of the solar panels which contributes to their visual impact</li> <li>(ii) Massing of the solar panels which also contributes to their visual impact</li> <li>(iii) Extent, height and visual impact of the battery storage installations</li> <li>(iv) Extent, height and visual impact of the switch gear housing and other ancillary equipment</li> <li>(v) Extent, height and visual impact of security fencing. There is no indication which buildings and installations are to be surrounded by high metal industrial security fences and gates or where they will be located</li> <li>(vi) Quantity of industrial and security lighting, its visibility from roads and nearby settlements and light pollution generated</li> <li>(vii) Percentage of the site that might be under panels</li> <li>(viii) Quantity of noise generated.</li> </ul>		<p>consultation and resubmitted during the statutory consultation.</p> <p>Details of project components including PV panels, BESS, switch gear housing and other ancillary equipment, fencing and lighting are presented in <b>Chapter 2 The Scheme of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Impacts from noise are assessed in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>Since none of this basic information has been supplied, the Parish Council can neither fully assess the impact of the scheme nor make fully reasoned responses/feedback. Whilst it is appreciated that this questionnaire comprises the first round of consultation, the paucity of information renders this process fundamentally flawed. The consultation and the conclusions that the applicant/proposer arrives at - can only be as good as the quality and amount of information that it supplies. That same information is insufficient.</p>			
<b>Design</b>	<p>Natural England notes that the refinement of the DCO Site boundary is likely to continue as the Scheme design progresses. We welcome that the reasons for selecting the site, will be presented in the ES, along with a description of and justification for the evolution of the DCO Site boundary. We note two grid connection routes are shown within the DCO Site Boundary but that it is anticipated this will be refined to one route for the DCO Application, this should be described in the ES</p>	Natural England	<p>The evolution of the DCO site boundary has been guided by the technical disciplines, including ecological constraints and opportunities (amongst other factors such as consultee feedback and ongoing design work). The Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a rigorous process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental, and planning perspective. The Applicant also sought a site that is well suited to connecting to the 400 kV power line between</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>Braintree and Rayleigh and secured a grid connection agreement from National Grid. The Applicant identified that the Solar Farm Site is highly suitable in terms of proximity to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS) as it is located directly below the 400kV NETS power lines, and in close proximity to Bulls Lodge Substation.</p> <p>To note, the Order limits have been further refined, and the grid connection route chosen. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>.</p>	
<b>Design</b>	<p>It is essential that the demarcation of land both within the internal operating space as well outside the immediate parameters is controlled formally and informally. There is a vast choice of physical and electronic security measures available to supplement this primary aim and these will need to be considered in depth.</p>	Essex Police	<p>The Applicant will ensure there is appropriate security mitigation measures to counter any assessed security risk. The <b>Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (OCEMP) [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b> sets out the Applicant's approach to security in the construction phase. Site security during construction will be managed by the contractor. The</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>site security fencing will remain in place throughout the duration of the construction period. Any storage of materials will be kept secure to prevent theft of vandalism. A safe system for accessing the materials storage areas would be implemented by the contractor.</p> <p>There will be designated security staff during construction who will manage the Order limits and patrol the perimeter. During the operational phase, the Applicant's security approach to any assessed enhanced security risk will be proactive, harnessing up to date security threat intelligence, recognised methodologies such as Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), and ensuring effective liaison with Essex Police to achieve a Security Risk As Low Risk As Possible (ALARP) setting.</p>	
<b>Design</b>	<p>It should also be acknowledged that despite the most careful and appropriate design and the use of the most sophisticated physical and electronic</p>	Essex Police	<p>The Applicant will ensure there is appropriate security mitigation measures to counter any assessed security risk. The <b>Outline</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	security measures the nett result will be diminished without suitable policies and procedures.		<p><b>Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP)</b> [EN010118/APP/7.10] sets out the Applicant's approach to security in the construction phase. Site security during construction will be managed by the contractor. The site security fencing will remain in place throughout the duration of the construction period. Any storage of materials will be kept secure to prevent theft of vandalism. A safe system for accessing the materials storage areas would be implemented by the contractor.</p> <p>There will be designated security staff during construction who will manage the Order limits and patrol the perimeter. During the operational phase, the Applicant's security approach to any assessed enhanced security risk will be proactive, harnessing up to date security threat intelligence, recognised methodologies such as Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), and ensuring effective liaison with</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>Essex Police to achieve a Security Risk As Low Risk As Possible (ALARP) setting.</p> <p>As part of the Applicant's proportionate security in depth approach this may include Deter elements e.g. signage. Achieving further Deter and Delay includes fencing which, whilst achieving this integrated security in-depth approach, will be sympathetic to the environmental setting of the Scheme.</p> <p>Detect, and further Deter, will be achieved via electronic security arrangements, with an appropriate inspection and maintenance regime, as required which will very likely contribute too, or directly achieve, a Respond element as to entry into any identified, delineated, site areas.</p>	
<b>Design</b>	<p>Moreover, the polices must be translated into practice through relevant management training and evaluation. A Policy folder on a shelf does not deliver the intended outcome: its implementation does.</p>	Essex Police	<p>The Scheme will receive several Security Risk Management Threat Assessments during its development, construction, operation, and ultimately decommissioning phases. These</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>Security Risk Management Threat Assessments are conducted by Suitable Qualified and Experienced Persons (SQEP) and will determine Security Risks. This process will in turn influence the security design specifications of all aspects of the Scheme and shape the overall security strategy; to ensure it is proportionate, and effective, to mitigate and counter all security risks identified to a Low As Reasonably Practical (ALARP) setting. The security strategy for the Scheme will utilise recognised methodologies to achieve a Security Risk ALARP setting and produce security in depth for example by the application of Deter, Detect, Delay, and Respond.</p>	
<b>Design</b>	<p>The use of deer fencing is not considered to be a robust security installation however, it is acknowledged that to physically prevent an intruder gaining access the specification would be both demanding, nor would it be considered cost commensurate. Therefore, it is strongly recommended</p>	Essex Police	<p>This is noted. Details are still in planning however it is understood that a (deer type) security fence and security camera planning is in place; the latter affording analytical detection of unauthorised human presence with image detections to an off-site Alarm Response Centre</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>that electronic security i.e. CCTV system should be considered. The most important aspect of utilising CCTV is the quality of the system and its imagery. This should be based on a series of comprehensive operational user and requirement tables. It requested that the CCTV will be monitored 24/7, supported by management plans and procedures, alongside data sharing protocols clearly detailing the expectation of all parties. There is one simple philosophy to be adopted and applied to any CCTV system – ‘What is it intended to do? In a situation as varied as this, there will be differing needs depending on location. To accommodate the overall need it is essential that User Operational Requirement (UOR) be written. The accepted definition of this is: ‘A statement of needs based upon a thorough and systematic assessment of the problems to be solved and the hoped for solutions.’ Careful consideration must be applied to the positioning and installation of the CCTV cameras, along with the associated infrastructure, to ensure that they cannot be easily tampered with or</p>		<p>for monitoring and escalation. Ground sensors and/or break beam technology, which could work in unison with analytical CCTV detection, are unknown at this time. Given attacks to substations during theft attempts alerts should include failure of switchgear; this, and overt security force patrolling, has proved effective at other sites. As part of our holistic safety and security application at the Scheme, our site boundaries will have appropriate measures to ensure understanding of site delineation and quite likely other demarcation measures for additional identified areas also. As part of our proportionate security in depth approach this may include Deter elements e.g. signage. Achieving further Deter and Delay will likely include fencing which, whilst achieving this integrated security in depth approach, will be sympathetic to the environmental setting of Longfield. Detect, and further Deter, will be</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>disconnected from the system. In the event of a critical incident, CCTV will be imperative and therefore Essex Police welcome early discussions concerning the use, operational requirements, and accessibility. This will need to be embedded within contingency plans and overall policies and procedures, which should also include the nature the immediate response to suspicious activity.</p>		<p>achieved via electronic security arrangements, with an appropriate inspection and maintenance regime, as required which will very likely contribute too, or directly achieve, a Respond element as to entry into any identified, delineated, site areas.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises, and totally accepts, that seldom can Security Risk be effectively addressed by standalone physical and electronic security mitigation without effective human interfaces. Our resulting security design and strategy for the Scheme will therefore aim for an integration of physical, technical, procedural and human application with SQEP security professional governance and oversight to ensure site security arrangements align with the overall strategy; again achieving an ALARP Security Risk setting.</p>	
<b>Design</b>	<p>As well as symbolic safety boundary other mitigating security measures need to be taken, by adopting a well-designed</p>	Essex Police	<p>The security strategy for the Scheme will guide our process for overall security application at site</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	layered approach to the security. This will require a crime risk assessment to be undertaken.		<p>which again will be assembled, and reviewed, by SQEP security professionals to ensure the management of security, including security event responses, is clearly understood and applied at all staffing and management levels.</p> <p>As well as onsite security event exercising, the Applicant is likely to attract multi-agency Emergency Response focus and exercising ensuring overall alignment to Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Principles (JESIP); with Essex Police an important blue light stakeholder. As mentioned, security professionals employed on behalf of the Applicant maintain good police liaison at national, regional, and local policing levels.</p> <p>Based on the Applicant's Security Risk Management Threat Assessments, the security strategy for the Scheme will utilise recognised methodologies to achieve a Security Risk ALARP</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			setting and produce security in depth e.g. Deter, Detect, Delay, Respond. The Applicant's security approach, design, and strategy will therefore aim for an integration of physical, technical, procedural and human application with SQEP security professional's governance and oversight to ensure site security arrangements align with the overall proportionate strategy; again achieving an ALARP Security Risk setting.	
<b>Design</b>	The battery storage is one of many elements within a solar farm that is attractive and vulnerable to theft. With such components substations and other buildings, it is suggested that these critical assets are subject a separate independent risk assessment including commensurate security measures being utilised such as compound security fencing, Perimeter intruder detection (PIDS), building security, intruder alarms, fog generator (within buildings) and property marking.	Essex Police	The Applicant's Security Risk Management Threat Assessments will identify overall site Security Risk and specifically areas of potential criminal focus i.e. attractive component parts attractive to metal crime. Our approach will be security threat intelligence led again with good police liaison and include intelligence and operational experience gained from various forums including the UK National Police Chiefs Council Metal Crime Steering Group. This intelligence, combined with external and EDF's	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			(as majority shareholder of the Applicant) own internal operational experience as a major UK energy company, will drive our security approach, design, and strategy applying appropriate security mitigation elements yet again achieving an ALARP Security Risk setting.	
<b>Design</b>	Site and construction compound security will be crucial for all phases of the construction until all works are completed. A robust security regime will be fundamental to ensure the site does not encourage crime. Security plans and policies will be required for not only the site, but offices, mechanical plant, machinery, building supplies, tools/equipment and other vehicles. Security for the construction phase must be planned before work starts and adhered to throughout the development.	Essex Police	The Applicant will ensure there is appropriate security mitigation measures to counter any assessed security risk. The <b>Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b> sets out the Applicant's approach to security in the construction phase. Site security during construction will be managed by the contractor. The site security fencing will remain in place throughout the duration of the construction period. Any storage of materials will be kept secure to prevent theft of vandalism. A safe system for accessing the materials storage areas would be implemented by the contractor.	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			There will be designated security staff during construction who will manage the Order limits and patrol the perimeter.	
<b>Ecology</b>	Natural England supports the structure, scope and context of the Report, noting that this presents only the preliminary findings of ongoing survey work. We welcome the reference to The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), (Ref 8-18) net gain and note at 8.3.6 that a Biodiversity Net Gain report will be prepared with the Environmental Statement.	Natural England	Natural England's comments have been noted. A Biodiversity Net Gain Report is presented as the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> .	N
<b>Ecology</b>	In our view a project of this scale, should aim to make a proportionate contribution towards delivery of positive environmental outcomes, including biodiversity and environmental net gain. Natural England encourages National Highways to take advantage of the Discretionary Advice Service (DAS) which is offered to provide non-statutory advice related to development proposals and the Pre-submission Screening Service (PSS) for advice on proposals that will require a protected species mitigation licence. These services can help to resolve outstanding	Natural England	This has been noted. The Applicant has engaged with Natural England as set out in the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b> . A <b>Biodiversity Design Strategy</b> is included as <b>Appendix B</b> to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> to illustrate the design approaches that could be incorporated to further enhance biodiversity on and around the Scheme. As set out in the <b>Draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b> , Requirement	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>environmental matters, particularly relating to designated sites and protected species, early on in the process. Advice from Natural England under DAS, early on in the process, can help to scope out or refine protected species issues well before a draft wildlife licence application is prepared.</p>		<p>9 will necessitate the submission and approval of a detailed Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) to deliver the provisions as set-out out in the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> and to confirm how any approaches and measures set out in the <b>Biodiversity Design Strategy</b> have been incorporated into the design.</p> <p>For the purposes of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) the Scheme will result in an overall net gain of 79% habitat units for biodiversity and 20% of hedgerow habitats. The results of the BNG assessment are included as <b>The BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> and summarised in the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b></p>	
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>The proposed scheme boundary is immediately adjacent to the River Ter Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) notified for its fluvial geomorphology. It is important the Scheme does not interfere with the natural process of the river.</p>	Natural England	<p>Noted, whilst a section of approximately 100m the River Ter adjacent to the SSSI section of the River Ter is included in the Order limits this land is included for habitat enhancement and there is</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			no development planned adjacent to the River Ter. Please see section 8.8 in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>	
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>The scheme also lies within close proximity to the following designated nature conservation sites:• Blake's Wood &amp; Lingwood SSSI (~ 3.7km);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Woodham Walter Common SSSI (~ 4.6 km);</li> <li>• Essex Estuaries Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (~9.3km)</li> <li>• Blackwater Estuary (Mid-Essex Coast Phase 4) Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar</li> </ul> <p>The proposed scheme is also within close proximity to a number of locally designated wildlife sites and areas of priority habitat including ancient woodland. The scheme will include measures for the creation of new and replacement habitats to mitigate impacts to protected species and sustainable drainage features for attenuation of flows and treatment of water quality. We welcome that the final form and location of these measures will be determined through the EIA process and through</p>	Natural England	<p>The Applicant has assessed potential impacts on the sites in question in <b>Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement - Landscape and Visual, and in Chapter 8 on Ecology. [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Blake's Wood &amp; Lingwood SSSI are approximately 4km south of the order limits. Woodham Walter Common SSSI is approximately 4.6km to the south of the Order limits. These statutory designated sites (primary designation being woodland habitats) are all over 3km from the Order limits and there are no ecological or hydrological connections between these designated sites and the Scheme. The construction of the Scheme will not directly impact on habitat within these designated sites. The Essex Estuaries SAC / Blackwater Estuary (Mid-Essex</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	consultation with relevant environmental bodies.		Coast Phase 4) SPA and Ramsar is located over 9.3km from the Order limits and there are no ecological connections between this designated site and the Scheme.	
<b>Ecology</b>	Natural England is generally supportive of the Environmental Measures to be embedded within the scheme design to mitigate adverse environmental effects, as outlined in section 8.8 of the Report. Details of these measures will need to be presented in the Environmental Statement (ES).	Natural England	This is noted. Further detail of mitigation measures embedded in the Scheme design are set in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> , which includes a <b>Biodiversity Design Strategy</b> , as Appendix B, in the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> and in <b>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement - Ecology [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N
<b>Ecology</b>	We are supportive of the proposed methodology for the Environmental Impact Assessment outlined on Chapter 5 of the Report and believe this generally takes into account the advice provided by Natural England in response to the EIA scoping consultation. We welcome that a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening exercise is being carried out due to the presence of European sites and their relationship to the scheme. We support the proposed	Natural England	This is noted. Further detail of mitigation measures embedded in the Scheme design are set in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> , which includes a <b>Biodiversity Design Strategy</b> , as Appendix B, in the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> and in <b>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement - Ecology [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	incorporation of embedded mitigation measures to avoid and mitigate environmental impacts including habitat loss. Natural England supports the proposal to deliver wider environmental benefits where practicable.			
<b>Ecology</b>	We note from the Report that National Highways’s Biodiversity Net Gain calculations will be included in the ES, with over 10% net gain to be achieved. We welcome that calculations are being undertaken to establish to what extent embedded environmental measures being incorporated into the scheme will off-set biodiversity loss and potentially achieve biodiversity net gain. As discussed above, given the scale of the proposed scheme, we would expect the scheme to deliver significant biodiversity net gain in accordance with the aspirations of the Defra 25 Year Environment Plan.	Natural England	Noted, the BNG assessment uses the new Biodiversity Metric 3.0 and significantly exceeds the 10% mandated. For the purposes of BNG the Scheme will result in an overall net gain of 79% habitat units for biodiversity and 20% of hedgerow habitats. The results of the BNG assessment are included as the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> and summarised in the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> .	N
<b>Ecology</b>	Natural England is satisfied with the desk-study and field-based survey approach being taken to the assessment of impacts on biodiversity, including statutory and non-statutory wildlife sites, priority habitats and protected species. The approach outlined in Chapter 8 of	Natural England	This is noted. Further detail of mitigation measures embedded in the Scheme design are set in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> , which includes a <b>Biodiversity Design Strategy</b> , as Appendix B, in the	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	the Report appears broadly in line with CIEEM2 best practice guidance for Ecological impact Assessment (EclA).		<b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13] and in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement - Ecology [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b>	
<b>Ecology</b>	Natural England advises that the ES should demonstrate how the project has taken advantage of opportunities to conserve and enhance biodiversity and geological conservation interests in accordance with NPS requirements. The NPS references the Government's Biodiversity 2020 and the Natural Environment White Paper (NEWP) vision for moving progressively from net biodiversity loss to net gain, by supporting healthy, well-functioning ecosystems and establishing more coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. The ES should seek to demonstrate the contribution the proposed scheme will make towards this vision.	Natural England	For the purposes of BNG the Scheme will result in an overall net gain of 79% habitat units for biodiversity and 20% of hedgerow habitats. The results of the BNG assessment are included as the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> and summarised in the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) [EN010118/APP/6.5].</b>	N
<b>Ecology</b>	The proposed scheme lies within close proximity to several statutorily designated wildlife sites as discussed above. Section 8.9.4 of the Report considers that construction and operation of the Scheme is unlikely to	Natural England	This has been noted. The <b>Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) [EN010118/APP/6.7]</b> of the Environmental Statement has been prepared in accordance with the	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>have a significant effect on any of these sites subject to implementation of the proposed standard protection mitigation measures. Other sites are considered to be too distant and/or not ecologically connected for the scheme to have any adverse impacts. Our advice is that evidence should be provided in the ES to demonstrate this. Natural England notes the proposal to prepare a HRA Screening Report in accordance with the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the Habitats Regulations) (as amended). We trust that the findings of the HRA will inform the ES.</p>		<p>requirements of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 [REF-1] to set out whether the Scheme is likely to have any significant effect on European designated sites</p>	
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>Table 8.6 of the Report indicates the only priority habitats potentially affected include - mixed woodland, veteran trees, standing water, running water and hedgerows. Designated ancient woodlands of County importance are present adjacent to Site. Habitat creation including bare ground, grassland, hedgerow, tree and scrub are proposed to seek to achieve overall biodiversity net gain. Natural England is supportive of this and advises that opportunities should be sought to maximise</p>	Natural England	<p>For the purposes of BNG the Scheme will result in an overall net gain of 79% habitat units for biodiversity and 20% of hedgerow habitats. The results of the BNG assessment are included as the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> and summarised in the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP7.13]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>biodiversity net gain including buffering and connecting designated sites and habitats.</p> <p>Natural England generally welcomes the protected species assessment work being progressed, as presented in Chapter 8 of the report, noting that surveys for some species is ongoing. Based on survey work carried out to date section 8.10 of the Report concludes that whilst there will be adverse impacts to some species, through construction, these will mitigated to ensure that impacts are not significant. The Report indicates that operational impacts to habitats and species are considered not significant and/or can be mitigated through scheme design. Evidence to confirm these initial findings, and details of any mitigation measures to address adverse impacts, will need to be presented in the ES. Our advice is that survey effort, assessment and mitigation relating to protected species should generally accord with Natural England’s standing advice. A clear rationale for any departures from this advice, and any likely</p>	Natural England	<p>For the purposes of BNG the Scheme will result in an overall net gain of 79% habitat units for biodiversity and 20% of hedgerow habitats. The results of the BNG assessment are included as <b>The BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> and summarised in <b>the OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>consequences, should be provided in the ES.</p> <p>In order to resolve any outstanding issues early in the process the Applicant is encouraged to seek advice on protected species survey, assessment and draft mitigation proposals through Natural England’s DAS and PSS. PSS provides early advice on all 3 licensing tests (in relation to European protected species), before a Development Consent Order is granted. This service also extends to other protected species (such as badger and water vole), protected by domestic wildlife legislation. This early assessment provides seeks to provide confidence, where required, that Natural England, as the statutory licensing authority, has considered the appropriate issues relating to protected species. In order to do this, Natural England will conduct a review, based on a full draft licence application, in advance of the formal submission of the NSIP application to the Inspectorate. Following the review of the draft licence application, Natural England will either: provide a Letter of No Impediment (LONI), explaining that based on the</p>	Natural England	<p>This is noted and the Applicant thanks Natural England for responding to the consultation and explaining its assessment process. The Applicant does not anticipate any protected species licensing requirements.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	information reviewed to date, that it sees no impediment to a licence being granted in the future should the DCO be issued; or if there are licensing issues to address, these will be set out in writing for the applicant to resolve.			
<b>Ecology</b>	We welcome the preliminary roost appraisal (PRA) that was undertaken of buildings and structures and mature trees, following guidance as described in the Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) 'Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines 3rd Edition' and note that Preliminary Roost Appraisal of new areas within the revised Site layout where impacts are predicted, will be undertaken. The Report assesses this site as having no potential for significant effects.	Natural England	This has been noted. The report on surveys for bats can be found in <b>Appendix 8I of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> . There will be no species mortality during construction of the Scheme. Therefore, there are no impact pathways, either directly or indirectly, that would impact upon roosting or foraging bats.	N
<b>Ecology</b>	We note that 10 badger setts have been identified as being potentially within or sufficiently close to the Scheme that they may be impacted by construction works. The scheme could impact badger through the need to destroy a sett(s) and disrupt movement for feeding.	Natural England	<b>Appendix 8J of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> comprises the badger survey report. No impacts to these Badger setts are predicted as they are within buffer areas of the Scheme (i.e. hedgerows, woodlands), although a re-survey will be undertaken prior to construction in case Badger	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Ecology</b>	No evidence of water vole was found during the surveys. Otter was found to use the River Ter, with one confirmed sighting and a number of recent desk study records nearby. The Site is assessed as of Local Importance for Otter. The scheme could impact otter by disturbance from noise, dust and lighting as well as temporary or permanent loss of riparian habitats to the Scheme.	Natural England	setts are found within or close to the works areas and sett disturbance cannot be avoided.  Noted, impacts to otter have been considered and no evidence of water vole. Please refer to <b>Appendix 8K: Report on surveys for riparian mammals of the Environmental Statement in [EN010118/APP/621]</b> .	N
<b>Ecology</b>	Habitat loss and disturbance has the potential to impact wintering and breeding birds including a number of species of conservation concern including Lesser-spotted Woodpecker, skylark, yellowhammer and linnnet, and Schedule 1 species such as Tree Sparrow, red kite, hobby and barn owl. The Report identifies the retention of hedgerows and woodland to reduce the potential impacts on breeding birds, however the loss of any arable habitat will lead to the temporary displacement of Skylark and may require replacement habitat. If works were to take place with in the breeding season and/or wintering	Natural England	Noted and this has been included in <b>Chapter 8 - Ecology - of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . Lesser spotted woodpecker in woodland close to River Ter will not be impacted. There are small numbers of wintering birds but no significant impacts predicted. Please refer to <b>Appendix 8G: Wintering Bird Survey Report and Appendix 8H: Report on surveys for breeding birds of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/8.2]</b> .	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>season then it is noted that disturbance / displacement e.g. through noise and lighting may impact some species.</p> <p>The Report does not appear to access the potential for loss of terrestrial invertebrate habitat through the scheme, but we note that section 5.4.19 of Appendix 8A- Ecological Appraisal states Based on the habitats and species recorded during the desk study, any potentially important habitats (i.e. woodland) are unlikely to be impacted by the Scheme and would be suitably buffered to avoid impacts to invertebrates, therefore detailed surveys for terrestrial invertebrates are unlikely to be required.</p>	Natural England	<p>The only suitable habitat is the woodland and mature hedges/veteran and/or ancient trees. None are impacted by the Scheme and are suitably buffered and scoped out of the assessment in consultation with the Applicant's invertebrate expert and Essex County Council Ecologist. It was agreed at a meeting on 23 July 2021 that this approach is appropriate. Further information can be found in <b>Appendix 8B: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal report of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>, and Table 88 in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>The report identifies that Further surveys (eDNA analysis) are considered necessary for ponds located outside of the Site, within a 250m Site buffer. The HSI score and any significant barriers to the Site will determine presence / likely absence of Great Crested Newt. One</p>	Natural England	<p>These additional ponds within 250m have been surveyed and results are included in <b>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement - Ecology [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Eight ponds outside the Order limits recorded the presence of</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	pond on site was determined to support two GCN. The pond will not be moved as part of the scheme and a buffer zone will be implemented.		Great Crested Newt. None will be impacted by the Scheme. Any potential loss of associated terrestrial habitat is assessed in the chapter. As per the original baseline there is one pond within the Order limits, supporting Great Crested Newt and this pond along with suitable adjacent terrestrial habitat is not impacted and buffered from the Scheme. Please refer to <b>Appendix 8E: Great Crested Newt Survey Report of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> and also see section 8.8 of <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	
<b>Ecology</b>	We note the aquatic macroinvertebrate survey of the River Ter has been undertaken and that no macroinvertebrates of conservation importance were identified. No White-clawed Crayfish were found during the surveys however suitable habitat was present.	Natural England	This has been noted. Further information can be found in <b>Appendix 8D: Aquatic Ecology Report of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> .	N
<b>Ecology</b>	Natural England advises that the detailed findings of all protected species survey and assessment work, and	Natural England	This has been updated and presented in <b>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement -</b>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	mitigation measures to address any adverse impacts, should be presented in the ES.		<b>Ecology [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b> Please also see <b>Appendices 8B to 8K of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/62.]</b>	
<b>Ecology</b>	As a minimum we advise that the ES should demonstrate how the project has taken advantage of opportunities to conserve and enhance biodiversity and geological conservation interests, in accordance with National Policy Statement (NPS) requirements. Our advice is that the scheme should aim to make a proportionate contribution towards delivery of positive environmental outcomes, including biodiversity and environmental net gain. The scheme should seek to contribute significant landscape-scale biodiversity enhancements to priority areas. In particular, Natural England would welcome ecological enhancement proposals which seek to reduce (and thus help to reverse) the isolation and fragmentation of ancient woodland habitat through ecological buffering and enhancement of habitat connectivity. This should include enhancement to the extent and connectivity of suitable foraging habitat for bats.	Natural England	These comments have been noted and the Environmental Statement demonstrates the contribution of the Scheme to NPS requirements [REF-2]. The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site. Please refer to <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>National Highways is encouraged to seek Natural England’s early advice on draft biodiversity enhancement / net environmental gain proposals through DAS.</p> <p>We fully support the proposals outlined in Chapter 6 of the Report to assess the effects of the scheme on the environment. The England Biodiversity Strategy published by Defra establishes principles for the consideration of biodiversity and the effects of climate change. The ES should reflect these principles and identify how the development’s effects on the natural environment will be influenced by climate change, and how ecological networks will be maintained.</p>	Natural England	<p>This has been noted. <b>Chapter 6 - Climate Change - of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> provides an assessment of the potential effects of the Scheme on the climate during construction, operation (and maintenance), and decommissioning. It also considers the resilience of the Scheme to the physical impacts of climate change. Planting will take into account the changes in climate. The management of the site will be monitored (e.g. grassland habitat monitoring) and where required the management adapted to maintain the habitats ecological networks for the long-term. Please see section 8.8 of <b>Chapter 8 - Ecology - of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>We will wish to ensure that any negative impact on this Local Wildlife Site (LoWS)</p>	Environment Agency	<p><b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>be minimised and mitigated for on a proportionate scale. The same principle would apply to any other impacts on LoWS.</p>		<p><b>[EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> sets out the design measures to avoid impacts upon LoWS. Landscape plans incorporate appropriate mitigation to address fragmentation. Gaps under fences for wildlife such as badger incorporated into design. Enhancement proposals comprising new planting (e.g. wildflower meadows, wetland restoration and creation) and provision of other new habitats such as hedges, woodland to improve habitat connectivity. Information is incorporated into the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>	
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>We would like to see some on-going ecological monitoring to research and assess whether the proposed benefits have worked and what ecological value has been delivered. It could be that well designed solar developments deliver a huge win-win for terrestrial and aquatic ecology but without some basic monitoring money could be wasted on failed projects without any knowledge being gained of their real potential.</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>A Biodiversity Design Strategy is included as Appendix B to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> to illustrate the design approaches that could be incorporated to further enhance biodiversity on and around the Scheme. As set out in the <b>Draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b>, Requirement 9 will necessitate the submission and approval of a detailed Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) to</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>deliver the provisions as set-out out in the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> and to confirm how any approaches and measures set out in the Biodiversity Design Strategy have been incorporated into the design. This may include waterscape enhancements. The Applicant will also collaborate with an academic partner to develop a biodiversity trial area within Project. It is the Applicant's ambition that this would add to the accumulated knowledge on biodiversity enhancements and land use at solar farms and help to inform the solar industry, including other future schemes.</p>	
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>The enhancement and addition of high conservation value ponds will be a considerable enhancement. These should be carefully designed to provide a multitude of alternative habitats including many varied individual niche features within them. We wish to see a cohesive network established and allowed to vegetate naturally from local seed sources.</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>There are a number of existing ponds on the site, though many are in a poor state due to siltation, eutrophication and excessive shading. The priority will be to restore these ponds. The 2 new SuDs ponds have been designed to benefit biodiversity with varied bank slope with shallower sections.</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>Wider swards of meadow/field boundary, we suggest 14m strips, need to be provided across the site to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. support populations of brown hare and ground nesting birds such as skylark (<i>Alauda arvensis</i>) and lapwing (<i>Vanellus vanellus</i>)</li> <li>b. Provide range for mammal species that frequent the site (badger, hedgehogs, etc)</li> <li>c. provide range for amphibians and reptiles, particularly at woodland margins and</li> <li>d. support growth of meadow flowers for pollinating insects which also provide a food source for local bird and bat species.</li> </ul>	Boreham Parish Council	<p>Field boundary grassland will be between 10 and 25m wide. Taken with other embedded mitigation measures set out in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, this is considered adequate to deliver an overall net gain of 79% habitat units for biodiversity and 20% of hedgerow habitats. The results of the BNG assessment are included as the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b></p>	N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>The use of sheep grazing should be reconsidered or limited. It is not conducive to increasing biodiversity. It deters hares and limits the use of the land to develop wildflower meadows which would support insect populations and feed birds and bats.</p>	Boreham Parish Council	<p>The Applicant considers there is no other alternative animal available for habitat management other than sheep that would not damage the infrastructure. A conservation grazing approach may be implemented and managed through an adaptive management strategy. At present, low stocking densities (e.g. 0.6LU/ha) may be grazed between Sept - March. No or very limited grazing is expected</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Ecology</b>	Minimise the impact of site lighting across the site and particularly at woodland margins, along bat flight lines and at times of nocturnal bird migration.	Boreham Parish Council	<p>between April and August during flowering. Site grazing would be managed to prevent overgrazing that can be damaging to populations of hare and insects.</p> <p>The visual impact of lighting has been assessed against Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Dark Skies mapping. The methodology followed is set out in <b>ES Volume 2 Appendix 10B [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. Landscape and visual mitigation has been described in Section 10.7 of the <b>ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and is shown on <b>Figure 10-12 Outline Landscape Masterplan [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b>. The proposed lighting has been designed to avoid and minimise the potential for adverse landscape and visual effects.</p> <p>An assessment of the proposed lighting, including any temporary lighting during construction, on ecology has been undertaken in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Throughout</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			the Scheme, the use of motion detection security lighting to avoid permanent lighting will be utilised and the inward distribution of light will avoid light spill on to existing boundary features and impacts on ecology.	
<b>Ecology</b>	We request that a complete ecological and historical survey be completed before any work commences at the proposed Longfield Solar Farm Site. This will provide an opportunity to record any historic features of the site before they are lost and to record the distribution of species of native plants, birds, animals and insects.	Boreham Parish Council	This is provided through <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage</b> and <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N
<b>Ecology</b>	We are not aware of the existence of a mammal gating system which would exclude humans and deer whilst being porous to all other mammals. We therefore ask for additional information demonstrating how such access will be accommodated.	Boreham Parish Council	The Scheme will include a mammal gating system. This is shown in <b>Figure 2-12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b> , Deer Fencing / CCTV shows the mammal gating system.	N
<b>Ecology</b>	We request the developer engages a qualified ecologist, preferably with local knowledge to consider the management of the fields of PV arrays to enhance biodiversity. We further request that the	Boreham Parish Council	Management will be reactive (via a clear and objective target-oriented habitat management plan) to ensure the level of grazing is reactive to site conditions (e.g.	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>developer deploys varied approaches and not rely on sheep grazing to control the grass.</p>		<p>sward height/herb: grass ratio). A suitably qualified ecologist has developed the conservation grazing and the adaptive management plan. Where necessary, mowing and strimming will also be used, but in all instances, management will be determined by the condition of the vegetation.</p>	
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>Why is the location of the Biodiversity Trial Area so close to the planned entrance to the site in an area bisected by the route which will be used by site traffic? It may be beneficial to include woodland borders in the Biodiversity Trial Area.</p>	<p>Boreham Parish Council</p>	<p>Biodiversity Trials are not expected to be severely impacted by proximity to site entrance. At present the exact nature of the trials are yet to be determined, however monitoring will likely favour taxa or features that respond quickly to change for example invertebrates, soil carbon, soil biodiversity, plants species. A woodland buffer is not expected to make any material difference in these instances. The fields are extremely large, and so any impact from traffic is likely to be extremely localised. Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Ecology</b>	We request that the developer undertake the construction and maintenance of the PV installation at Longfield in a time-sensitive manner avoiding such activity during the breeding seasons and ensure that there are suitable areas for ground nesting birds.	Boreham Parish Council	As set out in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> , the Scheme will retain key areas for breeding birds across the Order limits both within existing areas, but also by ensuring the majority of boundary features (hedgerows, trees and woodland) are retained and protected during construction. However, construction activities are predicted to result in the direct loss of arable habitats supporting notable breeding bird assemblages. Although, land has been embedded within the Scheme design for creation of biodiverse habitats these will take time to develop and therefore, there is likely to be a temporary and short-term adverse effect on the breeding bird assemblage particularly those species associated with arable farmland. However, as significant areas of grassland habitats, along with boundary features (hedgerows, trees and woodland), will be retained and protected during	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>construction with their quality improved (through positive management), which will help mitigate in the short-term for the loss of other areas and whilst mitigation areas develop. Additional nesting / roosting provision in the form of a variety of bird boxes on trees suitable for some species of birds (including over-wintering species) within hedges / copses will be provided while these habitats develop. Once habitats are established it is predicted that the Scheme will be able to deliver a net gain in habitats required to support a diverse breeding bird assemblage similar to that currently present, but at an increased population size and the overall impact will be beneficial.</p> <p>Taking into account embedded protection measures and Scheme design to minimise the impact of construction activities causing direct loss of habitats supporting a notable breeding bird assemblage, this impact has been assessed as</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Ecology</b>	Please provide information on how the existing great crested newt population will be protected during construction phase.	Boreham Parish Council	<p>temporary low adverse, which results in a temporary minor adverse effect, that is not considered significant.</p> <p>No suitable terrestrial habitat surrounding the pond will be lost and the pond and bankside terrestrial habitats will be buffered by at least 20m. Arable fields are not considered suitable terrestrial habitat for Great Crested Newt. If temporary fencing is needed in any locations to prevent Great Crested Newts from entering works areas, then this can be put in place. Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	N
<b>Ecology</b>	We are very concerned that the proposed Longfield Solar Farm will destroy or severely reduce our local and legally protected bat populations. We request a clear plan from the developer which sets out the steps which will be taken to avoid disturbing or displacing the bat population and how the effectiveness of these steps will be monitored and reported.	Boreham Parish Council	No bat roosts will be impacted by the scheme. Pre-construction surveys will be undertaken, and this will include potential roost sites. We anticipate the value of the Scheme for bats to increase substantially since existing hedges will be restored and new hedges created as part of our embedded mitigation. The reversion from	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Glint and Glare</b>	Comment, concerns made regarding potentially hazardous batteries, the end of life of the site and the desire for the site to be returned to original state, also the potential sun-glare on surrounding properties of traffic. Response to our concerns is requested.	Great and Little Leighs Parish Council	<p>able to grassland high in pollen and nectar resources will create ideal conditions for invertebrates that bats prey on. Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b></p> <p>A Glint and Glare Report is included with the DCO application as <b>Appendix 10G of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2].</b> This considers potential impacts on road users. The effects of glint and glare and their impact on local receptors has been analysed in detail and there is predicted to be Low impacts at seven Residential Receptors, whilst the remaining ground-based receptors are expected to have No Impacts once mitigation measures have been considered. Impacts upon aviation receptors are predicted to be None. Therefore, overall impacts are Negligible</p>	N
<b>Grid connection</b>	The proposed cabling route from the BESS and substation on the site to Bulls Lodge Substation needs to be revised.	Boreham Parish Council	Since the statutory consultation, the cable corridor has been selected and narrowed and will not	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>This will avoid damage to the old orchard and an ancient and very rare boundary hedge of coppiced small leafed lime (<i>Tilia cordata</i>) and hornbeam (the section of woodland to the west of Toppinghoehall Wood) and the bridleway to Waltham Road. The route also needs to avoid a rare and ancient small leafed lime pollard located.</p>		<p>pass through the orchard or boundary hedges to the west of Toppinghoehall Wood. Although the small, leafed lime pollard falls within the development area, it is sufficiently far away from the cable corridor as to be unaffected.</p>	
<b>Grid connection</b>	<p>Information provided is not clear as per the applicant/proposer's intentions in relation to the cabling and its specifications. A critical question needs to be addressed: Are the cables to be underground or overhead?          This is not a credible position. Cabling is a crucial part of this engineering project and the applicant/proposer must have determined what cabling will be required. Perhaps this omission boils down to cost? Is the applicant/proposer willing to voluntarily spend money to minimize the visual and environmental detriment of this project?</p>	<p>Hatfield Peverel Parish Council</p>	<p>This comment was submitted as part of the Parish Council's non-statutory consultation response and was resubmitted in response to the statutory consultation. It has been confirmed electrical cables within the solar PV array fields will be secured to the PV Mounting Structures, the BESS, or will be underground. No new overhead lines will be constructed. The maximum underground cable depth will be below existing ground level or ditch bottom (except where other separation is required to avoid existing services). Underground cable circuits will avoid root protection areas of trees and hedgerows, except where a hedgerow crossing is required.</p>	<p>N</p>



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<p><b>Human health and wellbeing</b></p>	<p>It is noted and welcomed that health and wellbeing is enhanced within the proposal with the retention of several public footpaths and tracks with supplementary paths and extensions to existing footpaths being added. The following needs to be considered to encourage use of this network of footpaths:</p> <p>Fear of crime; if footpaths running through the arrays of panels are too narrow or have restricted visibility splays especially where they turn, there is the potential for the user to feel closed in and unable to evaluate potential risk, reducing the desire to use the footpaths and open space available.</p> <p>Boundary fencing as well as providing a symbolic boundary, needs to provide security to prevent possible access for those with criminal intent or the potential of innocent access by children and pets.</p> <p>If crime is not deterred by risk commensurate measures, then those using footpaths are at risk from individuals involved within criminal activities.</p>	<p>Essex Police</p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the potential for fear and intimidation on users of the PROW network in <b>Chapter 13 Transport of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. The Scheme is not expected to result in any significant impacts with respect to fear and intimidation, with temporary minor adverse effects for PROW 213_4 and otherwise temporary negligible effects for the remaining receptors. Specifically, following the statutory consultation, the width of PROW and permissive paths has been set as a minimum 1.5m wide for footpaths and 3.0m for bridleways, with at least 5m either side of the centreline of the PROW or permissive path that will remain undeveloped outside of the solar PV fence line. This will ensure a 10m wide passageway will be maintained on all routes. Details are still in planning however it is understood that a (deer type) security fence and security camera planning is in place; the latter affording analytical</p>	<p>Y</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	The same considerations made when constructing Longfield need to be made when decommissioning.		<p>detection of unauthorised human presence with image detections to an off-site Alarm Response Centre for monitoring and escalation. Ground sensors and/or break beam technology, which could work in unison with analytical CCTV detection, are unknown at this time.</p> <p>Given attacks to substations during theft attempts alerts should include failure of switchgear; this, and overt security force patrolling, has proved effective at other sites. As part of our holistic safety and security application at the Scheme, our site boundaries will have appropriate measures to ensure understanding of site delineation and quite likely other demarcation measures for additional identified areas also. As part of our proportionate security in depth approach this may include Deter elements e.g. signage. Achieving further Deter and Delay will likely include fencing which, whilst achieving this integrated security in depth approach, will be</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>sympathetic to the environmental setting of the Scheme.</p> <p>Detect, and further Deter, will be achieved via electronic security arrangements, with an appropriate inspection and maintenance regime, as required which will very likely contribute too, or directly achieve, a Respond element as to entry into any identified, delineated, site areas.</p> <p>Appropriate measures to maintain human health will be adhered to throughout construction, operation, and decommissioning, as presented in the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>, <b>OEMP [EN010118/APP/7/11]</b>, and the <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b></p>	
<b>Human health and wellbeing</b>	<p>Among the issues that are not feasible to assess at present are the:</p> <p>Danger of explosion of lithium batteries</p> <p>General effects on health of the equipment and its operation.</p>	Hatfield Peverel Parish Council	<p>A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the Design Principles submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.	
<b>Human health and wellbeing</b>	According to HSE's records the proposed DCO application boundary for this Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project is not within the consultation zones of any major accident hazard sites or major accident hazard pipelines. This is based on the current configuration as illustrated in, for example, the Longfield Solar Farm Consultation Booklet 1 June to 13 July 2021 HSE would not advise against the current proposal.	Health and Safety Executive	This has been noted and the Applicant thanks HSE for investigating the matter.	N
<b>LVIA</b>	Essex Police welcomes the use of established and new hedging of natural species which helps protect and support the natural habitat of local wildlife. The use of densely planted hedging intermixed with species that are spikey in nature upon maturity, has been proven to act as a deterrent to crime. A landscape management plan should encompass the regular maintenance of	Essex Police	The Applicant's security strategy for the Scheme will attempt to include natural elements into our overall security planning; this may include naturally forming barriers such as hedging and will harness natural surveillance wherever possible for crime prevention. Any security mitigation elements will be planned with local features taken	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	shrubs, hedging and trees to ensure that they do not inhibit the operation of CCTV, natural surveillance or provide risk of concealment for those using public footpaths.		into consideration when siting e.g. tree growth/height. Whilst natural elements may be beneficial to security, the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> will ensure degradation to the Scheme's security infrastructure does not excessively occur from natural elements. Again careful and sympathetic siting of security infrastructure will assist with this along with an appropriate inspection and maintenance regime.	
<b>LVIA</b>	Among the issues that are not feasible to assess at present are the:(i) Light pollution from industrial lighting	Hatfield Peverel Parish Council	The visual impact of lighting has been assessed against Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Dark Skies mapping. The methodology followed is set out in <b>ES Volume 2 Appendix 10B [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> . Landscape and visual mitigation has been described in Section 10.7 of the <b>ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and is shown on <b>Figure 10-12 Outline Landscape Masterplan [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b> . The proposed lighting has been	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>designed to avoid and minimise the potential for adverse landscape and visual effects.</p> <p>An assessment of the proposed lighting, including any temporary lighting during construction, on ecology has been undertaken in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Throughout the Scheme, the use of motion detection security lighting to avoid permanent lighting will be utilised and the inward distribution of light will avoid light spill on to existing boundary features and impacts on ecology.</p>	
LVIA	<p>Natural England supports the approach to the assessment of landscape and visual impacts of the proposed scheme outlined in Chapter 10 of the Report, recognising that the study area falls within the South Suffolk and North Essex Clayland National Character Area (NCA), Northern Thames Basin NCA and a number of Local Character Areas (LCAs). The approach appears broadly in line with best practice Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact</p>	Natural England	<p>This has been noted. We have detailed potential landscape and visual impacts of the proposed scheme in <b>Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement - Landscape and Visual Impacts [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Footpaths and other public rights of ways will remain available - this is also detailed in Chapter 10.</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
LVIA	<p>Assessment, produced by the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Assessment and Management in 2013 (3rd edition). We welcome that the assessment will consider impacts on amenity from public rights of way and the effects of the scheme on tranquillity.</p> <p>The project area is not within or close to any statutorily designated landscape. Natural England does not generally provide detailed advice on non-statutory landscape matters. However the Report indicates that the scheme is likely to have some major to moderate adverse impacts on landscape character and amenity for some residents and users of PROWs. We note that section 10.10 states that the residual significant landscape and visual effects are due to the change in land use and the massing of the panels and associated structures. Whilst long term, the residual significant effects would be temporary. It would not be possible to mitigate every adverse effect due to the requirements of the Scheme. Since all mitigation is embedded in the Scheme no additional mitigation measures are proposed.</p>	Natural England	<p>In identifying the Solar Farm Site, the Applicant identified that it is remote from nearby villages and that the relatively flat landform and existing woodland and hedgerow limits views into the site. As such there are only a small number of residential properties where visual impacts would be likely to result from the Scheme. The Applicant has also taken account of the visual impact on residential receptors in the design of the Scheme, including by providing strategically located stand-offs from receptors to above ground solar farm infrastructure in order to limit visual impact. Further information can be found in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	Appropriate mitigation measures should be detailed in the ES.		<b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b> The assessment was undertaken and reported by a team of competent Chartered Landscape Architects with extensive experience in LVIA of solar farms and other large-scale infrastructure development.	
<b>LVIA</b>	This is a most aesthetically pleasing and un-spoilt piece of countryside. It has been traditionally farmed for hundreds of years. As the site stands, it does not require any enhancement. The solar farm would blight the landscape and any adjustments made to the proposed scheme would not begin to mitigate the resultant environmental damage. In order to give a meaningful answer to this question, results from the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) need to be known. It would be helpful to be notified as to whom -what body or institution - would be carrying out this exercise to confirm objectivity and impartiality.	Hatfield Peverel Parish Council	<p>This comment was submitted as part of the non-statutory consultation and resubmitted during the statutory consultation. Further detail of the Applicant's assessment of landscape and visual impact was included in Chapter 10 of the PEIR and <b>Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b></p> <p>The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>, includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site.</p> <p>In identifying the Solar Farm Site, the Applicant identified that it is remote from nearby villages and</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>LVIA</b>	The site area has enormous visual amenity having been traditionally farmed for hundreds of years. The imposition on	Hatfield Peverel Parish Council	<p>that the relatively flat landform and existing woodland and hedgerow limits views into the site. As such there are only a small number of residential properties where visual impacts would be likely to result from the Scheme. The Applicant has also taken account of the visual impact on residential receptors in the design of the Scheme, including by providing strategically located stand-offs from receptors to above ground solar farm infrastructure in order to limit visual impact.</p> <p>The assessment was undertaken and reported by a team of competent Chartered Landscape Architects with extensive experience in LVIA of solar farms and other large-scale infrastructure development. Please see the <b>Statement of Competence (Appendix 1C of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2].)</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>this landscape of such imposing industrial installations - many surrounded by high security fencing and industrial lighting - would result in the total destruction of the landscape's visual amenity.</p>		<p><b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b> The LVIA considers the duration of the effects, and their 'reversibility'. The Scheme has been designed to avoid and minimise adverse effects on the local environment through the sensitive siting of the proposed elements. Extensive areas of new woodland, species rich grassland, areas for natural regeneration and scrub are proposed as part of the scheme, resulting in a biodiversity net gain. The LVIA concludes that, while there will be some moderate adverse impacts on Local Landscape Character Areas (LLCAs) when assessed at 1 year of operation, these are reduced to no significant effects after 15 years of operation.</p>	
<b>Noise</b>	<p>Among the issues that are not feasible to assess at present are the:                      Noise and low frequency hum and vibration from the operation of the equipment</p>	<p>Hatfield Peverel Parish Council</p>	<p>The Applicant has set out our assessment of potential noise impacts in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b> The assessment considers the</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>location of operational plant. The design of the Scheme has incorporated measures such as distancing of inverters away from sensitive receptors, and locating the BESS compound in an area away from large concentrations of receptors as well as towards the A12 where existing ambient noise levels are higher (such that noise emissions from the BESS are less impactful).</p> <p>As set out in the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> included as an appendix of the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>, inverters within 250m of residential dwellings will be treated with acoustic barriers which achieve a minimum 10dB(A) sound reduction, or an inverter selected with sound power levels at least 10dB lower than 96dB, which has been applied to inverters in the EIA.</p>	
<b>Operations</b>	No consideration appears to have been given to the effect of changes in technology in a quickly evolving environment over the lifespan of the	Hatfield Peverel Parish Council	The infrastructure such as PV panels and battery storage units will be recycled as far as practical and in accordance with legislation	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>project. This could result in further large-scale rounds of disruption on the scale of the original construction as equipment is refurbished or replaced.</p>		<p>and guidance applicable at the time, or if more suitable at the time, sold for refurbishment and reuse. It is expected that a Decommissioning Resource Management Plan (DRMP) will be needed and is committed to in the DCO to manage the disposal of waste from the Order limits, but the approach to and content of this will be driven by the relevant legislative and policy requirements at the time of decommissioning.</p>	
<p><b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b></p>	<p>The preliminary environmental information report identifies that up to 600 workers will be required for the construction phase of the development and that the construction period is anticipated to last 24 months. The presence of this large number of workers in the area is likely to impact healthcare provision and should be assessed and mitigated. Similarly, the impacts of the decommissioning phase should also be assessed and mitigated. The CCG would welcome engagement during the development consent order process, including prior to submission of the application to ensure that information</p>	<p>NHS Mid and South Essex CCG</p>	<p>It is anticipated that approximately 45% of the workforce will be sourced from a catchment area of up to a 60-minute travel time from the Order limits, in which case it is anticipated that these workers will already be registered with relevant primary healthcare providers, and thus would not represent additional demand for primary healthcare locally.</p> <p>In addition, as detailed in <b>Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>,</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>assessing the impacts of the proposals are included with the application documents. It is important that these are understood and can be considered as part of the DCO process.</p>		<p>in a worst-case scenario that the remaining workforce requires accommodation during the construction and decommissioning phases, it is anticipated that accommodation will be sought across the catchment area of a 60-minute drive time in which case the demand for primary healthcare services is unlikely to be concentrated in a single area.</p>	
<p><b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b></p>	<p>We note from Chapter 12 of the Report considers the Agricultural Land Classification of the DCO Site and shows much land is within each category of the ALC assessment, with approximately 109.5ha of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land lost for the lifetime (40 years) of the Scheme until it is Decommissioned. Natural England Technical Information Note 049 - Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land [REF-17] also contains useful background information. The ES should provide details of how any adverse impacts on soils can be minimised. Further guidance is contained in the Defra Construction</p>	<p>Natural England</p>	<p>A sequential assessment regarding agricultural land quality has been undertaken and is presented in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>. In summary, the vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar ALC to the site. The Order limits comprise approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.</p> <p>All of the land within the area of search is either:</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soil on Development Sites.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the site);</li> <li>• Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the site);</li> <li>• Grade 4, but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test; or</li> <li>• Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</li> </ul> <p>There are therefore no alternative sites available meeting the Applicant’s search criteria that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits.</p> <p>Further assessment of agricultural land is included in <b>Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land Use</b></p>	



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>The generation of renewable energy is both noble and essential. Any major engineering project to generate it will come with disadvantages and involve compromise. A green energy solution however does not imply an unfettered license to carry out projects where the benefit delivered is outweighed by damage to the environment. It is a matter of balance and proportionality. The Longfield Solar Farm project falls foul of this test because:(i) The site - and its environs - comprises Grade 2 agricultural land which is a finite resource. It is a resource that is in limited supply. The site is a tract of land that is essential to the maintenance of food security in a small island country with a large population. The appropriate location for solar panel farms is on industrial land or alongside 'dead' ground such as motorways. Panels attached to new build housing and industrial units can also make a significant contribution. If the sacrifice of agricultural land is necessary and</p>	<p>Hatfield Peverel Parish Council</p>	<p><b>of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b></p> <p>A sequential assessment regarding agricultural land quality has been undertaken and is presented in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>. In summary, the vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar ALC to the site. The Order limits comprises approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.</p> <p>All of the land within the area of search is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the site),</li> <li>-Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the site),</li> <li>-Grade 4, but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test, or</li> <li>-Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</li> </ul>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	unavoidable, it certainly should not be agricultural land graded 1 to 3.		<p>There are therefore no alternative sites available meeting the Applicant's search criteria that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits.</p> <p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. Section 12.8 of <b>Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>An <b>Outline Soil Resource Management Plan</b> is provided as an <b>Appendix</b> to the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>. This sets out principles for how soils will be managed and protected during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme. A</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Socioeconomics and Use</b>	<p>The construction phase will no doubt be carried out by major national civil and electrical engineering contractors. They will import the skilled personnel required to carry out the work. There is insufficient skilled labour in Hatfield Peverel and Terling to contribute in any significant extent to the construction process which will in any event be temporary. In operation, solar farms are not labour intensive. Maintenance of the major units such as switch gear etc. tends to comprise significant works carried out periodically and therefore suitably skilled labour will be imported from time-to-time to undertake it. The small number of people employed in this activity in Hatfield Peverel and Terling goes no way near to justify or outweigh the disadvantages of the scheme. Further information is needed to answer this question. The applicant/proposer</p>	<p>Hatfield Peverel Parish Council</p>	<p>detailed soil resource management plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction, prior to operation, and prior to decommissioning, as set out by the Requirements of the <b>draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b>.</p> <p>It is not possible to ascertain the exact number of jobs that would be taken up by residents in any local authority or statistical area, given that take-up of jobs will be dependent on individual skill levels and suitability. Overall, the Scheme will support, on average, 380 total jobs per annum during the construction period. Of these, 171 jobs per annum are expected to be taken-up by residents within the study area.</p> <p>In terms of the comment about skilled labour, the Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training.</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>should be able to provide information from similar projects but it is likely the contribution will be relatively small.</p> <p>The solar farm would constitute an industrialisation of this piece of countryside and thereby blight the landscape. The land in question is also best and most versatile agricultural land. The resultant food production loss would be ill-advised on sustainability grounds.</p>	Hatfield Peverel Parish Council	<p>A sequential assessment regarding agricultural land quality has been undertaken and is presented in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>. In summary, the vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar ALC to the site. The Order limits comprises approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.</p> <p>All of the land within the area of search is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the site),</li> <li>-Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the site),</li> <li>-Grade 4, but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test, or</li> </ul>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>-Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</p> <p>There are therefore no alternative sites available meeting the Applicant's search criteria that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits.</p> <p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. Section 12.8 of <b>Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>An <b>Outline Soil Resource Management Plan</b> is provided as an <b>Appendix</b> to the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>. This sets out principles for how soils will be managed and protected during</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Transport</b>	<p>We will in due course expect to see a Transport Assessment (TA) setting out the impact of the proposal, not just in operation but also during construction and decommissioning at end of life. The TA should be carried out in accordance with Policy laid out in Department of Transport Circular 02/2013, WebTAG and National Highways’s protocol on dealing with planning applications. It is strongly advised that you speak to us before undertaking work as this has been shown to result in a smoother passage through the planning process. If transport mitigation on the strategic network is needed then this should be discussed with National Highways to avoid abortive work or collude strategies.</p>	National Highways	<p>construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme. A detailed soil resource management plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction, prior to operation, and prior to decommissioning, as set out by the Requirements of the <b>draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b>.</p> <p>A full <b>Transport Assessment (TA)</b> has been submitted as part of the DCO application, as <b>Appendix 13A of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. The chapter considers the potential effects of the Scheme on traffic and transport during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases. The chapter has been prepared in accordance with various policies and guidance including the NPPF [REF-4], NPPG [REF-5], NPS EN-1 [REF-2], NPS EN-3 [REF-9], ECC’s Development Management Policies [REF-7] and CCC’s Local Plan [REF-8], to assess the likely impacts of the proposals and identify any required mitigation.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Transport</b>	<p>From the information provided as part of the Statutory Consultation, key issues from a traffic perspective are that there will be combined impacts during the construction of both the Longfield Solar Farm and the A12 scheme, due to overlaps in terms of timescales and geography / traffic routing, especially at A12 Junction 19. However, traffic impacts associated with the construction phase of the proposed Longfield Solar Farm will be minimised through the use of mini-buses, use of local workers, 7am to 7pm shift times (i.e. unlikely to coincide with the peak hours of operation at A12 Junction 19) etc. We would request that the developers keep the A12 team within National Highways fully informed during the process leading up to the submission of their DCO.</p>	National Highways	<p>This has been developed through ongoing collaborative working with Essex County Council (ECC) Highways and National Highways (formerly Highways England) and is both tailored to local circumstances whilst reflecting the size and scope of the proposed development.</p> <p>A couple of meetings have been held with National Highways / Jacobs to review potential synergies between the A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening proposals and the Scheme. Also, potential cumulative impacts during the construction phase of the Scheme and mitigation to reduce these impacts on the Strategic Road Network including the A12(T) and the Boreham Interchange have been considered. The <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, the <b>Transport Assessment [Appendix 13A of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]]</b> and <b>Construction Traffic</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p><b>Management Plan (Appendix 11B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> include details of the mitigation that will be implemented to reduce the traffic impacts of the Scheme during the construction phase. The <b>Construction Traffic Management Plan (Appendix 11B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> also includes details of how the projects will liaise on an ongoing basis during the construction phase. It is acknowledged that the construction A12 widening team sees no objection to the plans presented by The Applicant.</p>	
<b>Transport</b>	<p>Royal Mail notes that the main construction access will be via road at Junction 19 of the A12 (A130 and B1137) and that abnormal loads are expected to be required. The A12 is of very high strategic importance to Royal Mail's operations. National, regional and local mail and parcel distribution services use it, including services to Ipswich and Norwich.</p>	Royal Mail	<p>Based on National Highways's pre-application response, the Scheme is not expected to have a significant impact on the A12(T) or the A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening scheme on the basis that appropriate measures will be adopted during construction (where necessary) and that further discussions have been held with the local highway authorities. This</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>Royal Mail understands that all construction access arrangements will be confirmed as the scheme design progresses and in consultation with National Highways and the County Highways Authorities.</p> <p>The timing of the construction works for the Longfield Solar Farm relative to those for National Highways's proposed A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening Scheme and proposed M25 J27 Improvement works will need careful consideration. Any overlap between the construction phases of these schemes would potentially have cumulative impacts that could be highly disruptive to Royal Mail services between London and the Eastern region.</p> <p>At this time, insufficient information is available for Royal Mail to adequately assess the level of risk to its operation and the available mitigations for any risk. Therefore, Royal Mail hereby wishes to reserve its position to submit a consultation response/s at a later stage in the consenting process and to give</p>		<p>includes several meetings with National Highways/ Jacobs to review potential synergies between the A12(T) to A120 Widening proposals and the Scheme. The <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, the <b>Transport Assessment [Appendix 13A of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]]</b> and <b>Construction Traffic Management Plan (Appendix 11B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> consider potential cumulative impacts during the construction phase of the Scheme and identify mitigation to reduce these impacts on the Strategic Road Network including the A12(T) and the Boreham Interchange. The ongoing Boreham Interchange improvements and construction of the Radial Distributor Road (RDR) are also due to be completed prior to the construction phase of the Scheme, adding further capacity to the surrounding highway network</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	evidence at any future Public Examination, if required.		with the expectation of easing congestion. Given these considerations, the Scheme is not expected to have a material impact on the Strategic Road Network	
<b>Transport</b>	<p>It is noted that there will be one singular point of access to the site and that to reach the access point traffic will need to travel from Essex Regiment Way via Wheeler's Hill and Cranham Road. Both Wheeler's Hill and Cranham Road are narrow country lanes and there will be a substantial impact upon the residents who live along the lanes. It is appreciated that during the construction phase there will be lorry movements to deliver plant to site to enable the solar farm to be constructed. It is considered that by having just a single point of access with mean both additional traffic along the A131 and Essex Regiment Way, possible congestion at Essex Regiment Way and also along Wheeler's Hill and Cranham Road which will have an adverse impact upon the area.</p>	Little Waltham Parish Council	<p>The site will have a single point of access with traffic being routed through the site to different areas during the phases of construction.</p> <p>The route from Essex Regiment Way via Wheeler's Hill and Cranham Road provides the most direct route from higher order roads and will minimise disruption in the nearby villages of Boreham and Hatfield Peverel.</p> <p>An appropriate routing and access strategy has been identified which seeks to limit the usage of Protected Lanes and local roads through Boreham and Hatfield Peverel to the south. HGVs will be routed to / from the west via the A130, Wheelers Hill, and Cranham Road, with supporting highway improvements (carriageway widening) where necessary. There</p>	N
	<p>The Parish Council contends that at the very least there should be a second entrance onto site closer to the A12</p>			

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	perhaps in the Hatfield Peverel area which would ease the impact during the construction phase.		will be the potential to utilise the RDR following its completion prior to the construction phase. For further information, please see Sections 13.5 and 13.9 in <b>Chapter 13 - Transport of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .  The <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> details the mitigation measures required to reduce the impacts of increased traffic flows including HGVs on the roads and severance and intimidation associated with increased traffic and abnormal loads.	
<b>Transport</b>	We welcome consideration of the effects of the proposed scheme on Public Right of Way (PROW) users within chapter 12, focusing on the impact of severance of existing routes and the resulting changes in journey lengths and times and local travel patterns. Natural England supports proposed embedded	Natural England	Several meetings have been held with ECC Highways (including PROW officers) to review, revise and agree the proposed strategy for managing PROW during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. This includes measures to physically	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>mitigation measures to minimise impacts and the opening of permissive footpaths during the operational phase. We believe this generally accords with NPS requirements to minimise impacts on public access and to identify opportunities for enhancements. Any assessment should consider potential impacts on access land, public open land and rights of way in the vicinity of the development. We also recommend reference to the relevant Right of Way Improvement Plans (ROWIP) to identify public rights of way within or adjacent to the proposed site that should be maintained or enhanced.</p> <p>Natural England encourages any proposal to incorporate measures to help encourage people to access the countryside for quiet enjoyment. Measures such as reinstating existing footpaths together with the creation of new footpaths and bridleways are to be encouraged. Links to other green networks and, where appropriate, urban fringe areas should also be explored to help promote the creation of wider green infrastructure</p>		<p>segregate existing PROW from proposed construction routes, as well as having controlled crossing points (with gates and banksmen) to safely accommodate pedestrians and cyclists. No PROW will be permanently closed or diverted as a result of the Scheme, and the minimum legal PROW widths will continue to be met or exceeded in all instances. A separate <b>PROW Management Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> has been prepared to illustrate the proposed strategy which supports the Framework CTMP. See also <b>Figure 13-4 of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>Several permissive paths will be provided within the Order limits during the operational phase of the Scheme to improve connectivity through the Order limits as well as with existing PROW.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Water resources</b>	<p>We support the inclusion of chapter 9 of the Report to assess the potential effects of the scheme on the water environment. We welcome that this includes consideration of the ecological potential of waterbodies and other sensitive ecological receptors such as the River Ter SSSI, great crested newt ponds and potential impacts on water-dependent species including fish, macroinvertebrates, macrophytes and riparian mammals. Natural England is satisfied that this generally meets NPS requirements to protect the water environment and dependent habitats and species. We welcome the proposed embedded and standard mitigation measures which seek to minimise impacts to the water environment, predominantly through scheme design and pollution prevention measures. The assessment considers that with these mitigation measures in place impacts are generally unlikely to be significant. Natural England welcomes this and advises that the detailed assessment and mitigation measures to address any adverse impacts should be presented in the ES.</p>	Natural England	<p>This has been noted and the Applicant thanks Natural England for their comments. Further information can be found in, for instance, the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10], Appendix 9A: Flood Risk Assessment in Chapter 9 - Water Environment - of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1];</b> and in <b>Appendix 9B: Water Framework Directive Assessment, also in Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b></p> <p>The design principles set out in the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> provided as Appendix B of the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> form the Rochdale Envelope limits within which the Scheme can be built and operated. An illustrative Concept Design has been created to provide a tangible example of a scheme that could be constructed within the Design Principles – an added advantage of this is a more realistic assessment for some</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>technical aspects such as landscape and visual.</p> <p>The Chelmsford Surface Water Management Plan [REF-3] confirms the site does not fall within a Critical Drainage Area (CDA).</p> <p>Further, an outline drainage strategy is provided within the <b>Appendix 9C Longfield SuDS Strategy of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> detailing the approach to managing firewater runoff. Consultation with the ECC Fire and Rescue department has been undertaken during development of the strategy. This will form part of a Requirement under the <b>draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Water resources</b>	Although currently the majority of the new climate change allowances have not exceeded the current extent of the existing flood zone 2 (where modelled), given the scale of this NSIP we feel it is appropriate to request the applicant to model the River Ter; designated main	Environment Agency	The <b>Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 9A in Chapter 9 - Water Environment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> states that fluvial modelling is not required as it is reasonable to assume fluvial	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>river, and the Boreham Brook including the non-main element upstream of it in order to incorporate the new climate change allowances.</p>		<p>flood levels would not reflect an increase in flood level. Additionally, both the Strategic Flood Risk Assessments (SFRAs) indicate Flood Zone 2 as a proxy for the 65% climate change extent, with the revised climate change allowances now only requiring 38% for design purposes; the fluvial design extent level would be less, providing a greater depth difference to the PV Panels.</p>	
<b>Water resources</b>	<p>Peak river flow allowances: the Upper end allowance should be applied for Essential Infrastructure. For the River Ter (North end of the site) this may affect a very small proportion of PV installations.</p> <p>For the ordinary watercourse (Southern end of the site) upstream of the main River Boreham Brook, the extent of the floodplain is more unknown and therefore should be modelled to identify if any of the proposed PV installations would be located in the flood plain.</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>The <b>Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 9A of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> states that fluvial modelling is not required as it is reasonable to assume fluvial flood levels would not reflect an increase in flood level. Given all PV panel installations are in Flood Zone 1 no further modelling has been undertaken.</p> <p>It is considered that fluvial modelling of both the River Ter and Boreham Brook is not required as it is reasonable to assume fluvial flood levels would not reflect an</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Water resources</b>	We consider it essential that a FRA considers the implications of the H++ scenario and the approach that could be taken to manage this risk. The H++ scenario (a requirement for FRAs that look at “safety critical” elements of infrastructure proposals) is currently found in the document “Adapting to climate change: guidance for risk management authorities”.	Environment Agency	<p>increase in flood level, in the order of magnitude that the PV panels sit above the estimated Flood Zone 2 levels. Additionally, both the SFRA's indicate Flood Zone 2 as a proxy for the 65% climate change extent, with the revised climate change allowances now only requiring 38% for design purposes; the fluvial design extent level would be less, providing a greater depth difference to the PV panels.</p> <p>Previously the H++ Scenario would be applied to infrastructure projects of this scale; however the current allowance for design purposes for the Order limits is now the Higher Central allowance of 38% (for Essential Infrastructure). H++ still applies to sea level rise, although this specific area of the UK is not considered to be impacted by sea level rise, and so H++ is not considered further.</p> <p>Please see the <b>Flood Risk Assessment in Appendix 9A of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>.</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Water resources</b>	If the applicant does not undertake modelling ahead of the DCO submission, then they should be able to justify why modelling is not required.	Environment Agency	Given all PV panel installations are in Flood Zone 1 no further modelling has been undertaken. Justification and plans to support the approach have been provided in <b>Appendix 9A Flood Risk Assessment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> , with further detail also given in an earlier response in this table.	N
<b>Water resources</b>	The FRA has not shown the built development in relation to the Flood Zones therefore this will need to be updated within the FRA before it can be concluded that hydraulic modelling is not required at this time.	Environment Agency	The updated FRA is available in <b>Appendix 9A Flood Risk Assessment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> . Also please refer to <b>Figure 9.2 Fluvial Flood Zones in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b> which shows built development in relation to flood zones.	N
<b>Water resources</b>	The key points to note from the submitted FRA, (based upon the SFRA flood zones): o A small area to the North of the site lies within the flood extent for a 1% (1 in 100) annual probability event, including an allowance for climate change. o The Scheme layout in Appendix A	Environment Agency	The updated FRA is available in <b>Appendix 9A: FRA [Environmental Statement EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> . Also refer to <b>Figure 9.2 Fluvial Flood Zones [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b> which shows built development in relation to flood zones.	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>indicates no development, PV panels or associated infrastructure will be located within flood risk areas (Flood Zones 2 and 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Section 5.2.3 states - Any works planned in flood risk areas (Flood Zones 1 and 2) will be water compatible (such as landscape buffers/environmental enhancement).</li> <li>o These works will need to be detailed and any impact on flood risk updated in the FRA prior to DCO submission.</li> <li>o Appendix A of the FRA shows the layout of the development. It should also have a map showing built development in relation to the flood zones (including climate change, for the lifetime of development and beyond, as a sensitivity test)</li> </ul>			
<b>Water resources</b>	<p>The applicant may need an environmental permit for flood risk activities if they want to do work in, under, over or within 8 metres (m) from a fluvial main river and from any flood defence structure or culvert. The Rivers Ter and Boreham Brook are designated as Main Rivers.</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>Noted, and requirements for an environmental permit are outlined within <b>Chapter 9 – Water Environment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. In particular see Section 9.1 in this chapter. Please also note that Boreham Brook is only a Main River downstream of Brick House Farm.</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>A buffer of 10m has been provided around main rivers (measured from the centre line of the watercourse as shown on OS Mastermap) except where crossings are required.</p>	
<b>Water resources</b>	<p>We wish to see a soil strategy to improve and rest soils on the site from agricultural use and ensure restoration of structure and texture whilst preventing erosion compaction and loss of fine sediment into the watercourses. This will be especially important in the construction phase when work on bare ground could cause serious damage to soils and watercourse habitats.</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>Measures for protecting the water environment from pollution (including runoff of fine sediment during construction) are outlined in <b>Chapter 9 – Water Environment – of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and in <b>OCEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>.</p> <p>An <b>Outline Soil Resource Management Plan (SRMP)</b> is provided as an <b>Appendix</b> to the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>. This sets out principles for how soils will be managed and protected during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme. A detailed soil resource management plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction,</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			prior to operation, and prior to decommissioning, as set out by the Requirements of the <b>draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b> .	

## Appendix J-2: Regard had to statutory consultation responses from consultees under s42(1)(b)

**Table J-2.1** below sets out responses to the statutory consultation from consultees under s42(1)(b) of PA 2008 and the regard had to them by the Applicant. It should be read in conjunction with Section 7.2 of the **Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]**.

**Table J-2.1 Regard had to statutory consultation responses from consultees under s42(1)(b)**

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	It is noted that the PERID states that the reasons for selecting the Longfield site as opposed to other site options will be presented in the ES. The Council reserve the right to comment on this following receipt of this information. At this stage comments contained within the PEIR in relation to matters such as proximity to existing National Grid assets and site topography are noted.	Braintree District Council (BDC)	Section 4.4 of NPS EN-1 [REF-2] summarises the legislative and policy position in relation to alternative sites. This sets out that there is a requirement to include in the ES, as a matter of fact, information about the main alternatives that have been studied. This is included within <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .  Aside from that, NPS EN-1 [REF-2] sets out that the	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>consideration of alternatives is only applicable in relation to a limited number of particular policy points. These are where there would be harm to biodiversity and geological conservation interest (5.3.7), the flood risk sequential and exception test (5.7.13), and in the case of development within a designated landscape (5.9.10). Of these, only flood risk is applicable to the Scheme, and the DCO application will provide details of this. In addition, a proportionate consideration of alternatives may form part of the justification for the site including some best and most versatile agricultural land within its boundary. Information on this will also be presented with the DCO application.</p> <p>Further information on alternatives assessed is</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	The lack of information in the PEIR on site alternatives, together with an explanation for selecting this site over other alternatives means that ECC is not in position to be able to comment on whether or not Longfield Solar Farm is the better location	Essex County Council (ECC)	<p>provided in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant. Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that is capable of producing a large amount of electricity.</p> <p>Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>The Solar Farm Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an</p>	



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable). The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecological constraints – SAC’s, SPA’s, SSSI’s, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li> <li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li> <li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li> <li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li> <li>• Settlements;</li> <li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li> </ul>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li> <li>• Green Belt; and</li> <li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li> </ul> <p>The search was used to identify contiguous potential developable areas of around or greater than 300ha with the ability to accommodate a large scale solar scheme.</p> <p>Further to the high level constraints identified above, further search criteria were applied at a local level, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topography – the Site needs to be flat or gently south facing slopes;</li> <li>• Field Shape and Pattern – fields need to be large and of regular shape;</li> <li>• Number of landowners – ideally a small number of landowners;</li> <li>• Landscape and Visual – aiming to locate the Site out of landscape designations, with a</li> </ul>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>high degree of existing vegetation for natural screening, limited long distance views;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential Amenity – checking for proximity to settlements;</li> <li>• Heritage – proximity to Listed Buildings and other designations such as Scheduled Monuments, and presence of below ground archaeology;</li> <li>• Ecology – avoid or minimise proximity to designated areas within or close to the Site;</li> <li>• Flood Risk – seek to locate the Site in Flood Zone 1, and reduce intrusion into zones 2 and 3;</li> <li>• Public Rights of Way – seek to either minimise effects upon receptors using PROW or seek opportunities to provide connectivity; and</li> <li>• Access – ease of access for construction and decommissioning stages to be considered.</li> </ul> <p>The Order limits are situated</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			within the optimal 5km of the Bulls Lodge Substation and provides a developable area with the ability to accommodate a large scale solar scheme. It was deemed a suitable option to move forwards with an application for the Scheme.	
<b>BESS</b>	The battery storage proposed is significant and further information is requested in relation to measures which would be taken to safeguard the surrounding area and its inhabitants in the event of a fire or similar large-scale disaster and of mitigation measures which could be taken to prevent such an event form occurring.	BDC	A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p>	
<b>BESS</b>	Any associated infrastructure and buildings required to support the solar equipment must also be designed and constructed to minimise their landscape and visual impact and be of a design appropriate to the rural context.	Chelmsford City Council (CCC)	<p>The BESS and Longfield Substation have been sited to benefit from good screening from existing mature vegetation. Toppinghoehall Wood to the north and south and Lost Wood to the east provide thick coverage.</p> <p>Additional planting will be implemented to screen the BESS to the south west and will be allowed to mature to a</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>substantial height.</p> <p>Phase 2 of the BESS is intended to be undertaken five years after the Scheme becomes operational, to allow sufficient time for screening implanted to the south east of the BESS to mature and provide sufficient screening – this will provide a “bridge” between Toppinghoehall and Lost Woods until planting has had sufficient time to mature to a point that it provides sufficient screening. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>BESS</b>	<p>CCC considers there to be an opportunity for the design of the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) to be outstanding and innovative and promotes high levels of sustainability in accordance with the nature of the scheme.</p>	CCC	<p>The detailed design of the Scheme cannot be confirmed until the tendering process for the design and construction of the Scheme has been</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>completed. For example, due to the rapid pace of technological development in the solar photovoltaic (PV) and energy storage industry, the Scheme could utilise technology which does not currently exist and sufficient flexibility therefore needs to be incorporated into the DCO application.</p> <p>To address this, a 'Rochdale Envelope' approach is used, as described in the Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 9 [REF-10]. This involves assessing the maximum (and where relevant, the minimum) parameters for the Scheme where flexibility needs to be retained. The principles and justification for this approach are set out in section 5.2 of <b>Chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>The design principles set out in the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> provided as <b>Appendix B</b> of the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> form the Rochdale Envelope limits within which the Scheme can be built and operated. These Design Principles are broad, allowing for flexibility in the Scheme design.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises the opportunity presented by the BESS to be outstanding and innovative in design terms and will consider this when developing its detailed design.</p>	
<b>BESS</b>	<p>Until the fully designed scheme is available CCC reserves the right to make further comments on this aspect of the proposal in terms of the scale, design, access for maintenance, landscape and visual impact, impact on the biodiversity, flood risk and drainage, safety, and amenity impacts such as noise. Without additional information on these points being made available for consideration CCC are not in a position to support the proposal.</p>	CCC	<p>The Applicant considers the sufficiently detailed information to enable comment on the BESS was provided through the PEIR. The Applicant has provided an updated description including details of scale, design and access of the BESS through the <b>Chapter 2 The Scheme of the</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p><b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b> The Environmental Statement examines comprehensively ecological impacts (Chapter 8), landscape and visual impacts (Chapter 10), noise and vibration levels (chapter 11) air quality (chapter 14) human health (chapter 15) and other topics of concern.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment was also undertaken and this can be viewed in <b>Appendix 9A of the Environment Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>).</p>	
<b>BESS</b>	<p>It should be noted that there is local community concern over the safety aspect of the battery storage facility. As set out above in response to question 2 it is noted that consultation on the design on this area is still on-going with the relevant local fire, police, and public health authorities about how this should be designed and implemented to ensure that it is appropriate and safe for the site. Until the fully designed scheme is available CCC</p>	CCC	<p>A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	reserves judgement on the safety of this aspect of the proposal.		<p>in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
BESS	Until a detailed scheme for the BESS is made available ECC is unable to comment on this aspect of the proposal in terms of its acceptability, scale, design, access for maintenance, landscape and visual impact, impact on biodiversity, flood risk and drainage and safety.	ECC	<p>chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p> <p>A description of the Scheme is presented in <b>Chapter 2: The Scheme of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]. The Outline Design Principles</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. contain controls over the BESS. This includes that the BESS will utilise an electrochemical energy storage system as well as lithium ion. The enclosures forming part of the BESS will be white or light grey or green in colour, and no component of the BESS, except for components included in Work No. 2(l) will exceed 4.5m in height AGL (existing levels). The BESS will incorporate fire detection and suppression measures including adequate provision for water storage to provide a minimum supply of 1,800 litres per minute for 4 hours. In the event of an emergency any firewater will be captured by automated systems within the BESS SuDS design and may be reused as required. Captured firewater runoff will be</p>	



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>analysed and treated / disposed of in accordance with extant guidance for the treatment of contaminated water.</p> <p>A full Environmental Statement (ES) <b>[EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> has been submitted with the DCO application for the Scheme. The Environmental Statement examines comprehensively ecological impacts (Chapter 8), landscape and visual impacts (Chapter 10), air quality (chapter 14) human health (chapter 15) and other topics of concern.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment was also undertaken, and this can be viewed in <b>Appendix 9A of the Environment Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>.</p>	
<b>Climate change</b>	With regard to climate change, whilst climate change has been acknowledged as a significant drive for the development, no reference has been made to BDC's Climate Change Strategy [REF-18] or how it will support	BDC	The DCO application sets out this context in relation to national climate change policy and legislation through the Planning	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>the key priorities. Areas of the strategy that this development may impact are as follows: “Following a review of the draft Climate Change Strategy 2021-2030 Document.ashx, the following areas of focus for business support have been identified (Braintree District Council has announced its draft strategy to help the District tackle the climate change challenge and will go out to public consultation in May 2021). Themes involving skills have also been derived from the Green Skills Infrastructure Review – Scoping Consultation Paper [REF-19] by Essex Climate Action Commission.</p> <p>Support businesses to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reduce commercial carbon emissions – particularly in the transport sector (highest emissions commercial sector)</li> <li>2. Be commercially educated, engaged and encouraged to improve and increase carbon neutralising mitigation practices</li> <li>3. Adapt to and prepare against climate change – emergency planning training/education including those that are reliant on natural systems for their livelihoods to adapt to change and increase resilience</li> <li>4. Receive training to support new technology implementation, including installation, management and maintenance and associated activities</li> <li>5. Deliver sustainable travel for employees</li> </ol>		<p>Statement <b>[EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>. This document also make reference to local climate change policies where applicable. The Applicant has also prepared a <b>Statement of Need [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> setting out the need for the Scheme.</p> <p>The UK is legally bound through the Climate Change Act (2008), as amended in 2019, to reduce carbon emissions and to reach ‘net zero’ carbon emissions by 2050. This commitment is needed in order to help contribute to limiting global warming to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, as per the Paris Agreement (2015). This requires urgent action to decarbonise energy system. The Government has set the following three objectives for the energy system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decarbonisation</li> </ul>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>6. Work with training providers, and further education establishments to increase skills and employment opportunities associated with this sector – green skills for green jobs including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Skills supporting resource efficiency</li> <li>b. Skills supporting low carbon industry</li> <li>c. Skills supporting climate resilience</li> <li>d. Skills to manage natural assets”</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Security of Supply</li> <li>• Affordability</li> </ul> <p>These objectives will need to be delivered in the face of an increase for demand for electricity, which will result from the decarbonisation and electrification of sectors of the economy which have traditionally been primarily powered by carbon, in particular transport and heating.</p> <p>With regards employment, it is expected that an average of 380 jobs will be created during the construction period. During the operational phase, 8 full time staff would be employed on the site.</p> <p>A local skills and employment plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction. This will set out measures that the Applicant will implement in order to advertise and promote</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			employment opportunities associated with the Scheme in construction and operation locally. The Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training.	
<b>Construction</b>	In addition, consideration needs to be given where there will be soil stripping, storage and excavation for site compounds, access roads, cable trenching etc. Any site level changes should also be assessed and should not have a longer lasting impact when the site is returned following the decommissioning.	CCC	Detail on these activities is provided through the <b>OCEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b> . Soil stripping and/or storage activities are limited to the construction of hardstand areas around the inverter/transformer stations and the hardstands around the BESS & substation. Where possible, any overburden will be spread across the site with due consideration given to visual impact and surface water flow. There are some permanent cut and fill activities required at the National Grid Bulls Lodge	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>substation extension, where the development is permanent.</p> <p>Prior to commencement of works a Soil Resource Management Plan (SRMP) will be prepared in accordance with the <b>Outline Soils Resource Management Plan (Outline SRMP)</b>, provided as an appendix of the <b>OCEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>. The SRMP will detail the management of soil on areas such as temporary working compounds, temporary and permanent tracks and sites of temporary and permanent buildings. The SRMP will include details of topsoil and subsoil stripping depths, how and where soils will be stored, conditions under which soil stripping and reinstatement will be carried out and how the reinstatement will be carried out.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Construction</b>	Where possible, excavation should be minimised, and solar arrays and associated infrastructure installed in a manner that is capable of easy removal and the site returning to former use.	CCC	<p>The Applicant's preferred method of installation for the PV array would be the use of 'micro' piles. These require no excavation and can be easily removed using a tractor and/or hydraulic rig designed for this purpose.</p> <p>Where possible, array cables will be laid within the PV array support structure and so will also require no excavation. Where this is not practicable, such as for HV cables, we would select cable routes based on directness and serviceability. The Applicant's preference would always be to reduce the amount of trenching and associated excavation required. Further details of the methods proposed for use during decommissioning are included in the <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b>. This</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.	
<b>Construction</b>	A robust construction management plan would need to be implemented, particularly given the identification of piling as a construction method. Due consideration would also need to be given to the management of construction traffic both in terms of the impact of vehicle movements upon the highway network but also in terms of the potential for noise and air pollution impact. The aim should be for no noticeable effects and in particular no humming or tonal noise from inverters and cooling fans at noise sensitive receptors.	BDC	The Applicant recognises the importance of each of the issues raised in the response. The Applicant has set out details of its approach to managing impacts from construction in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b> and <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) included at Appendix 13B of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> included in the DCO application.	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>The issues set out above mean the proposal still lacks the detail required to enable CCC to fully assess the impact of the proposal. CCC will continue to engage with the applicants and further comments will be made on the proposal at the submission stage when it is expected that the necessary detailed information will be available. Without additional information and clarification on these points being made available for consideration CCC are not in a position to support the proposal.</p>	CCC	<p>The Applicant has set out our assessment of potential noise impacts in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The information presented by the Applicant at statutory consultation was necessarily preliminary and represented the Scheme at the time of consultation, in order to provide an opportunity for feedback on the proposals to influence the Scheme as it was finalised for the Application. The Applicant believes the level of detail presented in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report and other consultation documents was appropriate in this context. The Applicant has continued to engage with local authorities following the close of statutory consultation as set out</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>The three host authorities, the County Council, Braintree District Council and Chelmsford City Council are working in close collaboration on this Proposed Development and have provided separate but aligned responses to this statutory consultation. The three host authorities are strongly of the view that in moving forward, there needs to be a step-change in the level of technical engagement and that serious consideration needs to be given to appropriately informed political processes.</p>	CCC	<p>in <b>Table 8-1</b> of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>.</p> <p>The information presented by the Applicant at statutory consultation was necessarily preliminary and represented the Scheme at the time of consultation, in order to provide an opportunity for feedback on the proposals to influence the Scheme as it was finalised for the Application. The Applicant believes the level of detail presented in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report and other consultation documents was appropriate in this context. The Applicant has continued to engage with local authorities following the close of statutory consultation as set out in <b>Table 8-1</b> of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>. This has included 17 meetings in the period since statutory consultation, on topics including</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Consultation</b>	It is within this context that the host authorities are engaging with you on your proposal. You will be aware of the resources the host authorities have committed to the process to date and, in relation to this consultation, the commissioning of specialist technical advice. That advice, the views of the host authorities articulated in the responses of the individual hosts will hopefully provide a positive platform from which to further engage over the coming months in shaping the scheme prior to the submission of the Development Consent Order (DCO), which on current timetable is planned for late 2021.	CCC	LVIA, PROWs, traffic, minerals and socioeconomics.  The Applicant has continued to engage with local authorities following the close of statutory consultation as set out in <b>Table 8-1</b> of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b> . This has included 17 meetings in the period since statutory consultation, on topics including LVIA, PROWs, traffic, minerals and socioeconomics.	N
<b>Consultation</b>	In general Essex County Council (ECC) is satisfied that the 'Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC), published as part of the suite of consultation documents, sets out an engagement process that is appropriate. ECC is however aware that whilst the Essex Access Forum was listed as a contact for this consultation, the Essex Local Access Forum has not been consulted but should have as a key non-statutory consultee.	ECC	This is not the case. The Essex Local Access Forum was contacted at the outset of the statutory consultation as set out in <b>Appendix H-1</b> of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.9]</b> .	N
<b>Consultation</b>	Further, whilst it is recognised that the consultation materials meet the statutory requirements of the Planning Act 2008, all three host authorities are concerned by the lack of detail and missing technical	ECC	It is noted that ECC considered that the consultation meets the statutory requirements of the Planning Act 2008. The	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>information/engagement in some areas of the assessment. Particular areas of the PEIR where information is either unclear, unavailable or incomplete include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. the assessment of alternatives</li> <li>ii. full explanation of how the non-technical consultation exercise has informed the design of the Proposed Development</li> <li>iii. the review and incorporation of findings of the heritage statement into the boundary of the site and proposed mitigation measures</li> <li>iv. a Cumulative Effects Assessment</li> <li>v. a Glint and Glare Assessment</li> <li>vi. a Biodiversity Net Gain report</li> <li>vii. information on Lighting</li> <li>viii. Ambiguity of information covering Public Rights of Way</li> <li>ix. Missing Photomontages to illustrate the predicted visual effects of the development</li> <li>x. Residential Amenity Assessments</li> <li>xi. A Drainage Strategy and Land Management Strategy</li> <li>xii. A Decommissioning Plan</li> </ul> <p>Whilst it is fully appreciated that the PEIR can only be a 'point in time' indication of progress at the time of statutory consultation, undertaking this consultation now</p>		<p>information presented by the Applicant at statutory consultation was necessarily preliminary and represented the Scheme at the time of consultation in order to provide an opportunity for feedback on the proposals to influence the Scheme as it was finalised for the Application. The Applicant believes the level of detail presented in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report and other consultation documents was appropriate in this context. The Applicant has continued to engage with local authorities following the close of statutory consultation as set out in <b>Table 8-1</b> of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>. This has included 17 meetings in the period since statutory consultation, on topics including LVIA, PROWs, traffic, minerals and socioeconomics, as well as</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	brings into question whether this consultation is adequate.		advanced provision of information such as the <b>Glint and Glare Assessment (Appendix 10G of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> . The Applicant has included all requested assessments set out in the comment aside from the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA). The design of the Scheme has been reviewed and amended to avoid or mitigate potential significant adverse effects on residents. As such a RVAA is not required. This was agreed via email dated 15 October 2021 from the local authorities' adviser on this matter. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>	
<b>Consultation</b>	Of concern is the amount of technical work still to be undertaken and in turn the amount of information still to	ECC	The Applicant has continued to engage with local authorities	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>be provided and agreed prior to the submission of the DCO which is planned for late 2021. The host authorities are keen to work collaboratively with the applicant and to formalise an engagement process following completion of this statutory consultation exercise. This is in all parties' interests and will minimise the degree of technical debate during the examination process in order to give the Secretary of State the confidence to accept the application once it is submitted.</p>		<p>following the close of statutory consultation as set out in <b>Table 8-1</b> of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>. This has included 17 meetings in the period since statutory consultation, on topics including LVIA, PROWs, traffic, minerals and socioeconomics.</p>	
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>Having considered the statutory consultation details I can confirm that Thurrock Borough Council has no comments at this stage.</p>	<p>Thurrock Borough Council</p>	<p>This is noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
	<p>However the Council would wish to be consulted at any further stages of the application process</p>			
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>No heritage assets will be physically affected by the proposals, nor are there any included within the site boundary, however there will be an impact upon the setting of numerous heritage assets which are located in close proximity to the site. Those assets which have the potential to be impacted are outlined within the applicant's Heritage Statement and summarised in Figure 7-2; an appropriate zone of study has been used (1 km, rising to 3km for designated assets to which their setting makes an active contribution to their significance). The relevant and appropriate planning policies and guidance</p>	<p>BDC, ECC</p>	<p>This is noted. The archival research and mapping are revisited in <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>documents are also outlined within the applicant's Heritage Statement. The limited archival research and reproduction of maps conducted at this stage is acceptable in light of the Covid-19 related restrictions, however it is expected that this shortfall in information will be addressed in any further reports relating to the proposals.</p>			
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>The significance criteria outlined in section 7.4.15 of the heritage statement provides a clear methodology for the grading of heritage assets and appropriate baseline for the assessment provided. The 'criteria for determining the magnitude of impact on heritage assets' (Table 7-2) could benefit from further explanation, particularly regarding how harm to setting is defined and how this relates to the major and moderate effects described as 'significant for the purposes of the EIA Regulations' (7.4.20). Table 7-3 outlines matters raised regarding responses provided in previous consultations, and how these concerns have been addressed, however there are concerns that the manner in which the concerns have been addressed fails to fully alleviate or mitigate the concerns raised. Further design mitigation, beyond that described in section 7.7 would be beneficial.</p>	BDC	<p>The Applicant is pleased to note that the Council considers the methodology set out in <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> to be clear. Table 7.2 in this chapter includes a definition of how harm is defined and how this relates to the significance of effects.</p> <p>In developing the design, care has been taken to avoid, reduce and mitigate impacts on the setting of heritage assets. Further design mitigation is now set out in <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement</b></p>	Y

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p><b>[EN010118/APP/6.1].</b> Two areas of significant (medium or high value) archaeological activity have been removed from the Order limits. The areas of archaeological remains comprise of a single multi-occupation prehistoric and/or Roman settlement associated with medieval, post-medieval and modern features (A70) and a prehistoric settlement (A127). Both assets have been entirely removed from the Order Limits. Asset A127 was subject to an archaeological trial trench evaluation (Site D).                      Two areas of sensitivity in regard to the setting of Toppinghoe Hall and Ringer’s Farmhouse have been removed from the Order Limits.                      Two areas of sensitivity in regard to the setting of Scarletts Farm and Noakes Barn have been removed from the developable</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			area of the Scheme.	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>The document acknowledges that areas of sensitivity in relation to built heritage have been removed from the developable area, although these remain in the landscape works area of the scheme. These areas are detailed in Figure 3-1, 3-2 and 3-3 and are located in proximity to Scarletts Farm, Toppinghoe Hall and Ringers Farm, all designated heritage assets. In the opinion of the Council's Historic Buildings Consultant, the areas omitted from the developable area are cursory in nature and fail to make any notable mitigation impact or fully acknowledge the concerns raised. In particular, the proximity of the development to Ringer's Farm is a cause for concern. Further mitigation could be conducted to lower the level of harm anticipated to the setting of Ringers (removing the hexagonal section of land to the north of the farmhouse entirely from the scheme, for example) and it is recommended that the findings of this heritage statement are used more constructively to inform the site boundary. The submitted document does provide a clear indication of areas of sensitivity, yet this appears to have not had a clear impact upon the nature of the scheme or its boundary, when the details submitted for the scoping opinion and this PEIR assessment are compared.</p>	BDC, ECC	<p>As set out in <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, two areas of sensitivity pointed out by the respondent, in regard to the setting of Toppinghoe Hall and Ringer's Farmhouse, have been removed from the Order Limits. Two areas of sensitivity in regard to the setting of Scarletts Farm and Noakes Barn have been removed from the developable area of the Scheme. The areas removed from the Scheme are larger than those proposed during the statutory consultation. The design has been informed by built heritage considerations and impacts to listed buildings have been minimised wherever possible. Advice on protection of the setting of Ringers Farm has</p>	Y



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>Whilst there are concerns regarding how the findings of the Heritage Statement have influenced the proposals, the findings are clearly set out and provide an overview of the predicted harm to the designated heritage assets which neighbour the site. The conclusions and the levels of harm predicted are largely agreed with, nevertheless the setting of these heritage assets does appear to be underestimated. The proposed solar park is expansive and will partially, if not entirely remove the agricultural, historic setting of the heritage assets for the period in which it is operational. As the buildings identified are part of a large interconnected landscape of outlying farms, scattered throughout a rural landscape, better assessment of the cumulative affect of the park should be conducted. Furthermore, there is concern regarding how the change in setting will affect those assets which have already had their significance compromised, such as the Barn at Noake’s Farm. A 20m buffer, edge strengthening and the use of some low height panels have been proposed for the barn, yet this seems to not go far enough to mitigate any harm, and raises the question as to whether the importance of the barn’s surviving agricultural setting has really been understood. This is a heritage asset which has been largely removed from its</p>	BDC, ECC	<p>been incorporated into the design.</p> <p><b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> includes an assessment of the sensitivity of heritage assets and impacts on their settings. It is anticipated that physical effects on heritage assets would be on highly localised features, wholly within the Scheme, upon which there would be no cumulative effects from other developments. Given the intervening distance and nature of the schemes identified at the time of writing the ES, it is expected that there would be no additional cumulative effects on the setting of the archaeological remains, historic buildings or historic landscapes within the Order limits’ zone of influence additional to those already identified for the Scheme in</p>	Y

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	original context, more effort could be used to help it maintain one aspect which strongly contributes to its significance, its agricultural setting. Assessing the importance of the setting of the barn from a new perspective would be beneficial.		isolation. In conclusion, therefore, no cumulative impacts upon the cultural heritage resource (either archaeological or built heritage) are envisaged. The Applicant has included mitigation of the specific impacts referred to in the comment. Two areas of sensitivity in regard to the setting of Scarletts Farm and Noakes Barn have been removed from the developable area of the Scheme.	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	As with Noakes Barn, the proposals feature a buffer for some of the heritage assets adjacent to the site. The associated fencing, screening and power stations etc will, nonetheless, be visually prominent and detract from the visual quality of the historic landscape. Although this is acknowledged in the summary table, it is considered that the proposed site plan, including the areas of smaller, low height panels could be revised further. Screening is cited as a method of reducing harm, however this in itself will affect how the heritage assets are experienced and their significance. Particularly in the case of farmsteads which were intrinsically connected to the surrounding land, this	BDC, ECC	It is acknowledged within the PEIR (at 7.7.4) that screening may itself constitute an impact. For this reason it is also noted that screening will be appropriate and sensitive in nature and will take into consideration the surrounding landscape character. Planting as mitigation to screen views is limited to avoid the creation of new impacts; however, it has	Y

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>screening could have as greater impact, if not more, than the panels themselves, concealing heritage assets and altering the character of the landscape. Further analysis of the effects of planting and fencing, including plans for the removal or maintenance of any planting following the decommissioning of the solar park, should be provided if the application proceeds, beyond the description provide in section 7.8.82: 'Landscape restoration and remediation to suitable surfaces would be undertaken.' Assets which would particularly benefit from further analysis in this aspect are Scarlett's Farmhouse and Little Russells, Stocks Farm, Ringer's Farm and White House Farm.</p>		<p>been used to enhance existing screening and/ or futureproof against the loss of existing planting as appropriate. Further detail is set out in the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b></p>	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>The assessment of likely impacts and effects of the proposals upon heritage assets is outlined in section 7.8, including affects caused by the installation and removal of the equipment which will have a notable impact upon archaeological remains. Whereas these aspects will not have a physical affect upon built heritage assets, the visual effect of the building works and introduction of concrete hardstanding, solar stations and cabling upon the setting of built heritage assets has not been fully assessed. It is therefore recommended that as the application progresses, the location of any such associated plant, beyond the installation of the panels (switchgear, inverters etc) is informed by their proximity and visual prominence from heritage assets, as</p>	BDC, ECC	<p>In developing the design, care has been taken to avoid, reduce and mitigate impacts on the setting of heritage assets. The assessment set out in <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> includes the visual effects of construction, the introduction of concrete hardstanding, solar stations and cabling on the setting of build heritage assets. The outcomes of this assessment has informed</p>	Y

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>appropriate. The suggestion that ‘the setting of heritage assets will continue to be considered throughout detailed design development and opportunities for further mitigation of significant effects, such as through additional screening or set-backs, will be considered in the ES, if appropriate’ is positive (section 7.9.5) yet does not suggest this is necessary. It is highly recommended that further consideration of heritage assets is incorporated into a revised site boundary and scheme.</p>		<p>the design of the Scheme as well as the Applicant's approach to construction. Two areas of significant (medium or high value) archaeological activity have been removed from the Order limits. The areas of archaeological remains comprise of a single multi-occupation prehistoric and/or Roman settlement associated with medieval, post-medieval and modern features (A70) and a prehistoric settlement (A127). Both assets have been entirely removed from the Order Limits. Asset A127 was subject to an archaeological trial trench evaluation (Site D). Two areas of sensitivity in regard to the setting of Toppinghoe Hall and Ringer’s Farmhouse have been removed from the Order Limits. Two areas of sensitivity in regard to the setting of Scarletts Farm</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			and Noakes Barn have been removed from the developable area of the Scheme.	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>Appendix 10 focusses on the effects of the proposals upon the landscape and visual amenity. Viewpoint photomontages have not been submitted at this stage and are to be prepared as part of the ES. There was no consideration of summertime views at this stage as the report was completed during the winter months. There is an acknowledgement of heritage constraints within the report and there appears to be an appropriate link between the heritage and landscape assessment of the proposals. As per the suggestions above, further analysis of the impact of introducing formal fencing into the landscape would be beneficial as this is at odds with the prevailing character of the site and rural, largely informal character of the landscape at present. Visualisations may help aid this assessment, particularly in areas where public footpaths allow for views toward heritage assets, such as the footpath to the north west of Ringer’s Farm. Plotting of the panels on maps or other visual aids in relation to hedgerows and existing landscape features would also be of benefit, to understand if the proposed set back of panels described in section 10.8.8 is a binary notion or will be adapted where appropriate to reference</p>	BDC, ECC	<p><b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> assesses impacts from perimeter and deer fencing. Section 7.8 sets out that fencing will generally either be set back or screened from heritage assets. As a result, no significant effects on heritage assets are expected as a result of fencing. <b>Figure 10-12 Outline Landscape Masterplan [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b> include hedgerows and other existing landscape features.</p>	Y

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>curves and slopes in the field boundaries, for example, which could make the panels appear more prominent or dominant due to their comparatively stark, homogenous appearance.</p>			
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>In conclusion, greater incorporation of the findings of the Heritage Statement into the boundary of the site and proposed mitigation measures are recommended. In the later stages of this application it is hoped that a more sensitive approach to heritage assets and their setting is utilised, to better mitigate the harm that will occur as a result of these proposals. The harm varies dependent upon the asset, however in relation to the NPPF, this would be within the realms of less than substantial for all designated heritage assets identified, meaning section 196 of the NPPF would be relevant, section 197 applies for non-designated assets. Other appropriate national polices include section 127, 192 and 200 of the NPPF, section 16(2) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p>	BDC, ECC	<p>In developing the design, care has been taken to avoid, reduce and mitigate impacts on the setting of heritage assets. Further design mitigation is now set out in <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Two areas of significant (medium or high value) archaeological activity have been removed from the Order limits. The areas of archaeological remains comprise of a single multi-occupation prehistoric and/or Roman settlement associated with medieval, post-medieval and modern features (A70) and a prehistoric settlement (A127). Both assets have been entirely removed from the Order Limits.</p>	Y

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>Asset A127 was subject to an archaeological trial trench evaluation (Site D).</p> <p>Two areas of sensitivity in regard to the setting of Toppinghoe Hall and Ringer’s Farmhouse have been removed from the Order Limits.</p> <p>Two areas of sensitivity in regard to the setting of Scarletts Farm and Noakes Barn have been removed from the developable area of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant agrees with the conclusion that any harm would be less than substantial and an assessment in this respect is provided as an appendix to the Planning Statement. Please see <b>Planning Statement Appendix E: Designated Heritage Assets Harm Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b></p>	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	Protected lanes are not captured within the assessment. These should also be included and considered as non designated heritage assets. Notably, Birds Farm Lane,	CCC	Protected lanes have been further assessed in <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the</b>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	Noakes Lane and part of Boreham Road are protected lanes.		<b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and are treated as non-designated assets as per the ECC recommendations on Protected Lanes and in line with BDC's New Local Plan (adopted 2021) Policy LPP 38 and BDC's Protected Lanes Assessments (2013) [REF-11]	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>CCC agree with the grading of significance and the impacts in many instances, but there are several sites where the level of significance and/or the magnitude of impacts CCC does not agree with. These include Birds Farm, Noakes Barn and the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lawns Farmhouse –impact medium</li> <li>o Whitehouse Farm – medium significance</li> <li>o Little Holts – impact high</li> <li>o St Marys Church – impact medium</li> <li>o Buftons –impact medium</li> <li>o Thatched Cottage – impact medium</li> <li>o Stocks Farm - impact medium, significance medium</li> <li>o Whalebone Cottage – impact medium</li> <li>o Russell Green Cottages – impact low</li> <li>o Hedgerow Cottage and Noakes House – impact high</li> </ul>	CCC	<p>The NPS EN-1 [REF-2] and the NPPF [REF-4] make a distinction between grade II listed buildings and registered parks and gardens and 'assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites.</p> <p><b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> reflects this distinction, treating grade II</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>listed buildings as being of medium heritage value and grade I and II* listed buildings as being of high heritage value. As noted in paragraph 7.4.15 of the chapter 'When professional judgement is considered, some sites may not fit into the specified category presented in Table 71. Each heritage asset is assessed on an individual basis and considers regional variations and individual qualities of sites, including the contribution made by its setting.' On this basis, two non-designated built heritage assets have been treated as being of medium rather than low heritage value within the chapter.</p> <p>Impacts to relevant non-designated heritage assets through changes to their setting is fully assessed in Section 7.8. in line with the methodology outlined in Section 7.4.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	There are groups of heritage assets, for instance at Stocks Farm and Noakes Lane, where cumulative heritage impacts should be considered.	CCC	<p>Embedded mitigation measures are described in Section 7.5 and in assessments of individual assets in Section 7.8. Additional Mitigation and Enhancement Measures are described in Section 7.9.</p> <p>As set out in <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, the Applicant has assessed cumulative impacts on heritage assets. The cumulative schemes have been agreed in consultation with Essex County Council. It is anticipated that physical effects on heritage assets would be on highly localised features, wholly within the Scheme, upon which there would be no cumulative effects from other developments. Given the intervening distance and nature of the schemes identified</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	Mitigation measures should be provided for all impacts above negligible. These should be set out.	CCC	<p>at the time of writing the ES, it is expected that there would be no additional cumulative effects on the setting of the archaeological remains, historic buildings or historic landscapes within the Order limits' zone of influence additional to those already identified for the Scheme in isolation. In conclusion, therefore, no cumulative impacts upon the cultural heritage resource (either archaeological or built heritage) are envisaged.</p> <p>The Scheme includes embedded design mitigation, as set out in Section 7.7 of <b>Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, and additional mitigation as set out in Section 7.9 of the same document.</p>	N
<b>Cumulative effects</b>	Particular consideration will need to be given to the new Chelmsford Garden Community, in terms of opportunities for new sustainable travel connections to the east, into	ECC	This is noted and has been investigated as the design for the DCO application was developed. The Applicant has	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	the wider countryside and opportunities to supply renewable energy to the new Garden Community.		continued to engage with the developer of the new Chelmsford Garden Community, Countryside Zest (Beaulieu Park) LLP as set out in <b>Table 8-1 of the Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b> , with a view to exploring the opportunities raised by ECC.	
<b>Cumulative effects</b>	It is noted that construction for Longfield would be likely to be concurrent with the A12 widening scheme and this could impact greatly upon Hatfield Peverel and Boreham villages as well as linking roads. In addition, the Bradwell B NSIP project could also coincide within this time period and again impact upon the movement of traffic within the area. Whilst highway impact is a matter for the relevant Highway Authorities BDC wish to flag a general concern around this point and the fact that the highway impact upon main and local roads would need to be carefully assessed and managed.	BDC	This is noted. Based on National Highways' pre-application response, the Scheme is not expected to have a significant impact on the A12(T) or the A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening scheme on the basis that appropriate measures will be adopted during construction (where necessary) and that further discussions have been held with the local highway authorities. This includes several meetings with National Highways and Jacobs to review potential synergies between the A12(T) to A120 Widening	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>proposals and the Scheme. The <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1], Transport Assessment [appendix 13A [EN010118/APP/6.2]] and Construction Traffic Management Plan (appendix 11C [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> consider potential cumulative impacts during the construction phase of the Scheme and identify mitigation to reduce these impacts on the Strategic Road Network including the A12(T) and the Boreham Interchange. The proposed A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening Scheme will be supported by a CTMP. Detailed CTMPs will also be prepared in due course for the Solar Farm Site and Bulls Lodge Substation which will include further details of the A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening Scheme where relevant. The ongoing Boreham Interchange</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>improvements and construction of the Radial Distributor Road (RDR) are also due to be completed prior to the construction phase of the Scheme, adding further capacity to the surrounding highway network with the expectation of easing congestion. Given these considerations, the Scheme is not expected to have a material impact on the Strategic Road Network.</p>	
<p><b>Cumulative effects</b></p>	<p>There are still some areas which require further detailed information to be provided for CCC to reach a judgement on the cumulative impacts of the proposal against the benefits the scheme would offer. CCC will continue to engage with the process and provides further detailed comments in response to question 4 below but without the additional information on these points being made available for consideration CCC are not in a position to support the proposal.</p>	<p>CCC</p>	<p>An assessment of cumulative impacts is set out in each of the main chapters of the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Details of the developments considered in conducting this assessment is provided in <b>Appendix 5A Long List of Cumulative Schemes of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. This list was shared with ECC, CCC and</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Cumulative effects</b>	Given the wider context of energy development in the region at this time and the likely delivery of further development within the near future BMSDC consider that particular regard should be had to the need for adequate assessment of potential cumulative effects.	Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council	BDC prior to the submission of the DCO application.  An assessment of cumulative impacts is set out in each of the main chapters of the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . Details of the developments considered in conducting this assessment is provided in <b>Appendix 5A Long List of Cumulative Schemes of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> . This list was shared with ECC, CCC and BDC prior to the submission of the DCO application.	N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	What safeguards are in place surrounding the de-commissioning of the site if for example The Applicant ceased to trade as a business. Who would then take responsibility for the de-commissioning of the site?	BDC	Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p>	



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal does not include suitable justification on why Hazel Dormouse and terrestrial invertebrates have been scoped out from further assessment. Hazel Dormouse is protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and their breeding sites and resting places are fully protected. They are also a Priority Species under the NERC Act 2006. The species has been confirmed to be present within a 2km radius, as listed within Appendix 8J - Essex Field Club Desk Study. Therefore, as the proposals will involve the loss of suitable habitat for the species (hedgerows) and will be situated adjacent to deciduous woodlands, we request that further information should accompany this application on this European Protected Species.</p>	BDC	<p>The Essex Field Club records search extend further than 2km (up to 5km) and these records of hazel dormouse are over 2km. We are aware of more recent unpublished records along the A12. On the basis of retaining and buffering existing habitat, lack of dormouse records near to the site and current scheme proposals only having a small impact on dormouse habitat due to minor hedgerow removal, it is considered that the current approach of scoping out dormouse assessment is acceptable. This approach was agreed with the ECC ecologist at a meeting on 23 July 2021. Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>In addition, there may be scope for rare/notable invertebrate species associated within arable land to be situated within the application site. Therefore, we request</p>	BDC	<p>The only suitable habitat is the woodland and mature hedges/veteran and/or ancient</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	that further information is provided to support this development on the likely impacts of terrestrial invertebrates, which could include surveys undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist		trees. None of this is impacted by the Scheme and will be suitably buffered. It has therefore been scoped out of the assessment in consultation with our invertebrate expert. The ECC ecologist agreed at a meeting on 23 July 2021 that this approach is appropriate. Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	
<b>Ecology</b>	The Badger Surveys undertaken in 2020 identified the presence of Badger within the Site, but the proposed works would not impact upon their breeding or resting places for the species. Foraging habitat for the protected species is considered good and will likely be retained as a result of the proposed works. However, it is indicated that additional surveys for Badger will be required within areas not previously surveyed within the revised Site boundary, as well as further surveys immediately prior to commencement. This is necessary to fully determine the likely impacts upon Badger and assess whether a development licence from Natural England will be required for this scheme.	BDC	No impacts on Badger are predicted. In addition, a re-survey would be undertaken prior to construction in case badger setts are found within the works areas. Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>Therefore, as the proposed solar farm will contain panels which are closely spaced, it is presumed that the development will result in a permanent loss of nesting habitat for this Priority Species, where solar panels are proposed on suitable nesting habitat for the species. Consequently, it is considered highly likely that the proposals could impact on Skylark at a population level. As a result, the bespoke mitigation strategy will need demonstrate that on-site and off-site compensation will be delivered, which considers the cumulative impacts of other solar farm and residential development schemes within the local districts. This could include the provision of Skylark Plots and further creation of areas of set-aside or 'cover crops' within the local area. This may also require communication with local landowners or Stakeholders, which could be brokered by local land agents with specific experience in these matters. The bespoke mitigation strategy will need to be set out prior to commencement and should include post-construction monitoring to determine the success of the compensation and inform future Solar Farm proposals.</p>	BDC	<p>Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has increased the amount of land available for of grassland/set-aside managed for ground nesting birds including skylark within the Scheme boundary. Work Number 10 within the <b>Works Plans [EN010118/APP/2.1]</b> shows the location of dedicated ecological set asides. Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	Y
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>The Breeding Bird Survey indicates that the scheme will retain as much of the existing boundary habitat as is practicable. Therefore, it is indicated that we strongly support this approach to ensure that minimal habitat loss will be caused to breeding bird species. However, the</p>	BDC	<p>Boundary habitats will be retained and enhanced with buffer zones between the hedges /woodland and scheme. As per the previous comment, as</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	scheme will result in habitat loss used by breeding birds, particularly arable farmland and grassland species. As a result, the works will result in the temporary / permanent displacement of ground-nesting breeding bird species reliant on this habitat, such as Skylark, a Priority species.		part of the mitigation strategy that a suitable area of grassland/set-aside managed for ground nesting birds including skylark will be included within the Scheme boundary. Hedges will be infilled and widened with areas of scrub. Additional planting include bird seed mixes and nesting boxes will be provided. Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	
<b>Ecology</b>	As a result, the site could be considered functionally linked land to the highlighted Internationally Designated Sites, as it provides foraging habitat for Lapwing and Golden Plover during the overwintering period. Consequently, we request that further information should be included within the Chapter 8 (Ecology) to set out the likely impacts on these species during the construction and operation phases, as the majority of the overwintering foraging habitat for the species will be lost from development of the proposed solar farm.	BDC	This is provided in the <b>Habitats Regulations Assessment [EN010118/APP/6.7]</b> .	N
<b>Ecology</b>	We note that the Great Crested Newt Survey identified a small Great Crested Newt population in Pond P5.	BDC	eDNA surveys have confirmed great crested newt presence in 8	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>However, further eDNA surveys have been proposed for 28 ponds and further traditional survey methods may be required if any ponds determine that Great Crested Newt are present. Therefore, the results of these further surveys, as well as an outlined mitigation strategy should be delivered as soon as possible to allow the LPA to have certainty of the likely impacts upon this European Protected Species (EPS). This should determine whether a EPS Mitigation Licence is required to be secured for this development prior to commencement of works. The developer may be interested to know that Natural England's District Level Licensing (DDL) for GCN is now available in Essex where sites can be registered to be covered by this strategic mitigation scheme. However, it is suggested that there are significant opportunities to enhance the habitat within the site boundary for Great Crested Newt. Therefore, the DDL approach may not be best suited for this scheme if a EPS Mitigation licence is required.</p>		<p>ponds outside the site and within 250m. There are unlikely to be impacts to these populations, but this will be considered in the final impact assessment and if a licence for loss of terrestrial habitat is required then this would be obtained. Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>We note that the Reptile Survey did not confirm the presence of reptiles within the site. As a result, we support the proposed outlined mitigation strategy to minimise potential incidental killing or injury of animals and mitigate for the loss of reptile habitat. It is highlighted that the habitat creation within the site will likely provide significant enhancements for reptiles and may be a good</p>	BDC	<p><b>A Biodiversity Design Strategy</b> is included as <b>Appendix A</b> to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> to illustrate the design approaches that could be incorporated to further</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	receptor site for future developments within the local area, once habitat has established.		enhance biodiversity on and around the Scheme.  The area within the Order limits, in its current condition is exceptionally poor habitat for all four common species of reptile. Hedgerows and grass margins were considered to have some, albeit low, value for reptiles and so reptile surveys were undertaken as a result, though none were recorded.  The Applicant's ambition for the Scheme is that it becomes a haven for biodiversity. Reptiles will benefit from the new biodiverse grassland around the arrays, meadow and floodplain grassland and the rewilding scrub. New hibernacula for reptiles to ensure overwintering habitat is suitable to ensure reptiles can thrive once they colonise the site. In addition,	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>new and restored hedgerows will also contribute to the overall value of the site. All deadwoods will be retained onsite in log piles, predominantly in hedgerows or woodland edges.</p> <p>There are no plans for introductions or translocations of any species at the Scheme at present. The Applicant considers that the Biodiversity Design for the site be of significant value to reptiles and their prey and we would assume that the enhancement at the site would lead to natural colonisation by reptiles. The Applicant does however recognise that reptiles can be a constraint to local development and since the Scheme will be creating vast amounts of excellent reptile habitat, we would be open to using the site as a receptor for</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>We note that the Bat Survey Report has concluded that the roosts and potential roost features identified are outside the current footprint of the Scheme. Therefore, we are satisfied that no further detailed roost presence/absence or characterisation surveys are required within the surveyed locations. We also note that commuting and foraging habitat for bats is assessed as of up to County/District Importance, due to the maternity roosts of common species and small numbers/individual roosts of rarer species such as Barbastelle, a species listed in Appendix II of both the Bern and Bonn Conventions to which the UK is a signatory. However, we note the site boundary has been amended and now includes a few additional fields to the south-west and east of the Site that may include grid connection routes and other infrastructure. Therefore, further Preliminary Roost Assessment and more detailed roost presence/absence survey should be undertaken in these areas, as necessary, prior to DCO submission.</p> <p>It is also accepted that it is too early to fully predict long-term effects on bat populations from solar farms, as large-scale solar farms have not been routinely monitored to predict long-term effects on bat populations. Therefore, whilst we are satisfied that the construction and operation</p>	BDC	<p>local development once habitat is established.</p> <p>No roosts will be impacted by the scheme. Pre-construction surveys will be undertaken and this will include potential roost sites. We anticipate the value of the Scheme for bats to increase substantially since existing hedges will be restored and new hedges created as part of our embedded mitigation. The reversion from arable to grassland high in pollen and nectar resources will create ideal conditions for invertebrates that bats prey on. Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>impacts can be predicted as much as reasonably possible, we strongly support the proposal to include monitoring to improve confidence in the assessment of residual adverse or beneficial effects, which would feedback into the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, to be secured by a DCO Requirement, and provide a dataset for future large scale solar schemes.</p>			
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>We are satisfied the conclusions of the Riparian Mammal Survey, which confirmed Water Vole to be absence from the River Ter and that Otter were using the water course for foraging and commuting purposes. We support the proposal to provide an update survey for Water Vole and Otter along the river and buffer areas, which would be undertaken prior to commencement where required. However, it is recommended that further surveys should be conducted if plans are amended and will impact any additional water bodies within the local area, which could be suitable for Riparian Mammals.</p>	BDC	<p>This is noted. An updated assessment is presented in <b>Appendix 8J Report on Surveys for Riparian Mammals of the Environmental Statement [EN10118/6.2]</b></p>	N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>We are satisfied with the conclusions of the Flora Survey Report. This concluded that there will be minor losses of small sections of hedgerows (estimated up to 25m wide), but are satisfied that this loss can be compensated throughout the site. It is also identified that there will potentially be a loss of important arable plant assemblage of up to local value. Therefore, these species should be</p>	BDC	<p>The minor loss to hedgerows will be adequately compensated by 5.8km of new hedgerow and the restoration of 22.1km of existing hedgerow. The existing hedgerows are currently poorly managed, gappy, and leggy. Their restoration will ensure</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	aimed to be retained within the grassland/edge habitats to be incorporated within the final design.		significantly better nesting and foraging for birds, resources for invertebrates and commuting and foraging habitat for bats and other mammals.  In 2020 surveys, five species of important arable plant were recorded, including one individual of Corn Chamomile. However the latter species was not recorded in 2021 surveys. The intensive arable management of the landscape has likely lead to the general loss of the arable weed community. However, there may still be a viable seedbank within the soil. Within the Biodiversity Design for the site, we have included conservation margins as a habitat that will be managed and maintained throughout operation of the solar farm. It is anticipated that at least 60% of the conservation margins will	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>comprise cereals sown at half the typical rate, under annual cultivation. This will allow for the existing seedbank to come to the surface and provide the disturbed ground that any wind - dispersed seeds can grow in. Free of overcrowding by crops and without pesticide use, it is hoped that the arable weed community, including chamomile, will flourish. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and the <b>Biodiversity Design Strategy</b> included as <b>Appendix A</b> to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> to illustrate the design approaches that could be incorporated to further enhance biodiversity on and around the Scheme.</p>	
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>We are pleased to see that reports accompanying the planning application follow the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM)</p>	BDC, ECC	<p>The Applicant can confirm that adequate ecological surveys and assessments have been</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>guidelines. However, it is indicated that the proposals will need to be supported by adequate ecological surveys and assessments to ensure the development is in compliance with national and local policy and its statutory duties. All further surveys must be undertaken by suitably qualified ecologists at the appropriate time of year using standard methodologies.</p>		<p>undertaken and have been prepared by suitably qualified technical consultants on behalf of the Applicant. Please see <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>We also support that 15-25m grassland buffers will be provided around all Ancient Woodland, an irreplaceable habitat, which is in line with Government guidelines to avoid root damage. However, it is indicated that the buffer zones should be 5m from the edge of the tree's canopy if that area is larger than 15 times the tree's diameter. In addition, it also may be necessary to deliver functional buffers greater than 15 metres to further minimise any potential edge effects identified from the proposed development. Nevertheless, we are pleased that the Outline Landscape Plan has provided buffers, whilst also creating ecological networks across the wider site, which join up previously fragmented deciduous woodlands, Priority habitat.</p>	BDC, ECC	<p>This is noted and the buffer zones proposed are consistent with this advice.</p>	N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>It is indicated that we support the conclusions outlined within the Chapter 8 (Ecology) and Preliminary Ecological Appraisal on the likely impacts on nearby designated sites (national and local), with mitigation measures able to be secured via the finalised Construction</p>	BDC, ECC	<p>The Applicant is pleased to note that the response supports the conclusions of <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>Environmental Management Plan under a DCO Requirement.</p> <p>We also note that a Biodiversity Net Gain report will be prepared with the Environmental Statement but is not available at this stage of the design. Therefore, whilst we appreciate the design of the scheme is continually changing, it is indicated that a draft Biodiversity Net Gain report would be extremely useful to accompany the initial design planning. This is because a Biodiversity Net Gain report will determine the extent of the biodiversity net gains that will be achieved from the proposed soft landscaping and allow the deliverability of the proposals to be appropriately assessed. The Biodiversity Net Gain report should use the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or any successor. The content of the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment should preferably include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baseline data collection and assessment of current conditions on site.</li> <li>• A commitment to measures in line with the Mitigation Hierarchy and evidence of how BNG Principles have been applied to maximise benefits to biodiversity.</li> <li>• Provision of the full BNG calculations, with detailed justifications for the choice of habitat types, distinctiveness, condition and ecological functionality.</li> <li>• Outlined details of the implementation measures and</li> </ul>	BDC, ECC	<p><b>Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b></p> <p>Biodiversity net gain has been calculated using the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 and is reported in the DCO application through the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b>. An overall gain of approximately 79% of habitat units and 20% of hedgerow habitats is predicted.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>management of proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outlined details of the monitoring and auditing measures.</li> </ul>			
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>It is worth noting that the forthcoming release of the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 is imminent. Therefore, it is advised that applicant ecologist should be aware that may be changes to Biodiversity Metric Calculator following this update. It is also highlighted that proposals of the Biodiversity Net Gain report will need to be incorporated into the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, to ensure the aims of plan will be delivered throughout the site.</p>	BDC, ECC	<p>Biodiversity net gain has been calculated using the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 and is reported in the DCO application through the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b>. An overall gain of approximately 79% of habitat units and 20% of hedgerow habitats is predicted.</p>	N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>In terms of the deliverability of the soft landscape plans, as outlined within the Biodiversity Overlay Plan within the Consultation Booklet, it is considered highly unlikely that species-rich neutral grasslands can be achieved under the solar panels. This is because the solar farm will contain panels which are closely spaced, which will cause shading of grassland beneath for the majority of a day and reduce productivity of flowering species. In addition, the grassland underneath the panels would be grazed by sheep, which would keep the entire sward very short, not just the competitive grasses. However, it is accepted that this will ultimately depend on the livestock stocking densities, as well as how the grazing is rotated across the site. Therefore, whilst we are pleased to see that the</p>	BDC, ECC	<p>This is agreed and species rich grassland habitat type has not been used in the BNG calculation. It is still a target habitat type and long-term management will aim to promote species rich grassland that will replace intensively managed and arable crops resulting in higher biodiversity.</p> <p>The Applicant fully appreciates and accepts the challenge of creating species-rich grassland</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>proposals aim for the provision of species-rich neutral grasslands, we recommend that Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment should set out the likelihood of species-rich neutral grasslands being realistically achieved within the proposals.</p>		<p>beneath the panels. The Applicant has moved away from using the term 'species-rich grassland' in favour of 'biodiverse grassland' for those reasons. As a biodiverse grassland, the aim will be to manage the grassland so that it is species-rich (i.e. &gt;15 sp/m<sup>2</sup>) though accept 9-15 sp/m<sup>2</sup> on average is more likely. Shade is expected to be less of an issue, as beneath the panels is surprisingly well-lit. There are no significant differences in plant diversity in quadrats between rows and underneath panels (though under panels were generally less diverse). A bigger issue is the high N and P in the soil. We will be managing this as best we can in advance of construction through a cut and carry approach.</p> <p>Conservation grazing will be</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>Overall, it is indicated that we support the outlined principles of the Biodiversity Overlay Plan, which seeks to create a range of new habitats and ecological networks, whilst also incorporating the management and enhancement of existing ecological assets. However, we will need to review this in closer detail when further information is available. In particular, we are pleased to see the provision of a biodiversity trial area, which will help improve how to deliver natural capital benefits alongside solar farms and inform new management strategies. However, it would be useful to see what the biodiversity trial areas will contain at a later stage of the proposals.</p>	BDC, ECC	<p>implemented. Sheep are an issue, but with a careful grazing plan, this is possible. This is expected to comprise 0.6LU/ha between Sep-March, avoiding grazing in spring and summer. All habitat management including grazing will be managed through an adaptive habitat management and planning approach.</p> <p>A <b>Biodiversity Design Strategy</b> is included as <b>Appendix B</b> to the <b>Design Statement</b> to illustrate the design approaches that could be incorporated to further enhance biodiversity on and around the Longfield Solar Farm. As set out in the <b>Draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b>, Requirement 9 will necessitate the submission and approval of a detailed Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) to deliver the provisions as set-out</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>out in the Outline LEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13] and to confirm how any approaches and measures set out in the <b>Biodiversity Design Strategy</b> have been incorporated into the design. The Applicant will also collaborate with an academic partner to develop a biodiversity trial area within Project. It is anticipated that different methods of planting under and around PV Arrays would initially be trialled to investigate which methods may be most effective in the context of current, operational and future needs of the land. It is the Applicant's ambition that this would add to the accumulated knowledge on biodiversity enhancements and land use at solar farms and help to inform the solar industry, including other future schemes.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Ecology</b>	We would also strongly support the provision of new pond creations, adjacent to re-wilded scrub and grassland areas. This is because it is a relatively declining habitat mosaic and would provide significant benefits for declining bird species (e.g. Turtle Dove), whilst also providing benefits for amphibians, reptiles and invertebrate species.	BDC, ECC	There are a number of existing ponds on the site, though many are in a poor state due to siltation, eutrophication and excessive shading. The priority will be to restore these ponds. The 2 new SuDs ponds have been designed to benefit biodiversity with varied bank slope with shallower sections.	N
<b>Ecology</b>	We also note that de-commissioning impacts for this solar farm have not been considered, when solar farms only have a relatively short lifespan. Therefore, we recommend that these are added to the Chapter 8 (Ecology) ahead of DCO submission.	BDC, ECC	Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.	
<b>Ecology</b>	The applicant needs to provide adequate ecological surveys and assessments for legally protected and Priority species. This should include Hazel Dormouse, Great Crested Newt and terrestrial invertebrates. It should also include updated surveys for sections of the site which have not been surveyed (e.g. Bats & Badger).	BDC, ECC	Updates have been undertaken for protected species (where accessible) which had not previously been surveyed and are presented in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement</b>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Ecology</b>	A bespoke mitigation strategy for ground nesting birds would need to be delivered, as it considered not possible that the development can compensate for impacts within the site boundary.	BDC, ECC	<p>[EN010118/APP/6.1]. Hazel dormice and terrestrial invertebrates scoped out unless habitats where they could potentially occur are impacted. This approach was agreed with the ECC ecologist at a meeting on 23 July 2021.</p> <p>Based on the revised Scheme layout, the Applicant anticipates that sufficient mitigation within the Order limited will be delivered by providing suitable grassland habitats in undeveloped fields. This was discussed and agreed with the councils at a meeting on 23 July 2021. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement</b> [EN010118/APP/6.1].</p>	N
<b>Ecology</b>	Further information is required within Chapter 8 (Ecology) on the likely impacts on Lapwing and Golden Plover, with consideration on whether adverse effects on site integrity would be caused from the relevant European and	BDC, ECC	This information is provided in the <b>Habitats Regulations Assessment</b> [EN010118/APP/6.7]. It is	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	International Designated Sites. This may require a simple shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment to support the documentation.		thought unlikely that the Scheme would result in any adverse effects on a European site as the wintering bird population using the site is low and the site is distant from the designated sites. This was discussed and agreed with the councils at a meeting on 23 July 2021.	
<b>Ecology</b>	A Biodiversity Net Gain report should be delivered as soon as possible to support the draft proposals, which should provide further justification on whether proposals are deliverable.	BDC, ECC	Biodiversity net gain has been calculated using the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 and is reported in the DCO application through the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> . An overall gain of approximately 79% of habitat units and 20% of hedgerow habitats is predicted.	N
<b>Ecology</b>	We recommend that impacts from the de-commissioning of the site should also be addressed within Chapter 8 (Ecology).	BDC, ECC	Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning, including for ecology. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy,</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.	
<b>Ecology</b>	The development proposal is likely to deliver significant enhancements for biodiversity in accordance with local and national policies. There should however be a net gain percentage set now, which should go beyond the 10% to be mandated in the Environment Bill, once passed.	CCC	Biodiversity net gain has been calculated using the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 and is reported in the DCO application through the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> . An overall gain of approximately 79% of habitat units and 20% of hedgerow habitats is predicted.	N
<b>Ecology</b>	Concerns in respect of lighting do not appear to have been overcome. This feature should respond to the rural context and minimise the use of artificial habitat disturbing the functioning of new and existing habitats such as, hedgerows and woodland and the permeability of mobile species across the landscape. More detail should be included of all lighting features and the impact this would have to local biodiversity.	CCC	No visible lighting will be utilised at the Order limits perimeter. InfraRed lighting will be provided by the CCTV/security system to provide night vision functionality for CCTV. Visible lighting will be installed at site entrance points, the Longfield substation (entrance, parking area and control room), and operations building (entrance, parking and refuge) only. Lighting in these locations would be installed no higher than 4m above ground level, be fitted	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>with downward directional cowls. Lighting would be turned to allow security personnel to leave Site. Visible lighting would be installed at solar stations and the BESS but used only in emergencies. The visual impact of lighting has been assessed against Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Dark Skies mapping. The methodology followed is set out in <b>ES Volume 2 Appendix 10B [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. Landscape and visual mitigation have been described in <b>Section 10.7</b> of the <b>ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and is shown on <b>Figure 10-12 Outline Landscape Masterplan [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b>. The proposed lighting has been designed to avoid and minimise the potential for adverse landscape and visual effects. The following mitigation has</p>	



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>been embedded in the design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No visible lighting will be utilised at the site perimeter fence more generally. Infrared lighting will be provided by the CCTV/security system to provide night vision functionality for CCTV.</li><li>• Lighting at solar stations will be manually operated used only in fault or emergency situations.</li><li>• Lighting at Longfield substation will be PIR operated (passive infra-red), calibrated to detect vehicles and personnel</li><li>• Lighting at the BESS entrances and adjacent to the access track within the BESS will be operated by PIR calibrated to trigger on vehicle and personnel, with the option of manual control.</li><li>• All visible lighting would be 50W, installed at a maximum height of 4m with cowls fitted to prevent light spillage.</li><li>• External lighting at the</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>Operations and Maintenance Building would be provided by PIR operated lights calibrated to vehicles and personnel. These would be located at building entrances and to cover the parking and refuge areas. These will be PIR operated calibrated to vehicles and personnel.</p> <p>An assessment of the proposed lighting, including any temporary lighting during construction, on ecology has been undertaken in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Throughout the Scheme, the use of motion detection security lighting to avoid permanent lighting will be utilised and the inward distribution of light will avoid light spill on to existing boundary features and impacts on ecology.</p>	
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>There is limited detailed information made in respect of the decommissioning process. There is a high degree of uncertainty what impact the decommissioning would have</p>	CCC	<p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>on established habitats and the species they would support. The PEIR states the effects of decommissioning are likely to be similar to those for construction. It is unclear to what extent adjacent habitats, both existing and those created, would be affected by the works and how the landscape would be restored.</p>		<p>Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.	
<b>Ecology</b>	Species rich grassland – this must consider underlying site soils and other biotic factors such as hydrology when selecting the most appropriate mix. This is to ensure the species selection for the grassland is meaningful and likely to establish to provide the desired enhancements. Turf and soil stripping should be re-used and established as new grassland habitats.	CCC	A <b>Biodiversity Design Strategy</b> is included as <b>Appendix B</b> to the <b>Design Statement</b> to illustrate the design approaches that could be incorporated to further enhance biodiversity on and around the Longfield Solar Farm. As set out in the <b>Draft DCO [EN010118/App/3.1]</b> , Requirement 9 will necessitate the submission and approval of a detailed Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) to deliver the provisions as set-out in the Outline LEMP <b>[EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> and to confirm how any approaches and measures set out in the <b>Biodiversity Design</b>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p><b>Strategy</b> have been incorporated into the design. The Applicant agrees that soil conditions (i.e. texture, moisture, pH) are fundamental to establishing a functional grassland that meets our ambition for biodiversity at the Scheme. Seed mixtures appropriate for the site will be included but are indicative as they are dependent on seed supplier. To mitigate this potential issue. the Applicant has included responsible sourcing of plants and seeds as a design principle.</p>	
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>Enhanced waterscape – early discussion with Natural England should occur to aid the landscape wide waterscape improvements that would benefit the River Ter SSSI. Consideration should also be given to the Great Crested Newt district level licencing scheme as to whether there is an opportunity to provide net new ponds that could be used in the scheme.</p>	CCC	<p>This is noted. The Applicant will discuss the potential for a district level licensing scheme for Great Crested Newt. The <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> sets out potential mitigation measures regarding habitats in the River Ter including: a. Widening the natural riparian zone by planting</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>riparian vegetation within the managed ground cover;</p> <p>b. Increasing the diversity of the vegetation structure on the bank face;</p> <p>c. Increasing the bank face natural bank profile and material richness;</p> <p>d. Increasing the macrophyte abundance and diversity within the channel;</p> <p>e. Improving channel bed siltation;</p> <p>f. Enhancements to flow types by altering the flow structure using deflectors;</p> <p>g. Improving the channel bed material richness; and</p> <p>h. Enhancement of sections of the watercourse in line with the recommendations of the Water Framework Directive Assessment report to ensure ‘no deterioration’.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>General</b>	Thank you for notifying Colchester Borough Council concerning the forthcoming DCO application for a solar farm to the north of the A12 in Braintree District. In this case we do not wish to comment further having regard to the location of the project a considerable distance from our Borough boundary.	Colchester Borough Council	This is noted.	N
<b>General</b>	Medway Council raise no objections to the proposed Development Consent Order application on the basis that the development would be unlikely to have a direct or significant impact on the Medway Council administrative area.	Medway Council	This is noted and we thank Medway Council for responding to the consultation.	N
<b>Glint and glare</b>	A full Glint and Glare Assessment has not been submitted at this stage. This remains a concern and the Council reserve the right to comment following the receipt of further information in relation to this matter.	BDC	It is correct that the Applicant did not publish a Glint and Glare Assessment as part of the PEI Report. Due to the nature and characteristics of the Scheme and the site, it is not expected that any significant glint and glare effects will result from the Scheme. Given the expectation that no significant effects would result, the glint and glare assessment was not required to enable stakeholders to understand the significant environmental effects of the	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>Scheme at statutory consultation stage.</p> <p>The Applicant has now conducted a <b>Glint and Glare Assessment</b>, which is included as <b>Appendix 10G of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. While this identifies potential high impacts from glint and glare at 10 residential receptors and 7 road receptors without mitigation, these are reduced to negligible impacts once mitigation measures such as hedgerows to be grown, infilled, gapped up and maintained to a height of at least 3m in affected areas.</p> <p>Until those hedgerows are grown sufficiently, a temporary 3m temporary wooden solid hoarding will be implemented and then removed once the hedgerows are of a sufficient</p>	



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>height. Further information is presented in <b>Appendix 10G: Glint and Glare Assessment of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. These measures will be secured through the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>. Further information regarding hedgerow growth can be found in <b>Chapter 16 – Other Issues – of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Glint and glare</b>	<p>In the absence of a full glint and glare assessment, it is not possible to properly consider the effects of glint and glare in all its aspects. CCC is of the view that the proposal has not currently demonstrated that it is compatible with neighbouring or existing uses within the vicinity of the development as it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would avoid unacceptable glint and glare emissions that can be mitigated where appropriate.</p>	CCC	<p>Paragraph 10.3.5 of the PEIR confirmed that a Glint and Glare assessment will be undertaken and a standalone report prepared, which would inform the ES and will be taken into account by the Transport Assessment. The Applicant did not publish a Glint and Glare Assessment as part of the PEI Report. Due to the nature and characteristics of the Scheme and the site, it is not expected that any significant glint and</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>glare effects will result from the Scheme. Given the expectation that no significant effects would result, the glint and glare assessment was not required to enable stakeholders to understand the significant environmental effects of the Scheme at statutory consultation stage.</p> <p>The Applicant has now conducted a <b>Glint and Glare Assessment</b>, which is included as <b>Appendix 10G of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. While this identifies potential high impacts from glint and glare at 10 residential receptors and 7 road receptors without mitigation, these are reduced to no impacts once mitigation measures such as hedgerows to be grown, infilled, gapped up and</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			maintained to a height of at least 3m in affected areas.	
			Until those hedgerows are grown sufficiently, a temporary 3m temporary wooden solid hoarding will be implemented and then removed once the hedgerows are of a sufficient height. Further information is presented in <b>Appendix 10G: Glint and Glare Assessment of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> . These measures will be secured through the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> . Further information regarding hedgerow growth can be found in <b>Chapter 16 – Other Issues – of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	
<b>Glint and glare</b>	It is premature to conclude that effects from glint and glare will be easily mitigated when a full glint and glare assessment has not been undertaken.	ECC	The Applicant has now conducted a Glint and Glare Assessment, which is included as <b>Appendix 10G of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> . While this	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>identifies potential high impacts from glint and glare at 10 residential receptors and 7 road receptors without mitigation, these are reduced to no impacts once mitigation measures as such hedgerows to be grown, infilled, gapped up and maintained to a height of at least 3m in affected areas. Until those hedgerows are grown sufficiently, a temporary 3m temporary wooden solid hoarding will be implemented and then removed once the hedgerows are of a sufficient height. Further information is presented in <b>Appendix 10G: Glint and Glare Assessment of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. These measures will be secured through the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>. Further information regarding hedgerow growth can be found in <b>Chapter</b></p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>16 – Other Issues – of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b>				
<b>Grid connection</b>	The proposal to extend Bulls Lodge substation and to erect the new Longfield sub station would need further assessment in their own right. At this stage there is very limited information surrounding the detail of these proposals, other than an indicative CGI image and some maximum height parameters. The impact of the Bulls Lodge extension on Toppinghoehall Wood would also need careful assessment.	BDC	During the statutory consultation, the Applicant presented information on extending Bulls Lodge Substation and building the Longfield Substation based on design parameters. Since the statutory consultation, the Applicant has developed its design for the Bulls Lodge Substation Extension and Longfield Substation in more detail and assessed potential environmental impacts through the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . This includes impacts on cultural heritage, assessed in Chapter 7, ecology, assessed in Chapter 8, flood risk and drainage, assessed in Chapter 9, landscape and visual amenity, assessed in Chapter 10, and noise and vibration, assessed in Chapter 11.	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>It is worth noting that Bulls Lodge Substation is located to the west of Waltham Road and not near to Toppinghoehall Wood.</p> <p>The site selected for the Longfield Substation and BESS was chosen due to the natural screening provided by Toppinghoehall Wood and Lost Wood. The mature trees therein provide excellent visual screening to the north, south and east. Additional planting will be implemented to screen the BESS and Longfield Substation to the south west and will be allowed to mature to a substantial height.</p> <p>Phase 2 of the BESS is intended to be undertaken five years after the Scheme becomes operational, to allow sufficient</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>time for screening implanted to the south east of the BESS to mature and provide sufficient screening – this will provide a “bridge” between Toppinghoehall and Lost Woods until planting has had sufficient time to mature to a point that it provides sufficient screening. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
			<p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b></p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. Please see Section 10.7 and Figure 10-12 in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Further details of the Bulls Lodge Substation Extension and Longfield Substation can be found in <b>Chapter 2 The Scheme of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Grid connection</b>	<p>Until a detailed scheme is made available, to include the cabling route, ECC is unable to comment on this aspect of the proposal in terms of its scale, design, access for maintenance, landscape and visual impact, particularly for the new Garden Community, impact on biodiversity, flood risk and drainage and safety.</p>	ECC	<p>The cable route has been finalised prior to the application submission. Electrical cables within the solar PV array fields will be secured to the PV Mounting Structures, the Balance of Solar Systems (BoSS), or will be underground. No new overhead lines will be</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>constructed. The Grid Connection Route will comprise of one 400 kV cable circuit. For more information, please refer to <b>Chapter 2 The Scheme of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, the <b>Works Plan [EN010118/APP/2.2]</b>, and Work No.4 – the Grid Connection Route. With regards the impacts raised in the response, landscape and visual impact is assessed in Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity, biodiversity at Chapter 8 Ecology, and flood risk and drainage at Chapter 9 Water Environment of the <b>Environmental Statement [En010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Human health and wellbeing</b>	<p>In addition, CCC consider that the proposal has potential to affect fear of crime. The siting of 3 metre high solar arrays, plus mitigation in close proximity to long and uninterrupted channels of footpaths has potential to create a tunnelling effect, harmful to the user experience of the Public Rights of Way. Consultation should be had</p>	CCC	<p>The Applicant has assessed the potential for fear and intimidation on users of the PROW network in <b>Chapter 13 Transport of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. The</p>	Y

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	with Essex Police to ensure that the proposals 'Design Out Crime' and provide safe access along the Public Rights of Way and any other areas that may be affected by the proposal.		<p>Scheme is not expected to result in any significant impacts with respect to fear and intimidation, with temporary minor adverse effects for PROW 213_4 and otherwise temporary negligible effects for the remaining receptors. Specifically, following the statutory consultation, the width of PROW and permissive paths has been set as a minimum 1.5m wide for footpaths and 3.0m for bridleways, with at least 5m either side of the centreline of the PROW or permissive path that will remain undeveloped outside of the solar PV fence line. This will ensure a 10m wide passageway will be maintained on all routes.</p> <p>The Applicant has consulted with Essex Police and the regard had to its comments is set out in <b>Appendix J-1 of the CR [EN010118/APP/5.11]</b>.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Longfield substation</b>	Until the fully designed scheme is available CCC reserves the right to make further comments on this aspect of the proposal in terms of the scale, design, access for maintenance, landscape and visual impact, impact on the biodiversity, flood risk and drainage, and amenity impacts such as noise during construction and decommissioning.	CCC	Detailed design of the Scheme cannot be confirmed until the tendering process for the design and construction of the Scheme has been completed. For example, due to the rapid pace of technological development in the solar photovoltaic (PV) and energy storage industry, the Scheme could utilise technology which does not currently exist and sufficient flexibility therefore needs to be incorporated into the DCO Application. The Applicant considers that it presented sufficient information regarding the Longfield Substation to comment at PEIR stage. It has presented updated design information in <b>Chapter 2 The Scheme of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . It has also assessed potential environmental impacts through the <b>Environmental Statement</b>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p><b>[EN010118/APP/6.1].</b> This includes impacts on cultural heritage, assessed in Chapter 7, ecology, assessed in Chapter 8, flood risk and drainage, assessed in Chapter 9, landscape and visual amenity, assessed in Chapter 10, and noise and vibration, assessed in Chapter 11.</p> <p>It is on this basis that the Applicant has continued to engage with Chelmsford City Council and other local authorities as set out in Table 8-1 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>LVIA</b>	<p>Further detailed information in relation to site lighting is required, covering all the scheme elements including the new substation and the substation extension. This is in regard to both visual impact and ecological impact as well as the potential impact upon existing residents in the locality and potential mitigation measures.</p>	BDC	<p>The visual impact of lighting has been assessed against Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Dark Skies mapping. The methodology followed is set out in <b>ES Volume 2 Appendix 10B [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>Landscape and visual mitigation has been described in Section 10.7 of the <b>ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and is shown on <b>Figure 10-12 Outline Landscape Masterplan [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b>. The proposed lighting has been designed to avoid and minimise the potential for adverse landscape and visual effects. An assessment of the proposed lighting, including any temporary lighting during construction, on ecology has been undertaken in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Throughout the Scheme, the use of motion detection security lighting to avoid permanent lighting will be utilised and the inward distribution of light will avoid light spill on to existing boundary features and impacts on ecology.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>LVIA</b>	<p>The principle of this location would seem to be sensible but until the full scheme details are available the full analysis of its impact is yet to be determined. The visual and landscape impact of the proposed sub-station extension will need to be assessed and the amenity impacts to the existing communities and the strategic proposals within the adopted Chelmsford Local Plan such as the proposed Chelmsford NE Bypass and new Garden Community (Strategic Growth Site 6) which make up some of the surrounding context need to be taken into full account.</p>	CCC	<p>Landscape and visual impacts of the Scheme are assessed in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. This includes potential impacts from the extension of Bulls Lodge Substation. The Bulls Lodge Substation Extension would be in keeping with the existing land use and therefore any further change to landscape character would result from the cumulative schemes alone, rather than any combined effect resulting from the DCO Scheme. The magnitude of effect therefore remains as very low. The Applicant has continued to engage with local authorities to provide further detail on developing Scheme design as set out in Table 8-1 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
LVIA	<p>The Landscape Institute have published new guidance on ‘Assessing Landscape Value Outside of National Designations’ (LI Technical Guidance Note 02/21) [REF-12]. This is intended to supplement existing guidance but is more up to date and detailed than Box 5.1 of Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA) which is cited in the PIER. The landscape value assessment in our view should be carried out using the new technical guidance note. A link to the new guidance is included below for reference:</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	BDC, CCC, ECC	<p>The Landscape Institute’s Technical Guidance Note 02/21 ‘Assessing Landscape Value Outside of National Designations’ [REF-12] has informed the methodology set out in <b>Appendix 10B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> and has therefore informed assessment of value.</p>	N
LVIA	<p>Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVVA LI Technical Guidance Note 02/2019) [REF-20] has not been carried out. This should be carried out for multiple residences along the western boundary of the site and individual farmsteads highlighted on the attached drawing.</p>	BDC, CCC, ECC	<p>The design of the Scheme has been reviewed and amended to avoid or mitigate potential significant adverse effects on residents. As such a RVAA is not required. This was agreed via email dated 15 October 2021 from the local authorities' adviser on this matter. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>				
<b>LVIA</b>	<p>The PIER states that viewpoints were agreed with the LPAs before the study was carried out, however this is incorrect. It would be helpful to have the direction of views on the viewpoint map indicated with an arrow. It is appreciated that this may make the map difficult to read at the scale it is currently shown at and it is suggested that the map is split into smaller sections for greater accuracy and legibility.</p>	<p>BDC, CCC, ECC</p>	<p>Prior to the PEIR assessment being undertaken, the viewpoints were considered to be generally acceptable by CCC. BDC and ECC were invited to comment but no response was received.</p> <p>Viewpoints were discussed again at the landscape and visual meeting of 29/06/21 set out in Table 6-2 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>, and it was agreed that the viewpoints used at PEIR were comprehensive. The councils suggested three additional viewpoints. Of the three additional viewpoints requested, 'B' located east of Stocks Farm, and 'C' located on PROW 213_18 have been incorporated into the assessment. Further discussion</p>	<p>N</p>



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>was had regarding the location of viewpoint A since it was not on a public right of way. It was agreed at a meeting and subsequently by email on 24/08/21 that the additional viewpoint 'A' on PROW 221_30 will be included.</p> <p>Arrows have been added to the plan and the scale of mapping revised.</p>	
LVIA	Interpretation of impact would be greatly aided if the extent of the solar arrays was shaded on the viewpoint photos.	BDC, CCC, ECC	At a meeting on 29 June 2021 set out in Table 6-2 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b> , the Applicant agreed with the councils not to add shading to viewpoint photos as this was considered to be misleading. Instead it was agreed that labels would be added for the different PDAs to help the reader.	N
LVIA	Following the completion of fieldwork by the LPA's Landscape Consultant, 3 key views have been	BDC, CCC, ECC	Viewpoints were discussed at the landscape and visual meeting of 29 June 2021 set out	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	established which have not been assessed (please refer to attached drawing at Appendix 1).		in Table 6-2 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b> , and it was agreed that the viewpoints used at PEIR were comprehensive. The councils suggested three additional viewpoints. Of the three additional viewpoints requested, 'B' located east of Stocks Farm, and 'C' located on PROW 213_18 have been incorporated into the assessment. Further discussion was had regarding the location of viewpoint A since it was not on a public right of way. It was agreed at a meeting and subsequently by email on 24/08/21 that the additional viewpoint 'A' on PROW 221_30 will be included.	
<b>LVIA</b>	The Outline Landscape masterplan should show the contours so that the relationship of the proposals to the landform can be more easily understood.	BDC, CCC, ECC	These are now included in <b>Figure 10-12 Outline Landscape Masterplan Sheet A</b> and <b>Figure 10-13 Outline Landscape Masterplan Sheet B of the Environmental</b>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<b>Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3].</b>	
LVIA	No sectional analysis from viewpoints at year 15 has been undertaken to test the impact of the mitigation proposals.	BDC, CCC, ECC	Illustrative sections are included in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3].</b>	N
LVIA	Construction and Year 1 assessments are predicted for winter, whereas Year 15 assessments are predicted in summer months. The reason for the different approach is questioned by Braintree District Council because it is not identified.	BDC, CCC, ECC	As set out in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> , the construction and Year 1 assessment have been undertaken to demonstrate the worst case scenario. The Year 15 assessment has been undertaken in summer to demonstrate the effect of proposed mitigation planting and consider the effect of seasons on landscape and visual amenity, in accordance with best practice guidance.	N
LVIA	There are currently no photomontages illustrating the predicted visual effects of the development. Verified view winter visualisations should be provided for key	BDC, CCC, ECC	As set out in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Impact of the Environmental</b>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	viewpoints (to be agreed with LPAs) to aid with visual impact assessment.		<p><b>Statement</b>  <b>[EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, all viewpoints are supported by Type 1 annotated photographs. Ten viewpoints are supported by Type 3 photomontages. The location of the viewpoints and photomontages was agreed with the LPAs at a meeting on 29 June 2021 and through subsequent discussion and agreement on 24 August 2021.</p>	
<b>LVIA</b>	Following field work by the LPA's Landscape Consultant, the applicants Local Landscape Character Areas mapping (Sheet Number Figure 10-7) has been reviewed and it is considered that the 'Ter Valley North' character area drawn by the applicant is too close to the river on the south side between Sandy Wood and Lyons Hall. The topography and alignment of the River Ter suggest that the edge of the character area should follow the 50m contour.	BDC, CCC, ECC	As set out in Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Impact of the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> , the southern boundary of the Ter Valley North Local Landscape Character Area (LLCA) was reviewed at a meeting with the LPAs' landscape advisors on 15 September 2021, with a follow up site visit on 5 October 2021. The boundary of the LLCA was confirmed via email on 15 October 2021.	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
LVIA	Ter Valley – Omitting the northern-most field from the scheme (south of Sandy Wood) would preserve the valley floor and lower slopes, reducing effects on the Ter Valley. This would also lessen the impact on Leylands Farm and reduce harm to wider setting of the Grade 1 listed church at Lyons Hall.	BDC, CCC, ECC	As set out in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> , further site analysis was undertaken from 2 to 4 August 2021. The design was updated, introducing new planting to screen views from the River Ter Valley. The extent of proposed PV Arrays at the northern extent of the Order limits was reduced, mitigating potential landscape effects on the character of the river valley.	Y
LVIA	Views to the proposed battery storage have generally been well considered. However, views from receptors using the public footpath the north-west have not been fully assessed. It is suggested that an additional viewpoint is included and that more mitigation may be required to screen views.	BDC, CCC, ECC	With reference to <b>Figure 10-10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b> , 57 viewpoints have been identified as representative of views experienced by people within the study area.  Viewpoints have been selected to demonstrate the experience of	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>the receptor groups identified above. Sequential viewpoints have also been identified along the Essex Way, to represent users of this long-distance PROW.</p> <p>The viewpoints have been selected to show a variety of distances and orientation toward the Order limits.</p> <p>A series of viewpoints have also been included to illustrate where intervening landform and existing vegetation screens views towards the Order limits where the screened ZTV showed theoretical visibility.</p> <p>The location of the final selection of 57 viewpoints was agreed with Wynne Williams Associates acting on behalf of with Essex County Council, Chelmsford City Council and Braintree District</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
LVIA	Mitigation is required higher on slopes to screen from long views from Fuller Street.	BDC, CCC, ECC	<p>Council (the Host Authorities), via email and a meeting on 24 August 2021. This includes four additional viewpoints requested by the Host Authorities, namely viewpoints 54, 55, 56 and 57.</p> <p>As set out in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Impact of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, the overall layout has undergone extensive review and refinement to respond to the landscape character baseline. The northern part of the Order limits is identified as the most tranquil. Larger elements of the Scheme have therefore been sited in the south of the Order limits.</p> <p>The Ter River valley is identified as one of the most sensitive landscape features. Although within the Order limits, all development has been excluded</p>	Y

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>from this area in order to protect and conserve the integrity of this area. The part of the Order limits in this area would be used for visual screening and ecological enhancement.</p> <p>In addition, further planting has been added to higher slopes on the north western edge of the Scheme.</p>	
<b>LVIA</b>	<p>Scarlett's farm and Noakes Farm (both Grade II listed) are left as islands in landscape character terms and fields to the west have impact upon properties on Boreham Road. It is questioned whether the fields down to Noakes Farm could be omitted. This would preserve the relationship between the farmsteads at Noakes and Scarletts.</p>	<p>BDC, CCC, ECC</p>	<p>As set out in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, further design changes have been made, including the exclusion of fields around Noakes Barn, retaining the undeveloped link to Scarlett's Farm; and increased set-backs and planting relating to properties on the Boreham Road.</p>	<p>Y</p>



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
LVIA	Consideration of the setting for ancient woodlands is identified as being important – they are a heritage feature as well as buildings.	BDC, CCC, ECC	The Design Principles set out in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> include that a minimum buffer of 15m from the edge of all designated ancient woodland will be maintained, within which there will be no built development.	N
LVIA	The proposed development will lead to a considerable change to the perception of the landscape experienced by receptors using public footpath routes. It is questioned whether there are opportunities to design ‘break’ areas within the arrays that allow for a visual and perceived rest from the considerable extent of built form.	BDC, CCC, ECC	As set out in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Impact of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> , the overall layout has undergone extensive review and refinement to respond to the landscape character baseline. This includes embedded mitigation of the type described.  Following mitigation, people walking on the Essex Way to the west or south of Fuller Street (VP45 and VP46) would experience minor adverse effects, which are not considered	Y

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>to be significant. The level of effect is reduced from year 1 because existing and proposed vegetation would be in leaf, filtering views of the PV Arrays such that the Scheme would be unobtrusive. People walking on the Essex Way on the south western corner of Sandy Wood would experience close range views of the Scheme, however this would be for a very short duration of the route such that the overall effect on people walking the Essex Way would remain minor adverse.</p>	
			<p>People walking on PROW 213_19 and PROW 113_25 within the Order limits would experience major adverse effects because of close range views of the proposed PV Arrays in the immediate foreground. These effects are considered significant.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>LVIA</b>	The siting of intrusive PV panels at a height of 3 metres, together with screening and other mitigation measures either side of a PROW will have a major adverse effect on the 'experience' of users of the network.	ECC	<p>People walking on the wider PROW network beyond the Order limits boundary would not experience significant effects resulting from operation during year 15.</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed potential impacts on the landscape and visual amenity of users of the PROW network in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Once screening and planting included as mitigation in the Scheme has matured, people walking on the Essex Way to the west or south of Fuller Street (VP45 and VP46) would experience minor adverse effects, which are not considered to be significant. The level of effect is reduced from year 1 because existing and proposed vegetation would be in leaf,</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>filtering views of the PV Arrays such that the Scheme would be unobtrusive. People walking on the Essex Way on the south western corner of Sandy Wood would experience close range views of the Scheme, however this would be for a very short duration of the route such that the overall effect on people walking the Essex Way would remain minor adverse. People walking on PROW 213_19 and PROW 113_25 within the Order limits would experience major adverse effects because of close range views of the proposed PV Arrays in the immediate foreground. These effects are considered significant. People walking on the wider PROW network beyond the Order limits boundary would not experience significant effects resulting from operation during year 15.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Need</b>	Consideration should be given for this scheme to also directly provide neighbourhood-scale power for the new garden community.	CCC	The Applicant has a grid connection agreement in place for a 500MW capacity connection to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS) at Bulls Lodge Substation within the south west of the Order limits. The Scheme aims to maximise the renewable energy generation onsite by making full use of the available grid capacity and contributing to a net zero economy. It will therefore make its contribution directly to the NETS. This responds to the urgent national need for new solar energy generation set out in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> .	N
<b>Need</b>	CCC welcomes the fact that details of a number of issues previously raised have been included in this consultation. However, more information about the wider benefits of the electricity generation should still be included. In addition, more details regarding the reasons for the scale, location of the proposal, and decommissioning is still	CCC	The Applicant has set out the benefits of the form of electricity generation that will be delivered by the Scheme in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> . This also sets out in greater	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>awaited. Without additional information on these points being made available for consideration CCC are not in a position to support the proposal.</p>		<p>detail the benefits of delivering the Scheme at the scale and location proposed.            In short, the Scheme is a substantial infrastructure asset, capable of delivering large amounts of low-carbon electricity. The Scheme, along with other solar schemes, is of critical importance on the path to Net Zero, especially given the context of the Climate Change Committee’s recent identification of the need for urgent action to increase the pace of decarbonisation in the Great Britain electricity sector, and government’s adoption of their recommendations for the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033 – 2037) [REF-6].            Maximising the capacity of generation in the proposed Essex area is to the benefit of all British consumers, and the solar industry generally. The Scheme</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>will deliver large amounts of low-carbon power before many other large-scale solar projects (which are behind the Scheme in the development process, but which are also needed). The Scheme will also deliver power ahead of other potential technologies (which may have longer construction timeframes or have potentially not yet been proven at scale) which will support decarbonisation only in future years and only if they are brought forwards.</p> <p>The meaningful and timely contributions offered by the Scheme to UK decarbonisation and security of supply, while helping lower bills for consumers throughout its operational life, will be critical on the path to Net Zero. Without the Scheme, a significant and vital opportunity to develop a large-scale low-carbon generation scheme will</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>have been passed over, increasing materially the risk that future Carbon Budgets and Net Zero 2050 will not be achieved. Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy</b></p>	



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p><b>[EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p>	
<b>Need</b>	<p>ECC recognises that Longfield Solar Farm would play a part in delivering a national need for renewable energy; contributing to the Government’s national 2050 target. It supports in principle solar energy development, provided there are no significant adverse environmental impacts that cannot be managed and/or mitigated.</p>	ECC	This is noted.	N
<b>Need</b>	<p>The Essex Climate Action Commission has recommended (pending adoption by ECC) that ‘Essex produces enough renewable energy within the county to meet its own needs by 2040’, with the Commission seeing a critical role for large scale solar production but “on available land without unduly compromising agricultural land”.</p>	ECC	<p>For Essex to produce the amount of power it expects to consume in 2040 from renewable energy, it will need to install c. 4 times the currently installed &amp; currently proposed capacity. The Scheme is a</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			significant proportion of currently installed and currently proposed capacity (22%) and will supply 20% of power anticipated from that capacity. The Scheme is therefore a very important project in the pathway to Essex achieving its stated aim of producing enough renewable energy within the county to meet its own needs by 2040, delivering 5% of anticipated demand in 2040. Further detail is set out in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> .	
<b>Need</b>	The County Council is currently preparing a Solar Farm Standards document, the purpose of which is to make ECC's position clear on the authority's expectations for such schemes	ECC	This is noted. <b>Appendix D Local Planning Policy Accordance Table</b> in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b> sets out accordance with local planning policy.	N
<b>Noise</b>	Construction related noise for the project has the potential to cause significant disturbance to some receptors, however it can be managed and it is	BDC	This is noted. Impacts from noise during construction are assessed in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the</b>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	suggested that this noise would be no longer than a month for each receptor.		<p><b>Environmental Assessment [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and measures to manage construction noise set out in the <b>OCEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>. Construction noise limits have been identified for nearby noise sensitive receptors during evening and night-time periods, as well as Sunday daytime. Sensitive receptors have been identified and noise monitoring locations have been determined through desktop study during the scoping process and confirmed during site visits. The methodology for selection of assessment receptor positions and monitoring locations is discussed in sections 11.8.6 to 11.8.13.</p>	
<b>Noise</b>	Table 11.16 (Summary of Magnitude of Impact and Significance of Effect) of Chapter 11 of the PEIR shows that operational noise may lead to permanent significant adverse noise effect at certain receptors, some within the Braintree District area. It should be noted that this	BDC	The Applicant has set out our assessment of potential noise impacts in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement</b>	Y

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>conclusion is reached prior to considering noise mitigation such as final location of noise producing plant, quieter plant and integrated designed noise control such as barriers. Therefore it is positive that there is scope for reduction in predicted worst case noise levels</p>		<p><b>[EN010118/APP/6.1].</b> The assessment considers the location of operational plant. The design of the Scheme has incorporated measures such as distancing of inverters away from sensitive receptors and locating the BESS compound in an area away from large concentrations of receptors as well as towards the A12 where existing ambient noise levels are higher (such that noise emissions from the BESS are less impactful). As set out in the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> included as an appendix of the <b>Design Statement</b> <b>[EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>, inverters within 250m of residential dwellings will be treated with acoustic barriers which achieve a minimum 10dB(A) sound reduction, or an inverter selected with sound power levels at least 10dB lower than 96dB, which</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Noise</b>	CCC considered the issues identified in PEIR seem to be covered satisfactorily, providing the mitigation measures outlined are implemented. Full details on the actual measures/plant/barriers/layout are required so that the applicant can demonstrate there will be no undue noise disturbance created to noise sensitive properties by the operation of the Solar Farm.	CCC	<p>has been applied to inverters in the EIA.</p> <p>It will not be possible to provide full details of plant, layout and final noise mitigation measures, as the plant to be installed will depend on the technology on the market at the time of construction. However, the likely noise impacts have been assessed based on realistic worst case parameters, and mitigation will be proposed where necessary in order to minimise and mitigate noise impact on the health and quality of life of sensitive receptors, as per the requirements of NPS EN-1 [REF-2] paragraph 5.11.9. It is expected that the predicted noise levels with mitigation that are reported in the ES will be secured by a Requirement of the DCO. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 11 Noise &amp; Vibration of the</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b>				
<b>Other</b>	There is potential for utilities to be impacted during the construction phase through possible short-term damage to services during excavation and engineering operations. Necessary precautionary measures including the mapping of all utilities and infrastructure, and their avoidance will need to be put in place to reduce the risk of possible damage.	CCC	<p>Utility searches will be carried out across the site prior to construction commencing. Where any are identified or where ambiguity around the exact location of existing utilities exists on site survey works will be carried out to confirm. Utility stakeholders such as asset operators will be consulted on the design detail where appropriate.</p> <p>Protective provisions are included in the draft DCO in order to provide protection in relation to statutory and utility undertakers' assets, and to provide a framework where works are undertaken with the potential to impact on those assets. It is therefore considered that appropriate</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	CCC considers that the proposed site selection as set out in chapter 3 of the PEIR, (Design Evolution) does not provide sufficient and robust justification for the loss of the 109.5ha BMV agricultural land. It was previously requested that a sequential approach relating to the selection of agricultural land was undertaken. It is CCC's understanding that the PEIR omits evidence of the sequential approach and it is unclear whether this assessment has been undertaken.	CCC	<p>protection for these services is in place.</p> <p>A sequential assessment regarding agricultural land quality has been undertaken and is presented in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>. In summary, the vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar ALC to the site. The Order limits comprises approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.</p> <p>All of the land within the area of search is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the site),</li> <li>-Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the site),</li> </ul>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>-Grade 4, but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test, or -Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</p> <p>There are therefore no alternative sites available meeting the Applicant's search criteria that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits.</p> <p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. Section 12.8 of <b>Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental</b></p>	



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p><b>Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>An <b>Outline Soil Resource Management Plan</b> is provided as an <b>Appendix</b> to the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>. This sets out principles for how soils will be managed and protected during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme. A detailed soil resource management plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction, prior to operation, and prior to decommissioning, as set out by the Requirements of the <b>draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	Further information is required in relation to what would happen to the land within the site boundary following decommissioning. Would it be returned to agricultural use and if so what measures would be taken to safeguard soil quality? This is of particular importance given the major adverse impact identified upon best and most versatile	BDC	Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	agricultural land. What would happen to the ecology habitat areas? Would permissive pathways be retained?		<p>Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. Section 12.8 of <b>Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms. Where localised soil compaction occurs from the weight of mobile machinery used during decommissioning, the topsoil will be broken up through ploughing or similar methods by the contractor(s) or landowner/farmer to restore the soil drainage</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	The proposal for a sponsorship fund which would be open to applications from community projects or groups in the parishes effected by the proposal is noted and is supported. Further detail in relation to how this could work would be useful.	BDC	The Applicant has committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and negatives of the Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in consideration of the planning balance within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b> .	N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	Employment Density Guides do not advise on the number of jobs per hectare in the agricultural sector, and therefore, it is difficult to ascertain the detrimental impact of how many existing jobs will be displaced as a result of the development. There is reference made within the documents to there being 8 agricultural jobs related to the site but no further detail is provided around this. It is requested that further information is provided to advise how this number of jobs was calculated.	BDC	The amount of employment on the agricultural land is based on information provided by the current landowner. Further information is provided in <b>Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	Local workforce has been mentioned although it has been calculated that only 338 out of the 563 jobs would be from within a 60 minute commute radius, although there are no guarantees nor has it been detailed as to whether local recruitment campaigns would be launched. These figures are derived from national estimates and do not reflect actual outputs. It is worth noting that a 60 minute commute-radius is beyond the Braintree District boundaries, and therefore it is to be expected that there would be less than 338 roles taken up by local residents.	BDC	Job uptake will be dependent on skill levels and suitability to take up roles, it is not possible to ascertain the exact number of jobs that would be taken up by residents in any local authority or statistical area. Commuting journey times have been used to give an indication of how many jobs would likely be taken up by workers who travel to the site each day, which would include Braintree residents. Further information is provided in <b>Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	There is no reference as to whether some, or any of the roles, during or post construction may be apprenticeship opportunities.	BDC	A local skills and employment plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction. This will set out measures that the Applicant will implement in order to advertise and promote employment opportunities associated with the Scheme in	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			construction and operation locally. The Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training.	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	The document references engagement that has happened with local schools and colleges. BDC question whether there is a sustained plan to develop this further.	BDC	A local skills and employment plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction. This will set out measures that the Applicant will implement in order to advertise and promote employment opportunities associated with the Scheme in construction and operation locally. The Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training.	N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	There is no real plan or reference for accessing the local supply chain/sourcing local materials. It is also disappointing to note that only 8 permanent jobs will have	BDC	It is expected that an average of 380 jobs will be created during the construction period. During the operational phase, 8 full time	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	been created after the 2 years construction period, given the hectare coverage.		<p>staff would be employed on the site.</p> <p>A local skills and employment plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction. This will set out measures that the Applicant will implement in order to advertise and promote employment opportunities associated with the Scheme in construction and operation locally.</p> <p>The Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training.</p>	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>The non statutory consultation response from CCC requested more detail on community engagement with education providers and training opportunities for the job creation. Subsequent reference made to these aspects in the Consultation Booklet 1 June to 13 July 2021 suggests that engagement with local businesses, business organisations and skills providers is already taking place. It would be helpful to know more about who has been engaged, the discussion and early feedback</p>	CCC	<p>The Applicant consulted with a range of local businesses, business organisations and skill providers during the statutory consultation, as set out in <b>Appendix H-1 of the Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.9]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	CCC is disappointed that limited reference is made to the restoration of the agricultural land as a result of the decommissioning of the proposal. Paragraph 12.8.54 of the PEIR states that the agricultural land that was required for construction and operation (of the site) will be reinstated for arable agricultural use. It explains that the land will be in the same or better condition than it is currently in as a result of the expected natural enhancement.	CCC	An <b>Outline Soil Resource Management Plan</b> is provided as an <b>Appendix</b> to the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b> . This sets out principles for how soils will be managed and protected during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme. A detailed soil resource management plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction, prior to operation, and prior to decommissioning, as set out by the Requirements of the <b>draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b> .	N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	The inclusion of a sponsorship fund open to applications from community projects or groups in the parishes effected by the proposal is welcomed. CCC had also previously requested that consideration should be given to providing free or discounted energy to a local public building and establishing a local Environmental Trust. It is unclear if this has been considered.	CCC	The Applicant has committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>negatives of the Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in consideration of the planning balance within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>. It will not be possible to for the Scheme to provide electricity directly to local buildings as it will connect to the National Electricity Transmission System.</p>	
<p><b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b></p>	<p>Concern remains over the overall loss of agricultural land during the operational 40-year lifespan of the Proposed Development, particularly given that 60% of the site is classified as agricultural land. The loss of the 34% of the site which is BMV cannot be mitigated.</p>	<p>ECC</p>	<p>A sequential assessment regarding agricultural land quality has been undertaken and is presented in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>. In summary, the vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar ALC to the site. The Order limits comprises approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>All of the land within the area of search is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the site),</li><li>-Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the site),</li><li>-Grade 4, but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test, or</li><li>-Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</li></ul> <p>There are therefore no alternative sites available meeting the Applicant's search criteria that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits.</p> <p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. Section 12.8 of <b>Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms.	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	Without information on scheme alternatives and whether site alternatives would result in the loss of less overall agricultural land and Best and Most Versatile, it is difficult to reach a view on the rationale for taking forward this site.	ECC	A sequential assessment regarding agricultural land quality has been undertaken and is presented in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b> . In summary, the vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar ALC to the site. The Order limits comprises approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>All of the land within the area of search is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the site),</li><li>-Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the site),</li><li>-Grade 4, but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test, or</li><li>-Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</li></ul> <p>There are therefore no alternative sites available meeting the Applicant's search criteria that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits.</p> <p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	As the operational phase of the project will only support 8 permanent roles, opportunities should be explored to upskill the construction workforce, including within education settings to support emerging renewable technology innovation, jobs and skills retention within Essex, to further support the county's green economy.	ECC	<p>undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. Section 12.8 of <b>Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>It is expected that an average of 380 jobs will be created during the construction period. During the operational phase, 8 full time staff would be employed on the site.</p> <p>A local skills and employment plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction. This will set out measures that the Applicant will implement in order to advertise and promote employment opportunities associated with the Scheme in</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>construction and operation locally.            The Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training.</p>	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>The ECAC has recommended that “<i>All large-scale renewable developments should have an element of community ownership from 2021.</i>” Further, current draft wording of the Solar Farm Standard advises:            “Considering the potential scale of solar farms, many neighbouring communities may be impacted by the development and as such it is important that local communities can realise the benefits associated with the project throughout its lifetime through a “community led locality benefit” approach. Developer-led renewable energy infrastructure generation should make a financial or other contribution to the locality, led by the community such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assigned revenue to the locality at a £/MW installed or £/MWH generated</li> <li>• Supply of energy generated directly to local communities sold at a discounted rate</li> <li>• Negotiate a part community ownership model in collaboration with community energy groups</li> </ul>	ECC	<p>The Applicant has committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and negatives of the Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in consideration of the planning balance within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community investment through crowdfunding/community share offer, an alternative to the ownership model where residents could invest in and own a share of the solar farm</li> <li>• Use of retained business rates for the Local Authority and ring-fenced for community energy-related measures and projects.” The host authorities would welcome the opportunity to discuss the options for community ownership with Longfield Solar Farm Ltd.</li> </ul>			
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>ECC welcomes the establishment of a sponsorship fund open to applications from community projects or groups in the parishes of Terling and Fairstead, Hatfield Peverel, Boreham, Greta and Little Leighs and Little Waltham, and available until and if the DCO is approved. Following this, if a DCO is granted a fund will be put into place, the amount of which will be related to the energy outputs of the PV panels and will continue throughout the lifetime of the development. This is also welcomed. The host authorities would welcome further detail and discussion on the operation of these funds, particularly opportunities for community infrastructure projects and education-based projects for young people in the area.</p>	ECC	<p>This is noted. The provision of a Community Sponsorship Fund is separate to the application for a DCO and is part of the Applicant's commitment to the communities in which it works. The Applicant will continue to engage with local authorities on the scope of any funding.</p>	N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>ECC welcomes the creation of 375 new jobs in the construction phase and 8 permanent jobs once the solar farm is operational. These jobs and skills in the renewable technology sector supports ECAC’s ambition</p>	ECC	<p>This is noted and we are pleased the host authorities acknowledge and welcome the</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	to <i>“Make Essex a centre of innovation for emerging renewable technologies (e.g. manufacturing of renewables products such as solar tiles).”</i>		Scheme's contribution to the local economy and job market.	
<b>Transport</b>	The PEIR states that 25 HGVs and 600 staff will be on site at any given time during construction. This amount of traffic is significant. The suggested HGV restrictions between peak times, are noted and supported.	BDC	The Applicant has continued its assessments since the statutory consultation and presented updated figures for the number of construction vehicles and staff likely to be on site in <b>Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . The Applicant intends to restrict HGV movements to certain routes i.e. via the A130, Wheelers Hill and Cranham Road to the west, to prevent construction vehicles from using the B1137 Main Road and passing through Hatfield Peverel and / or Boreham. As part of the consultation process, principles were agreed with ECC Highways including the proposed site access location, visibility splays, crossing points on Noakes Lane and the	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>approach for surveys and supporting assessment work. In addition, it was agreed that the routing of HGVs should take place to / from the west via the RDR, A130 Essex Regiment Way, Wheelers Hill, Cranham Road and Waltham Road in order to prevent these larger vehicles from passing through the villages of Hatfield Peverel and Boreham, e.g. along the B1137 Main Road.</p> <p>The limits referred to are included in the <b>Framework CTMP provided as Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Transport</b>	<p>The Council has previously requested that consideration be given to achieving a permissive cycleway through the site. It is therefore requested that greater certainty and consistency is now shown with the proposed cycleway routes being shown on all relevant plans/drawings including within technical documents.</p>	BDC	<p>A green corridor is proposed through site. This will accommodate cycles and is to be shown on DCO application plans. Further detail is presented</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Transport</b>	The new Chelmsford Garden Community is allocated in the Chelmsford Local Plan to the south west of the site which when complete will be in the region of 10,000 new homes and significant new employment. The proposal includes an indicative cycle link and track from the site into the new Garden Community which would increase public accessibility into the wider countryside.	CCC	in the <b>Permissive Paths Plan [EN010118/APP/7.14]</b> .  This is noted. The Scheme includes a potential pedestrian / cycle connection point with the Chelmsford Garden Community, to accommodate a potential future desire line following the completion of this development and to improve public accessibility into the wider countryside. Please see Section 13.7 in <b>Chapter 13 Transport &amp; Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N
<b>Transport</b>	The consultation booklet (page 13) shows Waltham Road and Boreham Road as a Secondary Road and Cranham Road as a Local Road. Waltham Road, Boreham Road and Cranham Road are all Priority 2 (PR2) routes in ECCs hierarchy. This categorisation of route is misleading and needs amending as per ECC's Route Hierarchy.	ECC	The categorisation of these roads is correctly described and shown in the PEIR and <b>Transport Assessment</b> Scoping Report included as <b>Appendix 13A of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> . This has been carried through to <b>Chapter 13 Transport &amp; Access of the</b>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b>				
<b>Transport</b>	None of the plans show the new Radial Distributor Road (RDR) through Beaulieu and Channels. This would become a secondary route according to the classification used in the documentation. Similarly, the Outer Radial Distributor Road (RDR2) through CGV is not shown.	ECC	These highway improvements/ changes have been considered as part of the future baseline conditions within <b>Chapter 13 Transport &amp; Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b>	N
<b>Transport</b>	The RDR is particularly important as it will become the A131 and will provide access from Boreham Interchange to Essex Regiment Way, so will be the main route for construction traffic, similarly access to Bulls Lodge will be via the RDR to Generals Lane.	ECC	The future highway improvements / changes (including the RDR which will become the A131) are considered as part of the future baseline conditions of the ES and TA. The RDR forms part of the routing strategy for construction vehicles, given that this will provide access between the Boreham Interchange and the A130 Essex Regiment Way. Further details of other improvements including the A12 Chelmsford to A120 widening and the Chelmsford North East Bypass are provided within	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<p><b>Chapter 13 Transport &amp; Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b></p>				
Transport	<p>There has been no direct early engagement with the PROW team at ECC over the significant impact that this development will have on the large number of PROW within and close to the site. This raises serious concerns over the adequacy of the assessment of this topic to date.</p>	ECC	<p>The Applicant has since conducted a dedicated meeting with the PROW team. This took place on 12 August 2021 and has informed the approach taken to assessing impacts on PROWs set out in <b>Chapter 13 Transport &amp; Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b></p>	N
Transport	<p>What will happen to permissive paths after 40 years if the land then returns to an agricultural use after walkers, cyclist etc. have become used to and possibly reliant upon these connections?</p>	ECC	<p>Whilst PROW will remain in place after decommissioning, it is envisaged that any permissive paths created by the Scheme during the operational phase would ultimately be removed, as the potential retention of these routes would be outside the control of The Applicant and subject to third party landowner agreement. Measures (e.g. signage or temporary access</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			restrictions) will be implemented to prevent the permissive paths from becoming PROW during the operational phase, so that these can subsequently be removed if the landowner chooses. It should be noted that the connectivity of the Order limits post-decommissioning would be no worse than the existing situation. Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 13 Transport &amp; Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . A separate PROW Management Plan has also been prepared to illustrate the proposed strategy which supports the Framework CTMP. See also <b>Figure 13-4 in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b> .	
<b>Transport</b>	Unless clearly signed and registered as being permissive the landowner could face claims through usage, which	ECC	Whilst PROW will remain in place after decommissioning, it is envisaged that any permissive	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	could lead to a network of PROW not maintainable at public expense.		paths created by the Scheme during the operational phase would ultimately be removed, as the potential retention of these routes would be outside the control of the Applicant and subject to third party landowner agreement. Measures (e.g. signage or temporary access restrictions) will be implemented to prevent the permissive paths from becoming PROW during the operational phase, so that these can subsequently be removed if the landowner chooses. It should be noted that the connectivity of the Order limits post-decommissioning would be no worse than the existing situation. Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 13 Transport &amp; Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	
<b>Transport</b>	Regarding the amenity of the existing and proposed PROW, an analysis needs to be been undertaken as to	ECC	The Applicant has now conducted a <b>Glint and Glare</b>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>the possible effects of glint and glare from the solar panels on walkers on paths which have not been screened, or when the panels are visible from elevated PROW.</p>		<p><b>Assessment, which is included as Appendix 10G of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2].</b> This considers potential effects from glint and glare on users of the PROW. While this identifies potential high impacts from glint and glare at 10 residential receptors and 7 road receptors without mitigation, these are reduced to negligible impacts once mitigation measures such hedgerows to be grown, infilled, gapped up and maintained to a height of at least 3m in affected areas.</p>	
<b>Transport</b>	<p>Chelmsford North East bypass is not shown on the plans, nor have the consultation documents clearly detailed how the proposals connect to the wider movement strategy in the Beaulieu area. For example, Footpath 16 Boreham (which runs past CCC planning approved sports pitches) is shown on one of the plans, but it is not highlighted that this could become a potentially crucial link.</p>	ECC	<p>The future highway improvements / changes (including the RDR which will become the A131) and changes to pedestrian and cycle links are considered as part of the future baseline conditions in <b>Chapter 13 Transport &amp; Access of the Environmental Statement</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p><b>[EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. The RDR forms part of the routing strategy for construction vehicles, given that this will provide access between the Boreham Interchange and the A130 Essex Regiment Way. Further details of other improvements including the A12 Chelmsford to A120 widening and the Chelmsford North East Bypass are provided within the ES and TA.</p>	
<b>Transport</b>	<p>There are a number of questions about the design of the PROW and cycle paths on the green routes and how these will safely accommodate pedestrians and cyclists, as well as the way vehicles will interact with PROW.</p>	ECC	<p>Several meetings have been held with ECC Highways (including PROW officers) to review, revise, and agree the proposed strategy for managing PROW during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Scheme as set out in Table 8-1 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>. This includes measures to physically segregate existing PROW from proposed construction routes, as well as having controlled</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>crossing points (with gates and banksmen) to safely accommodate pedestrians and cyclists. No PROW will be permanently closed or diverted as a result of the Scheme, and the minimum legal PROW widths will continue to be met or bettered in all instances. A separate PROW Management Plan (<b>Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>) has been prepared to illustrate the proposed strategy which supports the Construction Traffic Management Plan (<b>Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>). See also <b>Figure 13-4 Public Rights of Way Management in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>	
<b>Transport</b>	The Highway Authority would look favourably on a bridleway creation along wide tracks (farm track in	ECC	There are no formal equestrian facilities (i.e. Bridleways) within	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	character – not surfaced for vehicle use) between the proposed country park and the rural road network to the north.		the Order limits; however, some of the roads surrounding the Order limits are lightly trafficked and therefore would not necessarily deter equestrians.  There is a bridleway (PROW 213_48) to the south of Bulls Lodge Substation which provides formal equestrian facilities along part of the private road to the substation.	
<b>Waste</b>	The Essex and Southend on Sea Waste Local Plan and Making Places Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) should be considered as measures in the construction environmental management plan (CEMP) and the construction resource management plan (CRMP). CCC will be guided by Essex County Council on this matter, as the waste authority covering the proposal site.	CCC	Local planning policy is considered by the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b> where it is likely to be considered important and relevant to the Secretary of State's decision.  The <b>OCEMP</b> sets out that Construction Resource Management Plan (CRMP) will be prepared by the contractors, which will specify the waste streams which would be	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			monitored and targets set with regards to the waste produced, including any re-use and recycling of materials. The CRMP will be finalised with specific measures to be implemented prior to the start of construction.	
<b>Water resources</b>	FRA is sound. 9.6.78 of the PEIR states that CCC SFRA was not available for Boreham Tributary. It is unclear whether this evidence is missing or if the consultant simply could not access it, but it needs to be taken into account. CCC would be happy to provide a copy of the Level 1 and Level 2 SFRA.	CCC	The Level 1 and Level 2 SFRA have been taken into account in the revised <b>FRA</b> which is included as <b>Appendix 9A of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> .	N
<b>Water resources</b>	It is recommended that a sustainable urban drainage system (SuDS) is used to manage surface water runoff from the site to avoid the potential impacts including channelised flows, soil erosion, sediment built up and soil compaction during the construction phase.	ECC	The construction of the Scheme will take place in accordance with a CEMP. The CEMP details the measures that would be undertaken during construction to mitigate the temporary effects on the water environment, including management of construction site runoff. <b>An OCEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b> has been prepared and this will form part of a Requirement	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>under the draft DCO. Refer to <b>Chapter 9 – Water Environment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> for further details.</p> <p>Further, an outline drainage strategy is provided within <b>Appendix 9C Longfield SuDS Strategy of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> detailing the approach to managing drainage during both the construction and operational phases of the Scheme. Please also refer to <b>Appendix 9D Bulls Lodge Substation Extension: Drainage Strategy [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>.</p> <p>Consultation with the ECC Fire and Rescue department has been undertaken during development of the strategy. The outline drainage strategy will</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			form part of a Requirement under the draft DCO.	
<b>Water resources</b>	The LLFA recommends the preparation of a Drainage Strategy and Land Management Strategy to support the submission of a DCO application.	ECC	An outline drainage strategy is provided within the <b>Appendix 9C Longfield SuDS Strategy of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and reflected in the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> Please also refer to <b>Appendix 9D Bulls Lodge Substation Extension: Drainage Strategy [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> . Outcomes of assessments related to the water environment are presented in <b>Chapter 9 Water Environment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N
<b>Water resources</b>	Appropriate buffer zones around existing ponds and watercourses are required to minimise any potential impacts on existing drainage features. The minimum buffer zone is 8m as measured from the top of the bank.	ECC	There will be a minimum buffer of 8m around watercourses (measured from the water/channel edge under normal flows) within which there will be no built development. However, for main rivers a 10m	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>buffer measured from the centre line of the watercourse as marked on Ordnance Survey mapping has been allowed for. A minimum buffer of 5m around all ponds is proposed, and 8m around watercourses. This is secured within the Design Principles for the DCO.</p> <p>Consultation was undertaken with Essex County Council as LLFA on 14/12/21 to discuss the drainage strategy, as well as other relevant issues.</p> <p><b>Please see section 9.6 in Chapter 9 - Water Environment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b></p>	

## Appendix J-3: Regard had to statutory consultation responses from consultees under s42(1)(d)

**Table J-3.1** below sets out responses to the statutory consultation from consultees under s42(1)(a) of PA 2008 and the regard had to them by the Applicant. It should be read in conjunction with Section 7.4 of the **Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]**. References to respondents are given in **Table E-2.1** and **Table E-2.2** of the **Appendix E-2** of the **Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.6]**.

**Table J-3.1 Regard had to statutory consultation responses from consultees under s42(1)(d)**

Topic	Comment	Reference	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Construction</b>	Given the scale of solar farm proposed, there are concerns over soil stripping, and soil replacement, levels of security fencing and lighting and the potential negative visual effects and impacts upon landscape character. These issues are compounded by the large scale of development proposed.	E2132	The effect of the Scheme on landscape character and visual amenity has been reported in the <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . The LVIA considers the duration of the effects, and their 'reversibility'. The Scheme has been designed to avoid and minimise adverse effects on the local environment through the sensitive siting of the proposed elements. Extensive areas of new woodland, species rich grassland, areas for natural regeneration and scrub are proposed as part of the scheme, resulting in a biodiversity net gain. The LVIA concludes that, while there will be some	N

Topic	Comment	Reference	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>moderate adverse impacts on Local Landscape Character Areas when assessed at 1 year of operation, these are reduced to no significant effects after 15 years of operation.</p> <p>Soil stripping and/or storage activities are limited to the construction of hardstand areas around the inverter/transformer stations and the hardstands around the BESS &amp; substation. Where possible, any overburden will be spread across the site with due consideration given to visual impact and surface water flow. There are some permanent cut and fill activities required at the National Grid Bulls Lodge Substation Extension, where the development is permanent.</p> <p>An <b>Outline Soil Resource Management Plan</b> is provided as an <b>Appendix</b> to the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>. This sets out principles for how soils will be managed and protected during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme. A detailed soil resource management plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction, prior to operation, and prior to decommissioning, as set</p>	



Topic	Comment	Reference	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>out by the Requirements of the <b>draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b>.</p> <p>No visible lighting will be utilised at the Order limits perimeter. InfraRed lighting will be provided by the CCTV/security system to provide night vision functionality for CCTV.</p> <p>Visible lighting will be installed at site entrance points, the Longfield Substation (entrance, parking area and control room), and operations building (entrance, parking and refuge) only. Lighting in these locations would be installed no higher than 4m above ground level, be fitted with downward directional cowls. Lighting would be turned to allow security personnel to leave Site. Visible lighting would be installed at solar stations and the BESS but used only in emergencies and/or for maintenance purposes.</p> <p>The visual impact of lighting has been assessed against Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Dark Skies mapping. The methodology followed is set out in <b>ES Volume 2 Appendix 10B [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>.</p> <p>Landscape and visual mitigation have been described in Section 10.7 of the <b>ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and is shown on <b>Figure 10-</b></p>	

Topic	Comment	Reference	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p><b>12 Outline Landscape Masterplan [EN010118/APP/6.3].</b> The proposed lighting has been designed to avoid and minimise the potential for adverse landscape and visual effects. The following mitigation has been embedded in the design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No visible lighting will be utilised at the site perimeter fence more generally. IR lighting will be provided by the CCTV/security system to provide night vision functionality for CCTV.</li><li>• Lighting at solar stations will be manually operated used only in fault or emergency situations.</li><li>• Lighting at Longfield substation will be PIR operated (passive infra-red), calibrated to detect vehicles and personnel</li><li>• Lighting at the BESS entrances and adjacent to the access track within the BESS will be operated by PIR calibrated to trigger on vehicle and personnel, with the option of manual control.</li><li>• All visible lighting would be 50W, installed at a maximum height of 4m with cowls fitted to prevent light spillage.</li><li>• External lighting at the Operations and Maintenance Building would be provided by PIR operated lights calibrated to vehicles and</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Reference	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			personnel. These would be located at building entrances and to cover the parking and refuge areas. These will be PIR operated calibrated to vehicles and personnel.	
<b>Construction</b>	Whilst mitigation measures are welcome, the scale of the development proposed and the large area upon which it is proposed to be sited, determines that the potential environmental impacts during the construction phase are likely to be significant. Insufficient information has been presented to date within the consultation documents to enable proper assessment of environmental impacts or mitigation measures.	E2132	During the statutory consultation stage, information was available in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR). These assessments were preparatory at that point, as the Scheme was consulted on at a point in time to allow feedback to be able to influence the ongoing EIA and design of the scheme. The Applicant has set out details of its approach to managing impacts from construction in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b> and <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) included at Appendix 13B of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> These set out the principles, controls, and measures the Applicant will use to manage and mitigate potential environmental impacts during construction.	N
<b>Consultation</b>	Yes. There is already an approach to my family home for access to one of our fields to lay cabling. The rather passive aggressive nature of the letter, informing us of the plan -	E2133	The Applicant contacted the individual in question as part of the diligent enquiry process set out in section 6.2 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b> and subsequently to consult them under s42(1)(d) of PA 2008. The Applicant	N

Topic	Comment	Reference	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>essentially, you would like to negotiate but if we don't you will issue a compulsory purchase order - is unhelpful. Also, one of your agents doorstepping us rather than going through our lawyers (who had written on our behalf) is unprofessional and troublesome.</p>		<p>has noted the consultee's preference to be contacted via their appointed agent and has done so since this contact.</p>	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>In terms of the historic environment (landscape and heritage assets), and in view of the scale of development proposed there is likely to be some harm to the historic environment as a result of the development proposed. It is not considered however that the Longfield Solar Farm proposal has shown how the overall impacts of the scheme are (or could be) made acceptable.</p>	E2132	<p>The Applicant has comprehensively examined designated heritage assets within the vicinity of the site, including scheduled monuments, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, and conservation areas.</p> <p>Non-designated heritage assets, including archaeological remains, historic buildings, and the historic landscape, have also been considered.</p> <p><b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> details the requirements of key legislative and policy requirements and describes how the Scheme will consider them; explains how information on the existing and future environment has been collected (through desk-based studies, survey work and stakeholder consultation); describes the understanding of the existing and future baseline environment, based</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Reference	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>on the baseline information; explains any further information to be obtained through further consultation, desk-based studies, or surveys; describes the potential effects of the Scheme on cultural heritage; and describes potential mitigation measures, if required.</p>	
<b>Decommissioning</b>	<p>Similarly, there are concerns around the construction and decommissioning phases of development and the potential impacts upon traffic, pollution and noise, highway safety and the amenity of local residents.</p>	E2132	<p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Reference	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p> <p>A robust construction management plan will be implemented, with due consideration to be given to the management of construction traffic both in terms of the impact of vehicle movements upon the highway network but also in terms of the potential for noise and air pollution impact. The Applicant has set out details of its approach to managing impacts from construction in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> and <b>Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)</b> included at <b>Appendix 13B of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> included in the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts from noise during construction and decommissioning are assessed in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. No significant residual adverse effects due to construction/decommissioning or operational phase noise and vibration have been identified.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Reference	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Design</b>	<p>NGET has a number of assets within the proposed Order's redline boundary.</p> <p>This includes the following assets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4VB 400kV overhead line route</li> <li>- Bulls Lodge 400kV substation</li> <li>- Fibre cables</li> <li>- Cables connecting BEAULIEU 25KV to Bulls Lodge</li> </ul> <p>National Grid's project team is currently liaising with Longfield's project team. We will continue to work with Matt throughout the DCO process.</p>	E2214	<p>This has been noted and the Applicant has and will continue to engage with National Grid as the application progresses and should the Scheme receive consent. Part of this engagement includes discussions in relation to protective provisions, for the protection of National Grid's assets.</p>	N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>The scale of the solar farm proposed is likely to have a negative effect upon biodiversity and nature conservation in the area. No information appears to be presented to explain fully the negative effects of the proposed solar farm upon biodiversity. It remains the case that due to the sheer scale of development proposed here, there is likely to be a significant impact upon</p>	E2132	<p>The Applicant will deliver an overall net gain of 79% habitat units for biodiversity and 20% of hedgerow habitats as set out in the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b>. The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>, includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site. The OLEMP also includes the provision for monitoring to assess how successful the biodiversity planting and management has been.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Reference	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	biodiversity, despite enhancement measures being put in place. More information is required in order to make an informed response to this point			
<b>LVIA</b>	The vast scale of the solar farm proposed with the physical development involved (including PV panels, powerlines and pylons, substations, cables and associated infrastructure) is likely to have a negative visual impact upon the landscape and upon landscape character types in this area of Chelmsford.	E2132	The effect of the Scheme on landscape character and visual amenity has been reported in the <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . The LVIA considers the duration of the effects, and their ‘reversibility’. The Scheme has been designed to avoid and minimise adverse effects on the local environment through the sensitive siting of the proposed elements. Extensive areas of new woodland, species rich grassland, areas for natural regeneration and scrub are proposed as part of the scheme, resulting in a biodiversity net gain. The LVIA concludes that, while there will be some moderate adverse impacts on Local Landscape Character Areas when assessed at 1 year of	N



Topic	Comment	Reference	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			operation, these are reduced to no significant effects after 15 years of operation.	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	Govt. guidance is that applicants should prioritise previously developed land for renewable technology developments. The proposed solar farm would be sited on undeveloped and agricultural land in the main, reducing considerably the amount of valuable agricultural land in the Authority.	E2132	<p>A sequential assessment regarding agricultural land quality has been undertaken and is presented in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>. In summary, the vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar ALC to the site. The Order limits comprise approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.</p> <p>All of the land within the area of search is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the site);</li> <li>• Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the site);</li> </ul>	N

Topic	Comment	Reference	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Grade 4, but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test; or</li><li>• Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</li></ul> <p>There are therefore no alternative sites available meeting the Applicant's search criteria that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits.</p> <p>Further assessment of agricultural land is included in <b>Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	

## Appendix J-4: Regard had to statutory consultation responses from consultees under s47

**Table J-4.1** below sets out responses to the statutory consultation from consultees under s42(1)(a) of PA 2008 and the regard had to them by the Applicant. Where multiple responses containing the same comment have been received, these are addressed at the same time in table below. It should be read in conjunction with Section 7.3 of the **Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]**.

**Table J-4.1 Regard had to statutory consultation responses from consultees under s47**

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	The development is located on good quality (Grade 2) agricultural land that has been successfully farmed for as long as local people can remember and is designated as such in the Local Plan. This land will be sterilised for decades by this proposal. We believe that the balance should be in favour of retaining the 1,400 acres of farmland to produce food as it is required as a nation that we become more self-sufficient in our food production, rather than solar power. There is an abundance of alternative brownfield sites and plenty of potential for solar on roofs in industrial areas as	Information related to alternative sites is presented within <b>Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . In summary, the vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) to the Order limits. The Order limits comprises approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.  All of the land within the area of search is either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the Site).</li> <li>• Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the Site).</li> </ul>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	opposed to the delicately balanced ecosystems and high-grade farmland. There are many locations in the county between the A12 and A127 with direct access to the National Grid and the quality of land is significantly poorer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Grade 4 but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test.</li><li>• Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</li></ul> <p>There are no alternative sites considered by the Applicant that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits (whilst also meeting other criteria of the Applicant, as set out in <b>Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>) within a reasonable distance of Bulls Lodge Substation (for which the Applicant has obtained a grid connection agreement).</p> <p>The Draft NPS EN-3 [REF-9] states that although BMV land should be avoided where possible in the development of renewable energy infrastructure, land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of site location.</p> <p>Within this context, the Applicant has sought to minimise the amount of agricultural land used within the Scheme. This includes removing land from the draft Order limits to reduce the amount of high grade agricultural land within the boundary of the scheme, and to avoid areas identified as having higher archaeological potential prior to the statutory consultation. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	<p>On researching solar farm efficiency, the results indicate that most UK solar farms will never get beyond 12 per cent of their true generating capacity in the course of a year, due to the cloudy British weather, apart from ruining the view and decimation the wild live, solar panels are also woefully inefficient at their only job which is to generate electricity amid the cloud and rain of the UK</p>	<p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. <b>Section 12.8 of Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>The Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) (Draft NPS EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that is capable of producing a large amount of electricity.</p> <p>Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>Estimates from National Grid, the National Infrastructure Commission and the Energy Systems Catapult of the capacities of new solar generation needed in order to meet Net Zero include 44 to 76GW of additional solar capacity by 2050, with approximately one quarter of this needed in the next ten years. In order to meet those projections (noting that, consistent with the NPSs, these capacities are not presented as a target, nor indeed a quota, and therefore could be gone further than) a very high proportion of (if not all) solar projects of any scale which come forward for consent will need to be approved. Falling short on solar development at any stage in the next decades will risk causing the UK falling behind on decarbonisation and will increase the magnitude of the task (and therefore the intolerable risk of failure) of meeting its 2050 legal commitments to achieve Net Zero. Please see <b>Section 11.4</b> in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> for further information. Figure 116 in this document shows the results of an analysis which illustrates that development of one large solar scheme brings carbon savings and economic benefits versus developing combinations of smaller independent schemes, each combination matching to the same total installed generation capacity. The analysis assesses the relative costs and construction timeframes associated</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>with the development of different sized independent solar schemes against the total cost and carbon benefit achievable through the development of one large solar scheme such as the proposed Scheme.</p> <p>The Solar Farm Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase, the Scheme becomes less financially viable and more third-party landowners are likely to be affected).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ecological constraints – SAC’s, SPA’s, SSSI’s, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li><li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li> <li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li> <li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li> <li>• Settlements;</li> <li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li> <li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li> <li>• Green Belt; and</li> <li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li> </ul> <p>The search was used to identify contiguous potential developable areas of around or greater than 300ha with the ability to accommodate a large scale solar scheme. Further to the high level constraints identified above, further search criteria were applied at a local level, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topography – the Site needs to be flat or gently south facing slopes;</li> <li>• Field Shape and Pattern – fields need to be large and of regular shape;</li> <li>• Number of landowners – ideally a small number of landowners;</li> <li>• Landscape and Visual – aiming to locate the Site out of landscape designations, with a high degree of existing vegetation for natural screening, limited long distance views;</li> <li>• Residential Amenity – checking for proximity to</li> </ul>	



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>settlements;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage – proximity to Listed Buildings and other designations such as Scheduled Monuments, and presence of below ground archaeology;</li> <li>• Ecology – avoid or minimise proximity to designated areas within or close to the Site;</li> <li>• Flood Risk – seek to locate the Site in Flood Zone 1, and reduce intrusion into zones 2 and 3;</li> <li>• Public Rights of Way – seek to either minimise effects upon receptors using PROW or seek opportunities to provide connectivity; and</li> <li>• Access – ease of access for construction and decommissioning stages to be considered.</li> </ul> <p>The Order limits are situated within the optimal 5km of the Bulls Lodge Substation and provide a developable area with the ability to accommodate a large-scale solar scheme. It was deemed a suitable option to move forwards with an application for the Scheme.</p>	
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	<p>It is not clear why the overcrowded South East of England is the most suitable place for the biggest solar farm so far in the UK. Other parts of the country are far less densely populated and so could more easily accommodate a farm of this size. Electricity is transported across the country with the grid system, so the farm does not have to be very close to this region. A</p>	<p>The Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>smaller solar farm would be more suitable to this small area of rural agriculture between the urban towns of Chelmsford, Witham and Braintree.</p>	<p>high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that is capable of producing a large amount of electricity.</p> <p>Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>Estimates from National Grid, the National Infrastructure Commission and the Energy Systems Catapult of the capacities of new solar generation needed in order to meet Net Zero include 44 to 76GW of additional solar capacity by 2050, with approximately one quarter of this needed in the next ten years. In order to meet those projections (noting that, consistent with the NPSs, these capacities are not presented as a target, nor indeed a quota, and therefore could be gone further than) a very high proportion of (if not all) solar projects of any scale which come forward for consent will need to be approved. Falling short on solar development at any stage in the next decades will risk causing the UK falling behind on decarbonisation and will increase the magnitude of the task (and therefore the intolerable risk of failure) of meeting its 2050 legal commitments to achieve Net</p>	<p></p>

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>Zero. Please see <b>Section 11.4</b> in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> for further information. Figure 116 in this document shows the results of an analysis which illustrates that development of one large solar scheme brings carbon savings and economic benefits versus developing combinations of smaller independent schemes, each combination matching to the same total installed generation capacity. The analysis assesses the relative costs and construction timeframes associated with the development of different sized independent solar schemes against the total cost and carbon benefit achievable through the development of one large solar scheme such as the proposed Scheme.</p> <p>The Solar Farm Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase, the Scheme becomes less financially viable and more third-party landowners are likely to be affected).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecological constraints – SAC's, SPA's, SSSI's, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li> <li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li> <li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li> <li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li> <li>• Settlements;</li> <li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li> <li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li> <li>• Green Belt; and</li> <li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li> </ul> <p>The search was used to identify contiguous potential developable areas of around or greater than 300ha with the ability to accommodate a large scale solar scheme. Further to the high level constraints identified above, further search criteria were applied at a local level, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topography – the Site needs to be flat or gently south facing slopes;</li> </ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field Shape and Pattern – fields need to be large and of regular shape;</li> <li>• Number of landowners – ideally a small number of landowners;</li> <li>• Landscape and Visual – aiming to locate the Site out of landscape designations, with a high degree of existing vegetation for natural screening, limited long distance views;</li> <li>• Residential Amenity – checking for proximity to settlements;</li> <li>• Heritage – proximity to Listed Buildings and other designations such as Scheduled Monuments, and presence of below ground archaeology;</li> <li>• Ecology – avoid or minimise proximity to designated areas within or close to the Site;</li> <li>• Flood Risk – seek to locate the Site in Flood Zone 1, and reduce intrusion into zones 2 and 3;</li> <li>• Public Rights of Way – seek to either minimise effects upon receptors using PROW or seek opportunities to provide connectivity; and</li> <li>• Access – ease of access for construction and decommissioning stages to be considered.</li> </ul> <p>The Order limits are situated within the optimal 5km of the Bulls Lodge Substation and provide a developable area with the ability to accommodate a large-scale solar scheme. It was deemed a suitable option to move forwards with an application for the Scheme.</p>	
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	You haven't given any alternative sites to consider or shown and consideration of reducing the size	The Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	so it's more bearable for local residents.	<p><b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b> It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that is capable of producing a large amount of electricity.</p> <p>Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>Estimates from National Grid, the National Infrastructure Commission and the Energy Systems Catapult of the capacities of new solar generation needed in order to meet Net Zero include 44 to 76GW of additional solar capacity by 2050, with approximately one quarter of this needed in the next ten years. In order to meet those</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>projections (noting that, consistent with the NPSs, these capacities are not presented as a target, nor indeed a quota, and therefore could be gone further than) a very high proportion of (if not all) solar projects of any scale which come forward for consent will need to be approved. Falling short on solar development at any stage in the next decades will risk causing the UK falling behind on decarbonisation and will increase the magnitude of the task (and therefore the intolerable risk of failure) of meeting its 2050 legal commitments to achieve Net Zero. Please see <b>Section 11.4</b> in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> for further information. Figure 116 in this document shows the results of an analysis which illustrates that development of one large solar scheme brings carbon savings and economic benefits versus developing combinations of smaller independent schemes, each combination matching to the same total installed generation capacity. The analysis assesses the relative costs and construction timeframes associated with the development of different sized independent solar schemes against the total cost and carbon benefit achievable through the development of one large solar scheme such as the proposed Scheme.</p> <p>The Solar Farm Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase, the Scheme becomes less financially viable and more third-party landowners are likely to be affected).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ecological constraints – SAC's, SPA's, SSSI's, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li><li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li><li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li><li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li><li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li><li>• Settlements;</li><li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li></ul>	



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li><li>• Green Belt; and</li><li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li></ul> <p>The search was used to identify contiguous potential developable areas of around or greater than 300ha with the ability to accommodate a large scale solar scheme.</p> <p>Further to the high level constraints identified above, further search criteria were applied at a local level, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Topography – the Site needs to be flat or gently south facing slopes;</li><li>• Field Shape and Pattern – fields need to be large and of regular shape;</li><li>• Number of landowners – ideally a small number of landowners;</li><li>• Landscape and Visual – aiming to locate the Site out of landscape designations, with a high degree of existing vegetation for natural screening, limited long distance views;</li><li>• Residential Amenity – checking for proximity to settlements;</li><li>• Heritage – proximity to Listed Buildings and other designations such as Scheduled Monuments, and presence of below ground archaeology;</li><li>• Ecology – avoid or minimise proximity to designated areas within or close to the Site;</li><li>• Flood Risk – seek to locate the Site in Flood Zone 1, and reduce intrusion into zones 2 and 3;</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Rights of Way – seek to either minimise effects upon receptors using PROW or seek opportunities to provide connectivity; and</li> <li>• Access – ease of access for construction and decommissioning stages to be considered.</li> </ul> <p>The Order limits are situated within the optimal 5km of the Bulls Lodge Substation and provide a developable area with the ability to accommodate a large-scale solar scheme. It was deemed a suitable option to move forwards with an application for the Scheme.</p>	
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	<p>Why is a site search not included?                      Why were some fields included but other fields adjacent not included within the DCO?                      For example why have fields 3E been excluded?                      Why have fields between Toppinghoehall Wood &amp; the Railway now been excluded?</p>	<p>The Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that is capable of producing a large amount of electricity.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>Estimates from National Grid, the National Infrastructure Commission and the Energy Systems Catapult of the capacities of new solar generation needed in order to meet Net Zero include 44 to 76GW of additional solar capacity by 2050, with approximately one quarter of this needed in the next ten years. In order to meet those projections (noting that, consistent with the NPSs, these capacities are not presented as a target, nor indeed a quota, and therefore could be gone further than) a very high proportion of (if not all) solar projects of any scale which come forward for consent will need to be approved. Falling short on solar development at any stage in the next decades will risk causing the UK falling behind on decarbonisation and will increase the magnitude of the task (and therefore the intolerable risk of failure) of meeting its 2050 legal commitments to achieve Net Zero. Please see <b>Section 11.4</b> in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> for further information. Figure 116 in the document shows the results of an analysis which illustrates that development of one large solar scheme brings carbon savings and economic benefits versus</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>developing combinations of smaller independent schemes, each combination matching to the same total installed generation capacity. The analysis assesses the relative costs and construction timeframes associated with the development of different sized independent solar schemes against the total cost and carbon benefit achievable through the development of one large solar scheme such as the proposed Scheme.</p> <p>The Solar Farm Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase, the Scheme becomes less financially viable and more third-party landowners are likely to be affected).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecological constraints – SAC’s, SPA’s, SSSI’s, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li> <li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li> <li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li> <li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li> <li>• Settlements;</li> <li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li> <li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li> <li>• Green Belt; and</li> <li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li> </ul> <p>The search was used to identify contiguous potential developable areas of around or greater than 300ha with the ability to accommodate a large scale solar scheme.</p> <p>Further to the high level constraints identified above, further search criteria were applied at a local level, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topography – the Site needs to be flat or gently south facing slopes;</li> <li>• Field Shape and Pattern – fields need to be large and of regular shape;</li> </ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of landowners – ideally a small number of landowners;</li> <li>• Landscape and Visual – aiming to locate the Site out of landscape designations, with a high degree of existing vegetation for natural screening, limited long distance views;</li> <li>• Residential Amenity – checking for proximity to settlements;</li> <li>• Heritage – proximity to Listed Buildings and other designations such as Scheduled Monuments, and presence of below ground archaeology;</li> <li>• Ecology – avoid or minimise proximity to designated areas within or close to the Site;</li> <li>• Flood Risk – seek to locate the Site in Flood Zone 1, and reduce intrusion into zones 2 and 3;</li> <li>• Public Rights of Way – seek to either minimise effects upon receptors using PROW or seek opportunities to provide connectivity; and</li> <li>• Access – ease of access for construction and decommissioning stages to be considered.</li> </ul> <p>The Order limits are situated within the optimal 5km of the Bulls Lodge Substation and provide a developable area with the ability to accommodate a large-scale solar scheme. It was deemed a suitable option to move forwards with an application for the Scheme.</p>	
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	The answers that you gave in the Q&A sessions served to confirm the underlying reality that your proposal to use this greenfield site	It is correct that the availability of a single, willing landowner for the Solar Farm Site has been a relevant consideration. This significantly minimises / avoids	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>is entirely opportunistic, driven by the availability of suitable land with a single owner, the relatively low cost of developing solar power on the site, and your objective of maximising profits. You claim that alternative brown-field sites would be more difficult and expensive for you to develop, but you are deliberately addressing the question only from a narrow commercial profit perspective. It is fundamental to the sustainability principles you espouse that wider aspects, such as the opportunity cost of the loss of agricultural land and the impact on bio-diversity, also need to be considered when making a balanced assessment.</p>	<p>impacts on third party landowners and the extent to which the Applicant has to seek compulsory acquisition powers.</p> <p>However, it is not the case that this was the Applicant's sole consideration. The Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that is capable of producing a large amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
-------	---------	----------	-----------------------

The Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable).

The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:

- Ecological constraints – SAC's, SPA's, SSSI's, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,
- Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;
- Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,
- Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;
- Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB,



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	I fully support solar energy BUT not on high quality productive agricultural land. You have not addressed the displacement of the lost production of prime Gr2 arable land. Where will the lost production come from? Are you returning previously non-productive agricultural land in Essex to production to offset this loss? Or are you expecting the market to replace this by imports from other 3rd Countries around the world?	<p>Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Settlements;</li> <li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li> <li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li> <li>• Green Belt; and</li> <li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li> </ul> <p>The use of agricultural land for the Scheme is justified by the urgent need for renewable energy generation. The Scheme is urgently needed in order to generate renewable energy to contribute to meeting the Government's legally binding commitment for the country to reach net-zero by 2050, and to address the cause of climate change. Whilst the Scheme will result in best and most versatile agricultural land not being available for arable agricultural use over its lifetime, the non-intrusive and reversible nature of solar development means that only 6ha of agricultural land will be permanently lost which is a tiny fraction of land used for food production in the UK. The soil resource will have benefitted from a recovery of soil organic matter over the approximately 40 year duration of the Scheme. An element of agriculture may also be retained over the life of the Scheme, with low density grazing an option being considered for the management of some of the habitats to be created on the Solar Farm Site. For further information, please see <b>Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010118/APP/6.2] – Socio-economics and Land Use.</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	<p>Since the announcement of Brexit, warehouse space in the UK has been in high demand. With hundreds of thousands of square feet in new warehousing being constructed along major transport routes both in Essex and nationally, surely it would make more sense to team up with such ventures to engineer structures that would support the weight of solar farms on the acres of available roof space. This would leave valuable agricultural land free for growing crops.</p>	<p>The land we have identified for Longfield is ideal for grid scale solar because it has a rare combination of factors. Those are:</p> <p>The land sits directly under existing 400Kv electricity transmission lines and in close proximity to the Bulls Lodge Substation, which allows for direct connection to the National Grid and the quick distribution of the energy. The location is also key to the wider National Grid, as demand in this zone is very high and still growing. The local topography (with broken views, expansive woodlands and high hedgerows) lends itself to solar technology.</p> <p>With the land being open and allowed to grow grass, and in some cases “wild”, this forms a temporary natural carbon-sink in volume, again addressing the wider climate need for safer, purer, breathable clean air. We reduced the amount of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land that we are proposing to use as part of the scheme by 60% following the non-statutory consultation. For further information regarding the site selection process, please see the <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>With regards to use of roof space, EDF Renewables, which is one of the partners in The Applicant, is currently working with a supermarket chain to place solar panels on the rooves of its stores. Longfield Solar Farm remains necessary alongside development of this type to meet the Country’s energy needs. For further details, please see</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	It's far too big, when we know wind farms are safer, less detrimental to the environment and generate more energy than solar.	<p><b>the Statement of Need</b> submitted as part of the <b>DCO application [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b>.</p> <p>The size of the scheme is proportionate to the size and urgency of the national need, which is substantial. There is also a need to make the most of the connection to the Grid - this is a limited resource.</p> <p>We do fully accept that this is a site of significant size. This is why we are working very hard to ensure that the design of the site is as sensitive as it can be to the local area. Seeking local opinion and ideas on how to design this site in detail are key requirements of the statutory consultation and something we take very seriously.</p> <p><b>Section 8.4</b> in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> explains without the development of additional solar projects, other measures will be required to fill the gap which solar will fill, effectively making it much harder for the UK to achieve Net Zero. While offshore wind makes the largest contribution to decarbonisation in most forward electricity system scenarios, solar complements offshore wind deployment (see <b>Section 9.8</b> also for further information). The first conclusion is therefore that the bringing forward of solar schemes such as this Scheme should be continued and progressed with determined rigour and drive, to enable their timely delivery. Secondly, that the further identification of solar schemes and other low-carbon initiatives which complement offshore wind generation should be progressed with urgency to ensure the</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	<p>I would like to register my strong objection to the proposed solar energy farm. It is simply too large for this area of good quality agricultural land (mostly Grade 2) when there are other, more appropriate and less environmentally sensitive sites - particularly making use of alternative brownfield sites or in/near to industrial areas. Indeed, Essex alone has 72,000 acres of poorer Grade 4 agricultural land, which should be considered for use before prime, Grade 2 land. From what I can see, 37 per cent of the scheme is on best and most versatile (BMV) land, in other words good quality farmland which the UK is losing at an alarming rate. This should all be removed from the scheme. The scheme will adversely affect the local environment, particularly the local biodiversity and will be forever damaging to the beautiful landscape. The scale of the project is inappropriate to the</p>	<p>required trajectory in reducing carbon intensity can be achieved or bettered.</p> <p>The Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that can produce a large amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>The Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>area. Much better to support green energy by having more, smaller schemes in less environmentally sensitive / beautiful areas. This proposal would represent a wanton destruction of the countryside, which would never be returned to what it is now.</p>	<p>for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecological constraints – SAC’s, SPA’s, SSSI’s, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li> <li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li> <li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li> <li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li> <li>• Settlements;</li> <li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local</li> </ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>Plan, for example open space and employment land;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li><li>• Green Belt; and</li><li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li></ul> <p>The vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) to the Order limits. The Order limits comprises approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.</p> <p>All of the land within the area of search is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the Site).</li><li>• Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the Site).</li><li>• Grade 4 but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test.</li><li>• Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</li></ul> <p>There are no alternative sites considered by the Applicant that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits (whilst also meeting other criteria of the Applicant, as set out in Chapter 3) within a reasonable</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>distance of Bulls Lodge Substation (for which the Applicant has obtained a grid connection agreement).</p> <p>The Draft NPS EN-3 [REF-9] states that although BMV land should be avoided where possible in the development of renewable energy infrastructure, land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of site location.</p> <p>Within this context, the Applicant has sought to minimise the amount of agricultural land used within the Scheme. This includes removing land from the draft Order limits to reduce the amount of high grade agricultural land within the boundary of the scheme and to avoid areas identified as having higher archaeological potential prior to the statutory consultation. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>.</p> <p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. <b>Section 12.8 of Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>The effect of the Scheme on landscape character and visual amenity has been reported in the <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental</b></p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	<p>There is simply no need to have a single scheme of this size when a number of smaller schemes, more spread out, and using brownfield sites and sites of lower grade land would be much more appropriate. The scale of this one scheme - one of the largest in the UK - is not appropriate for this high grade site.</p>	<p><b>Statement [EN010119/APP/6.1].</b> The LVIA considers the duration of the effects, and their ‘reversibility’. The Scheme has been designed to avoid and minimise adverse effects on the local environment through the sensitive siting of the proposed elements. Extensive areas of new woodland, species rich grassland, areas for natural regeneration and scrub are proposed as part of the scheme, resulting in a biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>The size of the scheme is proportionate to the size and urgency of the national need, which is substantial. There is also a need to make the most of the connection to the Grid - this is a limited resource. Estimates from National Grid, the National Infrastructure Commission and the Energy Systems Catapult of the capacities of new solar generation needed in order to meet Net Zero include 44 to 76GW of additional solar capacity by 2050, with approximately one quarter of this needed in the next ten years. In order to meet those projections (noting that, consistent with the NPSs, these capacities are not presented as a target, nor indeed a quota, and therefore could be gone further than) a very high proportion of (if not all) solar projects of any scale which come forward for consent will need to be approved. Falling short on solar development at any stage in the next decades will risk causing the UK falling behind on decarbonisation and will increase the magnitude of the task (and therefore the intolerable risk of failure) of meeting its 2050 legal commitments to achieve Net Zero. Please see <b>Section 11.4</b> in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> for further information. Figure 116 in</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>this document shows the results of an analysis which illustrates that development of one large solar scheme brings carbon savings and economic benefits versus developing combinations of smaller independent schemes, each combination matching to the same total installed generation capacity. The analysis assesses the relative costs and construction timeframes associated with the development of different sized independent solar schemes against the total cost and carbon benefit achievable through the development of one large solar scheme such as the proposed Scheme.</p> <p>We do fully accept that this is a site of significant size. This is why we are working very hard to ensure that the design of the site is as sensitive as it can be to the local area. Seeking local opinion and ideas on how to design this site in detail are key requirements of the statutory consultation.</p>	
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	<p>We feel the site is occupying too large an area of valuable productive farmland. The rate we're importing food is already very high. We're baffled at how a scheme of this size is seen as environmentally friendly when in reality it will result in even more importation which is far from green, especially given the UK doesn't enjoy full sun for much of the year. We</p>	<p>The Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>would like to see all BMV land removed from the scheme as a minimum.</p> <p>We would like to see evidence of alternative sites having been considered and the reasons for/against it as to date you have even admitted (first set of webinars) that no other sites in the local area have been considered. Power generation, whether green or otherwise, makes this an industrial site. Appropriate siting for solar farms is on industrial land or rooftops, not high grade agricultural land surrounded, used &amp; enjoyed by residents.</p>	<p>high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that can produce a large amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>The Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm,</p>	<p>Y</p>

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ecological constraints – SAC’s, SPA’s, SSSI’s, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li><li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li><li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li><li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li><li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li><li>• Settlements;</li><li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li><li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li><li>• Green Belt; and</li><li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li></ul> <p>The vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) to the Order limits. The Order limits comprises approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.</p> <p>All of the land within the area of search is either:</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the Site).</li><li>• Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the Site).</li><li>• Grade 4 but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test.</li><li>• Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</li></ul> <p>There are no alternative sites considered by the Applicant that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits (whilst also meeting other criteria of the Applicant, as set out in Chapter 3) within a reasonable distance of Bulls Lodge Substation (for which the Applicant has obtained a grid connection agreement).</p> <p>The Draft NPS EN-3 [REF-9] states that although BMV land should be avoided where possible in the development of renewable energy infrastructure, land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of site location.</p> <p>Within this context, the Applicant has sought to minimise the amount of agricultural land used within the Scheme. This includes removing land from the draft Order limits to reduce the amount of high grade agricultural land within</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>the boundary of the scheme and to avoid areas identified as having higher archaeological potential prior to the statutory consultation. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>.</p> <p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. <b>Section 12.8 of Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>The effect of the Scheme on landscape character and visual amenity has been reported in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. The LVIA considers the duration of the effects, and their 'reversibility'. The Scheme has been designed to avoid and minimise adverse effects on the local environment through the sensitive siting of the proposed elements. Extensive areas of new woodland, species rich grassland, areas for natural regeneration and scrub are proposed as part of the scheme, resulting in a biodiversity net gain.</p>	
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	I fear that only convenience and cost has driven key decisions. Despite considerable local opposition to the size of the scheme, there has been little	The size of the scheme is proportionate to the size and urgency of the national need, which is substantial. There is also a need to make the most of the connection to the Grid - this is a limited resource.	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>interest in reducing its size or in explaining why (beyond cost) more spread-out, smaller schemes and the use of brownfield, industrial and/or lower grade land has not been considered instead. It would be particularly useful to see a detailed explanation on why this particular site and use of BMV land has been selected for this purpose, rather than brownfield / lower grade land. I fail to understand this most important point.</p>	<p>Estimates from National Grid, the National Infrastructure Commission and the Energy Systems Catapult of the capacities of new solar generation needed in order to meet Net Zero include 44 to 76GW of additional solar capacity by 2050, with approximately one quarter of this needed in the next ten years. In order to meet those projections (noting that, consistent with the NPSs, these capacities are not presented as a target, nor indeed a quota, and therefore could be gone further than) a very high proportion of (if not all) solar projects of any scale which come forward for consent will need to be approved. Falling short on solar development at any stage in the next decades will risk causing the UK falling behind on decarbonisation and will increase the magnitude of the task (and therefore the intolerable risk of failure) of meeting its 2050 legal commitments to achieve Net Zero. Please see <b>Section 11.4</b> in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> for further information. Figure 116 in this document shows the results of an analysis which illustrates that development of one large solar scheme brings carbon savings and economic benefits versus developing combinations of smaller independent schemes, each combination matching to the same total installed generation capacity. The analysis assesses the relative costs and construction timeframes associated with the development of different sized independent solar schemes against the total cost and carbon benefit achievable through the development of one large solar scheme such as the proposed Scheme.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>In the context of there being a need for solar energy generation to be developed at scale, the Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that can produce a large amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>The Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ecological constraints – SAC's, SPA's, SSSI's, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li><li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li><li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li><li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li><li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li><li>• Settlements;</li></ul>	



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li><li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li><li>• Green Belt; and</li><li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li></ul> <p>The Applicant has also worked hard to ensure that the design of the site is as sensitive as it can be to the local area and where possible to reduce the amount of land used. Prior to arriving at the proposed Order limits, there were several stages of design evolution, during which the original area of the Longfield site was refined. That process of design evolution has been informed by ongoing environmental assessments, engineering and design considerations, as well as engagement with stakeholders. The surveys undertaken that influenced the reduction in the amount of land proposed to be within the Order Limits were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Agricultural Land Classification;</li><li>b. Landscape and Visual;</li><li>c. Cultural Heritage; and</li><li>d. Ecology.</li></ul> <p>Capacity was also a consideration as the Applicant's aim is to make efficient use of the land area in terms of generating the largest annual yield Megawatt hours (MWh) for the available developable area, once due</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>consideration is given to environmental and social constraints.</p> <p>Following publication of the PEI Report and completion of statutory consultation, the PEI Boundary was further refined to the area now proposed as the Order limits, being an area of 453 ha. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has also sought to minimise the amount of agricultural land used within the Scheme. This includes removing land from the draft Order limits to reduce the amount of high grade agricultural land within the boundary of the scheme and to avoid areas identified as having higher archaeological potential prior to the statutory consultation. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>.</p> <p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. <b>Section 12.8 of Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms.</p>	
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	Valuable farmland will be lost for this scheme. Why has this site been chosen rather than a site on poorer quality land or a brownfield	The Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the</b>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	site. Many more suitable sites are available with direct access to the national grid.	<p><b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b> It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that is capable of producing a large amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>The Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ecological constraints – SAC’s, SPA’s, SSSI’s, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li><li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li><li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li><li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li><li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li><li>• Settlements;</li><li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li><li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li><li>• Green Belt; and</li><li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>The Applicant has also worked hard to ensure that the design of the site is as sensitive as it can be to the local area and where possible to reduce the amount of land used. Prior to arriving at the proposed Order limits, there were several stages of design evolution, during which the original area of the Longfield site was refined. That process of design evolution has been informed by ongoing environmental assessments, engineering and design considerations, as well as engagement with stakeholders. The surveys undertaken that influenced the reduction in the amount of land proposed to be within the Order Limits were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Agricultural Land Classification;</li><li>b. Landscape and Visual;</li><li>c. Cultural Heritage; and</li><li>d. Ecology.</li></ul> <p>Capacity was also a consideration as the Applicant's aim is to make efficient use of the land area in terms of generating the largest annual yield Megawatt hours (MWh) for the available developable area, once due consideration is given to environmental and social constraints.</p> <p>Following publication of the PEI Report and completion of statutory consultation, the PEI Boundary was further refined to the area now proposed as the Order limits, being an area of 453 ha. Further information is presented</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has also sought to minimise the amount of agricultural land used within the Scheme. This includes removing land from the draft Order limits to reduce the amount of high grade agricultural land within the boundary of the scheme and to avoid areas identified as having higher archaeological potential prior to the statutory consultation. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>.</p> <p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. <b>Section 12.8 of Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms.</p>	
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	<p>Most people recognise that renewable energies are important within the context of environmental impact. However, if solar farms of this scale are going to be the future then the siting of them has to be thought through very carefully. In my opinion, the location of this site is entirely</p>	<p>The Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>wrong and based on the wrong principles. It would be a dangerous precedent to set. Availability of land from a land owner wanting to cash in and close proximity to plug into the national grid should not feature in the decision of where to site such a scheme.</p>	<p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that is capable of producing a large amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>The Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ecological constraints – SAC’s, SPA’s, SSSI’s, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li><li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li><li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li><li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li><li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li><li>• Settlements;</li><li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li><li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li><li>• Green Belt; and</li><li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li></ul> <p>The Applicant has also worked hard to ensure that the design of the site is as sensitive as it can be to the local area and where possible to reduce the amount of land used. Prior to arriving at the proposed Order limits, there</p>	



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>were several stages of design evolution, during which the original area of the Longfield site was refined. That process of design evolution has been informed by ongoing environmental assessments, engineering and design considerations, as well as engagement with stakeholders. The surveys undertaken that influenced the reduction in the amount of land proposed to be within the Order Limits were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Agricultural Land Classification;</li><li>b. Landscape and Visual;</li><li>c. Cultural Heritage; and</li><li>d. Ecology.</li></ul> <p>Capacity was also a consideration as the Applicant's aim is to make efficient use of the land area in terms of generating the largest annual yield Megawatt hours (MWh) for the available developable area, once due consideration is given to environmental and social constraints.</p> <p>Following publication of the PEI Report and completion of statutory consultation, the PEI Boundary was further refined to the area now proposed as the Order limits, being an area of 453 ha. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has also sought to minimise the amount of agricultural land used within the Scheme. This includes removing land from the draft Order limits to reduce the</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>amount of high grade agricultural land within the boundary of the scheme and to avoid areas identified as having higher archaeological potential prior to the statutory consultation. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>.</p> <p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. <b>Section 12.8 of Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms.</p>	
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	I don't believe we have enough sunshine in this country to make solar panels work efficiently.	<p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that can produce a large amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	<p>The scheme is far too large given the nature of the area, it would be overwhelming and have too great an impact on the agricultural setting of residential properties, many of which are listed. There are also significant archaeological assets which need to be protected.</p> <p>The amenity loss for residents and visitors who use the area for recreation cannot be mitigated by the current proposals.</p> <p>A research of other applications for smaller solar farm schemes within the wider Essex area, being advanced with separate Local Planning Authorities, combine to the advised capacity of this proposed application to the Planning Inspectorate. Smaller schemes across the county would have less overall impact and still achieve the similar energy generation targets.</p>	<p>The Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography.</p> <p>The size of the scheme is proportionate to the size and urgency of the national need, which is substantial. There is also a need to make the most of the connection to the Grid - this is a limited resource. Estimates from National Grid, the National Infrastructure Commission and the Energy Systems Catapult of the capacities of new solar generation needed in order to meet Net Zero include 44 to 76GW of additional solar capacity by 2050, with approximately one quarter of this needed in the next ten years. In order to meet those projections (noting that, consistent with the NPSs, these capacities are not presented as a target, nor indeed a quota, and therefore could be gone further than) a very high proportion of (if not all) solar projects of any scale which come forward for consent will need to be approved. Falling short on solar development at any stage in the next decades will risk causing the UK falling behind on decarbonisation and will increase the magnitude of the task (and therefore the intolerable risk of failure) of meeting its 2050 legal commitments to achieve Net Zero. Please see <b>Section 11.4</b> in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> for further information. Figure 116 in this document shows the results of an analysis which illustrates that development of one large solar scheme brings carbon savings and economic benefits versus developing combinations of smaller independent schemes, each combination matching to the same total</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>The applicant's team have not demonstrated the site selection suitability criteria extends beyond their convenience, purely because there is one landowner involved, it is a (relatively) easy development potential to advance with little thought for the impact on residents. The applicant admits they have not considered other sites in detail.</p> <p>The applicants have still to demonstrate there is a need for a scheme of this size in this area.</p>	<p>installed generation capacity. The analysis assesses the relative costs and construction timeframes associated with the development of different sized independent solar schemes against the total cost and carbon benefit achievable through the development of one large solar scheme such as the proposed Scheme.</p> <p>Within this context, the Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that can produce a large amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>The Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ecological constraints – SAC's, SPA's, SSSI's, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li><li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li><li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li><li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li><li>• Settlements;</li><li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li><li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li><li>• Green Belt; and</li><li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li></ul> <p>The vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) to the Order limits. The Order limits comprises approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.</p> <p>All of the land within the area of search is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the Site).</li><li>• Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the Site).</li><li>• Grade 4 but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test.</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</li></ul> <p>There are no alternative sites considered by the Applicant that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits (whilst also meeting other criteria of the Applicant, as set out in Chapter 3) within a reasonable distance of Bulls Lodge Substation (for which the Applicant has obtained a grid connection agreement).</p> <p>The Draft NPS EN-3 [REF-9] states that although BMV land should be avoided where possible in the development of renewable energy infrastructure, land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of site location.</p> <p>Within this context, the Applicant has sought to minimise the amount of agricultural land used within the Scheme. This includes removing land from the draft Order limits to reduce the amount of high grade agricultural land within the boundary of the scheme and to avoid areas identified as having higher archaeological potential prior to the statutory consultation. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>.</p> <p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. <b>Section 12.8</b> of</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p><b>Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>The effect of the Scheme on landscape character and visual amenity has been reported in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. The LVIA considers the duration of the effects, and their 'reversibility'. The Scheme has been designed to avoid and minimise adverse effects on the local environment through the sensitive siting of the proposed elements. Extensive areas of new woodland, species rich grassland, areas for natural regeneration and scrub are proposed as part of the scheme, resulting in a biodiversity net gain.</p>	
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	<p>Rather than build this environmental catastrophe, why not put PVs on the south, east and west facing roofs of all new build houses? And why are there no incentives to retrofit them on to existing homes? Or encouragement of small turbines in place of chimneys? The cost would be no more than the gross cost (and space loss) of a chimney on a new house. This should be encouraged, in fact it should become part of the building control process, hence the copy of</p>	<p>Consideration of alternatives is presented in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. EDF Renewables, which is one of the partners in The Applicant, is currently working with a supermarket chain to place solar panels on the rooves of its stores. Longfield Solar Farm remains necessary alongside development of this type to meet the Country's energy needs. For further details, please see the <b>Statement of Need</b> submitted as part of the DCO application <b>[EN010118/APP/7.1]</b>.</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>this email to those in power.            Whereas your destruction of the countryside should be discouraged.</p>		
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	<p>If we must have them I feel solar panels should be installed on the roofs of hospitals and shopping centres not taking up valuable fields which could be put to better use.</p>	<p>EDF Renewables, which is one of the partners in The Applicant, is currently working with a supermarket chain to place solar panels on the rooves of its stores. Longfield Solar Farm remains necessary alongside development of this type to meet the Country's energy needs. For further details, please see the <b>Statement of Need</b> submitted as part of the DCO application <b>[EN010118/APP/7.1]</b>.</p>	N
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	<p>The area over which the panels are sited is still vast despite the welcome reduction in size. Why does this rural community need to make a major contribution to the UK's need for electricity (P7) when the greater usage of power is in urban and industrial areas. It should be proportionate to the use. A number of smaller developments could achieve the same objective but be much less disruptive to any one area. Striving for economies of scale overwhelms a rational consideration of the real impact.</p>	<p>The size of the scheme is proportionate to the size and urgency of the national need, which is substantial. There is also a need to make the most of the connection to the Grid - this is a limited resource.</p> <p>Estimates from National Grid, the National Infrastructure Commission and the Energy Systems Catapult of the capacities of new solar generation needed in order to meet Net Zero include 44 to 76GW of additional solar capacity by 2050, with approximately one quarter of this needed in the next ten years. In order to meet those projections (noting that, consistent with the NPSs, these capacities are not presented as a target, nor indeed a quota, and therefore could be gone further than) a very high proportion of (if not all) solar projects of any scale which come forward for consent will need to be approved. Falling short on solar development at any stage in the next decades will risk causing the UK falling behind on decarbonisation and will increase the magnitude of the</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>task (and therefore the intolerable risk of failure) of meeting its 2050 legal commitments to achieve Net Zero. Please see <b>Section 11.4</b> in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> for further information. Figure 116 in this document shows the results of an analysis which illustrates that development of one large solar scheme brings carbon savings and economic benefits versus developing combinations of smaller independent schemes, each combination matching to the same total installed generation capacity. The analysis assesses the relative costs and construction timeframes associated with the development of different sized independent solar schemes against the total cost and carbon benefit achievable through the development of one large solar scheme such as the proposed Scheme.</p> <p>In the context of there being a need for solar energy generation to be developed at scale, the Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that can produce a large amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>The Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm,</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecological constraints – SAC’s, SPA’s, SSSI’s, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li> <li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li> <li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li> <li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li> <li>• Settlements;</li> <li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li> <li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li> <li>• Green Belt; and</li> <li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li> </ul>	
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	The developers claim that the solar panels on this site may potentially “based on today’s technology, would be able to generate around 350MWp of electricity. However, as has been previously pointed out (comments	Estimates from National Grid, the National Infrastructure Commission and the Energy Systems Catapult of the capacities of new solar generation needed in order to meet Net Zero include 44 to 76GW of additional solar capacity by 2050, with approximately one quarter of this needed in the next ten years. In order to meet those projections (noting that, consistent with the NPSs, these	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>relating to Public Consultation 2 November – 14 December) the amount of solar radiation measured at ground level at a weather station located at Southend Airport is greater than double on average over a 7-year period to that measured at the nearby Chelmer Village weather station. Given the developers have completely ignored Government &amp; Planning Inspectorate Guidance and failed to search for any alternative sites, I believe this completely invalidates this application.</p>	<p>capacities are not presented as a target, nor indeed a quota, and therefore could be gone further than) a very high proportion of (if not all) solar projects of any scale which come forward for consent will need to be approved. Falling short on solar development at any stage in the next decades will risk causing the UK falling behind on decarbonisation and will increase the magnitude of the task (and therefore the intolerable risk of failure) of meeting its 2050 legal commitments to achieve Net Zero. Please see <b>Section 11.4</b> in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> for further information. Figure 116 in this document shows the results of an analysis which illustrates that development of one large solar scheme brings carbon savings and economic benefits versus developing combinations of smaller independent schemes, each combination matching to the same total installed generation capacity. The analysis assesses the relative costs and construction timeframes associated with the development of different sized independent solar schemes against the total cost and carbon benefit achievable through the development of one large solar scheme such as the proposed Scheme.</p> <p>In the context of there being a need for solar energy generation to be developed at scale, the Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that can produce a large amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>The Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ecological constraints – SAC’s, SPA’s, SSSI’s, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li><li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li><li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li><li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li><li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li><li>• Settlements;</li><li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li><li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li><li>• Green Belt; and</li><li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	<p>The development is located on good quality agricultural land which will be sterilised for decades and should be refused. There are many locations in the south of the county between the A12 and A127 where the quality of land is poorer. It is straightforward process to assemble a land bank to construct a similar project. My feeling is that this site has been favoured due the fact that the land is all under single ownership.</p>	<p>It is correct that the availability of a single, willing landowner for the Solar Farm Site has been a relevant consideration. This significantly minimises / avoids impacts on third party landowners and the extent to which the Applicant has to seek compulsory acquisition powers.</p> <p>However, it is not the case that this was the Applicant's sole consideration. The Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that is capable of producing a large amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>The Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ecological constraints – SAC's, SPA's, SSSI's, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li><li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li><li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li><li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>Battlefields;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li> <li>• Settlements;</li> <li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li> <li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li> <li>• Green Belt; and</li> <li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li> </ul>	
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	Why is it on agricultural land rather than brownfield?	<p>In the context of there being a need for solar energy generation to be developed at scale, the Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that can produce a large amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>The Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ecological constraints – SAC’s, SPA’s, SSSI’s, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li> <li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li> <li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li> <li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li> <li>• Settlements;</li> <li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li> <li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li> <li>• Green Belt; and</li> <li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li> </ul>	
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	<p>There are a large number of MOD unused airbases in the UK, e.g. one in Wethersfield Braintree (very close to this proposed project) and Woodbridge in Suffolk. There is the old nuclear power station at Bradwell where a new reactor will be built. This could then be connected to the national grid without miles of expensive cabling destroying the countryside.</p>	<p>The project partners in the Applicant considering bringing forward new solar energy generation at a range of sites in the UK. The land we have identified for the Scheme is ideal for grid scale solar because it has a rare combination of factors. It sits directly under existing 400Kv electricity transmission lines and in close proximity to the Bulls Lodge Substation, which allows for direct connection to the National Grid and the quick distribution of the energy; the location is key to the wider National Grid, as demand in this zone is very high and still growing; the local topography (with broken views, expansive woodlands and high hedgerows) lends itself to solar technology; and with the land being open and</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	We should be using this land to grow crops, not having acres of solar panels creating an eyesore, glint and glare and health risks, causing problems with wildlife and the environment.	<p>allowed to grow grass, and in some cases “wild”, this forms a temporary natural carbon-sink in volume, again addressing the wider climate need for safer, purer, breathable clean air. For further information regarding the site selection process, please see the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1] Chapter 3 - Alternatives and Design Evolution.</b></p> <p>The land the Applicant has identified for the Scheme is ideal for grid scale solar because it has a rare combination of factors. It sits directly under existing 400Kv electricity transmission lines and in close proximity to the Bulls Lodge Substation, which allows for direct connection to the National Grid and the quick distribution of the energy; the location is key to the wider National Grid, as demand in this zone is very high and still growing; the local topography (with broken views, expansive woodlands and high hedgerows) lends itself to solar technology; and with the land being open and allowed to grow grass, and in some cases “wild”, this forms a temporary natural carbon-sink in volume, again addressing the wider climate need for safer, purer, breathable clean air. We have assessed potential impacts on glint and glare (<b>Appendix 16.2 of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>), Human Health and Wellbeing (<b>Chapter 15 Human Health of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>) and Ecology (<b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>) respectively. These identify no significant adverse impacts in the areas referenced. The Applicant reduced the amount of Best</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	I don't understand why new build housing and solar power firms haven't made deals to make better use of roof space. Would likely get more people interested in new builds if lower prices were offered for roof rent on a development.	<p>and Most Versatile agricultural land that we are proposing to use as part of the scheme by 60% following the non-statutory consultation. For further information regarding the site selection process, please see <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>EDF Renewables, which is one of the partners in The Applicant, is currently working with a supermarket chain to place solar panels on the rooves of its stores. Longfield Solar Farm remains necessary alongside development of this type to meet the Country's energy needs. For further details, please see the <b>Statement of Need</b> submitted as part of the DCO application <b>[EN010118/APP/7.1]</b>.</p>	N
<b>BESS</b>	The manufacturing of batteries is energy intensive. Have other solutions such as air pumps been investigated?	<p>Globally, BESS have already achieved significant advances in technological ability and economic performance: batteries are becoming bigger, better (greater power, durability and longer operating lives) and cheaper. Portable applications, such as consumer electronics, drove cost reduction and technological innovation in batteries in the early 2000s. Since 2010, electric mobility has been behind the growth in inventive activity in battery packs, and since then, improvements to battery packs catering for the wide range of all-electric cars and plug-in hybrid cars on the market have had positive spill-over effects on stationary applications, such as grid-scale battery energy storage solutions. Please see the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> for further information.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>BESS</b>	<p>The application takes no account for the volumes of water required, distribution methodology and prevention of run off. Making safe of the BSS after an event such as this is also problematic as cells that have been damaged can spontaneously heat up at a later date. Subject to the use of the BSS i.e. peal lopping the process is industrial so should be classed as that within the application.</p>	<p>Consultations with ECC Fire and Rescue (F&amp;R) department have outlined that the BESS Development has a fire risk which must be assessed in relation to the potential contaminants within any fire suppressing water runoff.</p> <p>Acknowledging the nature of the Scheme there will be an intent to contain any fire and allow it to burn out whilst keeping people at a safe distance, with fire water limited to cool surroundings to prevent spread.</p> <p>The BESS units will be underlain by a concrete base and any immediate runoff from the infrastructure during a fire event which would require direct firefighting would then runoff the concrete base and be intercepted by the drainage system. The limited infiltration capacity of the underlying grounds confirmed via localised infiltration testing would prevent any potentially contaminated water from percolating into the underlying grounds.</p> <p>Whilst the DCO Site is split across two hydrological catchments the BESS Development is limited to the River Ter catchment and therefore any runoff would be limited to a single catchment.</p> <p>In the instance there is a small fire which can be directly contained there may be potential for contaminated runoff into the SuDS system.</p> <p>During larger fire events whereby fires are to be managed onsite approximately 4,000 kilolitres of suppressant water will be released as per agreement with ECC F&amp;R. Due to the potential contaminants within any firewater runoff a separation and storage mechanism will be required within the drainage system.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>BESS</b>	<p>I object to the siting of this facility in an area of beautiful countryside. I do not understand why the BESS should be co located within a solar power plant other than as a method of avoiding local planning procedures for a facility which if placed outside the solar plant would not in itself benefit from the advantageous planning position of being part of an NSIP.</p> <p>The battery facility might be much better placed within an industrial zone rather than a beautiful rural landscape. There are several examples of this being the case within the UK.</p>	<p>To enable any contaminants to be extracted from the system it is proposed that the drains will have the ability to be bunged and a penstock to be implemented at the downstream extremity of pipe 1.013 to isolate the network. The penstock will then enable potential contaminated suppression waters to be isolated and stored within a sub-surface attenuation tank prior to extraction in order to be suitably tested and disposed of offsite without entering the surrounding hydrological network.</p> <p>To attenuate 4,000 kilolitres of firewater a sub-surface attenuation tank storage volume of 4,000 m<sup>3</sup> will be required in a storage tank.</p> <p>The BESS included with the Scheme is important to maximising its benefits. There is a clear, direct relationship between the solar generation station and the electricity storage which means that there are substantial benefits to their colocation which will result in an improved contribution to low carbon UK electricity supplies when compared to either coming forward independent of the other. The colocation of those assets enables additional operational capabilities to be accessed for system benefit, supporting the view of the Applicant that electricity storage is associated development as per the Guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects. Colocation is especially beneficial for National Grid where connections are to the transmission, rather than to the distribution network, because the combined asset is required to meet certain planning, notification and service obligations. Further</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>BESS</b>	<p>Battery technology has a reputation for being less than environmentally friendly. There are other energy storage solutions, such as recently announced, compressed air tanks and various solutions pumping or winching things uphill during periods of low demand.</p>	<p>information of the benefits of collocating the BESS with solar generation is set out in section 12.5 of <b>the Statement of Need [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b>.</p> <p>Globally, BESS have already achieved significant advances in technological ability and economic performance: batteries are becoming bigger, better (greater power, durability and longer operating lives) and cheaper. Portable applications, such as consumer electronics, drove cost reduction and technological innovation in batteries in the early 2000s. Since 2010, electric mobility has been behind the growth in inventive activity in battery packs, and since then, improvements to battery packs catering for the wide range of all-electric cars and plug-in hybrid cars on the market have had positive spill-over effects on stationary applications, such as grid-scale battery energy storage solutions. Please see the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> for further information.</p>	N
<b>BESS</b>	<p>Why can't the storage be closer to the substation? Less vehicles during maintenance, easier maintenance during outages.</p>	<p>The BESS is located adjacent to the Longfield Substation close to the Solar PV. We identified this as the most appropriate location for the BESS as it is well-screened and closer to the A12 and the railway line. The BESS at Bulls Lodge has been strategically located as its principal purpose is to store energy generated by the solar PV. Further detail can be found <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>BESS</b>	No but more details are required on the BESS at Toppinhoehall Wood.	<p>A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p>	
<b>BESS</b>	<p>There are many local residents with understandable concerns about the battery storage and I do not believe enough has been done to allay these fears. Little has been made public on the details of the batteries and of the communications, as I understand it, between yourselves and Essex Fire &amp; Rescue Service. This could and should be more transparent. Residents are very concerned</p>	<p>A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>about the combustibility of the batteries and the genuine risk they have for neighbouring property and residents. There is also the element of noise which the batteries will create which too wasn't easy information to prize but I would urge you to look into whatever measures possible to mitigate any noise pollution, however minimal this might be.</p>	<p>minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out our assessment of potential noise impacts in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. The assessment considers the location of operational plant. The design of the Scheme has incorporated measures such as distancing of inverters away from sensitive receptors, and locating the BESS compound in an area away from large concentrations of receptors as well as towards the A12 where existing ambient noise levels are higher (such that noise emissions from the BESS are less impactful).</p> <p>As set out in the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> included as an appendix of the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>, inverters within 250m of residential dwellings will be treated with acoustic barriers which achieve a minimum 10dB(A) sound reduction, or an inverter selected with sound power levels at least 10dB lower than 96dB, which has been applied to inverters in the EIA.</p>	
<b>BESS</b>	Also there are always losses when converting energy or storing it and batteries are inefficient, having	The 500MW is the maximum that the combined solar and battery plants will be able to export through their shared	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>BESS</b>	<p>their own losses. Is the 500MW suggested before or after these losses? Is that figure for Summer, Winter, a peak or an average ?</p> <p>Where is the H&amp;S analysis of the storage facility space? E.g. fire, explosion, storage risks.</p>	<p>point of connection at Bull’s Lodge Substation. It is a peak figure.</p> <p>A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>BESS</b>	Some of our main concerns have been raised within the body of our previous answers so we do not believe it add any value in repeating our answers in this section. However we will reiterate that before any work is undertaken in or around Terling and the neighbouring villages /	<p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>dwelling a full report of the toxic impurities and noxious chemicals that will be omitted, not only from the solar farm when fully functional but also throughout the development stage too.</p>	<p><b>Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as</p>	



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
BESS	<p>I also have concerns about operational noise pollution, maintenance traffic, light pollution, security risks, effects of unplanned thermal events, explosions and potential release of toxic gases. Recent articles in the UK and international press have increased my concern. I would like to be reassured that the local incident response elements of the police, fire, ambulance and Environment Agency services have produced a robust, resilient plan for dealing with a hazardous, unplanned event involving the BESS.</p>	<p>assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p> <p>A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p>	
<b>BESS</b>	I think that the hardware involved will be unsightly, may have an impact on wildlife and is an inappropriate addition to an	The site selected for the Longfield Substation and BESS was chosen due to the natural screening provided by Toppinghoehall Wood and Lost Wood. The mature trees therein provide excellent visual screening to the north,	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>ancient rural landscape. It would be better placed in an industrial zone hence Bulls Lodge is probably the least visually offensive location and also benefits from the proximity of rail and road communications.</p>	<p>south and east. Additional planting will be implemented to screen the BESS and Longfield Substation to the south west and will be allowed to mature to a substantial height. Phase 2 of the BESS is intended to be undertaken five years after the Scheme has become operational, to allow sufficient time for screening implanted to the south and east of the BESS to mature and provide sufficient screening. This will provide a 'bridge' between Toppinghoehall and Lost Woods. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>BESS</b>	<p>There is a recognised concern over the safety of the battery storage and its location as the risks of explosions and toxic fume leaks are real possibilities. With local wind directions variable from both southwest and northeast this puts Boreham in direct line of exposure. Even as recently as Sunday 13th July 2021 Professor Wade Allison from Oxford University is quoted as saying “With the potential for huge explosions, fires and clouds of toxic gas, the battery 'farms' could devastate towns and villages nearby”. This is unacceptable to the residents of Boreham. The</p>	<p>A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>siting of the battery storage and substation next to Toppinchoehall Wood is a poor site selection. Significant fire hazards such as battery storage adjacent to woodland is a catastrophe just waiting to happen. This historic wood attracts hundreds of walkers each year and is well known as a beautiful local bluebell wood. To site the compound adjacent to this wood would be detrimental to the natural flora and fauna and ruin a local community amenity.</p>	<p><b>Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local community and natural flora and fauna in Toppingchoehall Wood would be very low.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>BESS</b>	<p>Overall, I am very concerned about the drastic effect on the environment near Terling, the impact on the amenity surrounding the village, the potential for long term increase in noise, particle and light pollution, but mainly the threat to safety posed by the BESS.</p>	<p>A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out our assessment of potential noise impacts in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. The assessment considers the location of operational plant. The design of the Scheme has incorporated measures such as distancing of inverters away from sensitive receptors, and locating the BESS compound in an area away from large concentrations of receptors as well as towards the A12 where existing ambient noise levels are higher (such that noise emissions from the BESS are less impactful).</p> <p>As set out in the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> included as</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>an appendix of the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>, inverters within 250m of residential dwellings will be treated with acoustic barriers which achieve a minimum 10dB(A) sound reduction, or an inverter selected with sound power levels at least 10dB lower than 96dB, which has been applied to inverters in the EIA.</p> <p>Landscape and visual mitigation has been described in Section 10.7 of the <b>ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and is shown on <b>Figure 10-12 Outline Landscape Masterplan [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b>. The proposed lighting has been designed to avoid and minimise the potential for adverse landscape and visual effects.</p> <p>An assessment of the proposed lighting, including any temporary lighting during construction, on ecology has been undertaken in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<p><b>BESS</b></p>	<p>The advantage of the location of the BESS compound by Toppinghoehall Wood is that it will be screened by existing trees. It does mean however that it will be necessary to link the BESS to the relatively exposed Bulls Lodge substation close to the A12, East/West Main line railway line &amp; existing community of Beaulieu Park consisting of 3,600 homes 3 schools by underground cables. Underground cabling is preferred</p>	<p>The corridor for the cable route has been finalised prior to the application submission. No new overhead lines will be constructed. The Grid Connection Route will comprise of one underground 400 kV cable circuit. For more information, please refer to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>.</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
BESS	<p>to yet more intrusive overhead lines.</p> <p>They are (in some people’s eyes) potential risk and therefore, need to be a suitable distance from dwelling and also discreetly screened where possible.</p>	<p>A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p> <p>Phase 2 of the BESS is intended to be undertaken five years after the Scheme becomes operational, to allow sufficient time for screening implanted to the south east of the BESS to mature and provide sufficient screening – this will provide a “bridge” between Toppinghoehall and Lost Woods until planting has had sufficient time to mature to a point that it provides sufficient screening. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>BESS</b>	I have concerns over the battery storage re the real threat of fume leaks and explosions to Boreham which is in close proximity to it.	<p>A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p>	
<b>BESS</b>	<p>Since the publication of the first brochure the location of battery storage units and other ancillary equipment that will be used on the proposed “solar farm” have been very vague with the exact location of this equipment. In a document sent to us from “No To Longfield Team” there is drawing showing a conductor / battery storage unit just meters from our garage and no more than 20 metre from our</p>	<p>Within the Order limits the selection of the location of the BESS has been based on a number of factors. The most pertinent factor being the selected site has tried to minimise the proximity to receptors of any nuisance with the distance to properties maximised where possible. This has the benefit of reducing the visual and noise impact but also minimises any potential impacts on the local population should an event occur. The location of the proposed BESS is around 500m from any properties. Further detail of the location of specific Scheme elements is included in <b>Chapter 2 The Scheme of the Environmental Statement [EN01011/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
BESS	<p>home, this alone is causing us both extreme anxiety and stress.</p> <p>There should be a full risk assessment included provided by an independent organisation as well as reduction in overall plant size.</p>	<p>The <b>Statement of Need [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> provides an analysis of the economic viability of large-scale solar generation as a future contributor to a low-carbon Great Britain electricity supply system in comparison to alternate technologies; and an analysis of why the Scheme will be most beneficial to the achievement of government’s aims if it is consented to the scale proposed. Solar power reduces the market price of electricity by displacing more expensive forms of generation from the cost stack. This delivers benefits for electricity consumers; Due to technological advances, power generated by solar plants is already at or below grid parity cost in Great Britain. Solar power is economically attractive in Great Britain against many other forms of conventional and renewable generation. Size remains important, and maximising the generating capacity of schemes improves their economic efficiency, so bringing power to market at the lowest cost possible. Larger solar schemes deliver more quickly and at a lower unit cost than multiple independent schemes which make up the same total capacity, bringing forward carbon reduction and economic benefits in line with government policy. The Scheme proposes a substantial infrastructure asset, which if consented will deliver large amounts of cheap, low-carbon electricity both during and beyond the critical 2020s timeframe. Maximising the capacity of generation in the resource-rich, accessible and technically deliverable proposed location, represents a</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>significant and economically rational step forwards in the fight against the global climate emergency.</p> <p>With regards risk, a plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p>	
<b>BESS</b>	<p>What safety assessments have been made for battery storage? Lithium-ion is in short supply and is needed in car battery production, why use it in this application? What alternative storage solutions have been considered that don't use rare earth materials?</p>	<p>The BESS included with the Scheme is important to maximising its benefits. There is a clear, direct relationship between the solar generation station and the electricity storage which means that there are substantial benefits to their colocation which will result in an improved contribution to low carbon UK electricity supplies when compared to either coming forward independent of the other. The colocation of those assets enables additional operational capabilities to be accessed</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>for system benefit, supporting the view of the Applicant that electricity storage is associated development as per the Guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects. Colocation is especially beneficial for NGESO where connections are to the transmission, rather than to the distribution network, because the combined asset is required to meet certain planning, notification and service obligations. Further information of the benefits of collocating the BESS with solar generation is set out in section 12.5 of the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b>. The Applicant considers that lithium-ion batteries are the only viable means of delivering a BESS collocated with the Scheme.</p> <p>With regards risk, plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no</p>	



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>BESS</b>	As there's never been a scheme on this scale you cannot predict the hazards of lithium-ion batteries. Unknown risks of fire and explosions. You lack a comprehensive risk assessment for fire and evacuation.	<p>worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p> <p>A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>BESS</b>	<p>I am still concerned about the safety of the battery storage location, as I am led to believe that the risks of explosions and fume leaks are real possibilities. Indeed, I understand from your last webinar that pollution plumes are being analysed generally in the direction of the prevailing SW</p>	<p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>wind. I am not sure if you understand the weather conditions here in Boreham, as often the wind varies in all quarters of the North and East, which puts Boreham in direct line of exposure.</p>	<p><b>Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>BESS</b>	<p>Industrial scale Lithium-ion battery storage systems are a relatively new application of this chemical technology. Despite well-known inherent risks associated with this technology, these systems are being utilised across the UK despite them being completely unregulated. The Health &amp; Safety Executive regard them as “articles” &amp; therefore they do fall within HSE’s legal remit &amp; therefore they do not fall within – are regulated or designated as COMAH sites (Control of Major Accident Hazards Regulations). This ultimately places responsibility upon local Fire &amp; Rescue Services to deal with aspects of safety &amp; incidents. Lacking oversight from the HSE &amp;</p>	<p>assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p> <p>A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>any safety regulations, the entire responsibility for major accident planning currently lies with local Fire and Rescue Services. Currently the Fire &amp; Rescue Services in Essex have not conducted &amp;/or published a detailed Risk Analysis for BESS battery Systems – &amp; will in all probability not have the training or resources necessary to deal with the management of a major “thermal run-a-way” incident.</p>	<p>approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p>	
<b>BESS</b>	<p>There has been little attempt to hide or mitigate the battery containers other than by screening. As they are set to be</p>	<p>The site selected for the Longfield Substation and BESS was chosen due to the natural screening provided by Toppinghoehall Wood and Lost Wood. The mature trees</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>located in a rural landscape, they should be housed in vernacular type Essex barns. The limited and as yet unproven risks associated with runaway fires and explosions linked to Lithium batteries needs to be very carefully considered and evidenced. Changes to sodium and other new technology batteries should be advanced to allay present fears. The Consultation document is particularly thin on this element of the proposal.</p>	<p>therein provide excellent visual screening to the north, south and east. Additional planting will be implemented to screen the BESS and Longfield substation to the south west and will be allowed to mature to a substantial height.</p> <p>Phase 2 of the BESS is intended to be undertaken five years after the Scheme becomes operational, to allow sufficient time for screening implanted to the south east of the BESS to mature and provide sufficient screening – this will provide a “bridge” between Toppinghoehall and Lost Woods until planting has had sufficient time to mature to a point that it provides sufficient screening. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>.</p>	
BESS	<p>Little detail has been given about the batteries, we don't feel there has been enough and would like to see more. We're very aware of the significant risk of fire and explosion from such battery units, with Lithium storage explosions or incidents becoming more commonplace and there is</p>	<p>A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>documented evidence of this. We are really very worried about this, we would like to see published evidence of appropriate risk assessments made by the fire inspectorate and the plan of action in the event of thermal runaway agreed and approved by Essex Fire &amp; Rescue. It's extremely close to residential housing and the resulting toxic gasses could travel for miles. How would such a large evacuation be undertaken? What are the emergency services expected to do? It feels like we're all crossing our fingers that it won't happen which isn't very safe in a worse case scenario.</p>	<p>minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the Design Principles submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>BESS</b>	<p>Recent press and technical publications comment on the explosions and consequent pollution or air and water courses following fires at such installations. A robust technical and locational justification for the battery storage element is required in detail by the applicant in the DCO submission for examination.</p>	<p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p>	N
		<p>A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p>	
		<p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service</p>	



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the Design Principles submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p>	
<b>BESS</b>	<p>Additionally the “hum” being generated 24/365 coming from these battery areas as they charge /discharge and are cooled by a confection and collection of air conditioning plants each with</p>	<p>The Applicant has set out our assessment of potential noise impacts in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. The assessment considers the location of operational plant. The design of the Scheme has incorporated measures such as distancing of inverters away from sensitive</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>their trigger boost switches needs to be explained and by reference to “db” ratings at the boundaries of the wider Longfield site to World Health Organisation mandates. The Planning Inspectorate should quantify such limits in any consideration of a DCO approval.</p>	<p>receptors, and locating the BESS compound in an area away from large concentrations of receptors as well as towards the A12 where existing ambient noise levels are higher (such that noise emissions from the BESS are less impactful).</p> <p>As set out in the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> included as an appendix of the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>, inverters within 250m of residential dwellings will be treated with acoustic barriers which achieve a minimum 10dB(A) sound reduction, or an inverter selected with sound power levels at least 10dB lower than 96dB, which has been applied to inverters in the EIA</p>	
<p><b>Climate change</b></p>	<p>Have you offset the carbon footprint of importing replacement food production against the site’s planned production?</p>	<p>The vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) to the Order limits. The Order limits comprises approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.</p> <p>All of the land within the area of search is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the Site).</li> <li>• Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the Site).</li> </ul>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Grade 4 but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test.</li><li>• Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</li></ul> <p>There are no alternative sites considered by the Applicant that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits (whilst also meeting other criteria of the Applicant) within a reasonable distance of Bulls Lodge Substation (for which the Applicant has obtained a grid connection agreement).</p> <p>The Draft NPS EN-3 [REF-9] states that although BMV land should be avoided where possible in the development of renewable energy infrastructure, land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of site location.</p> <p>Within this context, the Applicant has sought to minimise the amount of agricultural land used within the Scheme. This includes removing land from the draft Order limits to reduce the amount of high grade agricultural land within the boundary of the scheme and to avoid areas identified as having higher archaeological potential prior to the statutory consultation. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>There will be very little loss of farmland. An Agricultural Land Survey has been carried out as part of the DCO application which will form the basis of how the land will be left at the end of the Scheme. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is therefore expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. Where localised soil compaction occurs from the weight of mobile machinery used during decommissioning, the topsoil will be broken up through ploughing or similar methods by the contractor(s) or landowner/farmer to restore the soil drainage.</p> <p>Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has also assessed the Scheme’s impact on carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in <b>Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. This concludes that the residual effect for greenhouse gas emissions is that the Scheme will have a major positive benefit.</p>	
<b>Climate change</b>	<p>The net effect of the multiple impacts on the carbon economy are by no means clearly evident. The carbon footprint of production, transport, maintenance, periodic</p>	<p>The Scheme is a substantial infrastructure asset, capable of delivering large amounts of low-carbon electricity. The Scheme, along with other solar schemes, is of critical importance on the path to Net Zero. The Applicant has assessed the Scheme’s impact on carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in <b>Chapter 6 Climate Change</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Climate change</b>	<p>replacement and decommissioning of equipment is not stated and is probably unknown.</p> <p>There is a failure to take into account the carbon footprint of manufacturing thousands of these solar panels, mainly in China, mainly in contravention of any human rights. The landscape will disappear under a sea of glass of metal.</p>	<p><b>of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b> This concludes that the residual effect for greenhouse gas emissions is that the Scheme will have a major positive benefit.</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed the Scheme’s impact on carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in <b>Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b> This concludes that the residual effect for greenhouse gas emissions is that the Scheme will have a major positive benefit.</p>	N
<b>Construction</b>	<p>I am assuming that as part of your planning process you will set out key commitments that your approved contractors will adhere to, although your ‘well established principles’ are unclear as to the extent you are setting best practice across the industry. It is imperative that disruption to locals is kept to a minimum and the internal road structure is welcomed.</p>	<p>A robust construction management plan will be implemented, with due consideration to be given to the management of construction traffic both in terms of the impact of vehicle movements upon the highway network but also in terms of the potential for noise and air pollution impact. The Applicant has set out details of its approach to managing impacts from construction in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> and <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) included at Appendix 13B of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> included in the DCO application. Requirements to the DCO will secure the implementation of both management plans. Impacts from noise during construction are assessed in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> No significant residual adverse effects due to construction/decommissioning or operational phase noise</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Construction</b>	<p>There has to be a review of the working times indicated with the “Longfield Consultation Booklet” with regards to the extensive working week of 07.00am to 19.00pm Monday to Friday as this will without doubt have an enormous impact on the recreation time of local residents and also cyclists who frequently ride these lanes.</p>	<p>and vibration have been identified. Residual effects are listed in Table 1117 (Scheme construction and decommissioning) and Table 1118 (Scheme operation) in the Chapter. As also concluded in <b>Chapter 15: Health of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> there will be no significant health impacts due to the interaction of noise, land quality, transport, and landscape and visual amenity.</p> <p>HGVs associated with construction will only travel to/ from the Order limits between 09:00-17:00, to avoid the traditional network peak hours of 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00 and so no HGVs associated with the development will access the site before 09:00. All construction HGV traffic will have a designated route via Wheelers Hill / Cranham Road, avoiding the Waltham Road/ Main Road junction in Boreham, Boreham village itself, Hatfield Peverel village and the protected lanes (such as Boreham Rd) in the area. The designated route and access strategy has been specified by/ agreed with ECC highways</p> <p>No on-site residential accommodation is proposed within the Order limits and as previously mentioned measures to reduce the numbers of staff vehicle trips (local and non-local) arriving/ departing the site are proposed.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out details of its approach to managing impacts from construction in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> and <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Construction</b>	<p>It is totally unacceptable to residents and users of our quiet lanes to operate construction traffic with 7am starts on 6 days a week. This is outside normal time conditions for planning consents which are Monday to Friday 8-5 and Saturday 8-1. There should be no permitted charging of vehicle air systems or plant preparation and delivery of materials/plant outside of these times.</p> <p>We assume there will be no on-site residential accommodation or caravans other than 24/7 security cabins?</p>	<p>included at <b>Appendix 13B of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. Implementation and compliance with both management plans is proposed to be secured by a requirement to the DCO.</p> <p>HGVs associated with construction will only travel to/ from the Order limits between 09:00-17:00, to avoid the traditional network peak hours of 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00 and so no HGVs associated with the development will access the site before 09:00. All construction HGV traffic will have a designated route via Wheelers Hill / Cranham Road, avoiding the Waltham Road/ Main Road junction in Boreham, Boreham village itself, Hatfield Peverel village and the protected lanes (such as Boreham Rd) in the area. The designated route and access strategy has been specified by/ agreed with ECC highways</p> <p>No on-site residential accommodation is proposed within the Order limits and as previously mentioned measures to reduce the numbers of staff vehicle trips (local and non-local) arriving/ departing the site are proposed.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out details of its approach to managing impacts from construction in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> and <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) included at Appendix 13B of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. Implementation and compliance</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Construction</b>	<p>Access roads have been placed immediately to the north of our property and to the south. We live on Boreham Road and at this point it is a protected lane with signs stating it is unsuitable for HGVs. I am concerned about the increased traffic both HGV and cars. I believe this to be a serious issue. This is a road where there have been deaths in the past from road traffic accidents and this scheme will increase the risk. How will this risk be mitigated? The road is there. I am not aware of any law that can stop traffic using the road should they so wish. Will Longfield be widening the road, putting in a round about? The access road is on a dangerous bend. I cannot find any information as to the plans for making the road safe for the pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders that currently use it.</p>	<p>with both management plans is proposed to be secured by a requirement to the DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant is not expecting to use Boreham Road for access to the site. The site will have a single point of access with traffic being routed through the site to different areas during the phases of construction. The route from Essex Regiment Way via Wheeler's Hill and Cranham Road provides the most direct route from higher order roads and will minimise disruption in the nearby villages of Boreham and Hatfield Peverel. Where necessary, Cranham Rd and Wheeler's Hill will be widened to allow vehicles to pass safely. More information regarding access can be found in <b>Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement, Transport [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. A robust construction management plan will be implemented, with due consideration to be given to the management of construction traffic both in terms of the impact of vehicle movements upon the highway network but also in terms of the potential for noise and air pollution impact. The Applicant has set out details of its approach to managing impacts from construction in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> and <b>Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) included at Appendix 13B of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2] included in the DCO application</b>. This includes measures to physically segregate existing PROW from proposed construction routes, as well as having controlled crossing points (with gates and banksmen) to safely accommodate</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Construction</b>	<p>We would like to see the construction phase operating only during weekdays with more reasonable hours. To run six days a week with 7am starts is really invasive especially given it's not just vehicle noise but welfare compounds and ground works too.</p>	<p>pedestrians and cyclists. No PROW will be permanently closed or diverted as a result of the Scheme, and the minimum legal PROW widths will continue to be met or bettered in all instances.</p> <p>The <b>Outline Construction Environment Management Plan [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b> and <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> restrict the hours of construction work which may be potentially disruptive. This includes restricting the hours of HGV deliveries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoiding arrivals or departures on a weekday between 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00;</li> <li>• No arrivals or departures on a Saturday before 08:00 or after 13:00; and,</li> <li>• No arrivals or departures on Sundays or public holidays.</li> </ul>	N
<b>Construction</b>	<p>Concerned about the impact during construction on the availability of safe cycle routes. What temporary safe cycle routes are being offered? What are the plans for ensuring HGV drivers and traffic accessing the site be cycle-aware?</p>	<p>Two new permissive paths (for pedestrians and cyclists) are proposed during the operational phase of the Scheme and are shown by supporting drawings in Section 13.7 of the <b>Chapter 13 Transport of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Several meetings have been held with ECC Highways (including PROW officers) to review, revise, and agree the proposed strategy for managing PROW during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. This includes measures to physically segregate existing PROW from proposed construction routes, as well as having controlled crossing points (with gates and banksmen) to safely accommodate pedestrians and</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>cyclists. No PROW will be permanently closed or diverted as a result of the Scheme, and the minimum legal PROW widths will continue to be met or bettered in all instances. A separate PROW Management Plan has been prepared to illustrate the proposed strategy which supports the <b>(Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b>. See also <b>Figure 13-4 in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Construction</b>	<p>How will you ensure HGVs do not impact wildlife and biodiversity during the construction process?</p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed impacts from construction on Ecology in <b>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> based on management measures in the CEMP and CTMP. This does not identify any significant adverse effects. The Applicant's approach to biodiversity can also be found in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> and in the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>	N
<b>Construction</b>	<p>Inadequate compensatory measures have been proposed during the construction process.</p>	<p>The Applicant recognises the potential impact of construction on our neighbours and will put in place a plan designed to ensure potential impacts are managed and properly communicated. The Applicant has set out details of its approach to managing impacts from construction in the <b>Outline Construction Environment Management Plan [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b> and <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b>. These set out the principles, controls, and measures we will use to manage and mitigate potential environmental impacts during construction.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>Measures the Applicant will put in place during construction include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restricting HGV movements to the A130, Wheelers Hill and Cranham Road</li> <li>Restricting HGV movements during certain times of the day, such as between 8am-9am and 5pm-6pm Implementing a delivery management system for HGV deliveries from the start of the construction period</li> <li>Recording the journeys of all HGVs travelling to and from the site to ensure they use agreed routes Implementing temporary traffic management on Waltham Road during the period when the grid connection cables are installed</li> <li>Encouraging local construction staff to share cars, to reduce single occupancy car trips Implementing a shuttlebus service to transfer non-local staff to and from local worker accommodation</li> <li>Providing on-site car and cycle parking Off-site highway improvements at Cranham Road are likely to be needed, which could involve small scale road widening to accommodate construction traffic.</li> </ul>	
<b>Construction</b>	Page 32 indicates that temporary traffic management on Waltham Road will be implemented during certain periods. It seems reasonable that this information should have been made available	During the statutory consultation stage, information was available in the PEIR. These assessments were preparatory at that point, as the Scheme was consulted on at a point in time to allow feedback to be able to influence the ongoing EIA and design of the scheme. However, the Applicant has set out details of its approach	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>as part of this consultation process, given the potential disruptive impact on residents on Waltham Road. The degree of noise and disturbance has not been outlined in this proposal as the Consultation Document does not include any Traffic Impact Assessment or a Noise Impact Assessment reports. This is a failure to consult with relevant details and information in order that the public fully understands the implications of the Consultation proposals.</p>	<p>to managing impacts from construction in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> and <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) included at Appendix 13B of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. Measures the Applicant will put in place during construction include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Restricting HGV movements to the A130, Wheelers Hill and Cranham Road</li><li>• Restricting HGV movements during certain times of the day, such as between 8am-9am and 5pm-6pm Implementing a delivery management system for HGV deliveries from the start of the construction period</li><li>• Recording the journeys of all HGVs travelling to and from the site to ensure they use agreed routes Implementing temporary traffic management on Waltham Road during the period when the grid connection cables are installed</li><li>• Encouraging local construction staff to share cars, to reduce single occupancy car trips Implementing a shuttlebus service to transfer non-local staff to and from local worker accommodation</li><li>• Providing on-site car and cycle parking</li></ul> <p>Off-site highway improvements at Cranham Road are likely to be needed, which could involve small scale road widening to accommodate construction traffic.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Construction</b>	Please do your best to make sure lorries do not go down Leighs Road.	HGV movements will be restricted by a Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) to the A130, Wheelers Hill and Cranham Road. The Applicant has set out details of its approach to managing impacts from construction in the <b>OCEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b> and the <b>CTMP</b> included at <b>Appendix 13B of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>	N
<b>Construction</b>	How will you ensure that all site traffic (private cars and vans included) uses this route and does not pass through Hatfield Peverel. For any traffic coming from Colchester/Harwich/Felixstowe/the north of England, the obvious route is via this village and Waltham Road. You have stated that it is probable that the solar panels and related units will be imported, probably from Europe or the Far East, and thus Harwich is a very likely point of entry into the UK.	<p>An appropriate routing and access strategy has been identified which seeks to limit the usage of Protected Lanes and local roads through Boreham and Hatfield Peverel to the south. HGVs will be routed to / from the west via the A130, Wheelers Hill, and Cranham Road, with supporting highway improvements (carriageway widening) where necessary. There will be the potential to utilise the RDR following its completion prior to the construction phase. For further information, please see Sections 13.5 and 13.9 in <b>Chapter 13 - Transport of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1e]</b>.</p> <p>The <b>Framework CTMP (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> details the mitigation measures required to reduce the impacts of increased traffic flows including HGVs on the roads and severance and intimidation associated with increased traffic and abnormal loads. The final CTMP will be produced prior to construction based on the Outline CTMP. Measures to be implemented include:</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Implementation of a Travel Plan to reduce the volume of construction staff and employee trips to the Order limits;</li><li>• Construction vehicles will be required to use only approved access routes to the Order limits;</li><li>• Deliveries to the Order limits will be recorded. The source of the delivery, vehicle weight, registration number, date and time will be stored on the operator's system;</li><li>• HGV arrivals, including deliveries, will be managed as far as reasonably practicable such that they are spread evenly over the day. HGV deliveries will be scheduled to avoid peak hours as far as practical;</li><li>• The HGV routing plan would be distributed to all drivers during their induction;</li><li>• Signage will be used at the main junctions to ensure that all HGV traffic relating to the Scheme travel in the appropriate directions;</li><li>• Revising the vehicle routing strategy to make use of the Radial Distributor Road (RDR1) once complete to bypass parts of the A130 including White Hart Lane;</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Maintaining access to PROWs during the construction phase, or otherwise providing temporary diversion routes if required; and,</li><li>• Avoiding the usage of Protected Lanes, unless required for emergency access.</li></ul> <p>The Applicant will use internal management procedures to maximise compliance and its enforcement with the requirements of the Framework CTMP, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Contractor kick-off meetings: contractors will be reminded of the Applicant's standards and expectations as set out in contract documentation;</li><li>• Site induction: drivers will be briefed on the aims and objectives of the CTMP, including the booking system, designated routes and expected driver behaviour. A copy of the CTMP will be provided to each contractor to provide details of how the site will be managed as well as the rules and regulations; and,</li><li>• Reporting: incidences of non-compliance will be investigated within the CTMP. Reports from each incident will be raised and shared with the relevant contractor. The CTMP will be updated where necessary to resolve any ongoing issues.</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Construction</b>	<p>Please provide information to the community on what ground investigation rigs will be used, where they will be placed and whether regular monitoring will be required and for how long. It is not so much that the rigs are a problem, but it is an opportunity to engage with the public, share data on findings, introduce yourself and the Environmental statement to people and to high light the significance of this document. If working hours are 7-7 does this include or exclude the 30min set up time that is often given to construction projects to prepare. My preference would be that this 30 min window is incorporated within the 7-7 working hours.</p>	<p>Ground investigation will be completed prior to the main construction works. No monitoring will be required following these pre-construction works.</p> <p>The type of rigs used to carry out the ground investigation will depend on the likely ground conditions. Given the presence of gravel pits in the area it is likely that a shell and augur rig would be used.</p> <p>Sections 2.4 &amp; 2.5 of the <b>OCEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b> state that works outside the core hours will comply with noise limits 'agreed with the relevant planning authorities', so I don't think we can say that the 30 minute prep time would fall outside the working hours.</p>	N
<b>Construction</b>	<p>I am concerned about the level of traffic the construction phase is likely to generate. Whilst I welcome the proposal of having one access point on Waltham Road I query how practical this is in reality. Particularly if calculations were done on the hope that many workers would car share. This sounds unlikely,</p>	<p><b>Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> sets out that for the Solar Farm Site, local staff have been assumed to travel by car (95%, average car occupancy of 1.5 per vehicle which will be monitored and managed as part of the <b>Framework CTMP (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> or by other modes (5%) such as by bus or bicycle, which reflects the agreed mode share with ECC Highways;</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>especially if EDF is true to its wish of sourcing local contractors – many who will be independent tradespeople. Have you also made estimations into the take up of the shuttlebus service and how many are likely to cycle to work?</p>	<p>For the Solar Farm Site, all non-local staff will reside within local worker accommodation and will be transported to / from the Order limits by shuttle service (assumed average occupancy of 25 workers per service) which will be secured by the Framework CTMP;                      For Bulls Lodge Substation, all staff are expected to be sourced locally and there is expected to be a maximum of 26 construction worker vehicles per day. This allows for limited car sharing amongst the 33 construction workers equivalent to 1.2 occupants per vehicle i.e. given there will be fewer staff and therefore fewer opportunities to car share than for the Solar Farm Site. The shuttle service will not be used to transfer workers to/ from Bulls Lodge Substation as construction workers will be expected to travel directly to/ from the substation rather than via the Solar Farm Site.</p>	
<b>Construction</b>	<p>We also note that the proposed working times of the project, which will include the laying of cables and other infrastructure works, will be 07.00am to 19.00pm Monday to Friday. Do you not think the residents of Terling and the surrounding neighbourhood have enough stress and misery dealing with this proposed project blighting their lives that you now want to diminish their quality time at evenings and weekends?                      Alongside this extensive working</p>	<p>The <b>Outline Construction Environment Management Plan [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b> and <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)</b> prepared as <b>Appendix 13B of Chapter 13 – Transport - of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> restrict the hours of construction work which may be potentially disruptive. This includes restricting the hours of HGV deliveries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoiding arrivals or departures on a weekday between 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00;</li> <li>• No arrivals or departures on a Saturday before 08:00 or after 13:00; and,</li> </ul>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	week you will be adding more upset by the substantial increase in local traffic within the roads & lanes of the area being used by the Longfield employees during these times.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No arrivals or departures on Sundays or public holidays.</li></ul> <p>The <b>Framework CTMP (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> details the mitigation measures required to reduce the impacts of increased traffic flows including HGVs on the roads and severance and intimidation associated with increased traffic and abnormal loads. The final CTMP will be produced prior to construction based on the Framework CTMP. Measures to be implemented include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Implementation of a Travel Plan to reduce the volume of construction staff and employee trips to the Order limits;</li><li>• Construction vehicles will be required to use only approved access routes to the Order limits;</li><li>• Deliveries to the Order limits will be recorded. The source of the delivery, vehicle weight, registration number, date and time will be stored on the operator's system;</li><li>• HGV arrivals, including deliveries, will be managed as far as reasonably practicable such that they are spread evenly over the day. HGV deliveries will be scheduled to avoid peak hours as far as practical;</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The HGV routing plan would be distributed to all drivers during their induction;</li> <li>• Signage will be used at the main junctions to ensure that all HGV traffic relating to the Scheme travel in the appropriate directions;</li> <li>• Revising the vehicle routing strategy to make use of the Radial Distributor Road (RDR1) once complete to bypass parts of the A130 including White Hart Lane;</li> <li>• Maintaining access to PROWs during the construction phase, or otherwise providing temporary diversion routes if required; and,</li> <li>• Avoiding the usage of Protected Lanes, unless required for emergency access.</li> </ul>	
<b>Construction</b>	<p>Your construction period is likely to coincide with that of the A12 widening project which will, itself, cause enough major disruption to traffic flows in the area. Cranham Road is already totally unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles, as outlined in my original submission to you in December 2020. You have indicated that you will undertake some element of improvements to the road,</p>	<p>The Applicant has held pre-application and scoping discussions with the local authority, ECC Highways and National Highways to discuss the routing and transport strategy for the Scheme. Cumulative impacts between the construction phase of the Scheme and other committed developments / highway improvements including the A12 widening scheme have been considered as part of the <b>Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. The ES and TA include details of the mitigation that will be implemented to reduce the traffic impacts of the Scheme during the construction</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>including the construction of "passing places". However, this is a totally unrealistic solution to the problem of heavy goods vehicles trying to pass each other on what is, essentially, a narrow, winding country road. If Cranham Road HAS to be used, it HAS to have total widening - anything less will place the lives at risk of those using this "rat run" on a regular basis.</p>	<p>phase. It is acknowledged that the construction A12 widening team sees no objection to the plans presented by the Applicant. The <b>Construction Traffic Management Plan (Appendix 11B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> also includes details of how the projects will liaise on an ongoing basis during the construction phase. In accordance with the NPPF [REF-4], Chapter 13 also demonstrates that the Scheme would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety and that the residual cumulative impacts of the development on the road network would not be severe.</p> <p>It is anticipated that any cumulative effects arising from other developments would be focussed around the Strategic Road Network, including the A12(T), Boreham Interchange and the A130. Given the proposed construction phase of the Scheme is expected to result in limited increases in traffic on these parts of the network (see Table 13-8 in Chapter 13, as above), it is expected that there would be no additional cumulative effects on these parts of the highway network additional to those already identified for the Scheme in isolation.</p> <p>The <b>Framework CTMP (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> also includes details of how the projects will liaise on an ongoing basis during the construction phase.</p> <p>Carriageway widening improvements will be implemented on Cranham Road (as discussed and agreed with ECC)</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>to support the increase in HGV movements where necessary. It is possible that the majority of these highway improvements would not need to be implemented by the Applicant in the instance that these are undertaken by the developer of Land North of Cranham Road - see <b>Appendix 13A: Transport Assessment of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, as well as Section 13.11.</p> <p>The <b>Framework CTMP (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> details the mitigation measures required to reduce the impacts of increased traffic flows including HGVs on the roads and severance and intimidation associated with increased traffic and abnormal loads. The final CTMP will be produced prior to construction based on the Framework CTMP. Measures to be implemented include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Implementation of a Travel Plan to reduce the volume of construction staff and employee trips to the Order limits;</li><li>• Construction vehicles will be required to use only approved access routes to the Order limits;</li><li>• Deliveries to the Order limits will be recorded. The source of the delivery, vehicle weight, registration number, date and time will be stored on the operator's system;</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HGV arrivals, including deliveries, will be managed as far as reasonably practicable such that they are spread evenly over the day. HGV deliveries will be scheduled to avoid peak hours as far as practical;</li> <li>• The HGV routing plan would be distributed to all drivers during their induction;</li> <li>• Signage will be used at the main junctions to ensure that all HGV traffic relating to the Scheme travel in the appropriate directions;</li> <li>• Revising the vehicle routing strategy to make use of the Radial Distributor Road (RDR1) once complete to bypass parts of the A130 including White Hart Lane;</li> <li>• Maintaining access to PROWs during the construction phase, or otherwise providing temporary diversion routes if required; and,</li> <li>• Avoiding the usage of Protected Lanes, unless required for emergency access.</li> </ul>	
<b>Construction</b>	<p>Your decision not to use the Main Road to access the site is a welcome acknowledgement that it is not an acceptable nor practicable route for site related traffic. However, unless you can</p>	<p>The <b>Framework CTMP (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> details the mitigation measures required to reduce the impacts of increased traffic flows including HGVs on the roads and severance and intimidation associated with increased traffic and abnormal loads. The final CTMP will be</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	clearly demonstrate how “HGV access to the site” would be removed and enforced in practice, Main Road remains a major objection.	<p>produced prior to construction based on the Framework CTMP. Measures to be implemented include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Implementation of a Travel Plan to reduce the volume of construction staff and employee trips to the Order limits;</li><li>• Construction vehicles will be required to use only approved access routes to the Order limits;</li><li>• Deliveries to the Order limits will be recorded. The source of the delivery, vehicle weight, registration number, date and time will be stored on the operator’s system;</li><li>• HGV arrivals, including deliveries, will be managed as far as reasonably practicable such that they are spread evenly over the day. HGV deliveries will be scheduled to avoid peak hours as far as practical;</li><li>• The HGV routing plan would be distributed to all drivers during their induction;</li><li>• Signage will be used at the main junctions to ensure that all HGV traffic relating to the Scheme travel in the appropriate directions;</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revising the vehicle routing strategy to make use of the Radial Distributor Road (RDR1) once complete to bypass parts of the A130 including White Hart Lane;</li> <li>Maintaining access to PROWs during the construction phase, or otherwise providing temporary diversion routes if required; and,</li> <li>Avoiding the usage of Protected Lanes, unless required for emergency access.</li> </ul>	
<b>Construction</b>	<p>Site entrance - this could not be in a worse position. This junction is already "blind" to anyone exiting Cranham Road. Traffic approaches along Boreham Road and Waltham Road at speed and (based on 40 years experience of the junction) it is almost impossible to exit the junction safely in a car.</p>	<p>The Solar Farm Site will be served by a single point of access on Waltham Road. A speed survey has been carried out in the vicinity of the proposed access point in accordance with CA185 in order to establish the appropriate junction visibility and forward Sight Stopping Distance (SSD).</p> <p>The <b>Transport Assessment (Appendix 13A in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement)</b> [EN010118/APP/6.2] includes a highway impact assessment (including junction modelling) to demonstrate that the proposed site access for the Site on Waltham Road will be suitable for accommodating traffic during the construction phase. A secondary point of access is not required (or desired) for the Solar Farm Site, and the proposed routing and access strategy has been agreed with ECC Highways and National Highways. It should be noted that two separate points of access will be used to</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		access the Bulls Lodge Substation during the construction phase.	
		Several strategic routes can be used to travel to / from the Order limits including the A12 (north and south) and the A120 / A131. Carriageway widening improvements will be implemented on the local highway network where necessary to accommodate larger vehicles / HGVs during the construction phase.	
<b>Construction</b>	Your plan states that Regiment Way and Wheelers Hill are to be used, but this ignores that Regiment Way is already too busy and that Wheelers Hill is split into East and West, which is highly likely to result in HGV traffic trying to access Wheelers Hill WEST, which is a narrow residential cul de sac with nowhere for this type of large vehicles to manouvre or turn. It must be made clear that the roads / route for the HGV movements will be limited to Regiment Way and WHEELERS HILL EAST ONLY. A better plan would be for the HGVs to use Boreham Road, from the Boreham end, which is wider and more able to cope with this kind of traffic.	As part of the consultation process, a number of principles have been agreed with Essex County Council Highways including the proposed site access location for the Solar Farm Site, visibility splays, crossing points on Noakes Lane and the approach for surveys and supporting assessment work. In addition, it has been agreed that the routing of HGVs should take place to / from the west via the RDR, A130 Essex Regiment Way, Wheelers Hill, Cranham Road and Waltham Road in order to prevent these larger vehicles from passing through the villages of Hatfield Peverel and Boreham, e.g. along the B1137 Main Road. Further details, including drawings showing the locations of access points, visibility splays and swept paths are held within <b>Appendix 13A: Transport Assessment of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> .	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Construction</b>	No capital equipment for this proposal is manufactured by British Industry. I refuse to help China and Indian by agreeing to this proposal.	It is proposed that the Skills and Employment Plan will be secured by way of a DCO requirement. Heads of Terms for that agreement are provided as part of the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b> . The objectives of this include where economically and practically feasible, procuring goods and services from local contractors, sub-contractors and suppliers to support the employment of the local community. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N
<b>Consultation</b>	Countryside Zest (CZ) supports the principle of the Proposed Development which includes a solar farm co-located with battery storage, together with an extension to Bulls Lodge Substation and underground grid connection routes. As a relevant local landowner and developer, we request that DWD is added to you key local stakeholder list on behalf of CZ for all ongoing and future consultation exercises. This will ensure that CZ can continue to deliver Beaulieu and the wider CGC, whilst also ensuring the delivery of the propose solar farm can take place with minimal disruption and mutual benefit of both CZ and The Applicant, as	This has been noted and we thank Countryside Zest for responding to the consultation. The Applicant has ensured CZ was invited to participate in all consultation exercises and will continue to keep CZ updated on the Scheme's progress. A meeting was also held with CZ on 27 September 2021, with members of the Applicant's team in attendance, to discuss potential synergies between both parties. A representative from Gateley Hamer (the Applicant's land agents) was also present.	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>well as the wider Community. We request a meeting is set up to discuss the potential synergies between both parties which will inform the ongoing Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) work being undertaken.</p> <p>In particular we consider that the following EIA topics would benefit from joint working:</p> <p>Chapter 9 (Flood Risk, Drainage and Surface Water)                      Chapter 10 (Landscape and Visual Amenity)                      Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration)                      Chapter 12 (Socio-Economics and Land Use)                      Chapter 13 (Transport)                      Chapter 14 (Other Issues)                      Chapter 15 (Effects Interactions)</p>		
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>The Parish Council has disseminated the dates of the visits by Longfield staff, but the opportunities have been very limited and last-minute arrangements, for example the webinars were only a couple of days after the receipt of the booklet and the village hall dates</p>	<p>The Applicant's approach to community consultation was developed with stakeholders including officers and members at the local authorities. The Applicant used a range of techniques to consult the community. These were designed to allow people with different needs across the community to take part in the consultation in a way that was convenient to them, while complying with Government guidance on COVID 19.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	were added later. This has been made worse by the Covid restrictions not permitting any real form of public meeting to discuss the various concerns such a change will bring to an area of natural beauty and tranquillity.	<p>The Applicant publicised the consultation within consultation zone 1 by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Writing to all addresses within the at the start of the consultation period;</li><li>• Writing to elected representatives, parish councils, and community groups within the zone with details of the consultation at the start of the consultation period;</li><li>• Advertising the consultation in the following newspapers circulating in consultation zone: the Braintree and Witham Times, Chelmsford and Mid Essex Times, Essex Chronicle;</li><li>• Sending local broadcasters a press release for the scheme;</li><li>• Publishing details of the consultation online at the consultation website; and,</li><li>• Advertising the consultation on social media through posts on the Braintree and Witham Times online website, the Chelmsford and Mid Essex Times online website, and the Essex Chronicle online website.</li></ul> <p>To consult with residents, the Applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Sent a copy of a consultation booklet providing a non-technical overview of the proposed Longfield Solar Farm, the EIA process, the consultation and planning process, how to take part in the consultation, and proposed next steps to all addresses in consultation zone 1, alongside a consultation questionnaire and</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>pre-addressed Freepost envelope. This ensured that people living in the consultation zone had direct access to the core consultation information and could respond to the consultation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Hosted a virtual public exhibition;</li><li>• Hosted a series of webinars offering an opportunity to ask questions about the Scheme;</li><li>• Invited residents of consultation zone 1 to book an individual appointment to discuss the proposals by telephone, providing an opportunity for those without access to the internet to ask questions. Details of how to book an appointment were included in the consultation booklet and consultation advertising;</li><li>• Provided copies of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report for review, as well as copies of the consultation booklet and questionnaire, at deposit points in the local area (as permitted by Government guidance);</li><li>• Briefed elected members from Braintree District Council on 18 June 2021, elected members from Essex County Council on 23 June and elected members from Chelmsford City Council on 11 June 2021;</li><li>• Briefed representatives from the parishes of Boreham, Fairstead, Great and Little Leighs, Hatfield Peverel, Little Waltham and Terling prior to the consultation commencing, and offered a follow-up briefing during the stat consultation period;</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contacted community and voluntary organisations within consultation zone 1 to offer direct engagement and share detailed of the consultation;</li> <li>• Published all consultation materials online at the consultation website; and,</li> <li>• Invited enquiries and responses online, by Freephone or email.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant also held in-person meetings as part of the statutory consultation. These took place at venues in the area of the Scheme on 8 June 2021, 9 June 2021, 12 June 2021, 15 June 2021, 17 June 2021, 29 June 2021 and 30 June 2021.</p> <p>Further information on how the Applicant publicised the consultation, and how we consulted, can be found in <b>Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>It is the general consensus from the “Local Community” is that the consultation process has been very poor and ineffective with very little actual specifics being given by the development team at Longfield. Below are some of the concerns raised by residents:                      Information released by “Longfield” has been poor at best,</p>	<p>The Applicant’s approach to community consultation was developed with stakeholders including officers and members at the local authorities. The Applicant used a range of techniques to consult the community. These were designed to allow people with different needs across the community to take part in the consultation in a way that was convenient to them, while complying with Government guidance on COVID 19.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	documentation has changed with each new information pack released making it impossible to uncover the truth about what is being proposed; There has been very little answer to the question raised during webinars and exhibitions that have been held.	<p>The Applicant publicised the consultation within consultation zone 1 by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Writing to all addresses within the at the start of the consultation period;</li><li>• Writing to elected representatives, parish councils, and community groups within the zone with details of the consultation at the start of the consultation period;</li><li>• Advertising the consultation in the following newspapers circulating in consultation zone: the Braintree and Witham Times, Chelmsford and Mid Essex Times, Essex Chronicle;</li><li>• Sending local broadcasters a press release for the scheme;</li><li>• Publishing details of the consultation online at the consultation website; and,</li><li>• Advertising the consultation on social media through posts on the Braintree and Witham Times online website, the Chelmsford and Mid Essex Times online website, and the Essex Chronicle online website.</li></ul> <p>To consult with residents, the Applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Sent a copy of a consultation booklet providing a non-technical overview of the proposed Longfield Solar Farm, the EIA process, the consultation and planning process, how to take part in the consultation, and proposed next steps to all addresses in consultation zone 1, alongside a consultation questionnaire and</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>pre-addressed Freepost envelope. This ensured that people living in the consultation zone had direct access to the core consultation information and could respond to the consultation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Hosted a virtual public exhibition;</li><li>• Hosted a series of webinars offering an opportunity to ask questions about the Scheme;</li><li>• Invited residents of consultation zone 1 to book an individual appointment to discuss the proposals by telephone, providing an opportunity for those without access to the internet to ask questions. Details of how to book an appointment were included in the consultation booklet and consultation advertising;</li><li>• Provided copies of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report for review, as well as copies of the consultation booklet and questionnaire, at deposit points in the local area (as permitted by Government guidance);</li><li>• Briefed elected members from Braintree District Council on 18 June 2021, elected members from Essex County Council on 23 June and elected members from Chelmsford City Council on 11 June 2021;</li><li>• Briefed representatives from the parishes of Boreham, Fairstead, Great and Little Leighs, Hatfield Peverel, Little Waltham and Terling prior to the consultation commencing, and offered a follow-up briefing during the stat consultation period;</li></ul>	



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contacted community and voluntary organisations within consultation zone 1 to offer direct engagement and share detailed of the consultation;</li> <li>• Published all consultation materials online at the consultation website; and,</li> <li>• Invited enquiries and responses online, by Freephone or email.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant also held in-person meetings as part of the statutory consultation. These took place at venues in the area of the Scheme on 8 June 2021, 9 June 2021, 12 June 2021, 15 June 2021, 17 June 2021, 29 June 2021 and 30 June 2021.</p> <p>Further information on how the Applicant publicised the consultation, and how we consulted, can be found in <b>Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>Additionally, I am concerned that the methods employed to meet with residents with regard poor communication of meeting dates, repetition of scant information already given in the documentation posted to each house and apparent misinformation.</p>	<p>The Applicant’s approach to community consultation was developed with stakeholders including officers and members at the local authorities. The Applicant used a range of techniques to consult the community. These were designed to allow people with different needs across the community to take part in the consultation in a way that was convenient to them, while complying with Government guidance on COVID 19.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>The Applicant publicised the consultation within consultation zone 1 by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Writing to all addresses within the at the start of the consultation period;</li><li>• Writing to elected representatives, parish councils, and community groups within the zone with details of the consultation at the start of the consultation period;</li><li>• Advertising the consultation in the following newspapers circulating in consultation zone: the Braintree and Witham Times, Chelmsford and Mid Essex Times, Essex Chronicle;</li><li>• Sending local broadcasters a press release for the scheme;</li><li>• Publishing details of the consultation online at the consultation website; and,</li><li>• Advertising the consultation on social media through posts on the Braintree and Witham Times online website, the Chelmsford and Mid Essex Times online website, and the Essex Chronicle online website.</li></ul> <p>To consult with residents, the Applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Sent a copy of a consultation booklet providing a non-technical overview of the proposed Longfield Solar Farm, the EIA process, the consultation and planning process, how to take part in the consultation, and proposed next steps to all addresses in consultation zone 1, alongside a consultation questionnaire and</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>pre-addressed Freepost envelope. This ensured that people living in the consultation zone had direct access to the core consultation information and could respond to the consultation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Hosted a virtual public exhibition;</li><li>• Hosted a series of webinars offering an opportunity to ask questions about the Scheme;</li><li>• Invited residents of consultation zone 1 to book an individual appointment to discuss the proposals by telephone, providing an opportunity for those without access to the internet to ask questions. Details of how to book an appointment were included in the consultation booklet and consultation advertising;</li><li>• Provided copies of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report for review, as well as copies of the consultation booklet and questionnaire, at deposit points in the local area (as permitted by Government guidance);</li><li>• Briefed elected members from Braintree District Council on 18 June 2021, elected members from Essex County Council on 23 June and elected members from Chelmsford City Council on 11 June 2021;</li><li>• Briefed representatives from the parishes of Boreham, Fairstead, Great and Little Leighs, Hatfield Peverel, Little Waltham and Terling prior to the consultation commencing, and offered a follow-up briefing during the stat consultation period;</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contacted community and voluntary organisations within consultation zone 1 to offer direct engagement and share detailed of the consultation;</li> <li>• Published all consultation materials online at the consultation website; and,</li> <li>• Invited enquiries and responses online, by Freephone or email.</li> </ul>	
		<p>The Applicant also held in-person meetings as part of the statutory consultation. These took place at venues in the area of the Scheme on 8 June 2021, 9 June 2021, 12 June 2021, 15 June 2021, 17 June 2021, 29 June 2021 and 30 June 2021.</p>	
		<p>Further information on how the Applicant publicised the consultation, and how we consulted, can be found in <b>Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>The information also provided at Witham and Hatfield Peverel libraries is extensive and I understand was created by a large number of people working in isolation such that there is significant potential for errors. For example, and these examples are by no means the only causes for concern found (or probable but not seen yet by this reader);</p>	<p>At the statutory consultation stage, the Applicant shared and sought feedback on the preliminary results of our assessments. We did this in a document called a PEIR. Residents were also able to find out more information about the scheme by: viewing consultation materials and questionnaires they received in the post; reading information about the consultation in the local media; attending a virtual webinar; visiting our virtual public exhibition online or download the PEIR on our website; calling our freephone enquiry line; emailing the Project Team directly. The Applicant also held public consultation</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>The mapping across the seven areas of the development has legends without apparent content in the maps, legends without colour or map reference and clearly missing data.</p> <p>“Existing trees” defined in the map legends are shown as very few, despite this whole area being covered in a wide diversity of tree species and an unusually high number of mature and ancient oaks.</p> <p>Definitions of the site boundaries include highways and private lands and buildings not owned by the Rayleigh estate.</p> <p>“Existing hedgerows” have mapped areas showing only a tiny part of those which exist across the affected area.</p> <p>Why was this information not also available at the village hall presentations and within the villages affected? With only one bus a week from the village this meant residents without car or online facilities had no access to documentation.</p>	<p>events in Village Halls across June 2021, on a voluntary basis, after the COVID 19 threat level was lowered to allow a maximum of 6 persons to meet indoors, and 30 outdoors. At these events, attendees could pick up a copy of the consultation leaflet as well as a USB, with consultation materials such as the PEIR already pre-downloaded onto it. More information regarding how we consulted the local community can be found in the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>The only plans that have been widely shared are very simplistic and we do not believe the actual, detailed plans have been circulated among the community effectively. The community has had very little time to go through thousands of pages only recently made available, little effort has been given to guide residents through this quantity of information, even the detailed plan only buried in a page of a large document in the many downloads.</p>	<p>At the statutory consultation stage, the Applicant shared and sought feedback on the preliminary results of our assessments. The Applicant did this in a document called a Preliminary Environmental Information Report ("PEIR"). Residents were also able to find out more information about the scheme by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• viewing consultation materials and questionnaires they received in the post;</li> <li>• reading information about the consultation in the local media;</li> <li>• attending a virtual webinar;</li> <li>• visiting our virtual public exhibition online or download the PEIR on our website;</li> <li>• calling our freephone enquiry line;</li> <li>• emailing the Project Team directly.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant also held public consultation events in Village Halls across June 2021, on a voluntary basis, after the COVID 19 threat level was lowered to allow a maximum of 6 persons to meet indoors, and 30 outdoors. At these events, attendees could pick up a copy of the consultation leaflet as well as a USB, with consultation materials such as the PEIR already pre-downloaded onto it. More information regarding how we consulted the local community can be found in <b>the Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Consultation</b>	We would like to see improved communication to the residents of what is actually being drafted, not an artist's impression but scale plans including distances from boundaries, fencing, CCTV and lighting. We should also be seeing more detail regarding the 'small scale road widening' - where and how, given most roads are bordered with hedging?	The information presented during the statutory consultation was appropriate to the PEIR stage. The Applicant has presented updated information through the DCO application.	N
<b>Consultation</b>	Overall, I feel the application for the Solar Farm has been unduly rushed, particularly during this time when residents have been unable to consult many of the documents because of Covid Regulations on travel and availability of facilities. Where statutory consultees have given long and carefully consideration of the site it appears little or no detailed responses have been included within the consultation booklet, which is very vague on most intentions and includes no measurable targets despite several months between response to the Scoping and the publication	<p>The Applicant's approach to community consultation was developed with stakeholders including officers and members at the local authorities. The Applicant used a range of techniques to consult the community. These were designed to allow people with different needs across the community to take part in the consultation in a way that was convenient to them, while complying with Government guidance on COVID 19.</p> <p>The Applicant publicised the consultation within consultation zone 1 by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writing to all addresses within the at the start of the consultation period;</li> <li>• Writing to elected representatives, parish councils, and community groups within the zone with details of the consultation at the start of the consultation period;</li> </ul>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	of the Consultation booklet. Insufficient clarity has been made of the potential use of the site for electricity trading, which appears to be the principal purpose of the site, or of the risks and management of the batteries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Advertising the consultation in the following newspapers circulating in consultation zone: the Braintree and Witham Times, Chelmsford and Mid Essex Times, Essex Chronicle;</li><li>• Sending local broadcasters a press release for the scheme;</li><li>• Publishing details of the consultation online at the consultation website; and,</li><li>• Advertising the consultation on social media through posts on the Braintree and Witham Times online website, the Chelmsford and Mid Essex Times online website, and the Essex Chronicle online website.</li></ul> <p>To consult with residents, the Applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Sent a copy of a consultation booklet providing a non-technical overview of the proposed Longfield Solar Farm, the EIA process, the consultation and planning process, how to take part in the consultation, and proposed next steps to all addresses in consultation zone 1, alongside a consultation questionnaire and pre-addressed Freepost envelope. This ensured that people living in the consultation zone had direct access to the core consultation information and could respond to the consultation;</li><li>• Hosted a virtual public exhibition;</li><li>• Hosted a series of webinars offering an opportunity to ask questions about the Scheme;</li></ul>	



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Invited residents of consultation zone 1 to book an individual appointment to discuss the proposals by telephone, providing an opportunity for those without access to the internet to ask questions. Details of how to book an appointment were included in the consultation booklet and consultation advertising;</li><li>• Provided copies of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report for review, as well as copies of the consultation booklet and questionnaire, at deposit points in the local area (as permitted by Government guidance);</li><li>• Briefed elected members from Braintree District Council on 18 June 2021, elected members from Essex County Council on 23 June and elected members from Chelmsford City Council on 11 June 2021;</li><li>• Briefed representatives from the parishes of Boreham, Fairstead, Great and Little Leighs, Hatfield Peverel, Little Waltham and Terling prior to the consultation commencing, and offered a follow-up briefing during the stat consultation period;</li><li>• Contacted community and voluntary organisations within consultation zone 1 to offer direct engagement and share detailed of the consultation;</li><li>• Published all consultation materials online at the consultation website; and,</li><li>• Invited enquiries and responses online, by Freephone or email.</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>The Applicant also held in-person meetings as part of the statutory consultation. These took place at venues in the area of the Scheme on 8 June 2021, 9 June 2021, 12 June 2021, 15 June 2021, 17 June 2021, 29 June 2021 and 30 June 2021.</p> <p>Further information on how the Applicant publicised the consultation, and how we consulted, can be found in <b>Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>Some local individuals may benefit from the development of the Longfield Solar Farm but the overall feeling is likely be very negative from the community. There has been no meaningful discussions with local residents to negotiate the reduction in the number of solar panels proposed, especially properties that will be swamped by this development</p>	<p>The Applicant’s approach to community consultation was developed with stakeholders including officers and members at the local authorities. The Applicant used a range of techniques to consult the community. These were designed to allow people with different needs across the community to take part in the consultation in a way that was convenient to them, while complying with Government guidance on COVID 19.</p> <p>The Applicant publicised the consultation within consultation zone 1 by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writing to all addresses within the at the start of the consultation period;</li> <li>• Writing to elected representatives, parish councils, and community groups within the zone with details of the consultation at the start of the consultation period;</li> <li>• Advertising the consultation in the following newspapers circulating in consultation zone: the</li> </ul>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>Braintree and Witham Times, Chelmsford and Mid Essex Times, Essex Chronicle;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Sending local broadcasters a press release for the scheme;</li><li>• Publishing details of the consultation online at the consultation website; and,</li><li>• Advertising the consultation on social media through posts on the Braintree and Witham Times online website, the Chelmsford and Mid Essex Times online website, and the Essex Chronicle online website.</li></ul> <p>To consult with residents, the Applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Sent a copy of a consultation booklet providing a non-technical overview of the proposed Longfield Solar Farm, the EIA process, the consultation and planning process, how to take part in the consultation, and proposed next steps to all addresses in consultation zone 1, alongside a consultation questionnaire and pre-addressed Freepost envelope. This ensured that people living in the consultation zone had direct access to the core consultation information and could respond to the consultation;</li><li>• Hosted a virtual public exhibition;</li><li>• Hosted a series of webinars offering an opportunity to ask questions about the Scheme;</li><li>• Invited residents of consultation zone 1 to book an individual appointment to discuss the proposals by telephone, providing an opportunity for those without</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>access to the internet to ask questions. Details of how to book an appointment were included in the consultation booklet and consultation advertising;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Provided copies of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report for review, as well as copies of the consultation booklet and questionnaire, at deposit points in the local area (as permitted by Government guidance);</li><li>• Briefed elected members from Braintree District Council on 18 June 2021, elected members from Essex County Council on 23 June and elected members from Chelmsford City Council on 11 June 2021;</li><li>• Briefed representatives from the parishes of Boreham, Fairstead, Great and Little Leighs, Hatfield Peverel, Little Waltham and Terling prior to the consultation commencing, and offered a follow-up briefing during the stat consultation period;</li><li>• Contacted community and voluntary organisations within consultation zone 1 to offer direct engagement and share detailed of the consultation;</li><li>• Published all consultation materials online at the consultation website; and,</li><li>• Invited enquiries and responses online, by Freephone or email.</li></ul> <p>The Applicant offered meetings to people living close to the Order limits prior to the commencement of non-</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>statutory consultation. Further detail is set out in <b>Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant also held in-person meetings as part of the statutory consultation. These took place at venues in the area of the Scheme on 8 June 2021, 9 June 2021, 12 June 2021, 15 June 2021, 17 June 2021, 29 June 2021 and 30 June 2021.</p> <p>Further information on how the Applicant publicised the consultation, and how we consulted, can be found in <b>Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>My property is on the boundary of this proposal and I have had no direct contact from anyone other than the glossy brochure or round robin letter. My job did not allow me time to visit an exhibition. It is likely that the proposed development will massively impact on my property both environmentally and financially. I have had no offer of a personal consultation to discuss any mitigation that may help with this impact. I would like a representative to contact me who can visit my property and discuss</p>	<p>The Applicant consulted in line with the Statement of Community Consultation (<b>Appendix D-1 of the Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.5]</b>) which involved writing to all addresses within consultation zone 1 - any person or group likely to be directly impacted by the Scheme by virtue of their living or working in proximity to the site.</p> <p>This zone is defined by the boundaries of the parishes of Boreham, Fairstead, Great and Little Leighs, Hatfield Peverel, Little Waltham and Terling. The Applicant sent a copy of a consultation booklet providing a non-technical overview of the Scheme, the EIA process, the consultation and planning process, how to take part in the consultation, and proposed next steps to all addresses in consultation zone 1, alongside a consultation questionnaire and pre-addressed Freepost envelope. This ensured that people living in the consultation zone</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	the proposals that directly affect my property. Thank you.	had direct access to the core consultation information and could respond to the consultation. This is shown in the Consultation Report <b>[EN010118/APP/5.1]</b> .  As part of the consultation, the Applicant also met with a number of properties in the vicinity of the Order limits. Having reviewed the address provided by the respondent, the Applicant did not deem a site visit necessary as the property is not in the core consultation zone. Furthermore, the Applicant provided a number of alternative means, not solely the public exhibition, to participate in the consultation. A virtual public exhibition was available on the consultation website and members of the public could also register for a webinar, which included the opportunity to ask questions. Residents were also invited to book an individual appointment to discuss the proposals by telephone, or send in any enquiries by freephone, freepost or email.	
<b>Consultation</b>	I am concerned about the sums of money that it will require in order to put it in place. It points to huge profits as an outcome. I am concerned that Longfield will do what they like whatever we say, having proposed more than they planned so that they could cut back and make improvements as a result of the first consultation. (The extra work and less panels must have affected profits but that	The Applicant has had full regard to consultation feedback, as set out in the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b> . We will also be bound by the provisions of the DCO, should we receive consent. Further, the Applicant has produced a <b>Funding Statement [EN010118/APP/4.2]</b> as part of its DCO application which demonstrates how it will fund the liabilities it will incur as part of the implementation of the Scheme.	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>hasn't affected the eagerness to proceed, or apparently the 500MW output.) In the light of all of this, I am concerned that our voices are of little consequence against political and financial pressures.</p>		
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>Whilst recognising Covid19 Pandemic &amp; successive lockdowns has created serious issues relating to all aspects of consultation &amp; dialogue, there has been insufficient opportunity created for local consultation. For example, the option of face-to-face consultation through exhibitions were announced with only 2-3 advance notice. Many residents have complained that they receive any details at all. Given the demographics of the local community, it is unreasonable to expect many residents to have access to the internet or computers. Given the complexity of this renewables per se it is also unreasonable to expect the majority in our community to understand many of the key issues. They lack reliable</p>	<p>Consultation on the Scheme took place in the context of the COVID 19 pandemic. In common with the rest of the country and reflecting guidance provided by the Government, the Applicant worked in a flexible and proactive way to deliver consultation which allowed people from across the community to respond. This included significant voluntary activity over and above the consultation methods set out in the Applicant's Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC). A number of virtual consultation methods were employed throughout the consultation period - holding virtual events, hosting a virtual public exhibition online, offering telephone and online briefings, and accepting responses to the consultation in a variety of formats. These were included in the draft SoCC as summarised in 5.4.1 of the Consultation Report <b>[EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant engaged with the relevant local authorities prior to the production of the draft SoCC specifically to understand the local authorities' views on the measures it planned to include in relation to the COVID 19 pandemic, including virtual consultation (5.3.3 to 5.3.7 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>). Following</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>evidence &amp; the opportunity to debate more widely that their household. Much of the “evidence” supplied by the developers is naturally deeply biased toward the case for the development &amp; therefore unreliable.</p> <p>Furthermore, our local Parish Council has not received timely guidance or reliable information. Little information has percolated into the community because Parish Council meetings have been restricted to Zoom conferencing – even our trusted organ The Parish News has been confined &amp; restricted to a digital format via the internet! Consequently, the Parish Council has not been able to ensure key dates have been effectively communicated &amp; events highlighted in a proper manner.</p>	<p>consultation on the draft SoCC, the Applicant had regard to local authority responses as set out in 5.7.2 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b> and <b>Appendix C-4 of the Consultation Report [EN0118/APP/5.2]</b>.</p> <p>The statutory consultation included a mixture of virtual methods and direct forms of engagement such as telephone surgeries and in-person consultation events held in compliance with public health guidance in force at the time. These are summarised in sections 6.4 and 6.6 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>Greater buffers are required around listed properties and ancient woodlands including Choppings Wood and Lyons Hall Wood which is not even marked</p>	<p>The Applicant carefully assessed properties in the vicinity of the Scheme and identified any moderate or major significant residual effects on heritage assets. These effects are assessed in <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of</b></p>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	on maps and also Lyons Hall Spring wood and SSI.	<p><b>the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b></p> <p>It is proposed that the Scheme will retain existing field boundaries and hedgerows and it is not proposed to alter any aspects of hedgerow or Ancient Woodland. The ability to view and understand these historic landscapes will therefore not be altered by the construction or presence of the Scheme. The historic landscape, considered of <b>high value</b>, will be subjected to a <b>very low</b> magnitude of impact, resulting in a minor adverse effect. This is not considered significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>Furthermore, additional mitigation have been reviewed and incorporated in the ES and significant effects to cultural heritage assets have been reduced where possible. This includes, but is not limited to, further set-backs, height reduction, and preservation in situ.</p>	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	Two listed buildings overlook the solar farm site. No provision is made within the documentation and we believe the setting of these listed building will be compromised by the proposal.	<p>The Applicant believes this refers to Scarlett’s farm and Noakes Barn, both Grade II listed properties in the vicinity of the Scheme. These listed buildings, along with all designated and non-designated built heritage assets with the potential for impact as a result of the Scheme have been reviewed in the desk-based assessment and their significance assessed along with the contribution their setting makes to that significance. Impact on these listed buildings has been assessed in <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b> As set out in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> and <b>Chapter 7</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<p><b>Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, further design changes have been made in appreciation of these buildings and to respond to feedback, including the exclusion of fields around Noakes Barn, retaining the undeveloped link to Scarlett’s Farm; and increased set-backs and planting relating to properties on the Boreham Road. <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> confirms no adverse effects on these buildings.</p>			
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>The historic landscape appears to be under-represented, nor is there much sense that the three key components of the cultural heritage/historic environment; namely, archaeology, historic landscape and historic built environment are an integrated whole in dynamic relation to each other. Rather there is a tendency to treat them, and indeed individual heritage assets, separately. However, the cultural heritage/historic environment is more than the sum of its parts. Accordingly, it will be essential to develop an approach to the cultural heritage/historic environment which integrates those three elements. It also</p>	<p>The Applicant has comprehensively examined designated heritage assets within the vicinity of the site, including scheduled monuments, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, and conservation areas. Non-designated heritage assets, including archaeological remains, historic buildings, and the historic landscape, have also been considered. <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> details the requirements of key legislative and policy requirements and describes how the Scheme will consider them; explains how information on the existing and future environment has been collected (through desk-based studies, survey work and stakeholder consultation); describes the understanding of the existing and future baseline environment, based on the baseline information; explains any further information to be obtained through further consultation, desk-based studies, or surveys; describes the potential effects of the Scheme on cultural heritage; and describes potential mitigation measures, if required.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>appears that the potential for knowledge enhancement is not fully appreciated.</p> <p>An integrated approach to the cultural heritage/historic environment, will ensure that the necessary mitigation and offsetting of damage and destruction to the historic environment caused by the Scheme, can make a significant contribution to our knowledge and understanding. In that regard, it should be noted that the wording of the National Planning Policy Framework, when considering historic environment/cultural heritage issues focuses on enhanced understanding provided by mitigation and offsetting. From what is known of the cultural heritage/historic environment, particularly in terms of archaeology, to the west and south of the Scheme, it is reasonable to suppose that the results of such work will be important not only locally, but regionally. That should be made plain in the Environmental</p>	<p>The Applicant has comprehensively examined designated heritage assets within the vicinity of the site, including scheduled monuments, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, and conservation areas. Non-designated heritage assets, including archaeological remains, historic buildings, and the historic landscape, have also been considered. <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> details the requirements of key legislative and policy requirements and describes how the Scheme will consider them; explains how information on the existing and future environment has been collected (through desk-based studies, survey work and stakeholder consultation); describes the understanding of the existing and future baseline environment, based on the baseline information; explains any further information to be obtained through further consultation, desk-based studies, or surveys; describes the potential effects of the Scheme on cultural heritage; and describes potential mitigation measures, if required.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>Statement as part of the reasoned justification for the Scheme and be a key part of how the cultural heritage/historic environment is presented to the wider public. More particularly improved understanding of the cultural heritage/historic environment should be identified as an environmental enhancement.</p> <p>Central Essex, including the area affected by the Scheme has a landscape of great antiquity. Woods and hedges, frequently thought of as natural features, are human creations often of great antiquity, indeed next to the church, in most parishes they are likely to be the oldest easily visible remains of human activity. The pattern of field boundaries, woods, roads, tracks and footpaths is a significant survival from, the often remote, past into the present, and needs to be fully considered as such in assessing the cultural heritage/historic environment impacts of the Scheme. That is especially significant since investigations to the west of the</p>	<p>The Applicant has comprehensively examined designated heritage assets within the vicinity of the Order limits, including scheduled monuments, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, and conservation areas. Non-designated heritage assets, including archaeological remains, historic buildings, and the historic landscape, have also been considered. An assessment of the historical and archaeological background of the Site can be found in <b>Appendix 7A in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b>. This includes consideration of the well-recorded and relatively recent enclosure of the landscape within the Order Limits as presented by the Essex County Council Historic Landscape Characterisation. Great efforts have been made to retain historic landscape features such as field boundaries, trackways, and relationships between cultural heritage assets in order to preserve our ability to view and understand the historic landscape.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>area of the Scheme have shown that much of the present pattern of field boundaries developed in the Roman period (e.g., Rippon 2012). Whilst it is welcome that paragraphs 7.8.78-9 of the PEIR recognise the historic value of existing field boundaries, neither they nor other parts of Chapter 7 (Cultural Heritage) or Chapter 10 (Landscape and Visual), capture the likely historic time depth of such features, nor the intricate relationship of landscape features to below ground archaeology or historic buildings.</p>		
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>In considering archaeological remains it is clear, from work to the west and south of the area affected by the Scheme, that a wide variety of archaeological sites and deposits, ranging in date from prehistoric to post-medieval, are likely to be present.</p>	<p>The Applicant has comprehensively examined designated heritage assets within the vicinity of the Order limits, including scheduled monuments, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, and conservation areas. Non-designated heritage assets, including archaeological remains, historic buildings, and the historic landscape, have also been considered. <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> details the requirements of key legislative and policy requirements and describes how the Scheme will consider them; explains how information on the existing and future environment has been collected (through desk-based studies, survey work and stakeholder consultation); describes the understanding of the existing</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>and future baseline environment, based on the baseline information; explains any further information to be obtained through further consultation, desk-based studies, or surveys; describes the potential effects of the Scheme on cultural heritage; and describes potential mitigation measures, if required.</p> <p>Both non-intrusive (aerial photograph and LiDAR data assessment as well extensive magnetometry) and intrusive (archaeological trial trenching) have been carried out to support the Environmental Statement. As expected, these have identified areas of significant archaeological remains, including assets dating to the prehistoric, Roman, and modern periods, which will be further recorded through a programme of mitigation prior to construction. Further evaluations and mitigation prior to or during construction are presented in <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> which will be secured by an agreed Written Scheme of Investigation agreed to with the relevant stakeholders.</p>	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>Insufficient due diligence has been undertaken by Longfield of the area affected in terms of historic buildings, woodlands and lanes and their surroundings and the effects of construction, operation and cleaning of the site and mitigations possible, on an area of high-quality farmland, of peace and quiet and dark skies, valued</p>	<p>Given the intervening distance and nature of the schemes identified at the time of writing the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, it is expected that there would be no additional cumulative effects on the setting of the archaeological remains, historic buildings or historic landscapes within the Order limits' zone of influence additional to those already identified for the Scheme in isolation.</p> <p>The effects on historic buildings, both designated and non-designated, as well as effects to local Protected</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	not only by residents but also by responding statutory consultees.	Lanes and the wider Historic Landscape resulting from the construction and operation have been fully considered in <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . Where significant effects were identified in the PEIR, all efforts were made to reduce these effects through set-backs, screening, other design measures or mitigation.	
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	The field North of Whitehouse Farm which borders Boreham Road (“protected Lane”) and visible from a number of listed properties as it sits high above the Ter Valley. In addition deer roam freely across this field at present.	Details of protected lanes and an assessment of the Scheme’s potential impact is recorded in <b>ES Volume 1 Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . As agreed with Wynne Williams Associates acting on behalf of Essex County Council, Chelmsford City Council and Braintree District Council, at a meeting held on 16 December 2021; protected lanes are principally a heritage asset and therefore have not been assessed as a landscape receptor. Please see the Outline Landscape Masterplan [Figure 10-12] in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	Y
<b>Cumulative effects</b>	The proposed Hawthorn Garden Village (HGV), the continued amenity value of that residential area is even more important and will become even more necessary over the potential life span of the scheme with the increase in housing. Have London and Quadrant (one of the promoters of HGV) been made aware of the proximity of the applicants’	The Applicant has continued to engage with the developer of the new Chelmsford Garden Community, Countryside Zest (Beaulieu Park) LLP as set out in Table 8-1 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b> , with a view to exploring the opportunities raised by ECC	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	<p>proposals to their plans submitted to the City of Chelmsford planners?</p> <p>No date is given for the decommissioning plan. Is this part of the DCO process or will this be made closer to the end of the sites lifespan?</p>	<p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p>	N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	<p>Design should allow easy return to farmland/wild land, but also consider repowering of that's appropriate at the time.</p>	<p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	How will the solar farm be disposed of at the end of its life? Where are the detailed plans for decommissioning and use of the site after 40 years?	<p>would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p> <p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	<p>Assuming that, after some years, the solar farm might be dismantled, there should be a binding clause which ensures the land is returned to agricultural use, and is definitely not given over to housing or other development.</p>	<p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p> <p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. Section 12.8 of <b>Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	<p>It seems unrealistic to think this will ever happen, I think the permanent loss of good farmland is far more likely &amp; the scheme should be judged on that basis. Why would any owner not just ask for an extension to the existing period of permission? To allow for this would it be better that any community funding be perpetual and based on the amount of energy produced?</p>	<p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p> <p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. <b>Section 12.8 of Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	<p>There should be a fully funded insurance provided to an independent body or Essex County Council for the decommissioning of Longfield Solar Farm and all plant, equipment, and buildings, together with cleansing of the land (of cables, concrete, and other similar structures) and water aquifers and rivers, to full farming NUF approved (or appropriate similar body) and Government water quality standards, and provision of retraining any redundant staff to enable their future employment. The changes in battery and solar panel, and alternative energy technology anticipated over the expected 40-year life of this site is huge and provision must be made for early closure of the site and return to farming by the current landowner, (farming not by the lessee as indicated) or his heirs and successors. The population rise over 40 years will require even greater home country farm use. There is already documented</p>	<p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p> <p>Decommissioning comprises the process of removing all solar PV array infrastructure including modules, mounting structures, cabling inverters and transformers, for recycling or disposal in accordance with good practice and market conditions at that time.</p> <p>Bulls Lodge Substation Extension will be retained and will remain in National Grid Electricity transmission (NGET) control. The buried high voltage and low voltage cables may be left in-situ following decommissioning of the solar</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	evidence of toxic material “wash-out” from solar panels. Added to that fact is the leakage of toxic materials when the panels are decommissioned. What plans and processes are in place to remove, treat and return contaminated soil, and to what depth?	<p>farm. Areas of tree planting and habitat generation would be retained, and the fields returned/ restored/ reinstated to agricultural use.</p> <p>These works will be undertaken according to legislation, regulations, and best practice that are current at the time of decommissioning. Any cabling removed will be taken to an appropriate facility for recycling.</p> <p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. <b>Section 12.8 of Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms</p>	
<b>Decommissioning</b>	Decommissioning of this plant is possibly going to be 40 years hence. It is, however, also possible that developments in energy generation and usage will make this scheme obsolete in a much shorter time interval leading to further disruption caused by removal, replacement, or alterations to the installed equipment. Clearly from a practical perspective the process of decommissioning is likely to	<p>The Applicant expects the need for the Scheme to remain throughout its operational lifetime. Further detail is provided in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b>.</p> <p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>cause the same disruption as construction though possibly on a much more damaging scale. Many of the components of this technology contain toxic elements which may or may not be recoverable and recyclable.</p>	<p>decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p> <p>The infrastructure such as PV panels and battery storage units will be recycled as far as practical and in accordance with legislation and guidance applicable at the time, or if more suitable at the time, sold for refurbishment and reuse. It is expected that a Decommissioning Resource Management Plan (DRMP) will be needed and is committed to in the DCO to manage the disposal of waste from the Order limits, but the approach to and content of this will be driven by the relevant legislative and policy requirements at the time of decommissioning.</p>	
<b>Decommissioning</b>	<p>Waste products should be disposed of in environmentally safe way.</p>	<p>The infrastructure such as PV panels and battery storage units will be recycled as far as practical and in accordance with legislation and guidance applicable at the time, or if more suitable at the time, sold for refurbishment and reuse. It is expected that a Decommissioning Resource Management Plan (DRMP) will be needed and is committed to in the DCO to manage the disposal of waste from the Order limits, but</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	It is certain that any removal of the installation would involve massive disruption to the environment and detrimental local effects. This is another reason why it should be very much smaller if it is to be approved at all.	the approach to and content of this will be driven by the relevant legislative and policy requirements at the time of decommissioning.	N
		Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.	
		The nature of the decommissioning activities and potential for likely significant effects would be similar to construction. The DEMPs/DTMP will therefore include similar measures to those included in the Outline and the following detailed Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMPs), as well as and the <b>Framework CTMP (Appendix 13B of the</b>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	The developers have not shared information on decommissioning plans. We expect confirmation of pre-agreed, documented and limited effect on land, including guarantee that land will remain green field post decommissioning.	<p><b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> submitted with the Application, covering issues such as transportation methods, pollution prevention, and noise management.</p> <p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p> <p>An <b>Outline Soil Resource Management Plan</b> is provided as an <b>Appendix</b> to the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>. This sets out principles for how soils will be managed and protected during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme. A detailed soil resource management plan will be prepared</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	I cannot comment on what may or may not happen in 40 years time. If the scheme is decommissioned and returned to agriculture, the actual removal of panels and infrastructure could be a very damaging process since it would require, again, an enormous construction operation. This is a further argument for reducing the scale of the scheme and spreading out onto brownfield / industrial and lower grade land.	prior to the commencement of construction, prior to operation, and prior to decommissioning, as set out by the Requirements of the <b>draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b> .	N
		<p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p> <p>An <b>Outline Soil Resource Management Plan</b> is provided as an <b>Appendix</b> to the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>. This sets out principles for how soils will be managed and protected during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme. A detailed soil resource management plan will be prepared</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	We would like more information about the decommissioning of the solar farm to understand what happens to the land after such vast destruction.	<p>prior to the commencement of construction, prior to operation, and prior to decommissioning, as set out by the Requirements of the <b>draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b>.</p> <p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p> <p>An <b>Outline Soil Resource Management Plan</b> is provided as an <b>Appendix</b> to the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>. This sets out principles for how soils will be managed and protected during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme. A detailed soil resource management plan will be prepared</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>prior to the commencement of construction, prior to operation, and prior to decommissioning, as set out by the Requirements of the <b>draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Decommissioning</b>	<p>At the end of its useful life, it is not clear when the panels are decommissioned, how they will be recycled, particularly as they contain toxic substances such as cadmium. They will be difficult and expensive to recycle, raising the prospect of discarded panel mountains, leaking dangerous metals and toxic substances. Can I ask, how do you plan to recycle all these panels and ancillary equipment, batteries etc. at the end of its lifespan?</p>	<p>The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. The Decommissioning Strategy sets out that decommissioning will involve the removal of all solar PV array infrastructure including modules, mounting structures, cabling inverters and transformers, for recycling or disposal in accordance with good practice and market conditions at that time.</p>	N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	<p>Why is decommissioning a question? If solar is a viable source of long-term green energy, decommissioning should never be a consideration.</p>	<p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	What will happen at the end of the project? Will the land become brownfield, allowing for a large residential development?	<p>decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p> <p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	Some commitment to returning the area to nature and ecological benefit should be given. This should not be seen as route for further development.	<p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p> <p>Decommissioning comprises the process of removing all solar PV array infrastructure including modules, mounting structures, cabling inverters and transformers, for recycling or disposal in accordance with good practice and market conditions at that time.</p> <p>Bulls Lodge Substation Extension will be retained and will remain in National Grid Electricity transmission (NGET) control. The buried high voltage and low voltage cables may be left in-situ following decommissioning of the solar</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>farm. Areas of tree planting and habitat generation would be retained, and the fields returned/ restored/ reinstated to agricultural use.</p>	
		<p>These works will be undertaken according to legislation, regulations, and best practice that are current at the time of decommissioning. Any cabling removed will be taken to an appropriate facility for recycling.</p>	
<b>Decommissioning</b>	<p>Are there plans to renew the farm as original elements of the scheme reach end of life?</p>	<p>It is expected that there will be some routine replacement of parts through the ongoing maintenance of the Scheme during its operational lifetime. The Scheme has been designed so that once it has reached the end of its lifespan it can be dismantled and the land returned to its pre-existing condition. Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	What guarantee is there that at the end of the life of the solar farm, the firm responsible for reinstating the land has not gone bust (as at other sites) in order to avoid doing the work?	Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.  A detailed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) will be produced for the Scheme following the appointment of a contractor, prior to the start of the decommissioning phase of the Scheme. The detailed DEMP will be prepared in accordance with the <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> , as a Requirement of the Development Consent Order. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning including return of the land to agricultural use. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is enforceable via the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at the time.	N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	The farmland will be sterile for decades after the farm is decommissioned. The biodiversity plan includes an awful lot of "coulds" ie "we could create a biodiverse meadow" "we could establish regenerated woodland" etc and "there is an opportunity to improve biodiversity in the woodlands" However I doubt this will happen unless they are made	A detailed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) will be produced for the Scheme following the appointment of a contractor, prior to the start of the decommissioning phase of the Scheme. The detailed DEMP will be prepared in accordance with the <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> , as a Requirement of the Development Consent Order. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning including return of the land to agricultural use. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	to do it as these companies only care about making money and not the environment.	<p>accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is enforceable via the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at the time.</p> <p>With regards soil, an <b>Outline Soil Resource Management Plan</b> is provided as an <b>Appendix</b> to the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>. This sets out principles for how soils will be managed and protected during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme. A detailed soil resource management plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction, prior to operation, and prior to decommissioning, as set out by the Requirements of the <b>draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Decommissioning</b>	Firm plans for the closure of the site and restoration of the land, with large penalties and sufficient funds to deliver, must be put in place before planning consent is given.	<p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Decommissioning</b>	<p>The land must be returned to agricultural use at the end of the project and of a confirmed quality at the time to permit food production. Very stringent restrictions need to be placed on the applicant to ensure the (by then) established PROWs are continued and all deer proof fencing removed.</p> <p>It is assumed re-instatement will form a confection of conditions in any DCO consent granted by the Sec of State. There are two Local Authorities within the development boundary. Is it the responsibility of these separate authorities to ensure compliance for decommissioning or will it be Sec of State via the Planning Inspectorate?</p>	<p>DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p> <p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p>	N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>I think you should ensure that as much scope for nature is incorporated eg bug boxes, bat</p>	<p>BNG is a quantitative process applied to development to ensure that any impacts on Biodiversity, arising from any development, are taken into consideration and compensated with equivalent or additional gains.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	boxes, sowing wildflower around any structures etc.		
<b>Ecology</b>	The field between Scarletts Wood and Lyons Hall Spring as there are significant badger populations in the field and in Lyons Hall Spring wood. In addition deer roam freely across this field at present. Finally this field is visible from Essex Way.	Local deer will be allowed to flourish under the Scheme. Badger gates will be used in the fence design to allow passage of Badger and other mammals such as small deer, rabbits and hare. Large species of deer will be able to move through the Order limits along verges, hedges and tracks. See Section 8.8 of <b>Chapter 8 Ecology</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and refer to the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> .	N
<b>Ecology</b>	Panels located near Lyons Hall, Spring Wood, where many badger sets, bird populations are located and deer roam. Suggest field next to wood is removed from scheme or an absolute minimum unfenced buffer of 150m from the wood. At present looks like only 20m from sets.	Further site analysis was undertaken from 2 to 4 August 2021. The design was updated, introducing new planting (woodland and scrub) to screen views from the River Ter Valley. The extent of proposed PV Arrays at the northern extent of the Order limits was reduced, mitigating potential landscape effects on the character of the river valley. Please see the Outline Landscape Masterplan Figure 10-12 in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Impacts in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . Badger setts in this area are located within retained woodland and hedgelines and setts will be adequately buffered to protect them. There will be suitable habitat buffers, along with new grassland, scrub and woodland habitats suitable for badger, deer and birds. Updated surveys will be undertaken for badger prior to construction and advice from an Ecological Clerk of Works followed, as detailed in the <b>Outline Construction</b>	Y

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>			
Ecology	Remove solar panels from the following two perimeter fields and replace with net bio diversity area.	The inclusion of these fields is justified in the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N
Ecology	There is no biodiversity improvement strategy provided or if this can be achieved, further investigations are cited as being required, but there is no evidence a gain can be achieved. DM16 requires that the habitat be conserved and enhanced; this requirement is not met, the size of impact of this development makes this impossible to meet	The BNG assessment uses the new Biodiversity Metric 3.0 and significantly exceeds the 10% mandated. For the purposes of BNG the Scheme will result in an overall net gain of 79% habitat units for biodiversity and 20% of hedgerow habitats. The results of the BNG assessment are included as the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> and summarised in the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/7.13]</b> .	N
Ecology	A good start, but should consider wildlife crossing the site and how they will be affected	The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site. Please also refer to <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N
Ecology	Solar farms impact on biodiversity. That is fact and has been outlined by Natural England. It is ridiculous to say that there will be 'biodiversity enhancements' - you cannot 'enhance' what is already	The Applicant will deliver an overall net gain of 79% habitat units for biodiversity and 20% of hedgerow habitats as set out in the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> . The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> , includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site. The OLEMP also includes	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	working perfectly well without interference.	<p>the provision for monitoring to assess how successful the biodiversity.</p> <p>In addition, An <b>Outline Soil Resource Management Plan</b> is provided as an <b>Appendix</b> to the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>. This sets out principles for how soils will be managed and protected during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme. A detailed soil resource management plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction, prior to operation, and prior to decommissioning, as set out by the Requirements of the <b>draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>You mention excessive shading on the river Ter. Shaded watercourses can help maintain higher dissolved oxygen levels in summer which helps fish stocks. It also slows weed growth. Please consider this before removing the growth along the river. Natural flood management (NFM) options may be suitable here in consultation with the Environment Agency.</p>	<p>The River Ter SSSI (designated for Geology) will be avoided during construction of the Scheme. The construction of the Scheme will not directly impact on habitat within the River Ter SSSI as the nearest infrastructure will be at least 50m from the river and other adjacent fields within the Order limits will be used for habitat creation rather than built development. Please see the Outline Landscape Masterplan Figure 10-12 in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Amenity in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Embedded mitigation measures, with regards to the management of construction site run-off, the management of spillage risk, the management of flood risk, the management of risk to morphology of waterbodies (as described in <b>Chapter 9: Water Environment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>) will ensure that no indirect impacts</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		to watercourses, which in turn could affect the River Ter SSSI, occur.	
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>The developers have responded positively to create extremely restricted “pathways” from west to east. However migratory wildlife cannot be expected to adjust to such human constraints. Enabling larger mammals such as Herds of Fallow &amp; Roe deer frequent this area – as do the Muntjac. Creating “pathways” that enable deer to pass through the site unhindered - given its size &amp; configuration seem incompatible with the management of grazing sheep, however.</p>	<p>Local deer will be allowed to flourish under the Scheme. Badger gates will be used in the fence design to allow passage of Badger and other mammals such as small deer, rabbits and hare. Large species of deer will be able to move through the Order limits along verges, hedges and tracks. See Section 8.8 of <b>Chapter 8 - Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and refer to the <b>OLEMP</b>, included as <b>Appendix 10G of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>There is a complete absence of any published and available scientific data to support bio-diversity enhancements from existing solar farm developments. It is clear that none exist. Page 29 of the Consultation Booklet lists seven bio-diversity mitigation measures, each of which is caveated with the word ‘could’ which, as elsewhere in the</p>	<p>The Applicant will deliver an overall net gain of 79% habitat units for biodiversity and 20% of hedgerow habitats as set out in the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b>. The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>, includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site. The OLEMP also includes the provision for monitoring to assess how successful the biodiversity planting and management has been.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>Consultation Booklet seems to be code for 'probably won't'.                      Migratory and transitory wildlife cannot adjust to such human boundary constraints.</p>		
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>Will you use plastic sleeves to protect saplings for deer? Is there a more environmentally sustainable way?</p>	<p>100% plant based spiral tree guards which are fully biodegradable and have passed all the required tests to be fully compostable, and as a result, will not damage the environment, are available.</p>	N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>Planting of trees/shrubs should keep not be kept to a minimum.</p>	<p>The Applicant is proposing considerable new areas of tree planting and hedgerows to reduce long-distance views into the site. This will reduce impacts on the setting of heritage features. We have carefully considered what type of screening is most appropriate in each part of the site – in open parts of the site, we have avoided tall screening to allow views to remain open. The approach we have taken to the landscape will help us improve the environment and ways of getting around the area. Corridors for wildlife and new permissive paths are embedded into the design. This includes a new north-south green route and east-west green links via new permissive paths. More information can be found in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>	N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>The consultation is not specific on whether the existing field boundaries will be maintained and or replaced if necessary to remove</p>	<p>There will be buffers of 15m from hedges and trees around field boundaries therefore maintaining these features. No field boundaries are proposed to be lost with adjacent woodland, hedges, and ditches retained.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>sections during construction. I am glad that you have looked into maintaining them but it is unclear as to the scale of your commitment unless it is the highlighted ecology corridors. I request that it is necessary to offer a commitment to construct, fill in and maintain the hedgerows around the whole site. Whilst the panels will appear over the hedges the density and foliage will offer a distraction from the site.</p>	<p>Notably, the scheme will retain the majority of existing features, such as hedgerows to maintain connectivity across the Site.</p> <p>There is a commitment to new woodland and hedgerow planting and hedgerow infilling throughout the site that will aim to benefit biodiversity and enhance habitat linkage across the site (see <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement</b>) [EN010118/APP/6.1] and the <b>OLEMP</b> [EN010118/APP/7.13].</p>	
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>We need two more pollination trails rather than one running from East to West. Also, why can't the height of panels be increased to allow more ground to be available to wildlife?</p>	<p>There are numerous other wildlife corridors throughout the site, including restoration of hedges, new tree and hedgerow planting and grassland buffer strips with wildflowers. The pollinator trail is a specific area identified for enhancement that crosses through the centre of the site from north to south. The panels will be of sufficient height to allow wildlife underneath them, e.g. pollinators to access and grazing of animals underneath them (e.g. sheep grazing where undertaken). Further information is presented in the <b>BNG Report</b> [EN010118/APP/6.5].</p>	N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>How do you expect to guarantee the required 10% increase in biodiversity? Where is the evidence for this claim?</p>	<p>The BNG assessment uses the new Biodiversity Metric 3.0 and significantly exceeds the 10% mandated. For the purposes of BNG the Scheme will result in an overall net gain of 79% habitat units for biodiversity and 20% of hedgerow habitats. The results of the BNG assessment</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		are included as the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> and summarised in the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> .	
<b>Ecology</b>	No objections other than environmental impact should be minimised as much as possible. Also, damage to wildlife habitat should be minimised.	This is noted. The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> , includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site. Please also refer to <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N
<b>Ecology</b>	There is a lack of information about how existing habitats will be managed. The proposed mitigation and enhancements are very minor in scale and will take many years to have any benefits. New woodlands and hedgerows take time to grow and shield solar panels. It seems that at the time of this consultation the ecological studies have not been completed.	<p>The Applicant is proposing considerable new areas of tree planting and hedgerows to reduce long-distance views into the site. This will reduce impacts on the setting of heritage features. We have carefully considered what type of screening is most appropriate in each part of the site. The Applicant also recognises the need to provide time for screening to mature. Phase 2 of the BESS is intended to be undertaken five years after the Scheme becomes operational, to allow sufficient time for screening implanted to the south east of the BESS to mature and provide sufficient screening – this will provide a “bridge” between Toppinghoehall and Lost Woods until planting has had sufficient time to mature to a point that it provides sufficient screening. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>BNG is a quantitative process applied to development to ensure that any impacts on Biodiversity, arising from any development, are taken into consideration and compensated with equivalent or additional gains.</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Ecology</b>	I note that a lot of the ecological surveys were not complete. In general, the literature suggests a negative effect on biodiversity from solar panels. Literature also states that research is very limited. There is no detail on how existing sites for example the woodland areas will be managed during the operation phase.	<p>For the purposes of BNG, the Scheme will result in an overall net gain of 79% habitat units for biodiversity and 20% of hedgerow habitats. The results of the BNG assessment are summarised <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> and reflected in the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>. Whilst the majority of habitat lost is of low ecological value and of no more than local importance, e.g. arable farmland, any important ecological habitat features (such as marshy grassland) have been taken forward for further assessment and embedded design measures described below ensure no net loss in these important habitat types.</p> <p>Ecological studies were completed in 2020 and 2021 and the results are provided in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		managed.	
<b>Ecology</b>	There needs to be a genuine effort to promote natural diversity on the land devoted to the solar farm, and we believe an annual report should be done to assess how successful the diversity efforts are.	We anticipate the Scheme will deliver significant enhancements for biodiversity in accordance with local and national policies. Biodiversity net gain has been calculated using the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 and is reported in the DCO application through the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> . An overall gain of approximately 79% of habitat units and 20% of hedgerow habitats is predicted. The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> , includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site. The OLEMP also includes the provision for monitoring to assess how successful the biodiversity planting and management has been.	N
<b>Ecology</b>	We implacably oppose the Longfield Solar Farm scheme as the site utilises valuable productive farmland & richly endowed & diverse open countryside. Given larger mammals will be driven from the site & not allowed to return, the proposed solar farm will adversely affect biodiversity. Any proposed mitigation measures – according to the Consultation document are optional – described as “could”. The creation of wildflower	A <b>Biodiversity Design Strategy</b> is included as <b>Appendix B</b> to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> to illustrate the design approaches that could be incorporated to further enhance biodiversity on and around the Longfield Solar Farm. The site is dominated by intensively managed arable land with limited biodiversity and a lack of semi-natural habitats within the footprint of the Scheme. The Scheme will change the landscape dominated by arable fields to a landscape with solar infrastructure and higher biodiversity value with restored and new hedges, restored ponds, expansion of the adjacent woodlands and creation of biodiverse grassland habitats both in and around the solar arrays and across whole fields with no	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>meadows is in practice a fantasy. This is particularly the case if the site is to be closely grazed by sheep. Creating such “artificial meadows” at best takes several years &amp; consummate skills &amp; dedication. The use of wildflower &amp; grass from commercial sources cannot &amp; will not replicate indigenous plant mixtures or species which have developed naturally across this site over many hundreds of years. Invertebrates relying upon local herbaceous flowering species will have established within this specialised ecosystem. Contrived seed mixtures will not replicate local flora. This proposed site is located within a low rainfall region – and will be 80% covered by photovoltaic panels. These panels will prevent natural rainfall sustaining most herbaceous plants including indigenous grasses in a dry season – except invasive deeper rooted perennial weeds such as *Rumex ssp (docks); *Cirsium ssp (Creeping thistle); *Senecio ssp (Common</p>	<p>infrastructure. It is possible to create biodiverse grassland with sufficient ground preparation (potentially through turf stripping or inversion), seed planting using appropriate seed mixes, natural colonisation of species and appropriate long-term management. It is noted that this will not occur in the short term and the Biodiversity Management Strategy provided covers the first 10 years and will continue throughout the life of the Scheme. It is a long-term project and as such a biodiversity trial area is proposed that will trial different planting and management regimes to identify what works on this site and ensure maximum biodiversity benefits. Grazing where undertaken would be for biodiversity benefits at a low intensity for specific time periods and it is not proposed to closely graze the grassland throughout the year. No herbicide treatment is proposed in the grassland areas. See the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> for further detail, as well as the Biodiversity Design Strategy, included as Appendix A to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b></p>	<p></p>

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>Ragwort) &amp; Achillea ssp (Yarrow) are likely to infest the area. These weeds are not a food source to farm animals &amp; some such as Ragwort are highly toxic. The only effective control will include the widespread use of toxic herbicide across the entire site – including all fence lines.</p>		
Ecology	<p>I think that the planned “potential” biodiversity enhancements set out on pages 25 –29 are commendable and would be reassured if the word “potential” were removed and replaced by the word “mandatory” or even “planned.” I do not believe, however, that this planned, potential, enhancement will offset the damage done to the ecology of the area during the construction phase for a very long time if ever.</p>	<p>The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> will be secured through the DCO and includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Scheme's biodiversity net gain has been calculated using the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 and is reported in the DCO application through the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b>. An overall gain of approximately 79% of habitat units and 20% of hedgerow habitats is predicted.</p>	N
Ecology	<p>All I see is lots of new fencing. What will the impact be on local deer?</p>	<p>Local deer will be allowed to flourish under the Scheme. Badger gates will be used in the fence design to allow passage of Badger and other mammals such as small deer, rabbits and hare. Large species of deer will be able to move through the Order limits along verges, hedges and tracks. See Section 8.8 of <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and refer to the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>The area around Scarletts Farm and White House Farm is home to a large population of several species of deer. These animals move freely from Scarletts Wood across Church Field and either westwards to Lyons Hall Wood or northwards following the woodland on the far northwest boundary of the site towards the River Ter Valley and Sandy Wood. I am concerned for the wellbeing of these deer and also for the possibility that they may be channelled through my garden causing destruction to trees and other plants</p>	<p>Local deer will be allowed to flourish under the Scheme. Badger gates will be used in the fence design to allow passage of Badger and other mammals such as small deer, rabbits and hare. Large species of deer will be able to move through the Order limits along verges, hedges and tracks. See Section 8.8 of <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and refer to the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>	N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>Every year Skylarks use this area in CM33Nf for breeding purposes. They are now considered a RED LIST species and are under the Birds of Conservation review. They are under the UK BIODIVERSITY ACTION PLAN. Every year they nest and breed on this land. They cannot be contained to an area of 10 metres boundary to a field. You will be destroying their habitat.</p>	<p>There are sufficient areas of open grassland (fields without infrastructure &gt;80 hectares) as well as other boundary habitats within the Order Limits that will aim to mitigate the loss and enhance habitats for ground nesting birds, including skylark. Further information on this is provided in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. In the <b>OCEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b> timing / methods of work and ecological site supervision will be followed to ensure no disturbance to nesting birds.</p>	Y

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Ecology</b>	I cannot see any evidence of a proper Environmental Impact Assessment, especially for all the properties blighted by this proposal. At present the proposed site is one of exceptional beauty by and large unspoilt by modern human influence, it currently supports excellent biodiversity, and nothing proposed has lead me to believe this will be improved.	A full <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> has been submitted with the DCO application for the Scheme. The Statement examines comprehensively ecological impacts (Chapter 8), landscape and visual impacts (Chapter 10), noise and vibration levels (chapter 11) air quality (chapter 14) human health (chapter 15) and other topics of concern.	N
<b>Ecology</b>	The fields are currently used by a wide variety of animals for grazing, habitat and travel. The current plans do not appear to take into account current animal routes nor safe entry and exit points. This is likely to lead to an increased presence of deer and other animals on the surrounding roads increasing risk of collisions for both animals and drivers.	The site is largely arable farmland with small areas of cattle grazed improved grassland to the north. The plans allow movement of deer and other mammals across the site along public rights of way, habitat buffer strips and through fenced fields via sufficient gaps for smaller animals under boundary fencing. There is proposed to be conservation grazing by sheep in future and they will be securely fenced in where grazing is undertaken. Please refer to The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> , for more information.	N
<b>Ecology</b>	My great fear here is the delivery of them and the ambition to pursue them is not watertight – i.e. ‘potential’. A lot appears to hang on the willingness of the public to get involved through the	The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> will be secured through the DCO and includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site.	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
Ecology	Community Liaison Group and with the biodiversity trial area. It would be wholly unfair if many of the environmental measures and mitigations of this scheme are not realised due to local residents not being able to get involved. I also have concerns about the management and the measuring of the biodiversity enhancements.	The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site. Please also refer to <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . Furthermore, the Scheme's biodiversity net gain has been calculated using the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 and is reported in the DCO application through the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> . An overall gain of approximately 79% of habitat units and 20% of hedgerow habitats is predicted.	N
Ecology	Although the wording used in you “glossy brochure” all seems to mention the buzz words to indicate that the wild live within the area we not be decimated after and during the construction of this massive solar farm, we find it very hard to believe that wildlife in its current form will ever return	Biodiversity net gain has been calculated using the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 and is reported in the DCO application through the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> . An overall gain of approximately 79% of habitat units and 20% of hedgerow habitats is predicted. The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site. Please	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	should this project be granted permission.	refer to <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .  The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site. Please also refer to <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	
<b>Ecology</b>	The scheme is large in scale. Please protect the adjacent countryside Use it as a wildlife haven for bees and hedgehogs. Manage construction traffic. Ensure the countryside can return when decommissioned. As a local resident please do not degrade the environment.	The Applicant will deliver an overall gain in biodiversity of approximately 79% of habitat units and 20% of hedgerow habitats through Scheme design and sensitive management of the Scheme once operational, as set out in the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> . In addition, A <b>Biodiversity Design Strategy</b> is included as <b>Appendix B</b> to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> to illustrate the design approaches that could be incorporated to further enhance biodiversity on and around the Longfield Solar Farm. As set out in the <b>Draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b> , Requirement 9 will necessitate the submission and approval of a detailed Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) to deliver the provisions as set-out out in the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> and to confirm how any approaches and measures set out in the Biodiversity Design Strategy have been incorporated into the design. The Applicant will also collaborate with an academic partner to develop a biodiversity trial area within Project. It is anticipated that different methods of planting under and around PV Arrays would initially be	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>trialled to investigate which methods may be most effective in the context of current, operational and future needs of the land. It is the Applicant's ambition that this would add to the accumulated knowledge on biodiversity enhancements and land use at solar farms and help to inform the solar industry, including other future schemes.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out details of its approach to managing impacts from construction in the <b>OCEMP [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> and the <b>Framework CTMP included at Appendix 13B</b> of the <b>ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> included in the DCO application. Requirements to the DCO will secure the implementation of both management plans.</p> <p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.	
<b>Ecology</b>	We have not been able to find any unbiased reports that solar farms will achieve Net Biodiversity Gain by the required amount. At best it appears we don't know what environmental damage there might be and believe the application should be delayed until more evidence is gathered.	The Applicant will deliver an overall net gain of 79% habitat units for biodiversity and 20% of hedgerow habitats as set out in the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> . The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> , includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site. The OLEMP also includes the provision for monitoring to assess how successful the biodiversity planting and management has been.	N
<b>Ecology</b>	There appears to be some aspects of mitigation and enhancement that might be positive - such as to water courses crossing the site - but these appear to be fairly minimal. Rather, a solar farm on this huge scale will certainly damage traditional habitats through the concentrated development of industrial plant and infrastructure. Security fencing surrounding large areas of land will remove traditional pathways for transitory animals and	The Applicant will deliver an overall gain in biodiversity of approximately 79% of habitat units and 20% of hedgerow habitats through Scheme design and sensitive management of the Scheme once operational, as set out in the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> . In addition, A <b>Biodiversity Design Strategy</b> is included as <b>Appendix B</b> to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> to illustrate the design approaches that could be incorporated to further enhance biodiversity on and around the Longfield Solar Farm. As set out in the <b>Draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b> , Requirement 9 will necessitate the submission and approval of a detailed Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) to deliver the provisions as set-out out in the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> and to confirm how any	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>bird deaths are likely to be a common occurrence as large areas of glazing are mistaken for water.</p> <p>No information is given on how existing habitats will be managed. Despite the proposed introduction of sheep grazing between the panels, grass will still have to be mown and chemicals used to control weeds and pests. The land will be essentially changed from rural to industrial with a consequential impact on local wildlife. Some of the proposed mitigation areas seem minimal in scale and concept. Also, new woodland creation will take a considerable time to mature, so any of the stated visual/habitat benefits would take years to become established.</p>	<p>approaches and measures set out in the Biodiversity Design Strategy have been incorporated into the design. The Applicant will also collaborate with an academic partner to develop a biodiversity trial area within Project. It is anticipated that different methods of planting under and around PV Arrays would initially be trialled to investigate which methods may be most effective in the context of current, operational and future needs of the land. It is the Applicant's ambition that this would add to the accumulated knowledge on biodiversity enhancements and land use at solar farms and help to inform the solar industry, including other future schemes.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out details of its approach to managing impacts from construction in the <b>OCEMP [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> and the <b>Framework CTMP included at Appendix 13B</b> of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2] included in the DCO application. Requirements to the DCO will secure the implementation of both management plans.</p>	
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>Great to see the ambition in terms of biodiversity net gain, with plans for pond networks, meadows and wildflowers, planting of 14,000 trees and many hedgerows. It would be good to see as much as possible of this included as official Planning Conditions. Please do</p>	<p>Noted. We expect to provide significant gains for biodiversity. Fencing will have suitable gaps c.300 x 500mm for mammals such as badger, small deer and hedgehog. New woodland planting and areas with natural woodland regeneration is proposed. The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>, includes details of new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site. The OLEMP will be</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>ensure that any fence / walls have hedgehog holes. Could agroforestry be trialled as part of this project?</p>	<p>secured via DCO requirement. Further information can be found in the <b>OCEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>, and in the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b>; both will be secured via DCO requirement. In addition, a <b>Biodiversity Design Strategy</b> is included as <b>Appendix B</b> to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> to illustrate the design approaches that could be incorporated to further enhance biodiversity on and around the Longfield Solar Farm. As set out in the <b>Draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b>, Requirement 9 will necessitate the submission and approval of a detailed Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) to deliver the provisions as set-out out in the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> and to confirm how any approaches and measures set out in the Biodiversity Design Strategy have been incorporated into the design. The Applicant will also collaborate with an academic partner to develop a biodiversity trial area within Project. It is anticipated that different methods of planting under and around PV Arrays would initially be trialled to investigate which methods may be most effective in the context of current, operational and future needs of the land. It is the Applicant's ambition that this would add to the accumulated knowledge on biodiversity enhancements and land use at solar farms and help to inform the solar industry, including other future schemes.</p>	
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>SSSI – nearest location is within 400m of SSSI. National Planning</p>	<p>The River Ter SSSI is adjacent to the Order limits and a short undesignated section of the River Ter bisects the</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	Rules suggest larger distance required from SSSI	north of the Order limits. The SSSI is designated for geological importance, but the river itself does support aquatic macroinvertebrates, notable/protected fish and Otter. A full assessment has been undertaken of the impact on any designated sites, including SSSIs within the 5km of the Scheme. The impact assessment, detailed in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> , has been undertaken in accordance with best practice guidance for Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA), issued by the CIEEM (the CIEEM guidelines) entitled 'Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine [REF-13]. This assessment identified potential impacts, but with the implementation of embedded mitigation measures during construction, operation and decommissioning concluded no potential for significant effects.	
<b>Glint and glare</b>	We have been informed that one field adjacent to our property will have these panels directly facing our property therefore we will suffer the glint and glare directly into our property	Due to the nature and characteristics of the Scheme and the Order limits, it is not expected that any significant glint and glare effects will result from the Scheme. Given the expectation that no significant effects would result, the glint and glare assessment was not required to enable stakeholders to understand the significant environmental effects of the Scheme at statutory consultation stage. The Applicant has now completed a <b>Glint and Glare Assessment</b> , which is included as <b>Appendix 10G of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> . While this identifies potential high impacts from glint and glare at 10 residential receptors and 7 road receptors without mitigation, these are reduced to negligible once mitigation	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>measures such hedgerows to be grown, infilled, gapped up and maintained to a height of at least 3m in affected areas.</p> <p>It is assumed that planting will grow at 33cm per year (as set out in Section 10.3 of <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>) and therefore until those hedgerows are grown sufficiently, a temporary 3m temporary wooden solid hoarding will be implemented and then removed once the hedgerows are of a sufficient height. Further information is presented in <b>Appendix 10G: Glint and Glare Assessment of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. These measures will be secured through the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>. Further information regarding hedgerow growth can be found in <b>Chapter 16 Other Issues of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Glint and glare</b>	<p>A significant amount of the site is located to the North of Bufftons indeed there is a solid line of around 200 metres of panels directly north, meaning that at peak daytime there will be considerable reflection from the solar panels as we will be between the panels and the sun. We are extremely concerned that there will be a substantial glare from the panels on to our</p>	<p>Due to the nature and characteristics of the Scheme and the Order limits, it is not expected that any significant glint and glare effects will result from the Scheme. Given the expectation that no significant effects would result, the glint and glare assessment was not required to enable stakeholders to understand the significant environmental effects of the Scheme at statutory consultation stage. The Applicant has now completed a <b>Glint and Glare Assessment</b>, which is included as <b>Appendix 10G of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. While this identifies potential high impacts from glint and glare at 10 residential receptors and 7 road receptors without</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>property and have raised this with the Longfield team. They have provided no substantial plan or practical steps which they will take to tackle glare - they simply give vague answers that they plan to do a study, with no detail on how this will be avoided. There are many mitigations which could be put into place regarding the alignment, angle and placement of the panels yet they seem to have no plan for this significant adverse effect.</p>	<p>mitigation, these are reduced to negligible once mitigation measures such hedgerows to be grown, infilled, gapped up and maintained to a height of at least 3m in affected areas.</p> <p>It is assumed that planting will grow at 33cm per year (as set out in Section 10.3 of <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>) and therefore until those hedgerows are grown sufficiently, a temporary 3m temporary wooden solid hoarding will be implemented and then removed once the hedgerows are of a sufficient height. Further information is presented in <b>Appendix 10G: Glint and Glare Assessment of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. These measures will be secured through the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>. Further information regarding hedgerow growth can be found in <b>Chapter 16 Other Issues of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Grid connection</b>	<p>Can I request that more information is provided to the local community on risk, impact and explanation as to why this method has been chosen over any other. 13 meters for the site located sub station infrastructure is extreme. There is limited detail on what this feature will look like. You have acknowledged the preference for underground cables but with this</p>	<p>The Applicant considered building a new substation connecting directly into the 400kV lines within the site, but this was discounted at the optioneering stage due to significant environmental impacts. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>piece of infrastructure detail is less forthcoming. Imaging should be provided in the environmental statement and give clear rational as to why this feature and the height is necessary and chosen over any other means.</p>		
<b>Grid connection</b>	<p>How safe are underground cables?</p>	<p>The use of underground cables is a well-established technique. We have assessed the potential for major accidents and disasters in <b>Chapter 16 Other Environmental Topics of the Environmental Statement EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and on human health and wellbeing in <b>Chapter 15 Human Health of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. These identify no significant adverse effects in terms of health or safety.</p>	N
<b>Grid connection</b>	<p>Why no A12. Bulls Lodge Area will be where most of the work has to be done? A single-entry point via Wheelers Hill makes no sense - a very clumsy proposal.</p>	<p>The scheme consists of works in two areas with different access strategies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the Solar Farm Site. The proposed access strategy for the Solar Farm Site consists of a single-point of access on Waltham Road and an agreed routing strategy for large construction vehicles to access the Solar Farm Site from the west via A130, Wheelers Hill and Cranham Road (with supporting improvements to the carriageway). The single access point and routing strategy has been advised (and therefore agreed) with ECC highways and has been identified as a way to limit the usage of Protected Lanes (i.e.</li> </ol>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		Boreham Road) and local roads through Boreham and Hatfield Peverel to the south (i.e. Waltham Road to the South and Main Road) b. the Bulls Lodge Substation Extension Site (Bulls Lodge Area) which will be accessed via the A12(T), Boreham Interchange, RDR and finally a Private Road, not via Wheelers Hill/ Cranham Road as detailed above for the Solar Farm Site itself.	
<b>Grid connection</b>	Will connecting to the national grid lead to the destruction of wildlife?	The Applicant has assessed potential impacts on wildlife as part of <b>Chapter 8 - Ecology - of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . This does not identify any significant adverse impacts on wildlife from the grid connection.	N
<b>Grid connection</b>	There is no justification for the connection into the Bulls Lodge Substation. This defies common sense. The main National Grid power lines run through the proposed site and it makes far more sense to connect within the site than to dig up more agricultural land and potentially damage historic trees to run cables unnecessary distances.	The Applicant considered building a new substation connecting directly into the 400kV lines within the site, but this was discounted at the optioneering stage due to significant environmental impacts. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N
<b>Grid connection</b>	There seems to be no justification given for dropping the idea of connecting to the 400KV lines	The Applicant considered building a new substation connecting directly into the 400kV lines within the site, but this was discounted at the optioneering stage due to significant environmental impacts. Further information is	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	within the site; what is the justification?	presented in <b>Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	
<b>Grid connection</b>	The extension of Bulls Lodge substation seems logical and laying cables underground would be the preferred option. This seems sensible.	The Scheme includes the extension of the existing substation (Bulls Lodge Substation Extension), Work No. 5A, to provide the electrical connection point to the National Grid to facilitate the import and export of electricity to and from the Solar Farm Site. Work No. 5B comprises temporary overhead line alterations, including two temporary pylons, and realignment of the existing 400kV overhead line. Please see the <b>Work Plan [EN010118/APP/2.2]</b> .	Y
<b>Grid connection</b>	Underground cabling should be installed although this would be much less damaging to the area if on a much smaller site than that proposed.	Electrical cables within the solar PV array fields will be secured to the PV Mounting Structures, the BoSS, or will be underground. No new overhead lines will be constructed. The Grid Connection Route will comprise of one underground 400 kV cable circuit. For more information, please refer to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> .	N
<b>Grid connection</b>	You have stated that a sub-station would be put at Bull's Lodge. You originally stated that a prime advantage of the proposed site was that all the land was held by a single owner. Your own decision has completely nullified a stated prime advantage of the site in that the cabling from Bulls Lodge to the site would be dependent upon	The Solar Farm Site is within the control of a single landowner as set out in the <b>Book of Reference [EN010118/4.3]</b> and explained in the <b>Statement of Reasons [EN010118/APP/4.1]</b> . The Applicant is in discussions in relation to additional land and rights required in relation to the Grid Connection Route, Bulls Lodge Substation Extension and access to the Scheme, with a view to reaching agreement with relevant landowners. The Applicant seeks compulsory acquisition powers in the DCO in order that, should it not be able to	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	agreement by multiple landowners.	reach agreement with landowners, this nationally significant infrastructure project may still be delivered in line with the proposed programme, in order to meet the urgent need for renewable energy in the UK. The approach taken is common amongst energy infrastructure schemes. The <b>Statement of Reasons [EN010118/APP/4.1]</b> includes more detail in respect of the powers sought over land and the status of discussions with affected landowners.	
<b>Grid connection</b>	Will the buildings at the substation have solar panels on the roofs?	These are not included within the Scheme.	N
<b>Grid connection</b>	Any cabling should be below the height of the panels themselves i.e. under 3m from the ground.	Electrical cables within the solar PV array fields will be secured to the PV Mounting Structures, the BoSS, or will be underground. No new overhead lines will be constructed. The Grid Connection Route will comprise of one underground 400 kV cable circuit. For more information, please refer to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> .	N
<b>Grid connection</b>	While I object to the site in its entirety, the proposed substation location close to the A12 / railway line appears to be the most appropriate. I would argue that the whole scheme should be reduced in size and kept to this limited area. Underground cabling is certainly the preference and extending Bulls Lodge substation	The size of the scheme is proportionate to the size and urgency of the national need, which is substantial. There is also a need to make the most of the connection to the Grid - this is a limited resource. Estimates from National Grid, the National Infrastructure Commission and the Energy Systems Catapult of the capacities of new solar generation needed in order to meet Net Zero include 44 to 76GW of additional solar capacity by 2050, with approximately one quarter of this needed in the next ten years. In order to meet those	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>seems to be the most appropriate option. However, still, the destruction and negative impact this would have on the local biodiversity, environment and local communities would be catastrophic.</p>	<p>projections (noting that, consistent with the NPSs, these capacities are not presented as a target, nor indeed a quota, and therefore could be gone further than) a very high proportion of (if not all) solar projects of any scale which come forward for consent will need to be approved. Falling short on solar development at any stage in the next decades will risk causing the UK falling behind on decarbonisation and will increase the magnitude of the task (and therefore the intolerable risk of failure) of meeting its 2050 legal commitments to achieve Net Zero. Please see Section 11.4 in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> for further information. Figure 116 in this document shows the results of an analysis which illustrates that development of one large solar scheme brings carbon savings and economic benefits versus developing combinations of smaller independent schemes, each combination matching to the same total installed generation capacity. The analysis assesses the relative costs and construction timeframes associated with the development of different sized independent solar schemes against the total cost and carbon benefit achievable through the development of one large solar scheme such as the proposed Scheme.</p> <p>In the context of there being a need for solar energy generation to be developed at scale, the Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the</b></p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p><b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b> It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that is capable of producing can produce a large amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>The Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ecological constraints – SAC's, SPA's, SSSI's, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li><li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li><li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li><li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li><li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li><li>• Settlements;</li><li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li><li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Green Belt; and</li><li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li></ul> <p>The Applicant has also worked hard to ensure that the design of the site is as sensitive as it can be to the local area and where possible to reduce the amount of land used. Prior to arriving at the proposed Order limits, there were several stages of design evolution, during which the original area of the Longfield site was refined. That process of design evolution has been informed by ongoing environmental assessments, engineering and design considerations, as well as engagement with stakeholders. The surveys undertaken that influenced the reduction in the amount of land proposed to be within the Order Limits were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Agricultural Land Classification;</li><li>b. Landscape and Visual;</li><li>c. Cultural Heritage; and</li><li>d. Ecology.</li></ul> <p>Capacity was also a consideration as the Applicant's aim is to make efficient use of the land area in terms of generating the largest annual yield Megawatt hours (MWh) for the available developable area, once due consideration is given to environmental and social constraints.</p> <p>Following publication of the PEI Report and completion of statutory consultation, the PEI Boundary was further</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>refined to the area now proposed as the Order limits, being an area of 453 ha. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>An <b>OLEMP [EN01011/APP/7.13]</b> will be secured through the DCO and includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Scheme's biodiversity net gain has been calculated using the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 and is reported in the DCO application through the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b>. An overall gain of approximately 79% of habitat units and 20% of hedgerow habitats is predicted.</p> <p>The comments in terms of the underground cable and grid connection at Bulls Lodge Substation are noted. Electrical cables within the solar PV array fields will be secured to the PV Mounting Structures, the BoSS, or will be underground. No new overhead lines will be constructed. The Grid Connection Route will comprise of one underground 400 kV cable circuit. For more information, please refer to the <b>Design Statement [En010118/APP/7.3]</b></p>	
<b>Health and wellbeing</b>	Health & Safety issues including mental health strain of this development: the consultee reports suffering with mild panic	Primary mitigation measures are embedded within the Scheme, as set out in the respective chapters, to reduce other operational effects (such as noise, air quality and landscape) which in turn will mitigate the effects on the	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	attacks and an element of depression with the thought of imprisonment of their property knowing the “Longfield Solar Farm” will engulf their home on four sides.	<p>local community and existing facilities from a human health perspective.</p> <p>The health and well-being assessment is presented in Table 15-4 to Table 15-8 in <b>Chapter 15 Human Health of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. The assessment comprises an assessment of impacts during construction, operation and decommissioning on access to work and training, active travel, and social cohesion. Consideration is given to the potential for impacts on mental health through assessing an overall outcome in respect of each of these.</p>	
<b>Human health and wellbeing</b>	Many older citizens have pacemakers or defibs fitted under their skin. Surgeons warn of magnetism power surge that could be life threatening, I personally have experience.	<p>We have assessed potential impacts on human health and wellbeing in <b>Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and identified no significant negative impacts. The 132kV cables and 400kV grid connection cables are proposed to be underground. Therefore, the potential sources of EMF that might act in-combination with other sources are removed. Pacemakers and defibs are unlikely to be affected by Electromagnetic Interference (EMI) unless transmitters are near electrical infrastructure associated with the solar PV array. Please see <b>Chapter 16 – Other Issues – in the Environmental Statement (ES)</b> for further information [EN010118/APP/6.1].</p>	N
<b>Human health and wellbeing</b>	Will the whole site be 24 hours protected from terrorist attacks?	<p>The Applicant acknowledges there may be an enhanced Security Risk whilst in our construction phase. In unison with our Construction Design and Management Regulations adherence we will ensure there is appropriate security mitigation measures to counter any</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Health and wellbeing</b>	<p>Health &amp; Safety issues including mental health strain of this development: Even in these early stages of this consultation period we feel very anxious with one of us suffering with mild panic attacks' and an element of depression with the thought of imprisonment in their property knowing the "Longfield Solar Farm" will engulf their home on all four sides</p>	<p>assessed enhanced Security Risk during the construction phase. Our security approach will aim to protect our: People, Environment, Assets, and Reputation along with fiscal loss during all phases at Longfield Solar Farm. A Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010118/APP/7.6] has been submitted with the DCO application.</p> <p>Primary mitigation measures are embedded within the Scheme, as set out in the respective chapters, to reduce other operational effects (such as noise, air quality and landscape) which in turn will mitigate the effects on the local community and existing facilities from a human health perspective.</p> <p>The health and well-being assessment is presented in Table 15-4 to Table 15-8 in <b>Chapter 15 Human Health of the Environmental Statement [EN01011/APP/6.1]</b>. The assessment comprises an assessment of impacts during construction, operation and decommissioning on access to work and training, active travel, and social cohesion. Consideration is given to the potential for impacts on mental health through assessing an overall outcome in respect of each of these.</p>	N
<b>Health and wellbeing</b>	<p>I'm not happy about the health issues being so close to batteries etc.</p>	<p>Primary mitigation measures are embedded within the Scheme, as set out in the respective chapters, to reduce other operational effects (such as noise, air quality and landscape) which in turn will mitigate the effects on the local community and existing facilities from a human health perspective.</p> <p>The health and well-being assessment is presented in Table 154 to Table 158 in <b>Chapter 15 Human Health of</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Human health and wellbeing</b>	<p>I am concerned that the loss of beautiful views, peace and tranquility and diverse wildlife will have a negative effect on my mood and may lead to further anxiety and depression. I am concerned that I will not be alone in suffering these negative effects as a great number of people from the surrounding towns and villages use this area of countryside as an amenity for leisure pursuits including walking, running and cycling.</p>	<p><b>the Environmental Statement [EN01011/APP/6.1].</b> The assessment comprises an assessment of impacts during construction, operation and decommissioning including on air quality, noise and neighbourhood amenity. The assessment does not identify any significant negative impacts on the amenity of residents from air quality, noise or neighbourhood amenity where embedded design mitigation measures and further mitigation measures are followed.</p> <p>Primary mitigation measures are embedded within the Scheme, as set out in the respective chapters, to reduce other operational effects (such as noise, air quality and landscape) which in turn will mitigate the effects on the local community and existing facilities from a human health perspective.</p> <p>The health and well-being assessment is presented in Table 154 to Table 158 in <b>Chapter 15 Human Health of the Environmental Statement [EN01011/APP/6.1].</b> The assessment comprises an assessment of impacts during construction, operation and decommissioning including on access to work and training, active travel, and social cohesion. Consideration is given to the potential for impacts on mental health through assessing an overall outcome in respect of each of these. The assessment does not identify any significant negative impacts on the amenity of residents from air quality, noise or neighbourhood amenity where embedded design mitigation measures and further mitigation measures are followed.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Human health and wellbeing</b>	<p>We are gravely concerned of the long-term health issues that comes with this sort of project, not just the continues noise of the equipment generating power, which on its own would cause a mental strain on the most resilient person, but the actual physical health issues of living next to a solar farm.</p>	<p>Primary mitigation measures are embedded within the Scheme, as set out in the respective chapters, to reduce other operational effects (such as noise, air quality and landscape) which in turn will mitigate the effects on the local community and existing facilities from a human health perspective.</p> <p>The health and well-being assessment is presented in Table 154 to Table 158 in <b>Chapter 15 Human Health of the Environmental Statement [EN01011/APP/6.1]</b>. The assessment comprises an assessment of impacts during construction, operation and decommissioning including on air quality, noise and neighbourhood amenity. The assessment does not identify any significant negative impacts on the amenity of residents from air quality, noise or neighbourhood amenity where embedded design mitigation measures and further mitigation measures are followed.</p>	N
<b>Human health and wellbeing</b>	<p>As previously stated, a major concern for us is the “electromagnetic waves” that will be generated from the solar farm and a similar pollution being omitted from the “electrical pylons” that are strewn through the proposed solar panel fields around the village of Terling and the properties in the outlying areas. There is no documented evidence produce by the “Longfield Development Team”</p>	<p>The 132kV cables and 400kV grid connection cables are proposed to be underground. Therefore, the potential sources of EMF that might act in-combination with other sources are removed. Telecommunications and television providers are unlikely to be affected by Electromagnetic Interference (EMI) unless transmitters are near electrical infrastructure associated with the solar PV array. Please see <b>Chapter 16 Other Issues of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> for further information [EN010118/APP/6.1].</p> <p>Air quality impacts have been assessed in full and have been detailed in <b>Chapter 14 of the Environmental</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>that fully explains the full consequence of the omitted pollution from either the panels or pylons, the main sales pitch from Longfield is to try obscure the sighting of the panels without revelling the true damage of the toxic waves that will be submitted from both forms of the power network.</p>	<p><b>Statement Air Quality [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b> The potential impact of the Scheme on local air quality will be determined at sensitive (human and ecological) receptors identified in the vicinity of the Order limits, and is not significant. This comprises sensitive receptors within 350m of the Order limits, within 50m of roads expected to be affected by the construction phase traffic, and up to 500m from the site access points.</p>	
<p><b>Human health and wellbeing</b></p>	<p>One of our major concern is the “electromagnetic waves” that will be generated from the solar farm and a similar pollution being omitted from the nearby “electrical pylons” what the joint damage will be? As you can see our property would be totally engulfed by the “solar farm” and with the electrical pylons” in the adjoining field we feel that a full discloser report must be published on what the long-term damage to our health and wellbeing will be.</p>	<p>The 132kV cables and 400kV grid connection cables are proposed to be underground. Therefore, the potential sources of EMF that might act in-combination with other sources are removed. Telecommunications and television providers are unlikely to be affected by Electromagnetic Interference (EMI) unless transmitters are near electrical infrastructure associated with the solar PV array. Please see <b>Chapter 16 Other Issues in the Environmental Statement (ES) for further information [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b></p>	<p>N</p>
<p><b>LVIA</b></p>	<p>The total size is too large for this area and at 459 hectares is unnecessary and covers a large amount of the Terling Plateau, a designated agricultural area. The size is being driven partially by a</p>	<p>As set out in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Impact of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, the overall layout has undergone extensive review and refinement to respond to the landscape character baseline. As noted in the consultation response, the northern part of the Order limits is identified as the most</p>	<p>Y</p>

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>desire to be classified as a National Infrastructure and not go through local planning rules. The result of this is that the area is taking Grade 1 &amp; Grade 3a land out of normal production. My principal objections to the size could comfortably be resolved with the reduction of the scheme to the more sensitive environmental area to the North of the scheme but South of the River Ter. This is a more sensitive environmental and agricultural area than the areas further South and contain solar panels of up to 3m tall.</p>	<p>tranquil. Larger elements of the Scheme have therefore been sited in the south of the Order limits. The Ter River valley is identified as one of the most sensitive landscape features. Although within the Order limits, all development has been excluded from this area in order to protect and conserve the integrity of this area. The part of the Order limits in this area would be used for visual screening and ecological enhancement.</p> <p>In addition, further planting has been added to higher slopes on the north western edge of the Scheme.</p>	
LVIA	<p>The current proposal focuses too much on screening the solar farm and not enough on mitigating the sheer size of it. We would like to see a reduction in size overall, particularly the removal of the field to the North West of Noakes Barn.</p>	<p>Since the Scheme presented at consultation there has been further refinements designed to protect the setting of houses in close proximity to the Scheme. This includes offsets and viewing corridors to protect views from people's homes. The design has responded to individual views to retain important features. Design changes include the exclusion of entire fields from any development, the introduction of 200m viewing corridors to be free of development, and new offsets ranging from 50 – 70m. Please see Table 10.6 in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 - Landscape and Visual Amenity - of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> for further detail. No significant adverse effects on people's views from their homes have</p>	Y

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>been identified, once mitigation planting has fully established.                      The field to the north west of Hedgerow Cottage and Noakes Barn has been excluded from development of Solar PV arrays or solar farm or ancillary infrastructure</p>	
<b>LVIA</b>	<p>The Inverters, Transformers and Switchgears required by the scheme are being proposed to be housed in 3.5m containers for equipment maintenance and security. How will these buildings be sympathetically provided within the rural landscape? What materials will you use and what architectural style. Can I request that the roofs incorporate a living roof? These can be low maintenance and native. If planned for the structures to house the equipment can be built to have the necessary reinforcement to accommodate any additional weight. The consultation document does not provide detail on the number of these buildings. There is an indication of the acreage but it is not clear on the number of each building within a given field/ spread across the site.</p>	<p>There will be no more than 150 solar stations spread across the entirety of the site – approximately 5/6 per field. Visually they will be similar to a shipping container, which are the most likely solution for integrated central inverter solar stations. The solar stations will typically be coloured either RAL 6005 (Moss Green) or RAL 7004 (Signal Grey).</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
LVIA	<p>The Consultation Booklet refers to reduced height panels which are located next to residential boundary's, on page 22. There is no mention as to what the reduced height will be. Can this be communicated to me so I can understand if the proposed mitigation measures are robust and protect the amenity of my home including my garden.</p>	<p>Reduced height panels are no longer proposed. Instead, the Scheme design has been refined to remove panels where potential for significant adverse visual effects on residential properties were identified. The Applicant has also met with the resident in question as part of the further engagement set out in Chapter 8 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b> to discuss this topic.</p>	N
LVIA	<p>My home has a shared boundary with Little Holts, Waltham Road. It seems reasonable if the mitigation measures being afforded to Little Holts are to be extended to my home as well. The ground level of my property in relation to the proposed site is of a more raised level as compared to the other properties on the Waltham Road. As a result, the proposed site is more visible and hence more damaging to my amenity and the enjoyment of my home. Therefore, I would expect any buffer zone to take this into account. I believe an extensive buffer zone of at least 50 m of new trees, hedgerows and planting to my</p>	<p>The Applicant have carefully assessed properties in the vicinity of the Scheme and identified any moderate or major significant residual effects. These effects are assessed based on the Scheme described in <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Furthermore, additional mitigation has been reviewed and incorporated in the ES and significant effects to cultural heritage assets have been reduced where possible. This includes, but is not limited to, further set-backs and height reduction. Moderate adverse, significant effects have been identified for the following built heritage asset arising during Construction and throughout Operation from the presence of the Scheme: Ringer's Farmhouse. The Scheme will come close to Little Holts, interrupting the open fields to the south-west and affecting its setting. However, it has been assessed that the significant of the effect will be 'minor adverse' and therefore no mitigation</p>	Y



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	boundary to protect the amenity of my home. This should be of sufficient height and depth to protect my outlook from both ground and first floor levels and both to the Southeast and Northeast of my property boundary so my vista at the boundary is fully protected.	measures are being proposed for the property in question.	
<b>LVIA</b>	3m height of panels is too high and visible despite landscaping plans	<p>The proposed planting and existing deciduous vegetation would be in leaf. New and strengthened hedgerows would be maintained at 3m tall. This would screen or filter the Scheme in the majority of views. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment makes a conservative assumption that mitigation planting would grow by 33cm every year, such that it would have grown by approximately 5m by the Year 15 assessment (although this depends on when the vegetation was planted). It has been assumed that hedgerows would be maintained at 3m tall.</p> <p>Narrative has been added to the visual assessment explaining when Advanced Mitigation Planting and Construction Day 1 Planting would screen views.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 10.4.9 in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
LVIA	Reducing panel heights and increasing buffers in areas visible from Boreham Road.	As set out in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> , further design changes have been made, including the exclusion of fields around Noakes Barn, retaining the undeveloped link to Scarlett's Farm; and increased set-backs and planting relating to properties on the Boreham Road.	Y
LVIA	The track from White House Farm which goes to Scarletts is used by many people - walkers, runners, cyclists, horse riders. They use this track because it is beautiful countryside. When the solar farm is present the track will have 2m high fences either side with CCTV cameras and maybe even lighting. This will no longer be countryside. Mitigation should include moving the panels away from this track so that this amenity can still be enjoyed. The developers have suggested to me that they would be able to move the panels away from the track and maybe create either a wildflower meadow or an orchard.	As set out in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> , the overall layout has undergone extensive review and refinement to respond to the landscape character baseline. This includes embedded mitigation of the type described. The historic field boundary that divides the western end of the field to the north of Whitehouse Farm would be reinstated with a new native hedgerow. No Solar PV arrays are proposed in the western parcel of the field, thereby retaining a clear view north from White House Farm. Field parcels to the north and south of Scarlett's Farm have been excluded from construction of solar farm equipment and will instead be used for biodiversity enhancement and permissive paths. This will help retain the character of views of those fields from Scarletts Farm. Further information is set out in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> and the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/7.13]</b> .	Y
LVIA	We were very surprised to see that the fencing that can be seen	A thorough review of views from residential properties was undertaken since the PEIR stage. The review	Y

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>from our property does not have hedge screening in front of it. We would like this to be put in place as shown in other areas that are near to residential property and would very much appreciate consideration being given to early planting ahead of the main works to get established natural screening in place before construction begins.</p>	<p>resulted in substantial changes to the Scheme design, including the removal of panels from part of fields and an extensive landscape planting strategy was developed.</p> <p>Advanced planting is being considered wherever possible as a means of maximising the growth of proposed plants prior to operation of the Scheme. This will help reduce the visual impact of the Scheme and provide high quality habitat sooner.</p> <p>Please see the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>, for more information and the Outline Landscape Masterplan Figure 10-12 in <b>Chapter 10 - Landscape and Visual Impacts in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>LVIA</b>	<p>PIER 2.5 has a legend for “Permanent Plant Building” in bright yellow, but I could find none; where is this to be?</p>	<p>The permanent plant buildings would be 7.1m tall. Further information can be found in Chapter 10 - Landscape and Visual Impacts - in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</p>	N
<b>LVIA</b>	<p>The Boreham Road which borders the solar farm for at least a mile is a “protected lane” as defined by Chelmsford City Council and thus the location of solar panels near it is damaging to the surrounding “protected lane” its verges and views.</p>	<p>Additional planting has been added to higher slopes on the north western edge of the Scheme since the statutory consultation.</p> <p>Further design changes have been made, including the exclusion of fields around Noakes Barn, retaining the undeveloped link to Scarlett’s Farm; and increased set-backs and planting relating to properties on the Boreham Road.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>The response of the landscape design to the protected lanes has been set out in Section 10.7.14 in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Details of protected lanes and an assessment of the Scheme’s potential impact is recorded in ES Volume 1 Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage. As agreed with Wynne Williams Associates acting on behalf of Essex County Council, Chelmsford City Council and Braintree District Council, at a meeting held on 16 December 2021; protected lanes are principally a heritage asset and therefore have not been assessed as a landscape receptor. Please see the Outline Landscape Masterplan [Figure 10-12] in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Impacts - in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> where Boreham Road has been considered.</p>	
LVIA	<p>The Applicant offers, in the new material, to provide tree plantings such that users of Boreham Road will not have to suffer a direct view of the ugly development. Waltham Road is continuous with Boreham Road and has significantly more users; please provide equivalent tree plantings along the border of Waltham Road so that its users are similarly not</p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed visual impacts for users of Waltham Road in <b>Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. flanking the Waltham Road encloses the Order limits to the south west. Views from this area are limited to glimpses from the edge of the Order limits, as demonstrated by VP36. Visual impacts for people using Waltham Road are therefore assessed as low.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>LVIA</b>	<p>directly inflicted with the ugliness of the proposed development.</p> <p>In the Northern part, still south of the Ter river, the back of the solar panels will be visible from the “Essex Way” an important and historic footpath which is well known and used by many walkers. This area is small in context of the large scheme.</p>	<p>Consideration of people’s views from the Essex Way have been considered through the design development and assessed within <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Impacts in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Additional mitigation planting has been added since Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment found that people walking on the Essex Way would experience moderate adverse effects resulting from open views across the River Ter Valley of construction from locations south of Fuller Street (VP46) and west of Fuller Street (VP45). People on the route would also experience close range views of construction from the edge of Sandy Wood, however this would be experienced for a very short duration such that the effect remains moderate adverse. The effect on people walking on the Essex Way is therefore considered to be significant. It should be noted however that the significant effect is relatively localised. People on the wider route, such as within the River Ter Valley (VP3) and from the north east of the study area (VP20, VP21, VP24 and VP26), would not experience significant effects due to the enclosed landform and intervening vegetation. People would also experience localised moderate adverse effects during operation, however this would reduce to a minor adverse effect by year 15 with the establishment of mitigation planting.</p>	Y

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
LVIA	<p>We object strongly to the proposed connection into an enlarged Bulls Lodge Substation, which is not screened and will be clearly visible from the approach to Boreham from Chelmsford and from the long views east and west from north of the A12. This proposal suggests that it is preferred to disturb existing ecosystems including local streams and water systems for a distance of approximately 2000 meters to access an existing substation only constructed in the past two years.</p>	<p>Further information regarding impact can be found in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Impacts in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>During the statutory consultation, the Applicant presented information on extending Bulls Lodge Substation and building the Longfield Substation based on design parameters. Since the statutory consultation, the Applicant has developed its design for the Bulls Lodge Substation Extension and Longfield Substation in more detail and assessed potential environmental impacts through the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. This includes impacts on Cultural Heritage, assessed in Chapter 7, Ecology, assessed in Chapter 8, Flood Risk and Drainage, assessed in Chapter 9, Landscape and Visual Amenity, assessed in Chapter 10, and Noise and Vibration, assessed in Chapter 11.</p> <p>It is worth noting that Bulls Lodge substation is located to the west of Waltham Road. Mitigation planting around the edge of the proposed Bulls Lodge Substation Extension has been added since Statutory Consultation to limit its visibility. Views from local footpaths are represented by viewpoints 52 and 53.</p> <p>The cable route between the proposed Longfield Substation and Bulls Lodge Substation Extension has been carefully sited, seeking to minimise environmental impacts.</p>	Y

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>LVIA</b>	<p>We do not see any contributions to the local community that enhances the natural landscape, as it currently exists. Most of the proposals in the consultation documents are gestures to sweeten the bitter pill of having the landscape and easily accessible amenity taken away from the local community. The gesture of cycle routes and green corridors are designer and developer words that describes facilities that exists already. This proposal contributes nothing new or beneficial to the local community.</p>	<p>We anticipate the Scheme will deliver significant enhancements for biodiversity in accordance with local and national policies. Biodiversity net gain has been calculated using the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 and is reported in the DCO application through the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b>. An overall gain of approximately 79% of habitat units and 20% of hedgerow habitats is predicted. The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site.</p> <p>The Scheme seeks to improve routes and connectivity for non-motorised users by providing a Green Corridor and several permissive paths within the Solar Farm Site during the operational phase, to enhance connectivity with existing PROW, Essex Way and National Cycle Route 50. The proposed Green Corridor will intersect with various east-west routes (both existing PROW and proposed permissive paths) to maximise connectivity within the Solar Farm Site. The scheme also allows for the potential to provide a future pedestrian/ cycle connection between the site and the Chelmsford Garden Community when this comes forwards. Further information on PROWs and routes can be found in <b>Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
LVIA	<p>Essex Local Access Forum is concerned at the use of land adjacent to the north side of Toppinghoehall Wood, a local wildlife site, as the location for the solar &amp; battery storage infrastructure / new sub-station compound. This compound would be extremely visible both visually and aurally.</p>	<p>A buffer of at least 15m has been applied to all existing woodlands and ancient woodlands. This buffer has been integrated into the Scheme's Design Principles included within Appendix B of the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> to protect trees located on, and adjacent to, the Order limits. Please see Section 10.7 and Figure 10-12 in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The proposed Longfield Substation would not be visible from local footpaths (see representative viewpoints 13, 16, 50 and 57). The majority of the BESS would also be screened from view. Phase 2 of the BESS would be visible from PROW 90_36 located east of Toppinghoehall Wood; however, this would be mitigated by the proposed advanced mitigation planting which would heavily filter views of construction and screen views of the BESS once established. Further information regarding the viewpoints in proximity to the proposed Longfield Substation and BESS can be found in <b>Appendix 10F Visual Assessment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>.</p> <p>Effects on ecology are assessed in <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. This sets out that there are no significant adverse effects are expected on the Local Wildlife Site at Toppinghoehall Woods.</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
LVIA	<p>The open farmland landscape will become far more enclosed. The deer fencing will degrade the way the landscape is experienced; literally making you feel fenced in; especially when it is on both sides of the path. I don't see how this can this be overcome?                      If PINS were to approve I think any fences should be minimum distance away from the paths they fence in and I hope the appointed Examiners will be able to experience any minimum distance proposed to "feel" what it is like. It is no good opening new paths &amp; them feeling like walking between deer fencing.</p>	<p>In line with the information provided in <b>Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, the PROW and permissive paths will be a minimum 1.5m wide for footpaths and 3.0m for bridleways, with at least 5m either side of the centreline of the PROW or permissive path that will remain undeveloped outside of the solar PV fence line. This will ensure a 10m wide passageway will be maintained on all routes. All pathways, including temporary diversions and the establishment of a new permissive route, will be maintained.</p> <p>Larger offsets and areas of open species rich grassland have been introduced since Statutory Consultation adjacent to sections of PROW that cross the Order limits where possible, for example to the north of PROW 113_25.</p>	Y
LVIA	<p>Is the "Longfield Substation" to be permanent? The connection to the grid would mean the enlargement of the existing Bulls Lodge Substation and making this blot on the landscape bigger with no proposals for mitigation.                      The harm will outweigh the good in this location.</p>	<p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>LVIA</b>	<p>Buftons would be significantly impacted by the proposals and this has been clearly identified by the Longfield team themselves. We attended a consultation meeting with the Longfield Team on Wednesday, 9 June 2021 in Hatfield Peveral Village Hall and were shown a computer visualisation of the site from our property. The visualisation closely resembled a prison camp - with a high solid hedge located right on the boundary completely blocking our the view. It was complete with a high CCTV tower and the height and location of the hedge would be so close to our property that aside from destroying the open views from our property and making our house significantly</p>	<p><b>[EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. The extension to the Bulls Lodge Substation will not be decommissioned and will continue to be operated by National Grid.</p> <p>The design has developed substantially since June 2021. We recognise that the Scheme will have a major adverse effect on views from the property, without mitigation measures. The change in views from Buftons was a key consideration and has resulted in the introduction of a c.200m viewing corridor from between the property to Toppinghoehall Wood, to retain the visual connection to Porters Wood. This has been designed to maintain the important openness in the foreground of the view and the visual link to the distant woodland. A hedgerow on either side of the corridor would be planted to limit the visibility of any built features.</p> <p>Considering the design changes set out above, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (full reference below) found that the Scheme would result in temporary significant adverse effects on views from Buftons during construction and year 1 of operation, however the visual effect would reduce to a minor adverse with the establishment of new hedgerows.</p>	Y

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>darker by blocking the light, it would also risk structural issues to our property it is that big and close. Why has the Longfield team chosen to remove the previous wide land border and install a high, solid hedge directly outside our front door? Why did they not even show that our property existed on the maps on pages 24 and 31? They appear to have forgotten that our property exists, completely ignored their own statements that we are significantly impacted and propose to build a high solid hedge around our property.</p>	<p>Please see the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 - Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> for further detail.</p>	
<b>LVIA</b>	<p>The local countryside is exposed to long views from several well used recreational Public Rights of Way as well as roads travelling the length of the site &amp; from existing communities. It is inevitable this beautiful unspoilt countryside will be irreparably damaged by the installation of intrusive 3.5-metre-high solar panels &amp; urban chain-link fencing. No solar panels should be sited within a reasonable distance for</p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed potential impacts on the landscape and visual amenity of users of the PROW network in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Once screening and planting included as mitigation in the Scheme has matured, people walking on the Essex Way to the west or south of Fuller Street (VP45 and VP46) would experience minor adverse effects, which are not considered to be significant. The level of effect is reduced from year 1 because existing and proposed vegetation would be in leaf, filtering views of the PV Arrays such that the Scheme would be unobtrusive. People walking on the Essex Way on the south western corner of Sandy Wood</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>example a minimum of 50 metres from existing residential housing. Substantial tree &amp; shrub screens should be established prior to work on installing solar panels commences.</p>	<p>would experience close range views of the Scheme, however this would be for a very short duration of the route such that the overall effect on people walking the Essex Way would remain minor adverse.</p> <p>Whilst additional breaks in the proposed solar arrays have been introduced since Statutory Consultation, people walking on PROW 213_19 and PROW 113_25 within the Order limits would experience major adverse effects because of close range views of the proposed PV Arrays in the immediate foreground. These effects are considered significant. People walking on the wider PROW network beyond the Order limits boundary would not experience significant effects resulting from operation during year 15.</p> <p>The landscape and visual effects identified are considered temporary, albeit long term, since all built features would be removed during decommissioning.</p> <p>Design changes have been introduced since Statutory Consultation, in particular new offsets and viewing corridors have been integrated to protect views from people's homes. The design has responded to individual views to retain important features. Design changes include the exclusion of entire fields from any development, the introduction of 200m viewing corridors to be free of development, and new offsets ranging from 50 – 70m. Please see Table 10.6 in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape</b></p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<p><b>and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1] for further detail.</b></p>			
LVIA	<p>My home since 1990 is going to be immediately adjacent to an access point, the panels and inverters themselves, and the fencing which though described as "Deer fencing" will look more like "Security fencing" in the region of the roads, potential access points and my home. This will have a major negative visual impact, and significantly alter the character of the landscape.</p>	<p>Substantial design changes have been incorporated since Statutory Consultation, with a particular focus on mitigating the potential effects on people's views from their homes. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> establishes that no significant visual effects are expected once mitigation planting has established. Proposed planting is shown on <b>Figure 10-12 Outline Landscape Masterplan [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>	N
LVIA	<p>I object to this scheme for a great number of reasons. Whether solar electricity generation is the correct way ahead may or may not be true. Even if it is however I object to this scheme due largely to its location on land which is valuable for food production and as a large tract of beautiful countryside which is an amenity for around 450,000 local people.</p>	<p>The vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) to the Order limits. The Order limits comprises approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.</p> <p>All of the land within the area of search is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the Site).</li> <li>• Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the Site).</li> </ul>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Grade 4 but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test.</li><li>• Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</li></ul> <p>There are no alternative sites considered by the Applicant that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits (whilst also meeting other criteria of the Applicant, as set out in <b>Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>) within a reasonable distance of Bulls Lodge Substation (for which the Applicant has obtained a grid connection agreement).</p> <p>The Draft NPS EN-3 [REF-9] states that although BMV land should be avoided where possible in the development of renewable energy infrastructure, land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of site location.</p> <p>Within this context, the Applicant has sought to minimise the amount of agricultural land used within the Scheme. This includes removing land from the draft Order limits to reduce the amount of high grade agricultural land within the boundary of the scheme and to avoid areas identified as having higher archaeological potential prior to the statutory consultation. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. Section 12.8 of <b>Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms</p> <p>The effect on landscape character and visual amenity has been considered by the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Mitigation of potential adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity has been incorporated into the design, including the conservation and enhancement of the existing vegetation pattern across the Order limits and careful siting of the scheme in the landscape to limit adverse effects to people's views. Given the mitigation embedded in the design the Scheme was not found to result in significant adverse effects on landscape character by year 15 of operation, although some significant adverse effects were found in relation to people walking on PROW across the Order limits.</p>	
<b>LVIA</b>	It is essential provision is made for the future - and furthermore, for the upgrading of equipment to maintain efficiency without undue	An extensive landscape strategy has been prepared which includes the improvement of existing fragmented hedgerows, as well as the planting of new hedgerows and belts of woodland. The species proposed have been	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>disruption. It is essential boundaries are maintained and enhanced/ filled in to provide a suitable screen. Furthermore, the harshness of deer fencing needs to be softened by flora. Any buildings need to be sympathetically screened.</p>	<p>selected in response to the existing vegetation across the site to be in keeping with the character of the landscape.</p> <p>Structures and buildings have been sited to maximise existing screening wherever possible, and additional planting used wherever possible.</p> <p>Vegetation has typically been proposed against any proposed fencing.</p> <p>A detailed plan for the establishment and management of new hedgerows will be developed for the five year establishment maintenance period.</p> <p>The aim of establishment maintenance will be to support the early stages of growth to encourage the canopy to close, reducing future management requirements to address competition from weeds.</p> <p>Please see the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>, for more information.</p>	
<b>LVIA</b>	<p>Looking at all the documentation supplied by “Longfield” is quite clear the five main properties that will be impacted by this development. Little Weathers / White Oaks will be the property most seriously affected should the adjacent field be used to house solar panels, battery storage units</p>	<p>A thorough review of views from residential properties was undertaken following the statutory consultation, including Little Weathers and White Oaks. The review following the statutory consultation resulted in refinements to the Scheme design, including the removal of any panels from the part of fields behind each of these properties. This change retains the existing open views experienced by residents of both Little Weathers and White Oaks from the rear of their houses.</p>	Y



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	and any other equipment that is used when farming solar.	Overall, the Applicant is proposing a number of measures to mitigate the impact of the Scheme. This includes offsets and viewing corridors to protect views from people’s homes. The design has responded to individual views to retain important features. Design changes include the exclusion of entire fields from any development, the introduction of 200m viewing corridors to be free of development, and new offsets ranging from 50 – 70m. Please see Table 10.6 in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> for further detail. Further mitigation measures embedded in the Scheme design are set out in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> and in <b>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement - Ecology [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	
<b>LVIA</b>	I take exception to the wording used in this “Longfield” document in relation to response regarding the viewpoint in our property as “Low” in sections 1.13.1 and 1.14.4. What right does the author of this report having in determining these views points in this way, they do not live in our house, they have not experienced the changing seasons bring to these viewpoints, all they have done is taken a “snapshot” of what	The term ‘low’ is used in line with the methodology, as set out in <b>Appendix 10B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . This is only one part of the consideration that feeds into the overall sensitivity attributed to views from the property. The overall sensitivity was concluded to be ‘high’ which is explained as being representative of: Activity resulting in a particular interest or appreciation of the view (e.g. residents with principal private views, or people engaged in outdoor recreation whose attention is focused on the landscape and where people might visit purely to experience the view, such as promoted viewpoints) and/or a view of	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
LVIA	<p>they have seen on a one-off visit to the area.</p> <p>Aside from looking at those hideous panels, our lives will be dominated by acres of metal, glass, CCTV and generator boxes, many residents will feel like prisoners in this new landscape of security fences, warning signs and cameras.</p>	<p>national value (e.g. within/towards a designated landscape).</p> <p>A thorough review of views from residential properties was undertaken following the statutory consultation. The review following the statutory consultation resulted in refinements to the Scheme design, including the removal of any panels from the part of fields behind each of these properties.</p> <p>Overall, the Applicant is proposing a number of measures to mitigate the impact of the Scheme. This includes offsets and viewing corridors to protect views from people’s homes. The design has responded to individual views to retain important features. Design changes include the exclusion of entire fields from any development, the introduction of 200m viewing corridors to be free of development, and new offsets ranging from 50 – 70m. Please see Table 10.6 in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> for further detail. Further mitigation measures embedded in the Scheme design are set out in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> and in <b>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement - Ecology [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The proposed lighting has been designed to avoid and minimise the potential for adverse environmental effects, including measures such as: no visible lighting will be utilised at the site perimeter fence; InfraRed lighting will be provided by the CCTV/security system to provide night</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>vision functionality for CCTV; and visible light will be manually operated or by PIR (passive infrared) operated for access and in emergencies. Further information can be found in Section 10.7.13 of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>LVIA</b>	<p>As trees and vegetation takes years to grow, there will be great detrimental environmental impacts on this very large area including the excavations, construction activities and the consequent noise and lighting. It will look ugly for three years at least.</p>	<p>The Applicant is proposing a number of measures to mitigate against the impact of the Scheme. Measures embedded in the Scheme design are set out in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> and the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>.</p> <p>With reference to Figure 10-14 in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, new planting proposed as part of the Scheme would be delivered in three phases. Where it was found to be beneficial to undertake planting early, in order to maximise growth prior to the Scheme's operation, this has been included as Advanced Mitigation Planting. This will be carried out in the 2021/2022 planting season. In instances where planting required to mitigate adverse effects on people's views could not be undertaken in 2021/2022, it would be undertaken at the beginning of the construction phase. This planting is referred to as Construction Day 1 Planting. All remaining planting, referred to as Residual Mitigation Planting, would be undertaken at the end of the construction phase.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
LVIA	The present open landscape will be drastically changed by fences, high solar panels, high hedges and trees, obscuring views currently enjoyed by local residents, walkers, cyclists and motorists.	<p>The proposed lighting has been designed to avoid and minimise the potential for adverse environmental effects, including measures such as: no visible lighting will be utilised at the site perimeter fence; InfraRed lighting will be provided by the CCTV/security system to provide night vision functionality for CCTV; and visible light will be manually operated or by PIR (passive infra-red) operated for access and in emergencies. Further information can be found in Section 10.7.13 of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>, includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site. Please also refer to <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Scheme's biodiversity net gain has been calculated using the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 and is reported in the DCO application through the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b>. An overall gain of approximately 79% of habitat units and 20% of hedgerow habitats is predicted.</p>	N
LVIA	There has not been anywhere near enough consideration given to the houses directly affected by the scheme and the immediate communities. This land acts as a green buffer between the ever-	Since the Scheme was presented at consultation, there have been further refinements designed to protect the setting of houses in close proximity to the Scheme. This includes offsets and viewing corridors to protect views from people's homes. The design has responded to individual views to retain important features. Design	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	enlarging city of Chelmsford and these local villages. This proposal would take that green / countryside separation away.	<p>changes include the exclusion of entire fields from any development, the introduction of 200m viewing corridors to be free of development, and new offsets ranging from 50 – 70m. Please see Table 10.6 in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> for further detail. No significant adverse effects on people’s views from their homes have been identified, once mitigation planting has fully established.</p> <p>A cumulative assessment has now been prepared detailing the combined effect that the Scheme and other potential developments in the local area may have on the landscape. Of the visual receptors identified, set out in ES Volume 2 10D: Visual Baseline, only people walking on PROW 213_21 in proximity to Bulls Lodge Substation (represented by VPs 52 and 53) would experience views of the Scheme in combination with a cumulative scheme. No other visual receptors would experience cumulative visual effects.</p> <p>People walking south on the PROW route 213 21 would see glimpses of construction of the A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening Scheme. However, this would be unobtrusive and in the background such that cumulative effect would be minor adverse, and therefore no greater than the effects reported for the Scheme.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
LVIA	<p>I take exception to the wording used in this “Longfield” document in relation to response regarding the viewpoint in our property as “Low” in sections 1.13.1 and 1.14.4. What right does the author of this report have in determining these views points in this way, they do not live in our house, they have not experienced the changing seasons bring to these view points, all they have done is taken a “snapshot” of what they have seen on a one off visit to the area.</p>	<p>Please see <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Since the Scheme presented at consultation there has been further refinements designed to protect the setting of houses in close proximity to the Scheme. This includes offsets and viewing corridors to protect views from people’s homes. The design has responded to individual views to retain important features. Design changes include the exclusion of entire fields from any development, the introduction of 200m viewing corridors to be free of development, and new offsets ranging from 50 – 70m. Please see Table 10.6 in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> for further detail. No significant adverse effects on people’s views from their homes have been identified, once mitigation planting has fully established.</p> <p>A cumulative assessment has now been prepared detailing the combined effect that the Scheme and other potential developments in the local area may have on the landscape. Of the visual receptors identified, set out in ES Volume 2 10D: Visual Baseline, only people walking on PROW 213_21 in proximity to Bulls Lodge Substation (represented by VPs 52 and 53) would experience views of the Scheme in combination with a cumulative scheme.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>No other visual receptors would experience cumulative visual effects.</p> <p>People walking south on the PROW route 213 21 would see glimpses of construction of the A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening Scheme. However this would be unobtrusive and in the background such that cumulative effect would be minor adverse, and therefore no greater than the effects reported for the Scheme.</p> <p>Please see <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>LVIA</b>	<p>All visual mitigations appear to be based on masking the issue with hedgerows (which would take many years to establish) rather than addressing the main issue, which is simply the sheer size of the scheme.</p>	<p>The size of the Scheme is proportionate to the size and urgency of the national need, which is substantial. There is also a need to make the most of the connection to the Grid - this is a limited resource.</p> <p>The Applicant accepts that this is a site of significant size. This is why we are working very hard to ensure that the design of the site is as sensitive as it can be to the local area. Seeking local opinion and ideas on how to design this site in detail are key requirements of the statutory consultation and something we take very seriously.</p> <p>With reference to <b>Figure 10-14</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b>, new planting proposed as part of the Scheme would be delivered in three phases. Where it was found to be beneficial to undertake</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
LVIA	<p>Have EDF already commissioned the trees, shrubs, bushes etc that you are committing to within this consultation document. Whilst it may seem presumptuous it is in fact a cost saving as it will allow EDF to purchase these plants at an earlier and smaller stage. The plants can be held in storage, in agreement with the appropriate nursery/ arboriculturist support and given the additional time to grow whilst planning and construction continues. The end result will be more mature trees are planted at a much reduced rate.</p>	<p>planting early, in order to maximise growth prior to the Scheme's operation, this has been included as Advanced Mitigation Planting. This will be carried out in the 2021/2022 planting season. In instances where planting required to mitigate adverse effects on people's views could not be undertaken in 2021/2022, it would be undertaken at the beginning of the construction phase. This planting is referred to as Construction Day 1 Planting. All remaining planting, referred to as Residual Mitigation Planting, would be undertaken at the end of the construction phase.</p> <p>With reference to <b>Figure 10-14 of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b>, new planting proposed as part of the Scheme would be delivered in three phases. Where it was found to be beneficial to undertake planting early, in order to maximise growth prior to the Scheme's operation, this has been included as Advanced Mitigation Planting. This will be carried out in the 2021/2022 planting season. In instances where planting required to mitigate adverse effects on people's views could not be undertaken in 2021/2022, it would be undertaken at the beginning of the construction phase. This planting is referred to as Construction Day 1 Planting. All remaining planting, referred to as Residual Mitigation Planting, would be undertaken at the end of the construction phase. Further detail regarding the proposed planting and its mitigation of landscape and visual impacts can be found in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b></p>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
LVIA	<p>The impact on residential properties is too great, particularly the many listed buildings. At Rolls Farm (Grade II listed) the panels proposed are far too close to the property. The fact this property, and many others, is owned by the Landowner who is set to benefit from the project should not be ignored.</p>	<p>The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>, includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site. Please also refer to <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Since the Scheme presented at consultation there has been further refinements designed to protect the setting of houses in close proximity to the Scheme. This includes offsets and viewing corridors to protect views from people’s homes. The design has responded to individual views to retain important features. Design changes include the exclusion of entire fields from any development, the introduction of 200m viewing corridors to be free of development, and new offsets ranging from 50 – 70m. Please see Table 10.6 in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> for further detail. No significant adverse effects on people’s views from their homes have been identified, once mitigation planting has fully established.</p> <p>With regards Rolls Farm, hedgerow is to be enhanced to help screen it from the PV Arrays and deer fencing within it. <b>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> sets out that part of the rural setting of the asset, including views from the asset towards the Scheme, will experience a residual minor adverse effect.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
LVIA	The belief from the development team at “Longfield Solar Farm” that high hedge rows and bushes will mask this blot on the Terling countryside.	<p>The size of the Scheme is proportionate to the size and urgency of the national need, which is substantial. There is also a need to make the most of the connection to the Grid - this is a limited resource.</p> <p>The Applicant accepts that this is a site of significant size. This is why we are working very hard to ensure that the design of the site is as sensitive as it can be to the local area. Seeking local opinion and ideas on how to design this site in detail are key requirements of the statutory consultation and something we take very seriously.</p> <p>With reference to <b>Figure 10-14</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b>, new planting proposed as part of the Scheme would be delivered in three phases. Where it was found to be beneficial to undertake planting early, in order to maximise growth prior to the Scheme’s operation, this has been included as Advanced Mitigation Planting. This will be carried out in the 2021/2022 planting season. In instances where planting required to mitigate adverse effects on people’s views could not be undertaken in 2021/2022, it would be undertaken at the beginning of the construction phase. This planting is referred to as Construction Day 1 Planting. All remaining planting, referred to as Residual Mitigation Planting, would be undertaken at the end of the construction phase.</p>	N
LVIA	The field to the north of White House Farm is	Since the Scheme presented at consultation there has been further refinements designed to protect the setting of houses in close proximity to the Scheme. This includes	Y

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>immediately adjacent to my property and forms much of the view from the north facing upper storey windows. This view is across the River Ter Valley and includes field borders consisting of hedgerows and ancient trees. If this field is covered in panels with associated fencing and security devices then it will be detrimental to that view.</p>	<p>offsets and viewing corridors to protect views from people’s homes. The design has responded to individual views to retain important features. Design changes include the exclusion of entire fields from any development, the introduction of 200m viewing corridors to be free of development, and new offsets ranging from 50 – 70m. Please see Table 10.6 in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 - Landscape and Visual Amenity - of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> for further detail. No significant adverse effects on people’s views from their homes have been identified, once mitigation planting has fully established.</p> <p>The historic field boundary that divides the western end of the field to the north of Whitehouse Farm would be reinstated with a new native hedgerow. No Solar PV arrays are proposed in the western parcel of the field, thereby retaining a clear view north from White House Farm. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> and the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>	
LVIA	<p>No mitigation measures can or will conceal, in what is currently unspoilt open countryside - the industrial scale of the intrusion occasioned by such a vast array of almost 2.0 million solar panels. Given the entire area will be enclosed by urban 3.0 metres high chain-link fencing,</p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed potential impacts on the landscape and visual amenity of users of the PROW network in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Once screening and planting included as mitigation in the Scheme has matured, people walking on the Essex Way to the west or south of Fuller Street (VP45 and VP46) would experience minor adverse effects, which are not considered to be significant. The level of effect is reduced</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>punctuated with security lights &amp; CCTV cameras (albeit with restricted views) this entire area will be dramatically compromised as an area for informal recreation by large numbers of people – residents &amp; people travelling from across the region to enjoy this increasingly rare unspoilt rural tranquillity.</p>	<p>from year 1 because existing and proposed vegetation would be in leaf, filtering views of the PV Arrays such that the Scheme would be unobtrusive. People walking on the Essex Way on the south western corner of Sandy Wood would experience close range views of the Scheme, however this would be for a very short duration of the route such that the overall effect on people walking the Essex Way would remain minor adverse.</p> <p>People walking on PROW 213_19 and PROW 113_25 within the Order limits would experience major adverse effects because of close range views of the proposed PV Arrays in the immediate foreground. These effects are considered significant. People walking on the wider PROW network beyond the Order limits boundary would not experience significant effects resulting from operation during year 15.</p> <p>The Applicant is proposing a number of measures to mitigate against the impact of the Scheme. Measures embedded in the Scheme design are set out in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>, in the Biodiversity Design and Outline Management Plan (ref 7.9) and in <b>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement - Ecology [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>With reference to Figure 10-14, new planting proposed as part of the Scheme would be delivered in three phases. Where it was found to be beneficial to undertake planting early, in order to maximise growth prior to the Scheme's</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>operation, this has been included as Advanced Mitigation Planting. This will be carried out in the 2021/2022 planting season. In instances where planting required to mitigate adverse effects on people’s views could not be undertaken in 2021/2022, it would be undertaken at the beginning of the construction phase. This planting is referred to as Construction Day 1 Planting. All remaining planting, referred to as Residual Mitigation Planting, would be undertaken at the end of the construction phase.</p> <p>The proposed lighting has been designed to avoid and minimise the potential for adverse environmental effects, including measures such as: no visible lighting will be utilised at the site perimeter fence; InfraRed lighting will be provided by the CCTV/security system to provide night vision functionality for CCTV; and visible light will be manually operated or by PIR (passive infras-red) operated for access and in emergencies. Further information can be found in Section 10.7.13 of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
LVIA	<p>Very little mention of what we can expect on our roads &amp; lanes with regards to lighting, CCTV, signage etc that will blot the landscape.</p>	<p>The proposed lighting has been designed to avoid and minimise the potential for adverse environmental effects, including measures such as: no visible lighting will be utilised at the site perimeter fence; InfraRed lighting will be provided by the CCTV/security system to provide night vision functionality for CCTV; and visible light will be manually operated or by PIR (passive infras-red)</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
LVIA	<p>I request that Picken and Whitehouse is not used as it is grade 2 land and that it too could be an orchard or wildflower meadow or indeed further woodland. I also note that in winter time this field too has a large area of shade. Without removing trees this would not be a suitable field in which to harness the energy of the sun.</p>	<p>operated for access and in emergencies. Further information can be found in Section 10.7.13 of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Since the Scheme presented at consultation there has been further refinements designed to protect the setting of houses in close proximity to the Scheme. This includes offsets and viewing corridors to protect views from people’s homes. The design has responded to individual views to retain important features. Design changes include the exclusion of entire fields from any development, the introduction of 200m viewing corridors to be free of development, and new offsets ranging from 50 – 70m. Please see Table 10.6 in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 - Landscape and Visual Amenity - of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> for further detail. No significant adverse effects on people’s views from their homes have been identified, once mitigation planting has fully established.</p> <p>The historic field boundary that divides the western end of the field to the north of Whitehouse Farm would be reinstated with a new native hedgerow. No Solar PV arrays are proposed in the western parcel of the field, thereby retaining a clear view north from White House Farm. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> and the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>	Y

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
LVIA	Looking to reduce the size of this project due to the devastating effect this will have on the family homes of residents engulfed by this development.	Since the Scheme presented at consultation there has been further refinements designed to protect the setting of houses in close proximity to the Scheme. This includes offsets and viewing corridors to protect views from people’s homes. The design has responded to individual views to retain important features. Design changes include the exclusion of entire fields from any development, the introduction of 200m viewing corridors to be free of development, and new offsets ranging from 50 – 70m. Please see Table 10.6 in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 - Landscape and Visual Amenity - of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> for further detail. No significant adverse effects on people’s views from their homes have been identified, once mitigation planting has fully established.	N
LVIA	On a personal note, our own house is situated within the scheme, on Noakes Lane. We are surrounded in front, behind and to the east, by the scheme. As the proposal currently stands, as far as we can see from our house in whichever direction we look, we shall be looking at a continuous sea of PV panels. The vague promise that a bit of hedge will be planted to mask the panels	Since the Scheme presented at consultation there has been further refinements designed to protect the setting of houses in close proximity to the Scheme. This includes offsets and viewing corridors to protect views from people’s homes. The design has responded to individual views to retain important features. Design changes include the exclusion of entire fields from any development, the introduction of 200m viewing corridors to be free of development, and new offsets ranging from 50 – 70m. Please see Table 10.6 in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 - Landscape and Visual Amenity - of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> for further detail. No significant	Y

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	doesn't give us any true mitigation.	<p>adverse effects on people's views from their homes have been identified, once mitigation planting has fully established.</p> <p>We understand that this comment relates to Hedgerow Cottage. The field to the north west of Hedgerow Cottage and Noakes Barn has been excluded from development of Solar PV arrays or solar farm or ancillary infrastructure. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> and the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>	
<b>Need</b>	Solar PV is a totally inappropriate and inefficient way of land usage, they are proposed as a purely financial vehicle where local environmental impacts are unfortunately of little concern to the developers.	<p>Chapter 11 of the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b> provides an analysis of the economic viability of large-scale solar generation as a future contributor to a low-carbon Great Britain electricity supply system in comparison to alternate technologies; and an analysis of why the Scheme will be most beneficial to the achievement of government's aims if it is consented to the scale proposed. Solar power reduces the market price of electricity by displacing more expensive forms of generation from the cost stack. This delivers benefits for electricity consumers; Due to technological advances, power generated by solar plants is already at or below grid parity cost in Great Britain; Solar power is economically attractive in Great Britain against many other forms of conventional and renewable generation; Size remains important, and maximising the generating capacity of schemes improves their economic efficiency, so bringing power to market at the lowest cost possible. Larger solar schemes deliver more quickly and at a lower unit cost than multiple independent schemes</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>which make up the same total capacity, bringing forward carbon reduction and economic benefits in line with government policy; The Scheme proposes a substantial infrastructure asset, which if consented will deliver large amounts of cheap, low-carbon electricity both during and beyond the critical 2020s timeframe. Maximising the capacity of generation in the resource-rich, accessible and technically deliverable proposed location, represents a significant and economically rational step forwards in the fight against the global climate emergency. The Applicant has assessed the impacts of delivering a scheme of this scale through the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and mitigation to manage environmental effects are contained within the <b>OCEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10], OEMP [EN010118/APP/7.11]</b> and <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b></p> <p>The Applicant is proposing a number of measures to mitigate against the impact of the Scheme. Measures embedded in the Scheme design are set out in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> and in <b>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement - Ecology [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Need</b>	<p>There is no evidence in the submitted application documents which provide a cradle to grave carbon analysis of the development, it is suspected that as the grid continues to</p>	<p>The application documents provide estimates of the proposed development's carbon impacts across all phases from land use change, embodied carbon in materials, transport of materials, operations and decommissioning. The carbon assessment was carried out on the basis of the best available information in terms</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>decarbonise that Solar PV installation will have a carbon legacy rather than benefit. As the sourcing of the PV panels and associated equipment which go to make up the installation are outside the UK then we are effectively exporting the carbon legacy.</p>	<p>of activity data from the proposed development, and the most reliable emissions factors for different materials and activities. Some emissions factors are more robust than others, but this is acknowledged in the application. It is anticipated that emissions data relating to the supply of electrical components will improve in quality over time, and that these emissions will fall as the carbon efficiency of the supply chain improves.</p> <p>Regarding the overall carbon benefit of the proposed development from its supply of low carbon electricity to the UK national grid, it is important to acknowledge that the ongoing decarbonisation of the grid, so vital to the UK achieving its national emissions reductions targets, can only occur through investment in low-carbon generation such as the proposed development. To put this another way, the proposed development is not trying to out-compete the grid in terms of carbon intensity.</p> <p>Instead, to assess the overall benefits of the electricity to be supplied by the proposed development, it is necessary to compare the carbon intensity of its output with the carbon intensity of the power that would need to be generated elsewhere should the development not go ahead. Any such counterfactual scenario is clearly subject to considerable uncertainty, but an assumption that was made is that it is reasonable to compare the proposed development with an unabated combined cycle gas turbine, currently the most efficient form of fossil generation. Compared against this counterfactual, the</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>operational carbon intensity of the proposed development is over 95% lower. The dramatically reduced emissions from renewable schemes such as the proposed development is the reason that the UK grid carbon intensity is projected to fall so significantly over coming decades.</p> <p>Regarding the carbon leakage from sourcing components from outside the UK, this is a consequence of a globalised supply chain, and it is important that we acknowledge both our consumption- and production-related carbon impact. It should be noted that the significance of the proposed development is assessed by comparing its carbon impact with UK carbon budgets over different time periods. UK carbon budgets are production-based, i.e. they only take account of emissions taking place within the UK (and from the UK's share of international aviation and shipping from 2033). The carbon impacts of the proposed development on the other hand are consumption-based, i.e. they do not discriminate on the basis of the geographical origin of emissions. The assessment of significance, therefore, is highly conservative taking account as it does of both domestic and overseas emissions.</p>	
<b>Need</b>	<p>Why does this rural community need to make a major contribution to the UK's need for electricity (P7) when the greater usage of power is in urban and industrial areas. It should be proportionate</p>	<p>Estimates from National Grid, the National Infrastructure Commission and the Energy Systems Catapult of the capacities of new solar generation needed in order to meet Net Zero include 44 to 76GW of additional solar capacity by 2050, with approximately one quarter of this needed in the next ten years. In order to meet those</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>to the use. A number of smaller developments could achieve the same objective but be much less disruptive to any one area. Striving for economies of scale overwhelms a rational consideration of the real impact.</p>	<p>projections (noting that, consistent with the NPSs, these capacities are not presented as a target, nor indeed a quota, and therefore could be gone further than) a very high proportion of (if not all) solar projects of any scale which come forward for consent will need to be approved. Falling short on solar development at any stage in the next decades will risk causing the UK falling behind on decarbonisation and will increase the magnitude of the task (and therefore the intolerable risk of failure) of meeting its 2050 legal commitments to achieve Net Zero. Please see Section 11.4 in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> for further information. Figure 116 in this document shows the results of an analysis which illustrates that development of one large solar scheme brings carbon savings and economic benefits versus developing combinations of smaller independent schemes, each combination matching to the same total installed generation capacity. The analysis assesses the relative costs and construction timeframes associated with the development of different sized independent solar schemes against the total cost and carbon benefit achievable through the development of one large solar scheme such as the proposed Scheme.</p>	
<b>Need</b>	<p>What evidence is there that solar farms can produce enough energy in the UK?</p>	<p>Solar energy generation is well established in the UK, with more than 13GW of installed capacity. However, there are no solar farms of this scale currently operational in the UK. One, Cleve Hill Solar Park, has received a DCO and there are others going through the planning process. Improvements in technology have made solar PV panels and the other elements of solar farms more</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
Need	Why does the solar farm need to be so big?	<p>affordable. This has enabled proposals of a scale which can meaningfully contribute to the UK’s urgent need for renewable energy to begin to come forward. Please refer to the <b>Statement of Need</b> for further information <b>[EN010118/APP/7.1]</b>.</p> <p>The size of the scheme is proportionate to the size and urgency of the national need, which is substantial. There is also a need to make the most of the connection to the Grid - this is a limited resource. We do fully accept that this is a site of significant size. This is why we are working very hard to ensure that the design of the site is as sensitive as it can be to the local area. Seeking local opinion and ideas on how to design this site in detail are key requirements of the statutory consultation and something we take very seriously.</p> <p>Estimates from National Grid, the National Infrastructure Commission and the Energy Systems Catapult of the capacities of new solar generation needed in order to meet Net Zero include 44 to 76GW of additional solar capacity by 2050, with approximately one quarter of this needed in the next ten years. In order to meet those projections (noting that, consistent with the NPSs, these capacities are not presented as a target, nor indeed a quota, and therefore could be gone further than) a very high proportion of (if not all) solar projects of any scale which come forward for consent will need to be approved. Falling short on solar development at any stage in the next decades will risk causing the UK falling behind on decarbonisation and will increase the magnitude of the</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>task (and therefore the intolerable risk of failure) of meeting its 2050 legal commitments to achieve Net Zero. Please see Section 11.4 in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> for further information. Figure 116 in this document shows the results of an analysis which illustrates that development of one large solar scheme brings carbon savings and economic benefits versus developing combinations of smaller independent schemes, each combination matching to the same total installed generation capacity. The analysis assesses the relative costs and construction timeframes associated with the development of different sized independent solar schemes against the total cost and carbon benefit achievable through the development of one large solar scheme such as the proposed Scheme.</p>	
<b>Need</b>	<p>I am supportive of the use of solar energy to generate electricity and recognise the requirement to 'scale up' these types of the sites and energy sources over the coming years if we are to generate electricity through more sustainable means and reach net zero. Residents have raised their concerns to me about the size and scale of this particular site as well as the loss of arable farmland.</p>	<p>The size of the scheme is proportionate to the size and urgency of the national need, which is substantial. There is also a need to make the most of the connection to the Grid - this is a limited resource. Estimates from National Grid, the National Infrastructure Commission and the Energy Systems Catapult of the capacities of new solar generation needed in order to meet Net Zero include 44 to 76GW of additional solar capacity by 2050, with approximately one quarter of this needed in the next ten years. In order to meet those projections (noting that, consistent with the NPSs, these capacities are not presented as a target, nor indeed a quota, and therefore could be gone further than) a very high proportion of (if not all) solar projects of any scale</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>which come forward for consent will need to be approved. Falling short on solar development at any stage in the next decades will risk causing the UK falling behind on decarbonisation and will increase the magnitude of the task (and therefore the intolerable risk of failure) of meeting its 2050 legal commitments to achieve Net Zero. Please see Section 11.4 in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> for further information. Figure 116 in this document shows the results of an analysis which illustrates that development of one large solar scheme brings carbon savings and economic benefits versus developing combinations of smaller independent schemes, each combination matching to the same total installed generation capacity. The analysis assesses the relative costs and construction timeframes associated with the development of different sized independent solar schemes against the total cost and carbon benefit achievable through the development of one large solar scheme such as the proposed Scheme.</p> <p>In the context of there being a need for solar energy generation to be developed at scale, the Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>(EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that can produce a large amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>The Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree</p>	



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecological constraints – SAC’s, SPA’s, SSSI’s, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li> <li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li> <li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li> <li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li> <li>• Settlements;</li> <li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li> <li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li> <li>• Green Belt; and</li> <li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li> </ul>	
<b>Need</b>	I can’t overstate my concern at the scale of this development and its impact on the area as a whole. I	The size of the scheme is proportionate to the size and urgency of the national need, which is substantial. There	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>am concerned that PV panels are not the solution that we are looking for, but it is an available technology and it can be used to 'tick a box' for a government looking to reach a difficult target. In this environment, I am concerned that one landowner has found it profitable to convert his landholdings into a huge, long term power plant. (The words 'Field' and 'Farm' as part of this project give a false sense of rural idyll)</p>	<p>is also a need to make the most of the connection to the Grid - this is a limited resource. Estimates from National Grid, the National Infrastructure Commission and the Energy Systems Catapult of the capacities of new solar generation needed in order to meet Net Zero include 44 to 76GW of additional solar capacity by 2050, with approximately one quarter of this needed in the next ten years. In order to meet those projections (noting that, consistent with the NPSs, these capacities are not presented as a target, nor indeed a quota, and therefore could be gone further than) a very high proportion of (if not all) solar projects of any scale which come forward for consent will need to be approved. Falling short on solar development at any stage in the next decades will risk causing the UK falling behind on decarbonisation and will increase the magnitude of the task (and therefore the intolerable risk of failure) of meeting its 2050 legal commitments to achieve Net Zero. Please see Section 11.4 in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> for further information. Figure 116 in this document shows the results of an analysis which illustrates that development of one large solar scheme brings carbon savings and economic benefits versus developing combinations of smaller independent schemes, each combination matching to the same total installed generation capacity. The analysis assesses the relative costs and construction timeframes associated with the development of different sized independent solar schemes against the total cost and carbon benefit</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		achievable through the development of one large solar scheme such as the proposed Scheme.	
<b>Need</b>	Solar farms have a relatively low energy generation for the area they occupy, in that they have an output of between 7-11% of their annualised thereof maximum, primarily because of the number of hours they receive solar energy. The Government objective to decarbonise the electrical generation gride by 2050, there is evidence to show that this can be achieved using offshore wind energy of which the UK has a significant industry and resource to achieve that. Offshore wind energy has an output of around 33% of its theoretical maximum. Solar panels will be not able to meet these targets.	<b>Section 8.4</b> in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> explains without the development of additional solar projects, other measures will be required to fill the gap which solar will fill, effectively making it much harder for the UK to achieve Net Zero. While offshore wind makes the largest contribution to decarbonisation in most forward electricity system scenarios, solar complements offshore wind deployment (see <b>Section 9.8</b> also for further information). The first conclusion is therefore that the bringing forward of solar schemes such as this Scheme should be continued and progressed with determined rigour and drive, to enable their timely delivery. Secondly, that the further identification of solar schemes and other low-carbon initiatives which complement offshore wind generation should be progressed with urgency to ensure the required trajectory in reducing carbon intensity can be achieved or bettered.	N
<b>Need</b>	Good, will need it for balancing the grid and increasing stability with increasing amounts of intermittent renewables.	This is noted and the Applicant thanks the respondent for their comments.	N
<b>Need</b>	Developers that use the DCO process should recognise that this is for schemes of national	Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>strategic importance. Even where need for such schemes is demonstrated the location should be selected on the basis of an optimal solution in terms of national policy. This scheme is manifestly an opportunistic exercise and no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that this solution presents the optimal location for the energy generation proposed. In my submission the application should be refused.</p>	<p>the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that is capable of producing a large amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area. The electricity transmission system is major existing infrastructure that cannot be easily or quickly expanded. New large scale generating stations need to be located near to the transmission system, where bulk capacity to receive the electricity generated is available. The 400 kV power line between Braintree and Rayleigh is part of the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS) that has capacity to receive power from a large scale solar farm, and transmit it over a wide geography. Please see the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> for further information.</p> <p>The Applicant sought a site that is well suited to connecting to the 400 kV power line between Braintree and Rayleigh and secured a grid connection agreement from National Grid. The Applicant identified that the Solar Farm Site is highly suitable in terms of proximity to the NETS as it is located directly below the 400kV NETS power lines, and in close proximity to Bulls Lodge Substation. This afforded the Applicant a range of</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>technically deliverable options for connecting the proposed solar farm to the NETS, either via an entirely new National Grid substation within the Solar Farm Site, or via a short cable link to the existing Bulls Lodge Substation, which could be upgraded to receive the power from the solar farm.</p> <p>As the project developed, the point of connection to the NETS was confirmed by National Grid to be Bulls Lodge Substation. In providing a connection to the NETS, National Grid is required to provide the most economic and efficient solution. Bulls Lodge Substation also emerged from non-statutory consultation as the most popular option for the point of connection, over the alternatives set out at that stage.</p> <p>For further information regarding the site selection process, please see the <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Need</b>	<p>We are 100% opposed to the development as a whole. The revised proposal covers an extensive area of beautiful English countryside which is cherished by those living and working in its vicinity. We personally walk and cycle regularly in the area impacted which we believe will be significantly blighted by the construction of the farm.</p>	<p>The size of the scheme is proportionate to the size and urgency of the national need, which is substantial. There is also a need to make the most of the connection to the Grid - this is a limited resource.</p> <p>Estimates from National Grid, the National Infrastructure Commission and the Energy Systems Catapult of the capacities of new solar generation needed in order to meet Net Zero include 44 to 76GW of additional solar capacity by 2050, with approximately one quarter of this needed in the next ten years. In order to meet those projections (noting that, consistent with the NPSs, these capacities are not presented as a target, nor indeed a</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>quota, and therefore could be gone further than) a very high proportion of (if not all) solar projects of any scale which come forward for consent will need to be approved. Falling short on solar development at any stage in the next decades will risk causing the UK falling behind on decarbonisation and will increase the magnitude of the task (and therefore the intolerable risk of failure) of meeting its 2050 legal commitments to achieve Net Zero. Please see Section 11.4 in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> for further information. Figure 116 in this document shows the results of an analysis which illustrates that development of one large solar scheme brings carbon savings and economic benefits versus developing combinations of smaller independent schemes, each combination matching to the same total installed generation capacity. The analysis assesses the relative costs and construction timeframes associated with the development of different sized independent solar schemes against the total cost and carbon benefit achievable through the development of one large solar scheme such as the proposed Scheme.</p> <p>In the context of there being a need for solar energy generation to be developed at scale, the Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that can produce a large amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>The Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable).</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ecological constraints – SAC’s, SPA’s, SSSI’s, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li><li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li><li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li><li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li><li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li><li>• Settlements;</li><li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li><li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li><li>• Green Belt; and</li><li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li></ul> <p>The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>, includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site. Please also</p>	



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>refer to <b>Chapter 8 - Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Furthermore, the Scheme's biodiversity net gain has been calculated using the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 and is reported in the DCO Application through the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b>. An overall gain of approximately 79% of habitat units and 20% of hedgerow habitats is predicted.</p>	
<b>Need</b>	<p>It is difficult to see any positive contribution with a scheme of the proposed size. The use of selective vocabulary to describe potential impact/harm on existing premises, habitat, landscape is questionable at best. There will be harm and loss of amenity and challenges will have to be made to the applicant's comments in due course in the Examination stage of the DCO process.</p>	<p>The size of the scheme is proportionate to the size and urgency of the national need, which is substantial. There is also a need to make the most of the connection to the Grid - this is a limited resource. Estimates from National Grid, the National Infrastructure Commission and the Energy Systems Catapult of the capacities of new solar generation needed in order to meet Net Zero include 44 to 76GW of additional solar capacity by 2050, with approximately one quarter of this needed in the next ten years. In order to meet those projections (noting that, consistent with the NPSs, these capacities are not presented as a target, nor indeed a quota, and therefore could be gone further than) a very high proportion of (if not all) solar projects of any scale which come forward for consent will need to be approved. Falling short on solar development at any stage in the next decades will risk causing the UK falling behind on decarbonisation and will increase the magnitude of the task (and therefore the intolerable risk of failure) of meeting its 2050 legal commitments to achieve Net Zero. Please see Section 11.4 in the <b>Statement of Need [EN010118.APP/7.1]</b> for further information. Figure 116 in</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>this document shows the results of an analysis which illustrates that development of one large solar scheme brings carbon savings and economic benefits versus developing combinations of smaller independent schemes, each combination matching to the same total installed generation capacity. The analysis assesses the relative costs and construction timeframes associated with the development of different sized independent solar schemes against the total cost and carbon benefit achievable through the development of one large solar scheme such as the proposed Scheme.</p> <p>In the context of there being a need for solar energy generation to be developed at scale, the Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that can produce a large</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>The Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecological constraints – SAC’s, SPA’s, SSSI’s, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li> <li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li> <li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li> <li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li> <li>• Settlements;</li> <li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li> <li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li> <li>• Green Belt; and</li> <li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li> </ul>	
<b>Noise</b>	<p>We are gravely concerned of the long term health issues that comes with this sort of project, not just the continues noise of the equipment generating power, which on its own would cause a mental strain on the most resilient person, but the actual physical health issues of living next to a solar farm.</p>	<p>The Applicant has set out our assessment of potential noise impacts in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. The assessment considers the location of operational plant. The design of the Scheme has incorporated measures such as distancing of inverters away from sensitive receptors, and locating the BESS compound in an area away from large concentrations of receptors as well as towards the A12 where existing ambient noise levels are higher (such that noise emissions from the BESS are less</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
Noise	<p>Having visited a similar size solar farm in Hampshire we found at various location around the farm there were levels of “humming type noise” being omitted from the equipment operated on this development. This alone would have a dramatic effect on a person’s mental health and wellbeing, without the toxic blot on the landscape of a sea of glinting solar panels.</p>	<p>impactful).                      As set out in the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> included as an appendix of the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>, inverters within 250m of residential dwellings will be treated with acoustic barriers which achieve a minimum 10dB(A) sound reduction, or an inverter selected with sound power levels at least 10dB lower than 96dB, which has been applied to inverters in the EIA.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out our assessment of potential noise impacts in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. The assessment considers the location of operational plant. The design of the Scheme has incorporated measures such as distancing of inverters away from sensitive receptors, and locating the BESS compound in an area away from large concentrations of receptors as well as towards the A12 where existing ambient noise levels are higher (such that noise emissions from the BESS are less impactful).                      As set out in the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> included as an appendix of the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>, inverters within 250m of residential dwellings will be treated with acoustic barriers which achieve a minimum 10dB(A) sound reduction, or an inverter selected with sound power levels at least 10dB lower than 96dB, which has been applied to inverters in the EIA.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
Noise	<p>The Longfield team admit that the site will generate noise when in use, but do not seem able to quantify the level of noise generated, nor the locations where the noise will originate. They admit that the battery storage facility will generate noise as it is air conditioned however there will also be intermediate connection points all over the solar farm which will also generate noise. There seems to be no detail as to where these connection points are located and what amount of noise they will generate. As the battery storage facility is able to supply energy at any time of day, the noise will not cease outside daylight hours so this is a significant concern, and one that the Longfield team seem unable to quantify or plan to mitigate in any meaningful way.</p>	<p>The Applicant has set out our assessment of potential noise impacts in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. The assessment considers the location of operational plant. The design of the Scheme has incorporated measures such as distancing of inverters away from sensitive receptors, and locating the BESS compound in an area away from large concentrations of receptors as well as towards the A12 where existing ambient noise levels are higher (such that noise emissions from the BESS are less impactful).</p> <p>As set out in the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> included as an appendix of the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>, inverters within 250m of residential dwellings will be treated with acoustic barriers which achieve a minimum 10dB(A) sound reduction, or an inverter selected with sound power levels at least 10dB lower than 96dB, which has been applied to inverters in the EIA.</p>	N
Noise	<p>There is still huge uncertainty on levels of noise expected during the construction phase and the impact this would have on</p>	<p>Impacts from noise during construction are assessed in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Assessment [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and measures to manage construction noise set out in the <b>OCEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>. Construction noise limits have</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	biodiversity and local communities.	been identified for nearby noise sensitive receptors during evening and night-time periods, as well as Sunday daytime. Sensitive receptors have been identified and noise monitoring locations have been determined through desktop study during the scoping process and confirmed during site visits. The methodology for selection of assessment receptor positions and monitoring locations is discussed in sections 11.8.6 to 11.8.13 of <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Assessment [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	
<b>Noise</b>	And there's uncertainty of the noise levels during construction and your drawing are examples.	Impacts from noise during construction are assessed in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Assessment [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and measures to manage construction noise set out in the <b>OCEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b> . Construction noise limits have been identified for nearby noise sensitive receptors during evening and night-time periods, as well as Sunday daytime. Sensitive receptors have been identified and noise monitoring locations have been determined through desktop study during the scoping process and confirmed during site visits. The methodology for selection of assessment receptor positions and monitoring locations is discussed in sections 11.8.6 to 11.8.13 of <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Assessment [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N
<b>Noise</b>	Additionally, the "hum" being generated 24/365 coming from these battery areas as they charge /discharge and are cooled by a convection and collection of	The assessment of noise emissions from plant associated with the Proposed Development is undertaken with reference to guidance in BS 4142:2014+A1:2019 'Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound'. BS 4142 provides guidance on	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
Noise	<p>air conditioning plants each with their trigger boost switches needs to be explained and by reference to “db” ratings at the boundaries of the wider Longfield site to World Health Organisation mandates. The Planning Inspectorate should quantify such limits in any consideration of a DCO approval.</p> <p>The noise - not just whilst construction work is in place but once the farm is up and running. The A12 is already noisy enough I don't want more.</p>	<p>applying a rating level’ to account for tonal, impulsive or intermittent characteristics of noise. Plant noise emissions will likely be experienced at receptors as a distinctive continuous and steady hum; therefore, in accordance with BS 4142 guidance, a 3 dB correction to account for noise that is ‘distinctive against the residual acoustic environment’ has been applied when determining the rating level of plant noise.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out its assessment of potential noise impacts in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. The assessment considers the location of operational plant. The design of the Scheme has incorporated measures such as distancing of inverters away from sensitive receptors, and locating the BESS compound in an area away from large concentrations of receptors as well as towards the A12 where existing ambient noise levels are higher (such that noise emissions from the BESS are less impactful).</p> <p>As set out in the <b>Outline Design Principles</b> included as an appendix of the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>, inverters within 250m of residential dwellings will be treated with acoustic barriers which achieve a minimum 10dB(A) sound reduction, or an inverter selected with sound power levels at least 10dB lower than 96dB, which has been applied to inverters in the EIA.</p> <p>Impacts from noise during construction are assessed in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental</b></p>	



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p><b>Assessment [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and measures to manage construction noise set out in the <b>OCEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>. Construction noise limits have been identified for nearby noise sensitive receptors during evening and night-time periods, as well as Sunday daytime. Sensitive receptors have been identified and noise monitoring locations have been determined through desktop study during the scoping process and confirmed during site visits. The methodology for selection of assessment receptor positions and monitoring locations is discussed in sections 11.8.6 to 11.8.13.</p>	
<b>Operations</b>	Who would be in charge of any sheep farming?	<p>The Applicant is committed to operating the Scheme in the long-term and would take responsibility for aspects of management such as this. Long-term habitat management treatment has been embedded in the Scheme design and further within the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>. The OLEMP sets out the key measures required to avoid, mitigate and compensate for impacts and effects to terrestrial biodiversity and landscape from the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p>	N
<b>Operations</b>	Does the landowner still own the woodlands and the developer own the rest, but providing the landowner helps to maintain the woodlands?	<p>The Applicant will lease the site for the duration of the solar farm project, but the land will remain under the main landowner's ownership. The Applicant will be responsible however for the management and maintenance of the woodlands. Dedicated biodiversity enhancement areas have been designed in order to maximise the opportunity for biodiversity enhancement within the Scheme.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		Woodland enhancement is proposed as one of the mitigation measures.	
<b>Operations</b>	How do you keep the glass clear, as we have regular window cleaner visits?	The panels will be washed periodically. This has been confirmed in the <b>OEMP [EN010118/APP/7.11]</b> .	N
<b>Operations</b>	There needs to be commitment that any large-scale replacement programme of the panels will be done with consideration to the impact of local residents. Can assurances be given that any replacement programme over 15% of panels within one year will be done in consultation with the parish council and land owner?	The Applicant will establish a community liaison group (CLG) that will enable local community representatives to have a formal channel for monitoring and influencing developments at the site. In addition, the <b>OEMP [EN010118/APP/7.11]</b> outlines how maintenance of the site and panels will be undertaken.	N
<b>Operations</b>	8 staff responsible for the running and security of the site. Will the roles focus on the electric generation only? There are a lot of ecological commitments within the proposal – for them to be effective for the 40-year duration – will there be a permanent member of staff responsible for the management of the site ecology and land biodiversity? Or will this responsibility be contracted out? If so, what recourse does the community have if there are	The Applicant will establish the appropriate roles and responsibilities for site staff as set out in the <b>OEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b> . An Environmental Clerk of Works (ECoW) will be responsible for ensuring construction environmental mitigation measures are correctly implemented, monitored and maintained. These measures will include, but not be limited to, vegetation clearance, species identification and exclusion (protected or otherwise).  The ECoW's role will cover activities that have the potential to impact biodiversity, for example by advising on methods and techniques to prevent or minimise light	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>issues of poor maintenance. Different areas of the site will require different levels of security for H&amp;S and operation reasons. It is a large site and presumably monitored by CCTV too. Where will this be monitored?</p>	<p>spill and the delivery of Toolbox Talks prior to the start of works that could potentially affect habitats and species.</p> <p>The contractor appointed to construct the Scheme will be responsible for establishing, managing and monitoring the implementation and establishment of landscape and ecological mitigation within the five-year establishment aftercare period. The Applicant will inspect and report on the success of establishment during this period.</p> <p>The long-term biodiversity monitoring and management requirements will be set out the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>	
Other	<p>Please change the title of the project to exclude the word “Farm”; this project is not a farm within any dictionary definition. A “farm” is specifically concerned with utilising land in the growing of crops or animals, while this project is specifically designed to prevent the growing of crops or animals upon the land (and very good quality land at that).</p>	<p>A solar farm is a term commonly used to describe a collection of photovoltaic solar panels. There is no requirement regarding the acres of land needed, nor the number of panels installed, to be defined as one. Although solar farms are also known as solar parks and solar power stations, the term 'solar farm' is most commonly used and is the most recognisable.</p>	N
Other	<p>Will Longfield be prohibited from extracting mineral resources from the land on which the solar farm is destined e.g. gravel?</p>	<p>Proposals for mineral extraction do not form part of the Scheme. The DCO, if granted, will not permit mineral extraction. Following decommissioning of the solar farm, should any party wish to extract minerals from the site, a new planning permission would be required separate from the Scheme.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
Other	On a general note, we ask that any boundary fencing is of an open mesh type and not metal palisade with spikes as this could be dangerous to horse riders being of a greater height than a pedestrian.	Proposed fencing has been designed to minimise its visual prominence. The fence will be a deer fence or other wire mesh security fencing on timber poles approximately 2.5m in height. Fencing will be set back or screened from sensitive receptors. Further information on the landscape impacts of fencing is presented in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N
Other	Part of this land could be used for gravel extraction and subsequently a country park which will not be possible under the scheme.	The point of connection to the NETS at Bulls Lodge Substation is located adjacent to an existing consented sand and gravel quarry. The Applicant has carefully designed the Scheme, including careful siting of the Grid Connection Route, to avoid and minimise impact on the operation of the quarry. A small area of permanent land take from within the quarry will be required in order to construct the Bulls Lodge Substation Extension as part of the Scheme. This will result in the sterilisation of a small amount (c.18,000 m <sup>3</sup> ) of consented mineral. The Applicant has prepared assessments to consider the impact of the Scheme on safeguarded and consented minerals and considers that the small amount of mineral sterilised would not impact the viability of the quarry or the supply of minerals to the local market. The Applicant has also considered prior extraction of the sterilised minerals and concluded that this would be unlikely to be viable or warranted given the very small volume affected. Away from the Bulls Lodge Substation Extension, the Applicant has also considered the impact of the Scheme on safeguarded mineral and has concluded that no sterilisation of mineral within the Solar Farm Site or the	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
Other	How can you guarantee that there will be no interference with telecommunications, tv reception or utilities?	<p>Grid Connection Route would result, as no impediment to mineral extraction would remain after the Scheme has been decommissioned. Further information is presented in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme is unlikely to interfere with telecommunications infrastructure and therefore no effects are anticipated in the construction, operation, and decommissioning phases. In any event, the DCO will include the standard protective provisions for the protection of telecommunications operators, so measures will be in place for the protection of telecommunications infrastructure. For further information regarding this, please see <b>Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement - Other Environmental Topics [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	N
Socioeconomics and Land Use	I would ask that what is submitted is of a significantly reduced scale. In particular I would like to see all land that is classified as of high value (I understand this is called BMV) removed from the development and also no panels to be erected near to housing.	<p>A sequential assessment re: agricultural land quality has been undertaken and is presented in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>. In summary, the vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar ALC to the site. The Order limits comprises approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.</p> <p>All of the land within the area of search is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the site);</li> </ul>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the site);</li><li>• Grade 4, but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test; or</li><li>• Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</li></ul> <p>There are therefore no alternative sites available meeting the Applicant's search criteria that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits.</p> <p>Within this context, the Applicant has sought to minimise the amount of agricultural land used within the Scheme. This includes removing land from the draft Order limits to reduce the amount of high grade agricultural land within the boundary of the scheme and to avoid areas identified as having higher archaeological potential prior to the statutory consultation. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>.</p> <p>Very little agricultural land will be permanently lost. The vast majority of the Order limits will be available for return to agriculture after decommissioning, and the soil resource will have benefitted from a recovery of soil organic matter over the 40 year duration of the Scheme. An element of agriculture may also be retained over the life of the Solar Farm Site, with low density grazing an</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		option being considered for the management of some of the habitats to be created on the Order limits. Further assessment of agricultural land is included in <b>Chapter 12 Socio-economics of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	How does Bulls Lodge (Hanson) benefit from this project?	The Applicant is working with Hanson in order to ensure there is minimal impact on their future works from the Scheme. Where there is an impact, Longfield will seek to mitigate this and to agree the best way forward with Hanson. In some locations this will require an agreement on temporary and permanent land use and/or access.	N
<b>Socioeconomics and land use</b>	Why are we using arable land? 40% of land in the UK is poor grade; there are 72,000 acres of grade 4 land. We should be using this!	A sequential assessment regarding agricultural land quality has been undertaken and is presented in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b> . In summary, the vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar ALC to the site. The Order limits comprises approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.  All of the land within the area of search is either: -Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the site), -Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the site), -Grade 4, but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test, or -Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>There are therefore no alternative sites available meeting the Applicant's search criteria that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits. Further assessment of agricultural land is included in <b>Chapter 12 Socio-economics of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>Apart from generating power, I don't see any benefits to the local community apart from a loss of countryside.</p>	<p>The Applicant has committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and negatives of the Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in consideration of the planning balance within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>.</p>	N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>Insufficient contributions have been suggested, for example why not put electric car charging points in the area? Provision of solar panels for village school and village hall.</p>	<p>The Applicant has committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and negatives of the Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in consideration of the planning balance within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>.</p>	N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>Short term there would be jobs in construction but long term only specialists and a few people would be needed.</p>	<p>An assessment of the number of jobs created during the construction phase is provided in <b>Chapter: 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES [EN010118/6.1]</b>. Employment during the construction phase. It is expected</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>Despite some reduction in its original size, the site is planned to be one the largest in the UK, involving some 459ha of open countryside. Fields containing continuous rows of metal and glass will bring a dramatic industrial scar to the rural environment which is further damaged by perimeter security fencing, floodlighting, CCTV towers and a range of buildings housing all of the associated apparatus including the battery storage units.</p>	<p>that an average of 380 jobs will be created during the construction period. Of these, 171 jobs per annum are expected to be taken-up by residents within the study area. During the operational phase, 8 full time staff would be employed on the site.</p> <p>A local skills and employment plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction. This will set out measures that the Applicant will implement in order to advertise and promote employment opportunities associated with the Scheme in construction and operation locally.</p> <p>The Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training.</p>	N
		<p>A sequential assessment regarding agricultural land quality has been undertaken and is presented in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>. In summary, the vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar ALC to the site. The Order limits comprises approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.</p> <p>All of the land within the area of search is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the site),</li> <li>-Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the site),</li> <li>-Grade 4, but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test, or</li> </ul>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>All the land affected is good quality agricultural land, the majority being Grade 2. National planning guidance indicates a strong presumption against solar farm development on the 'best and most versatile farmland' (classified as Grades 1,2 and 3A). Similarly, the BRE 'Planning Guidance for the Development of Large Scale Ground Mounted Solar PV Systems' also underlines the fact that national planning policy would not support development on higher grade agricultural land and specifically states that 'the best quality land should be used for agricultural purposes'. With quality agricultural land such as this under threat and with the potential for this site to be one of the largest in the UK, CPREssex objects to such a large area of higher quality agricultural land being lost in a single location.</p>	<p>-Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</p> <p>There are no alternative sites considered by the Applicant that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits (whilst also meeting other criteria of the Applicant, as set out in <b>Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>) within a reasonable distance of Bulls Lodge Substation (for which the Applicant has obtained a grid connection agreement).</p> <p>The Draft NPS EN-3 [REF-9] states that although BMV land should be avoided where possible in the development of renewable energy infrastructure, land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of site location.</p> <p>Within this context, the Applicant has sought to minimise the amount of agricultural land used within the Scheme. This includes removing land from the draft Order limits to reduce the amount of high grade agricultural land within the boundary of the scheme and to avoid areas identified as having higher archaeological potential prior to the statutory consultation. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>.</p> <p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is therefore expected to</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>be the same or better quality as it is currently. Section 12.8 of <b>Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms.</p>	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>What about Longfield EV chargers at the station with discounts for locals?</p>	<p>It will not be possible to for the Scheme to provide electricity directly to local buildings as it will connect to the National Electricity Transmission System. The Applicant is instead proposing community funding.</p>	N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>I very much doubt many locals will be employed in anything other than cheap labour.</p>	<p>An assessment of the number of jobs created during the construction phase is provided in <b>Chapter: 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES [EN010118/6.1]</b>. Employment during the construction phase. It is expected that an average of 380 jobs will be created during the construction period. Of these, 171 jobs per annum are expected to be taken-up by residents within the study area. During the operational phase, 8 full time staff would be employed on the site.</p> <p>A local skills and employment plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction. This will set out measures that the Applicant will implement in order to advertise and promote employment opportunities associated with the Scheme in construction and operation locally.</p> <p>The Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training.</p>	N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>In addition, the local community will be affected by the reduction of the local employment of farmer</p>	<p>An assessment of the number of jobs created during the construction phase is provided in <b>Chapter: 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES [EN010118/6.1]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	works and the reduction of crops and farming produced in the area.	<p>The land will still require management throughout the life of the scheme and there will be 8 people employed on an operational basis. Moreover, the expected operational employment at the Scheme will be equivalent to the current amount of employment on the agricultural land at the Scheme, meaning there will be net no change in the amount of employment. This information is based on estimates informed by the Applicant's prior experience of similar schemes, and details provided by the current landowner.</p> <p>It is expected that an average of 380 jobs will be created during the construction period. Of these, 171 jobs per annum are expected to be taken-up by residents within the study area. During the operational phase, 8 full time staff would be employed on the site.</p> <p>A local skills and employment plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction. This will set out measures that the Applicant will implement in order to advertise and promote employment opportunities associated with the Scheme in construction and operation locally.</p> <p>The Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training.</p>	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	Current local jobs are largely in agriculture and people who lose their livelihoods from this project are highly unlikely to be employed in an aspect of this project.	An assessment of the number of jobs created during the construction phase is provided in <b>Chapter: 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES [EN0101118/6.1]</b> . Employment during the construction phase.	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>The land will still require management throughout the life of the scheme and there will be 8 people employed on an operational basis. Moreover, the expected operational employment at the Scheme will be equivalent to the current amount of employment on the agricultural land at the Scheme, meaning there will be net no change in the amount of employment. This information is based on estimates informed by the Applicant's prior experience of similar schemes, and details provided by the current landowner.</p> <p>It is also expected that an average of 380 jobs will be created during the construction period. Of these, 171 jobs per annum are expected to be taken-up by residents within the study area. During the operational phase, 8 full time staff would be employed on the site.</p> <p>A local skills and employment plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction. This will set out measures that the Applicant will implement in order to advertise and promote employment opportunities associated with the Scheme in construction and operation locally.</p> <p>The Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training.</p>	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	Would you be able to host school trips? Some of the local schools might be interested & this would	The Applicant is open to hosting school trips once the Scheme is operational.	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>increase local support for the scheme.</p> <p>Longfield did not give exact numbers but claim following                      Grade 1 land = 55 ha                      Grade 3a land = 103 ha                      Grade 3b land = 274 ha                      Total = 432 ha vs 450 ha, what is variance ?                      Best and Most versatile land reduced by 60%, what acreage remains BMV ?                      Grade 1 &amp; 3a land is not suitable for this solar farm</p>	<p>A sequential assessment re: agricultural land quality has been undertaken and is presented in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>. In summary, the vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar ALC to the site. The Order limits comprises approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.</p> <p>All of the land within the area of search is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the site);</li> <li>• Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the site);</li> <li>• Grade 4, but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test; or</li> <li>• Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</li> </ul> <p>There are therefore no alternative sites available meeting the Applicant's search criteria that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>Within this context, the Applicant has sought to minimise the amount of agricultural land used within the Scheme. This includes removing land from the draft Order limits to reduce the amount of high grade agricultural land within the boundary of the scheme and to avoid areas identified as having higher archaeological potential prior to the statutory consultation. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>.</p> <p>Very little agricultural land will be permanently lost. The vast majority of the Order limits will be available for return to agriculture after decommissioning, and the soil resource will have benefitted from a recovery of soil organic matter over the 40 year duration of the Scheme. An element of agriculture may also be retained over the life of the Solar Farm Site, with low density grazing an option being considered for the management of some of the habitats to be created on the Order limits. Further assessment of agricultural land is included in <b>Chapter 12 Socio-economics of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>Numerous footpaths and rights of way that are enjoyed by hundreds of people every year crisscross the site. This experience will be lost if the surrounding countryside is covered by solar panels and pathways are bounded by 1.8m high deer fencing. The pleasure of country walks will be totally lost.</p>	<p>In line with the information provided in <b>Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, the PROW and permissive paths will be a minimum 1.5m wide for footpaths and 3.0m for bridleways, with at least 5m either side of the centreline of the PROW or permissive path that will remain undeveloped outside of the solar PV fence line. This will ensure a 10m wide passageway will be maintained on all routes. All pathways, including</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>There is no proposals to mitigate this experience and to preserve the entitlement to walk rights of way and view the natural countryside.</p>	<p>temporary diversions and the establishment of a new permissive route, will be maintained. Several meetings have been held with ECC Highways (including PROW officers) to review, revise, and agree the proposed strategy for managing PROW during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Scheme as set out in Table 8-1 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>. This includes measures to physically segregate existing PROW from proposed construction routes, as well as having controlled crossing points (with gates and banksmen) to safely accommodate pedestrians and cyclists. No PROW will be permanently closed or diverted as a result of the Scheme. A separate <b>PROW Management Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> has been prepared to illustrate the proposed strategy which supports the Construction Traffic Management Plan (<b>Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>). See also <b>Figure 13-4 Public Rights of Way Management in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>	
<p><b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b></p>	<p>If permission is to be granted then provision of allotments on good soils with water supplied and car parking areas would be worth considering with all the Parish Councils, both now and every few years. Can community funding be perpetual and based on the</p>	<p>The Applicant has committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and negatives of the Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in</p>	<p>N</p>



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	amount of energy produced monthly or annually?	consideration of the planning balance within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b> .	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	I object to this proposal because the amount of land in each grade is reported but there is no way of telling whether fields 3C &D are within those figures	MAP 3 Agricultural Land Classification of <b>Appendix 12A, ALC Survey Report, of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> shows the location and Agricultural Land Classification of fields within the Order limits.	N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	Why does map PEIR 12.1 Agricultural Land Classification still say DRAFT?	PEIR 12.1 Agricultural Land Classification was published as part of the statutory consultation period. Please see <b>Chapter 12 Socioeconomics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> for further information regarding agricultural land classification.	N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	I see little that this scheme will contribute to the local community. Only a very small number, shown as just eight, jobs will be permanent and these I understand will be low skilled and probably low paid. There will undoubtedly be some skilled agricultural job redundancies in the farming community which will probably counter these new job numbers. During the construction period I do not see the opportunity for local labour gains, as the contractors will no doubt bring their staff from	The land will still require management throughout the life of the scheme and there will be 8 people employed on an operational basis. Moreover, the expected operational employment at the Scheme will be equivalent to the current amount of employment on the agricultural land at the Scheme, meaning there will be net no change in the amount of employment. This information is based on estimates informed by the Applicant's prior experience of similar schemes, and details provided by the current landowner. Moreover, it is expected that an average of 380 jobs will be created during the construction period. During the operational phase, 8 full time staff would be employed on the site.	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	previous contracts. Any local job opportunities will probably be low paid, short term and few in number.	A local skills and employment plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction. This will set out measures that the Applicant will implement in order to advertise and promote employment opportunities associated with the Scheme in construction and operation locally. The Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training.	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	One aspect which relates to every property in the area is the housing blight and loss of value this development will cause, as the purchase premium of peace, tranquillity and green outlook, much valued in the resident's survey for the Village design Statement only a few years ago, made very clear.	An extensive landscape management strategy has been developed. Please see the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b> ), for more information.  The Applicant has not found this to be the case based upon its experience. The Applicant is not proposing to offer compensation for any change in property values. The Scheme has where possible aimed to set back from residential dwellings and incorporate landscape mitigation and layout design measures to reduce the impact on residential dwellings.	N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	There are site selection criteria specified in National & Local Planning Policies to the Building Research Establishment documentation, which set out the standards. These are extensive, and take a much more holistic approach including the wider social, settings and local impacts:-	A sequential assessment regarding agricultural land quality has been undertaken and is presented in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b> . In summary, the vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar ALC to the site. The Order limits comprises approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.  All of the land within the area of search is either:	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>Ideally brownfields sites or attached to building., This site is currently agricultural usage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Land quality to be low grade 4 or 5, grade 3b land can be used but only with good reason. This land is a combination of high grade 2 and 3, a good agricultural with some 3b.</li> </ul> <p>Sites should be selected to minimise aesthetic impact. This site will effectively bring together the villages of Boreham, Terling, Hatfield Peverell, The Leighs and Fuller Street, forming one large mass. The area covering the site, some 459 hectares, or 1,100 acres in total causes real environmental damage to our precious farmland.</p>	<p>-Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the site),                      -Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the site),                      -Grade 4, but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test, or                      -Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</p> <p>There are therefore no alternative sites available meeting the Applicant's search criteria that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits. Further assessment of agricultural land is included in <b>Chapter 12 Socio-economics of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Within this context, the Applicant has sought to minimise the amount of agricultural land used within the Scheme. This includes removing land from the draft Order limits to reduce the amount of high grade agricultural land within the boundary of the scheme and to avoid areas identified as having higher archaeological potential prior to the statutory consultation. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>.</p> <p>Very little agricultural land will be permanently lost. The vast majority of the Order limits will be available for return to agriculture after decommissioning, and the soil resource will have benefitted from a recovery of soil organic matter over the 40 year duration of the Scheme.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>The prospect of these changes means that I would like to move house but I am concerned that this development will put planning blight on any chance of a sale until the construction is complete, and once completed, will have a negative effect on the worth of my house, thereby limiting my options to move. The projected timescale for planning and construction means that for myself and other local residents this period of uncertainty and anxiety may be 6 or more years. I would like to be informed whether I can apply for compensation for the decrease in value of my home consequent on this development and if so which organisation or party will pay this</p>	<p>An element of agriculture may also be retained over the life of the Solar Farm Site, with low density grazing an option being considered for the management of some of the habitats to be created on the Order limits. Further assessment of agricultural land is included in <b>Chapter 12 Socio-economics of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has not found this to be the case based upon its experience. The Applicant is not proposing to offer compensation for any change in property values. The Scheme has where possible aimed to set back from residential dwellings and incorporate landscape mitigation and layout design measures to reduce the impact on residential dwellings.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	compensation.		
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>I have been made aware that the process may involve removal of topsoil from large areas of the development. I imagine that this will have a very significant negative impact on the ecology of this large area of land causing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decreased biodiversity.</li> <li>Decreased Carbon capture</li> <li>Inability to achieve the stated aim of grazing sheep under and around the panels.</li> <li>Decrease in absorption and storage of water leading to more rapid run-off causing an increase in variation in levels of the water courses which drain the site and damage to the ecology of these water courses as well as increased risk of flooding downstream.</li> </ul>	<p>An <b>Outline Soil Resource Management Plan</b> is provided as an <b>Appendix</b> to the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>. This sets out principles for how soils will be managed and protected during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme. A detailed soil resource management plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction, prior to operation, and prior to decommissioning, as set out by the Requirements of the <b>draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b>.</p>	N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>There are no details about topsoil stripping. How deep will it go and where? Does it all</p>	<p>An <b>Outline Soil Resource Management Plan</b> is provided as an <b>Appendix</b> to the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b>. This sets out principles for how soils will be managed and protected during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme. A</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	get returned afterwards and how long would it take for plants to grow back?	detailed soil resource management plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction, prior to operation, and prior to decommissioning, as set out by the Requirements of the <b>draft DCO [EN010118/APP/3.1]</b> .	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	Much of the land involved in this scheme is BMV Grades1-3b. Government guidance seeks to prevent land of this productive quality being developed so it is anticipated based on what has occurred with other solar farm planning applications, the developers will cynically claim it is low grade.	<p>A sequential assessment regarding agricultural land quality has been undertaken and is presented in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>. In summary, the vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar ALC to the site. The Order limits comprises approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.</p> <p>All of the land within the area of search is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the site),</li> <li>-Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the site),</li> <li>-Grade 4, but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test, or</li> <li>-Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</li> </ul> <p>There are therefore no alternative sites available meeting the Applicant's search criteria that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>Further assessment of agricultural land is included in <b>Chapter 12 Socio-economics of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Within this context, the Applicant has sought to minimise the amount of agricultural land used within the Scheme. This includes removing land from the draft Order limits to reduce the amount of high grade agricultural land within the boundary of the scheme and to avoid areas identified as having higher archaeological potential prior to the statutory consultation. Further information is presented in the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>.</p> <p>Very little agricultural land will be permanently lost. The vast majority of the Order limits will be available for return to agriculture after decommissioning, and the soil resource will have benefitted from a recovery of soil organic matter over the 40 year duration of the Scheme. An element of agriculture may also be retained over the life of the Solar Farm Site, with low density grazing an option being considered for the management of some of the habitats to be created on the Order limits. Further assessment of agricultural land is included in <b>Chapter 12 Socio-economics of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	In the construction phase there may be a temporary positive contribution to the local economy in terms of providing a market for accommodation, food and	The land will still require management throughout the life of the scheme and there will be 8 people employed on an operational basis. Moreover, the expected operational employment at the Scheme will be equivalent to the current amount of employment on the agricultural land at	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>hospitality. I would expect that the scheme will also contribute widespread social disruption to the area in this phase. In the operation phase I would not expect that the scheme would impact greatly on the local economy except for the negative impact of removing the need for an agricultural labour force to look after the 1400 acres taken out of food production.</p>	<p>the Scheme, meaning there will be net no change in the amount of employment. This information is based on estimates informed by the Applicant's prior experience of similar schemes, and details provided by the current landowner.</p> <p>It is also expected that an average of 380 jobs will be created during the construction period. During the operational phase, 8 full time staff would be employed on the site.</p> <p>A local skills and employment plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction. This will set out measures that the Applicant will implement in order to advertise and promote employment opportunities associated with the Scheme in construction and operation locally.</p> <p>The Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training.</p> <p>Additionally, an <b>OCEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b> has been included in the DCO application to explain how construction effects will be managed.</p>	
<p><b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b></p>	<p>The provision of solar panels should be extended to all community facilities through Terling village – this should include the village hall, the swimming pool, the cricket pavilion and tennis courts. Again EDF should commit to an annual inspection / maintenance of this</p>	<p>The Applicant has committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and negatives of the Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in</p>	<p>N</p>



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>equipment. There should also be an 18 year replacement programme which EDF undertake. A community payback fund which will be in operation for the duration of the farm is great but these measures suggested should not be funded through this grant funding application process. They should be part of the undertakings and assurances linked to the planning process. It is imperative the solar farm has a positive, direct, financial impact on the community it is joining.</p>	<p>consideration of the planning balance within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>.</p>	
<p><b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b></p>	<p>Should this project be given permission to proceed, not only would we lose the peace and tranquillity of our surroundings and decimation of the wildlife in the process, but we would further be penalised with our property being devalued considerably.</p>	<p>An extensive landscape management strategy has been developed. Please see the <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>, for more information. The Applicant has not found this to be the case based upon its experience. The Applicant is not proposing to offer compensation for any change in property values. The Scheme has where possible aimed to set back from residential dwellings and incorporate landscape mitigation and layout design measures to reduce the impact on residential dwellings.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p><b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b></p>	<p>Although jobs would be created it is likely that many will be for people who have to move into the area rather than local people.</p>	<p>The land will still require management throughout the life of the scheme and there will be 8 people employed on an operational basis. Moreover, the expected operational employment at the Scheme will be equivalent to the current amount of employment on the agricultural land at</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>There will also be a reduction in farming employment.</p>	<p>the Scheme, meaning there will be net no change in the amount of employment. This information is based on estimates informed by the Applicant’s prior experience of similar schemes, and details provided by the current landowner.</p> <p>It is also expected that an average of 380 jobs will be created during the construction period. During the operational phase, 8 full time staff would be employed on the site.</p> <p>A local skills and employment plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction. This will set out measures that the Applicant will implement in order to advertise and promote employment opportunities associated with the Scheme in construction and operation locally.</p> <p>The Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training.</p> <p>Additionally, an <b>OCEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10]</b> has been included in the DCO application to explain how construction effects will be managed.</p>	
<p><b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b></p>	<p>If the planned farm is approved despite objections, to make it more acceptable, it should benefit the residents of the surrounding settlements personally by offering them substantially cheaper electricity if they switch to EDF or whichever company is producing the solar electricity. The local</p>	<p>The Applicant has committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and negatives of the Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	council has already consulted on the principle of local solar generation benefitting residents in this way.	consideration of the planning balance within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b> .	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	I request that the track to Scarletts farm from White house Farm remain open. I have walked this path 2-3 times a day for the past 30 years. I always imagined that I would continue to do so and enjoy the view for the rest of my days. I can look from there across the Ter valley to Fuller Street or to the church at Great Leighs In the evening I take the dog there and listen to the church clock chiming. Once the panels are in place these activities will be lost.	Several permissive paths (for pedestrians and cyclists) are proposed during the operational phase of the Scheme and are shown by supporting drawings in Section 13.7 of the <b>Chapter 13 – Transport - of the Environmental Statement - [EN010118/6.1]</b> . No PROW will be permanently closed or diverted as a result of the Scheme, and the minimum legal PROW widths will continue to be met or bettered in all instances. A separate <b>PROW Management Plan</b> has been prepared to illustrate the proposed strategy <b>[EN010118/APP/6/2]</b> .	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	How many people do you envisage will be required to maintain the upkeep of the solar farm and how local would these individual(s) be?	The land will still require management throughout the life of the scheme and there will be 8 people employed on an operational basis. Moreover, the expected operational employment at the Scheme will be equivalent to the current amount of employment on the agricultural land at the Scheme, meaning there will be net no change in the amount of employment. This information is based on estimates informed by the Applicant's prior experience of similar schemes, and details provided by the current landowner. It is also expected that an average of 380 jobs will be created during the construction period. During the	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>operational phase, 8 full time staff would be employed on the site.</p> <p>A local skills and employment plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction. This will set out measures that the Applicant will implement in order to advertise and promote employment opportunities associated with the Scheme in construction and operation locally.</p> <p>The Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training.</p>	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>The extensive network of PROWs which cross the site offer recreational amenity to the Terling community. This is set to be curtailed. Are the new PROWs set to be established in perpetuity or merely for the 46-year life of the facility?</p>	<p>No PROW will be permanently closed or diverted as a result of the Scheme. A separate <b>PROW Management Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> has been prepared to illustrate the proposed strategy which supports the Construction Traffic Management Plan (<b>Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>). See also <b>Figure 13-4 Public Rights of Way Management in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>Solar farms are temporary and typically have an operational lifespan of 40 years. Once Longfield Solar Farm reaches the end of its lifespan, infrastructure on the Solar Farm Site will be removed and the Solar Farm Site returned to the landowner. Post-decommissioning, it is expected that the landowner would return the Solar Farm Site to arable use, although it is assumed that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. The DCO will require the</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A <b>Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.</p> <p>Whilst PROW will remain in place after decommissioning, it is assumed that any permissive paths created by the Scheme during the operational phase would ultimately be removed, as the potential retention of these routes would be outside the control of the Applicant and subject to third party landowner agreement. Measures (e.g. signage or temporary access restrictions) will be implemented to prevent the permissive paths from becoming PROW during the operational phase, so that these can subsequently be removed if the landowner chooses. It should be noted that the connectivity of the Order limits post-decommissioning would be no worse than the existing situation.</p>	
<p><b>Socioeconomics and land use</b></p>	<p>I expect an influx of a temporary work force with infrastructure needs for accommodation, leisure, recreation, medical care and possibly schooling for families.</p>	<p><b>Chapter 12 Socioeconomics and Land Use</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> assesses temporary impacts from the Scheme on Residential Properties, Business Premises, and Community Facilities. Taking into account the residual effect assessment results of the air quality, noise/vibration, traffic and transport and visual</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	These facilities are already stretched by recent house building projects. I would like to be reassured that resilient plans will be made to meet these needs and mitigate any negative impact.	assessments relating to the construction activities, there are no receptors that would experience a significant effect on their amenity during construction, and as such there would be no effect.	
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	Solar energy generation is needed to implement the climate protection objectives of the UN's 2015 Paris Agreement. However, rollout of solar projects should not overrule adherence to human rights.	The Applicant does not believe the project to be in conflict with human rights.	N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	What would happen to remaining funds should the £64,000 not be fully spent in any given year?	The Applicant has committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and negatives of the Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in consideration of the planning balance within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b> .	N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	Not enough about what that commitment might be. EDF should commit to providing and maintaining solar panels for all village groups.	The Applicant has committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and negatives of the	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b>	<p>In the initial consultation a great deal of emphasis was given to educating the local community and supporting young talent to enter the industry. This is a 40 year project with minimal staff on site who will be focused on the general operations. I think it is a disservice to assume that long term engagement with the community will be effective in bring through young talent without specific solutions agreed and provided at this stage. I therefore suggest the following up front investment to gift future generation from Terling the best starting opportunities: Terling primary school serves all the residential properties directly impacted by the solar farm proposal. Investing in the school would provide a realisitc long term education opportunity. This can be achieved by providing the skills</p>	<p>Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in consideration of the planning balance within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>.</p>	N
		<p>The Applicant has committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and negatives of the Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in consideration of the planning balance within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>.</p> <p>A local skills and employment plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction. This will set out measures that the Applicant will implement in order to advertise and promote employment opportunities associated with the Scheme in construction and operation locally.</p> <p>The Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>and resources to build a wing to the side of the school within which a dedicated library, computer suit and independent study area, all of which is currently lacking. The construction can incorporate solar panels and provide electricity to the school. EDF should commit to an annual inspection / maintenance of this equipment. There should also be an 18 year replacement programme which EDF undertake. Terling school classes are a two year combined group. EDF should agree a minimum of a bi-yearly school visit where by students are given a guided tour of the site and introduced to the bio-diversity, sustainability and energy engineering evident on the site. STEM activities can be devised in partnership with local Stem ambassadors if EDF do not have their own colleagues that take part in the scheme. The provision of solar panels should be extended to all community facilities through Terling village – this should include the village hall, the</p>		



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>swimming pool, the cricket pavilion and tennis courts. Again EDF should commit to an annual inspection / maintenance of this equipment. There should also be an 18 year replacement programme which EDF undertake. A community payback fund which will be in operation for the duration of the farm is great but these measures suggested above should not be funded through this grant funding application process. They should be part of the undertakings and assurances linked to the planning process.</p>		
<p><b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b></p>	<p>The proposal includes the provision of cycle routes and the upgrade of and additional PROW. This is great and an amazing resources. However – who will be responsible for their maintenance to ensure their access can continue to be enjoyed through out the year. Their construction and material needs to be discussed with ECC public rights of way team. The connectivity to the network focuses on joining the north Chelmsford community to it.</p>	<p>The Scheme seeks to improve routes and connectivity for non-motorised users by providing a Green Corridor and two new permissive paths within the Solar Farm Site during the operational phase, to enhance connectivity with existing PROW, Essex Way and National Cycle Route 50. The proposed Green Corridor will intersect with various east-west routes (both existing PROW and proposed permissive paths) to maximise connectivity within the Solar Farm Site. The scheme also allows for the potential to provide a future pedestrian/cycle connection between the site and the Chelmsford Garden Community when this comes forwards. Further information on PROWs and routes can be found in <b>Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the</b></p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>What and how will Boreham community benefit from these cycle networks. The nearest connection point is along Waltham Road which I would not feel confident cycling along with small children. Boreham is more affected by the proposal than those in North Chelmsford yet it is these that are benefiting. Please ensure there is a safe route provided for Boreham residents to access the off road cycle network.</p>	<p><b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b> The Applicant has engaged with the ECC PROW team as set out in Table 8-1 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1].</b></p>	
<p><b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b></p>	<p>The size of the community fund is woefully small, it should be at least 10 times the size, the community is being asked to give up their local environment against their will. Terling will be the most impacted village, but the fund will be shared with other villages, these should be separate funds for each village.</p>	<p>The Applicant has committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and negatives of the Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in consideration of the planning balance within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2].</b></p>	<p>N</p>
<p><b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b></p>	<p>What will the scheme contribute to the local area in terms of the village of Terling and Fuller Street? Will the scheme contribute to improving the play park, amenity space, local village</p>	<p>The Applicant has committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and negatives of the</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>school etc? Will there be a CIL payment? What will the scheme contribute to local employment? What proportion of these will be temporary roles during construction only? There is little information on this, or very vague general comments that give no certainty. All of these areas should be enhanced and improved if this proposal were to be approved.</p>	<p>Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in consideration of the planning balance within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>.</p>	
<p><b>Socioeconomics and land use</b></p>	<p>There is no local benefit to the village communities, who will be affected the most by this development.</p>	<p>The Applicant has committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and negatives of the Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in consideration of the planning balance within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p><b>Socioeconomics and land use</b></p>	<p>I feel it is a missed opportunity that the vast number of solar panels needed for this project cannot be manufactured in this country. Again, we appear to be reliant on European</p>	<p>A local skills and employment plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction. This will set out measures that the Applicant will implement in order to advertise and promote employment opportunities associated with the Scheme in construction and operation locally.</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>manufacturing. I am sure that you can get them manufactured in this country as the numbers are vast, even if they have to be made under licence from a continental company. Please do not go for the simplest option as you have done with the land.</p>	<p>The Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training. Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<p><b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b></p>	<p>It appears there will be limited opportunity for permanent local employment or training by the applicant in these new energy sectors. Perhaps EDF can, and should, mirror the training initiative schemes it has established elsewhere in the country for different technologies.</p>	<p>A local skills and employment plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction. This will set out measures that the Applicant will implement in order to advertise and promote employment opportunities associated with the Scheme in construction and operation locally.</p> <p>The Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training. Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p><b>Socioeconomics and Land Use</b></p>	<p>Terling Primary School serves all the residential properties directly impacted by the solar farm proposal. For some people, the scheme will reduce their enjoyment of the unique rural environment and the opportunities for outdoor activity that the village currently provides. The scheme</p>	<p>The Applicant has committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and negatives of the Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>should offset some of this negative impact by providing sustainable long-term support to the group of village community organisations, including investing in the school. Installing and maintaining solar panels for these community facilities would be relatively small and achievable way of providing support. This would enable these facilities to reduce their long-term running costs, and focus on using their limited resources to deliver direct community benefit. It would also help reduce their impact on the environment and climate change. The scheme operators will already be managing and maintaining a large number of panels around the site for several decades to come, so this should be a relatively small commitment that would have a significantly positive impact for the community. Considering the numbers of pupils attending the school, in addition to the solar panels, funding could be for a dedicated library or independent study area, all of which is currently</p>	<p>consideration of the planning balance within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>.</p> <p>In addition, a local skills and employment plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction. This will set out measures that the Applicant will implement in order to advertise and promote employment opportunities associated with the Scheme in construction and operation locally.</p> <p>The Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training. Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>lacking. Construction should incorporate solar panels and provide electricity of the school. EDF should commit to an annual inspection/ maintenance of the equipment with an 18 year replacement programme which EDF would undertake. The site provides ideal opportunities for pupils to enhance their STEM knowledge and biodiversity awareness through a combination of site visits and learning off site (we discussed the Museum of Power in our meeting), but also consider bringing the learning into school given the challenges of cost travelling to Langford. The consultation includes a focus on biodiversity and the enhancing the environment around the solar panels. Careful consideration should be given of the best way for the pupils to be involved in that process and contributing to what is their future landscape. At our meeting, we discussed the current provision for grant applications through the Essex Community Foundation. Whilst I support this</p>		

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>fund, as a school and not a charitable organisation, we are not able to apply for funding of any kind. Our PTA, Friends of Terling School, could apply for funds but it seems that it is a missed opportunity to widen the scope of who can access funding. It would be important to consider a community group, with representatives from across the parishes, who would be able to allocated funding, including schools within that scope.</p>		
<b>Transport</b>	<p>There is a big concern about the traffic flow on Main Road in Boreham during the construction phase. The proposal for site access from Regiment Way via Wheelers Hill is impractical and unenforceable which leaves access from Boreham as being the default route to site. Other local developments have proved that traffic orders for deliveries and site operative are unenforceable.</p>	<p>Due to the nature of the Scheme, consideration has been given to a number of locations within the surrounding highway network which could potentially be impacted. We intend to restricting HGV movements to certain routes i.e. via the A130, Wheelers Hill and Cranham Road to the west, to prevent construction vehicles from using the B1137 Main Road and passing through Hatfield Peverel and / or Boreham. As part of the consultation process, principles were agreed with ECC Highways including the proposed site access location, visibility splays, crossing points on Noakes Lane and the approach for surveys and supporting assessment work. In addition, it was agreed that the routing of HGVs should take place to / from the west via the RDR, A130 Essex Regiment Way, Wheelers Hill, Cranham Road and Waltham Road in order to prevent these larger vehicles from passing through the</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Transport</b>	New cycle route is accessed at a hazardous point and the cycle route links to existing ones are poor. The new cycle route doesn't benefit those cycling from Boreham up the busy Waltham Road.	villages of Hatfield Peverel and Boreham, e.g. along the B1137 Main Road. Further information can be found in <b>Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N
<b>Transport</b>	The ambience of these PROWs will be negatively affected by the construction and operation of this site, and measures should be taken to keep this to a minimum.	As set out in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Impact of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> , the overall layout has undergone extensive review and refinement to respond to the landscape character baseline. This includes embedded mitigation of the type described.  Following mitigation, people walking on the Essex Way to the west or south of Fuller Street (VP45 and VP46) would experience minor adverse effects, which are not considered to be significant. The level of effect is reduced from year 1 because existing and proposed vegetation	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
Transport	It is essential that sufficient width and mitigation measures are implemented along the PROWs to ensure that users do not feel hemmed in by the fences and CCTV systems.	<p>would be in leaf, filtering views of the PV Arrays such that the Scheme would be unobtrusive. People walking on the Essex Way on the south western corner of Sandy Wood would experience close range views of the Scheme, however this would be for a very short duration of the route such that the overall effect on people walking the Essex Way would remain minor adverse.</p> <p>People walking on PROW 213_19 and PROW 113_25 within the Order limits would experience major adverse effects because of close range views of the proposed PV Arrays in the immediate foreground. These effects are considered significant.</p> <p>People walking on the wider PROW network beyond the Order limits boundary would not experience significant effects resulting from operation during year 15.</p> <p>As detailed in <b>Chapter 13: Access and Transport of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, the Scheme does not involve the permanent closure of any PROWs.</p> <p>A new permissive route is incorporated into the Scheme for the duration of the operational phase; the landowner would have the right to remove this following decommissioning.</p> <p>In line with the information provided in <b>Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, the PROWs and permissive paths will be a minimum 1.5m wide for footpaths and 3.0m for bridleways, with at least 5m either side of the centreline of PROWs or permissive path that will remain undeveloped outside of</p>	Y

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
Transport	<p>The development should conform to NPPF paragraph 98 at all stages existing PROWs, or acceptable alternatives, should remain open at all times. Significant viewing points should be maintained</p>	<p>the solar PV fence line. This will ensure a 10m wide passageway will be maintained on all routes.</p> <p>As detailed in <b>Chapter 13: Access and Transport of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, the Scheme does not involve the permanent closure of any PROWs.</p> <p>A new permissive route is incorporated into the Scheme for the duration of the operational phase; the landowner would have the right to remove this following decommissioning.</p>	N
Transport	<p>Measures to increase the safety of walkers, cyclists and horse riders using the access roads will be needed.</p>	<p>Several meetings have been held with ECC Highways (including PROW officers) to review, revise, and agree the proposed strategy for managing PROW during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Scheme as set out in Table 8-1 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>. This includes measures to physically segregate existing PROW from proposed construction routes, as well as having controlled crossing points (with gates and banksmen) to safely accommodate pedestrians and cyclists. No PROW will be permanently closed or diverted as a result of the Scheme. A separate <b>PROW Management Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> has been prepared to illustrate the proposed strategy which supports the <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b>. See also <b>Figure 13-4 Public Rights of Way Management</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Plan in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3].</b>			
<b>Transport</b>	<p>On page 7, your 'Vision' for the solar farm includes catering for the local community and the environment which we broadly welcome; however, you state that you will '...also create new paths for walking and cycling in the local area...' It is hugely disappointing that for a scheme of this magnitude that your vision appears to positively discriminate against one user group – equestrians – when considering new permissive access throughout the proposal.</p>	<p>There are no formal equestrian facilities (i.e. Bridleways) within the Order limits; however, some of the roads surrounding the Order limits are lightly trafficked and therefore would not necessarily deter equestrians.</p> <p>There is a bridleway (PROW 213_48) to the south of Bulls Lodge Substation which provides formal equestrian facilities along part of the private road to the substation.</p>	N
<b>Transport</b>	<p>Has any consideration been made about significantly increasing the number of public footpaths on the land? At present there is no off-road link between the paths by Toppinghoe Hall and the paths from there going North.</p>	<p>The Scheme seeks to improve routes and connectivity for non-motorised users by providing a Green Corridor and two new permissive paths within the Solar Farm Site during the operational phase, to enhance connectivity with existing PROW, Essex Way and National Cycle Route 50. The proposed Green Corridor will intersect with various east-west routes (both existing PROW and proposed permissive paths) to maximise connectivity within the Solar Farm Site. The scheme also allows for the potential to provide a future pedestrian/ cycle connection between the site and the Chelmsford Garden Community when this comes forwards. Further</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Transport</b>	<p>16 public right of way (PROWs) routes and 6 ancient woodlands / Local Wildlife are within or surrounded by the solar panel fields. Whilst 5 metre offsets from the PROWs are welcome, users of the PROW will be negatively affected as is noted. Planting with more mature hedging rather than small rootstock would mitigate this negative effect. The conversion of / provision alongside the north-south access track of public access is welcome. In the interest of public access for all, this north-south route should be a suitably surfaced public bridleway, or restricted byway, which provides public access for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Opportunities to upgrade suitable linking PROWs to bridleways should also be sought. The north-south route should be a permanent additions to the PROW network and not just a permissive route for the duration</p>	<p>information on PROWs and routes can be found in <b>Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Several meetings have been held with ECC Highways (including PROW officers) to review, revise, and agree the proposed strategy for managing PROW during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Scheme as set out in Table 8-1 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>. This includes measures to physically segregate existing PROW from proposed construction routes, as well as having controlled crossing points (with gates and banksmen) to safely accommodate pedestrians and cyclists. No PROW will be permanently closed or diverted as a result of the Scheme. A separate <b>PROW Management Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> has been prepared to illustrate the proposed strategy which supports the <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b>. See also <b>Figure 13-4 Public Rights of Way Management Plan</b> in the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>To note, there are no formal equestrian facilities (i.e. Bridleways) within the Order limits; however, some of the roads surrounding the Order limits are lightly trafficked and therefore would not necessarily deter equestrians.</p>	Y

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>of the solar panel installation. The potential provision of connections west to the development around Chelmsford is noted and welcomed. Again in the interest of public access for all, connections should be suitably surfaced public bridleways, or restricted byways, which provide public access for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. If PROWs have to be temporarily closed during the construction phase, then suitable and convenient alternatives must be provided.</p>	<p>There is a bridleway (PROW 213_48) to the south of Bulls Lodge Substation which provides formal equestrian facilities along part of the private road to the substation.</p> <p>Further, whilst PROW will remain in place after decommissioning, it is envisaged that any permissive paths created by the Scheme during the operational phase would ultimately be removed, as the potential retention of these routes would be outside the control of The Applicant and subject to third party landowner agreement. Measures (e.g. signage or temporary access restrictions) will be implemented to prevent the permissive paths from becoming PROW during the operational phase, so that these can subsequently be removed if the landowner chooses. It should be noted that the connectivity of the Order limits post-decommissioning would be no worse than the existing situation. Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 13 Transport &amp; Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
Transport	<p>I have made suggestions already about exploring the possibility of creating cycle routes across the solar farm, particularly to the new Beaulieu Park train station</p>	<p>The Scheme seeks to improve routes and connectivity for non-motorised users by providing a Green Corridor and two new permissive paths within the Solar Farm Site during the operational phase, to enhance connectivity with existing PROW, Essex Way and National Cycle Route 50. The proposed Green Corridor will intersect with various east-west routes (both existing PROW and proposed permissive paths) to maximise connectivity within the Solar Farm Site. The scheme also allows for</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
Transport	The promised new footpaths need to be delivered and need to be thoughtfully placed to make sure they are attractive so that people use them. They also need to be maintained.	the potential to provide a future pedestrian/cycle connection between the site and the Chelmsford Garden Community when this comes forwards. Further information on PROWs and routes can be found in <b>Chapter 13: Access and Transport of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N
Transport	There is a promise to maintain the public footpath throughout the site. While this sound great, the footpaths will be enclosed within high security fences on either side	Several meetings have been held with ECC Highways (including PROW officers) to review, revise, and agree the proposed strategy for managing PROW during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Scheme as set out in Table 8-1 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b> . This includes measures to physically segregate existing PROW from proposed construction routes, as well as having controlled crossing points (with gates and banksmen) to safely accommodate pedestrians and cyclists. No PROW will be permanently closed or diverted as a result of the Scheme. A separate <b>PROW Management Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> has been prepared to illustrate the proposed strategy which supports the <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> . See also <b>Figure 13-4 Public Rights of Way Management in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b> .	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	with CCTV cameras everywhere. It will be like walking through a prison, having lost all the precious views currently enjoyed.	<p>permissive path that will remain undeveloped outside of the solar PV fence line. This will ensure a 10m wide passageway will be maintained on all routes. All pathways, including temporary diversions and the establishment of a new permissive route, will be maintained.</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed potential impacts on the landscape and visual amenity of users of the PROW network in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Once screening and planting included as mitigation in the Scheme has matured, people walking on the Essex Way to the west or south of Fuller Street (VP45 and VP46) would experience minor adverse effects, which are not considered to be significant. The level of effect is reduced from year 1 because existing and proposed vegetation would be in leaf, filtering views of the PV Arrays such that the Scheme would be unobtrusive. People walking on the Essex Way on the south western corner of Sandy Wood would experience close range views of the Scheme, however this would be for a very short duration of the route such that the overall effect on people walking the Essex Way would remain minor adverse.</p> <p>People walking on PROW 213_19 and PROW 113_25 within the Order limits would experience major adverse effects because of close range views of the proposed PV Arrays in the immediate foreground. These effects are considered significant. People walking on the wider PROW network beyond the Order limits boundary would</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		not experience significant effects resulting from operation during year 15.	
Transport	Why not show PROW on all your plans? Certainly it would allow the public to get more of a feel for what will be experienced. PIER 2.5 does not show proposed or existing PROW, can these be added so we can see how paths pass through the panels and fencing?	As detailed in <b>Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> ., several permissive paths will be provided within the Order limits during the operational phase of the Scheme to improve connectivity through the Order limits as well as within existing PROW. The Scheme includes a potential pedestrian / cycle connection point with the Chelmsford Garden Community, to accommodate a potential future desire line following the completion of this development and to improve public accessibility into the wider countryside. Further information on PROWs and routes can be seen in <b>Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N
Transport	Theoretical estimates of traffic over an estimated 3-year period are always subject to unforeseen consequences, protracted delays & a large element of error. I question whether any traffic surveys have been conducted to quantify volumes & categories of existing traffic along this route. Serious damage to existing roads particularly the Boreham Road, which is a narrow country lane with passing places, is inevitable.	The peak construction year is anticipated to be 2025; this assumes commencement of construction in Q1 2024 and that the Scheme is built out over a 24-month period. This is a likely worst case from a traffic generation point of view because it compresses the trip numbers into a shorter duration and represents the greatest impact on the highway network. A lengthened construction phase would be expected to result in lower traffic impacts; therefore, the likely worst-case scenario has been assessed within the <b>Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . Moreover, as part of the consultation process, a number of principles have been agreed with ECC Highways	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>Large heavy goods vehicles will cause serious damage to the roads &amp; verges. Traffic congestion is inevitable as this route serves as a “rat-run” to commuters wishing to access the A12 north &amp; south, from suburbs to the north of Chelmsford. All roads/lanes in the region are heavily used by recreational cyclists, horse riders &amp; pedestrians. There are no existing footpaths associated with the Boreham Road.</p>	<p>including the proposed site access location, visibility splays, crossing points on Noakes Lane and the approach for surveys and supporting assessment work. In addition, it has been agreed that the routing of HGVs should take place to / from the west via the RDR, A130 Essex Regiment Way, Wheelers Hill, Cranham Road and Waltham Road in order to prevent these larger vehicles from passing through the villages of Hatfield Peverel and Boreham, e.g. along the B1137 Main Road. Further details, including drawings showing the locations of access points, visibility splays and swept paths are held within Appendix 13A: Transport Assessment of the ES.</p>	
<b>Transport</b>	<p>I note that you state that HGV movements will be restricted to 8am-9am and 5pm-6pm i.e. in the peak traffic flows and hours of darkness in the winter months when driving conditions and visibility are at their worst. HGV’s and shuttle buses rushing to meet deadlines will only exacerbate the current dangers of the route and endanger the lives of those of the workforce who choose to cycle to work and avail themselves of the cycle parking facilities that you provide for them. It would be an abrogation of your health and safety obligations to your</p>	<p>HGVs will only travel to/ from the Order limits between 09:00-17:00, avoiding the traditional network peak hours of 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00 and so no construction HGVs will arrive before 09:00 or depart after 17:00. Only construction workers (cars/ vans/ shuttle services) will travel to/ from the site before 09:00 and after 17:00.</p> <p>There will also be no ‘rushing’ to meet deadlines, as HGVs and shuttle buses will be carefully scheduled when required and a <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> has been prepared with measures to manage construction vehicle activity safely during the construction phase of the Scheme.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>employees to encourage travel on this route. Vehicle accidents though fortunately likely to be less serious would also be laid at your door.</p>	<p>A review of the existing highway collision record has been carried out as part of the <b>Transport Assessment (TA) (Appendix 13A of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> which reviews data over a 3 to 5-year period within the study area. This review reveals that the Scheme is not expected to exacerbate the existing collision record of the highway network.</p> <p>Several improvements will be implemented including carriageway widening on Cranham Road and Wheelers Hill to accommodate HGVs which will follow an agreed routing strategy as agreed with ECC Highways. In addition, a number of committed schemes, set to be completed before the construction phase of the Scheme (such as the Boreham Interchange improvements and the RDR) will afford construction-related traffic with an improved network to use to access the site.</p> <p>More information regarding access can be found in <b>Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1].</b></p>	
<b>Transport</b>	<p>Our road Boreham Road, is dangerous as it is now. A country road bendy and narrow in places on which many accidents have occurred, too many HGV vehicles use it and the thought of more vehicles on this road would be a disaster waiting to happen. I understand from your booklet the</p>	<p>The Applicant is not expecting to use Boreham Road for access to the site. The site is expected to have a single point of access with traffic being routed through the site to different areas during the phases of construction. The route from Essex Regiment Way via Wheeler's Hill and Cranham Road provides the most direct route from higher order roads and will minimise disruption in the nearby villages of Boreham and Hatfield Peverel. Where necessary, Cranham Rd and Wheeler's Hill will be</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	works would be ongoing for some 3 years or more. This is a big ask of the residents here to put up with all the noise and the traffic. All in all a disaster waiting to happen. Therefore I object to your proposals on the above grounds.	widened to allow vehicles to pass safely. More information regarding access can be found in <b>Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	
<b>Transport</b>	The proposed access route from Essex Regiment Way A130 via Wheelers Hill and Cranham Road is totally unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles and the volume of traffic involved in the project including most of the transport of workers to the site. It is narrow and winding with very narrow sections and overhanging trees that have to be avoided. Vegetation often blocks drivers' views – for example at the junction with Boreham Road. Large vehicles using this road at present take up space extending across the centre of the road in many places particularly on bends. I have frequently faced HGVs and large vehicles such as the worker transporting 'shuttlebuses' mentioned in the booklet, dangerously approaching my car	Due to the nature of the Scheme, consideration has been given to a number of locations within the surrounding highway network which could potentially be impacted. We intend to restricting HGV movements to certain routes i.e. via the A130, Wheelers Hill and Cranham Road to the west, to prevent construction vehicles from using the B1137 Main Road and passing through Hatfield Peverel and / or Boreham. As part of the consultation process, principles were agreed with ECC Highways including the proposed site access location, visibility splays, crossing points on Noakes Lane and the approach for surveys and supporting assessment work. In addition, it was agreed that the routing of HGVs should take place to / from the west via the RDR, A130 Essex Regiment Way, Wheelers Hill, Cranham Road and Waltham Road in order to prevent these larger vehicles from passing through the villages of Hatfield Peverel and Boreham, e.g. along the B1137 Main Road. Further information can be found in <b>Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>there and have had to take risky avoiding action. The proposed large increase in HGVs and other traffic will make it even more dangerous. If the plan is approved it will be essential for this road to be enlarged and straightened before any work starts on the solar farm. 'Small scale road widening' is mentioned in the consultation booklet but there is no detail and it is essential that it should be much more than 'small scale' and the cost covered by the solar farm. The planning and council involvement for the necessary improvements will take time to arrange and this will need to be done well before any work starts on the solar farm.</p>		
<b>Transport</b>	<p>You acknowledge, the proposed access from Essex Regiment Way via Wheelers Hill and Cranham Road is impracticable without improvements. My contention is that it would continue to be impracticable after the modest and minor improvements that you say are possible.</p>	<p>Due to the nature of the Scheme, consideration has been given to a number of locations within the surrounding highway network which could potentially be impacted. We intend to restricting HGV movements to certain routes i.e. via the A130, Wheelers Hill and Cranham Road to the west, to prevent construction vehicles from using the B1137 Main Road and passing through Hatfield Peverel and / or Boreham. As part of the consultation process, principles were agreed with ECC Highways including the proposed site access location, visibility splays, crossing</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
Transport	<p>As shown in the maps provided, there is very likely to be construction of the planned new road from Great Leighs to the Boreham interchange and planned construction of the thousands of new houses in the adjoining future housing estates called 'Chelmsford Garden Village' at the same time as the construction of the solar farm in the same area. There is no acknowledgement of this in the booklet. This huge amount of construction activity and vehicle movements at the same time as the construction of the solar farm will cause massive congestion and problems for all involved including local residents. Reference to</p>	<p>points on Noakes Lane and the approach for surveys and supporting assessment work. In addition, it was agreed that the routing of HGVs should take place to / from the west via the RDR, A130 Essex Regiment Way, Wheelers Hill, Cranham Road and Waltham Road in order to prevent these larger vehicles from passing through the villages of Hatfield Peverel and Boreham, e.g. along the B1137 Main Road. Further information can be found in <b>Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with the developers of the Chelmsford Garden Community on this provision made within the Scheme as set out in Table 8-1 of the Consultation Report <b>[EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>. Separately, a green corridor is proposed through site. This will accommodate cycles and is to be shown on DCO application plans. <b>Figure 10-12 Outline Landscape Masterplan of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b> present the green corridor which is made up of the permissive path and the existing footpath network.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>providing cycle parking for staff implies an encouragement of cycling. Unless there is an additional cycle lane provided, cycling along the narrow approach roads – particularly at the times when HGVs and shuttlebuses will also be using them – will be very risky and, in fact, will slow all traffic substantially as there is little room to overtake a cyclist safely.</p>		
<b>Transport</b>	<p>This development will greatly reduce the enjoyment the area brings to the community after open spaces, footpaths, bridleways will be turned in to high hedges lined lanes and paths, there will be absolute no benefit to the local community.</p>	<p>In line with the information provided in <b>Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, the PROW and permissive paths will be a minimum 1.5m wide for footpaths and 3.0m for bridleways, with at least 5m either side of the centreline of the PROW or permissive path that will remain undeveloped outside of the solar PV fence line. This will ensure a 10m wide passageway will be maintained on all routes. All pathways, including temporary diversions and the establishment of a new permissive route, will be maintained.</p> <p>Several meetings have been held with ECC Highways (including PROW officers) to review, revise, and agree the proposed strategy for managing PROW during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Scheme as set out in Tables 3-14 and 8-1 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>. This includes measures to physically segregate existing PROW from proposed construction routes, as well as</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>having controlled crossing points (with gates and banksmen) to safely accommodate pedestrians and cyclists. No PROW will be permanently closed or diverted as a result of the Scheme. A separate <b>PROW Management Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> has been prepared to illustrate the proposed strategy which supports the <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b>. See also <b>Figure 13-4 Public Rights of Way Management in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b>. The <b>OLEMP [EN010118/APP/7.13]</b>, includes new woodland, scrub, grassland and hedge habitats to buffer and enhance connectivity across the site. Please also refer to <b>Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Furthermore, the Scheme's biodiversity net gain has been calculated using the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 and is reported in the DCO application through the <b>BNG Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b>. An overall gain of approximately 79% of habitat units and 20% of hedgerow habitats is predicted.</p>	
<b>Transport</b>	<p>The proposed public footpath links should be expanded to include access for equestrian use, ie bridleways rather than footpaths. These links appear to be straight line links most likely with chain link security fencing either side. Hardly</p>	<p>In line with the information provided in <b>Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> , the PROW and permissive paths will be a minimum 1.5m wide for footpaths and 3.0m for bridleways, with at least 5m either side of the centreline of the PROW or permissive path that will remain undeveloped outside of the solar PV fence line. This will ensure a 10m wide</p>	Y

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>an enjoyable experience. Enjoyable bridleways and footpaths meander through changing countryside with hedges, diverse range of trees, ditches, ponds, views and changes in direction to both enhance the experience and the biodiversity. I can see no 20m plus screening proposals for all public or property facing boundaries on the site other than the odd listed building.</p>	<p>passageway will be maintained on all routes. All pathways, including temporary diversions and the establishment of a new permissive route, will be maintained.</p> <p>Several meetings have been held with ECC Highways (including PROW officers) to review, revise, and agree the proposed strategy for managing PROW during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Scheme as set out in Table 8-1 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>. This includes measures to physically segregate existing PROW from proposed construction routes, as well as having controlled crossing points (with gates and banksmen) to safely accommodate pedestrians and cyclists. No PROW will be permanently closed or diverted as a result of the Scheme. A separate <b>PROW Management Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b> has been prepared to illustrate the proposed strategy which supports the <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2])</b>. See also <b>Figure 13-4 Public Rights of Way Management in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>	
<b>Transport</b>	<p>Access: Historically the community has had access to field boundaries as foot paths for access to public foot paths avoiding walking along Waltham road. This method of access is significantly safer than the</p>	<p>Access to all existing PROW will be retained during the construction phase, with no PROW closures and a limited number of temporary localised PROW diversions around the Grid Connection Route works area when this is installed. The Scheme will maintain access to/ along PROW during the construction phase, including retention of the minimum legal widths for PROW users.</p>	Y



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	<p>national speed road and is routinely enjoyed by the community. Could access be granted in the buffer zones (field margins) behind the properties between Great Holts Farm and Stocks Farm, roughly parallel to the road.</p>	<p>Whilst the potential to provide permissive paths within the field margins behind the properties between Great Holts Farm and Stocks Farm was explored, it was not possible for these to be provided due to various constraints (i.e. third party land ownership and a lack of potential connections with existing PROW).</p> <p>Nonetheless, the Scheme seeks to improve routes and connectivity for non-motorised users by providing a Green Corridor and several permissive paths within the Solar Farm Site during the operational phase, to enhance connectivity with existing PROW, Essex Way and National Cycle Route 50. The proposed Green Corridor will intersect with various east-west routes (both existing PROW and proposed permissive paths) to maximise connectivity within the Solar Farm Site. The scheme also allows for the potential to provide a future pedestrian/ cycle connection between the site and the Chelmsford Garden Community when this comes forwards. Further information on PROWs and routes can be found in <b>Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Transport</b>	<p>The proposed site access point is on an area of Boreham Road which is dangerous. Boreham Road is already a challenging road to navigate with lorries and this would potentially create more</p>	<p>An appropriate routing and access strategy has been identified which seeks to limit the usage of Protected Lanes and local roads through Boreham and Hatfield Peverel to the south. HGVs will be routed to / from the west via the A130, Wheelers Hill, and Cranham Road, with supporting highway improvements (carriageway widening) where necessary. There will be the potential to</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
	accidents and hazardous conditions.	utilise the RDR following its completion prior to the construction phase. For further information, please see Sections 13.5 and 13.9 in <b>Chapter 13 - Transport of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010118/APP/6.2].</b>	
<b>Water resources</b>	Are you confident that adequate public utility services are available to satisfy site needs e.g. sewers and fresh water?	There is no requirement for connection to the sewers for this development. Foul drainage will be collected in a cess pit. The cesspit will be managed, maintained, inspected and drained by a licensed courier who will then dispose of the waste offsite. Mitigation measures for environmental effects on the water environment are outlined in section 9.7 6 Embedded Design Mitigation of <b>Chapter 9 Water Environment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and taken into account in the assessment of effects (Section 9.87). Specific flood risk measures are discussed in further detail in the FRA ( <b>Appendix 9A [Document Reference.2]) in Chapter 9 – Water – of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2].</b> )	N
<b>Water resources</b>	My property shares a foul water drain with 2 Stocks Cottages, Waltham Road. This is in the adjoining field including manhole access where the proposed site is to be located. Your proposals do not explain how you intend to preserve this vital service which supports my home during this construction phase. Any removal, damage or right of access prevention to this infrastructure	A site visit was undertaken in September 2021, where the Applicant confirmed to the resident that works will not prevent their access or maintenance of their assets.	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
<b>Water resources</b>	<p>will present a significant Health and Safety risk concern for me.</p> <p>How will Longfield mitigate to stop flooding in both our garden and across the road? And what will they do to make sure that our house does not flood and that our house insurance does not increase because of the proximity of the solar farm.</p>	<p>An outline drainage strategy provided within the Appendix 9C SuDS Strategy in <b>Chapter 9 Water Environment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> detailing the approach to managing drainage during both the construction and operational phases of the Scheme. Please also refer to <b>Appendix 9D Bulls Lodge Substation Extension: Drainage Strategy [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. Consultation with the ECC Fire and Rescue department has been undertaken during development of the strategy.</p> <p>Please also refer to <b>Appendix 9C: SuDS Strategy [EN010118/APP.6.2]</b>. Section 4 of that document sets out an outline drainage strategy and delivery of this will be secured under the DCO. An impact assessment of potential effects of operational runoff on the water environment, taking account of the SuDs Strategy is provided in section 9.8.</p> <p>According to the assessment undertaken in the Flood Risk Assessment (<b>Appendix 9A in Chapter 9 Water Environment of the Environment Statement [EN010118/6.1]</b>) the Scheme will not alter the current flood risk baseline. The drainage strategy will seek to ensure no detrimental impact relating to the surface water runoff from the Scheme following its construction. Therefore, no significant adverse changes to current baseline conditions are predicted for the future baseline,</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>and so the impact assessment is undertaken against existing baseline conditions.</p> <p>Mitigation measures for environmental effects on the water environment are outlined in section 9.6 Embedded Design Mitigation and taken into account in the assessment of effects (Section 9.7) in <b>Chapter 9 Water Environment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Specific flood risk measures are discussed in further detail in Appendix 9A: FRA. Given these embedded mitigation measures, no significant effects have been identified.</p> <p>The Chelmsford Surface Water Management Plan [REF-3] confirms the site does not fall within a Critical Drainage Area (CDA).</p>	
<b>Water resources</b>	<p>The proposed area is at high risk of surface water flooding. In the last 30 years the community has suffered two significant floods after heavy storms. We would like to see detailed and property-boundary-specific plans on proposed flood mitigation. Including documented assurance of no increased risk of flooding.</p>	<p>An outline drainage strategy provided within the Appendix 9C SuDS Strategy in <b>Chapter 9 Water Environment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> detailing the approach to managing drainage during both the construction and operational phases of the Scheme. Please also refer to <b>Appendix 9D Bulls Lodge Substation Extension: Drainage Strategy [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. Consultation with the ECC Fire and Rescue department has been undertaken during development of the strategy.</p> <p>Please also refer to <b>Appendix 9C: SuDS Strategy [EN010118/APP.6.2]</b>. Section 4 of that document sets out</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>an outline drainage strategy and delivery of this will be secured under the DCO. An impact assessment of potential effects of operational runoff on the water environment, taking account of the SuDs Strategy is provided in section 9.8.</p> <p>According to the assessment undertaken in the Flood Risk Assessment (<b>Appendix 9A in Chapter 9 Water Environment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/6.1]</b>) the Scheme will not alter the current flood risk baseline. The drainage strategy will seek to ensure no detrimental impact relating to the surface water runoff from the Scheme following its construction. Therefore, no significant adverse changes to current baseline conditions are predicted for the future baseline, and so the impact assessment is undertaken against existing baseline conditions.</p> <p>Mitigation measures for environmental effects on the water environment are outlined in section 9.6 Embedded Design Mitigation and taken into account in the assessment of effects (Section 9.7) in <b>Chapter 9 Water Environment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>). Specific flood risk measures are discussed in further detail in Appendix 9A: FRA. Given these embedded mitigation measures, no significant effects have been identified.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		The Chelmsford Surface Water Management Plan [REF-3] confirms the site does not fall within a Critical Drainage Area (CDA).	
<b>Water resources</b>	Can assurance be given that no adverse discharges will occur to existing watercourses e.g. River Ter?	Drainage Strategies have been produced indicating how surface water runoff from the various parts of the Scheme will be managed (see <b>Appendix 9C and 9D of the Environmental Statement</b> ). This includes management of any firefighting water that might be required within the BESS Development in case of emergency. The drainage strategies are designed to control surface water runoff from the site for up to the 1 in 100 year event, including a 20% allowance for climate change, reducing flood risk off site. Two new surface water drainage outfalls would be required by the Scheme. The first is to an unnamed ditch (a tributary of the River Ter), and the second to Boreham Brook. In both cases water is treated using sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) prior to discharge to ensure no adverse impacts on water quality. The rate of discharge is also controlled to prevent any increase in flood risk or morphological impacts to the channel such as scour. An assessment of water quality impacts from the scheme is provided in <b>Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and <b>Appendix 9B: Water Framework Directive (WFD) Assessment [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b> . No adverse impacts have been identified with regard to water quality or flood risk.	N
<b>Water resources</b>	There are also environmental issues such as flood risks from water runoff from panels.	An outline drainage strategy provided within the Appendix 9C SuDS Strategy in <b>Chapter 9 Water Environment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>	N

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>detailing the approach to managing drainage during both the construction and operational phases of the Scheme. Please also refer to <b>Appendix 9D Bulls Lodge Substation Extension: Drainage Strategy [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. Consultation with the ECC Fire and Rescue department has been undertaken during development of the strategy.</p> <p>Please also refer to <b>Appendix 9C: SuDS Strategy [EN010118/APP.6.2]</b>. Section 4 of that document sets out an outline drainage strategy and delivery of this will be secured under the DCO. An impact assessment of potential effects of operational runoff on the water environment, taking account of the SuDs Strategy is provided in section 9.8.</p> <p>According to the assessment undertaken in the <b>Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 9A in Chapter 9 Water Environment of the Environment Statement [EN010118/6.1])</b> the Scheme will not alter the current flood risk baseline. The drainage strategy will seek to ensure no detrimental impact relating to the surface water runoff from the Scheme following its construction. Therefore, no significant adverse changes to current baseline conditions are predicted for the future baseline, and so the impact assessment is undertaken against existing baseline conditions.</p> <p>Mitigation measures for environmental effects on the water environment are outlined in section 9.6 Embedded</p>	

Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		<p>Design Mitigation and taken into account in the assessment of effects (Section 9.7) in <b>Chapter 9 Water Environment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>). Specific flood risk measures are discussed in further detail in Appendix 9A: FRA. Given these embedded mitigation measures, no significant effects have been identified.</p> <p>The Chelmsford Surface Water Management Plan [REF-3] confirms the site does not fall within a Critical Drainage Area (CDA).</p>	
<b>Water resources</b>	<p>We are concerned about flood risk and the appropriate ongoing maintenance of ditches and waterways including connection to ditches across Waltham Road and around our property. There have been historical issues with ditches not connecting and flooding across Waltham Road, then freezing and causing a number of accidents. We are really keen to get some understanding of how this will be mitigated given the removal of crops that currently soak up the majority of excess water.</p>	<p>Pre-scheme, according to the <b>Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 9A of the Environment Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1])</b> there was largely a low or very low risk of flooding in the vicinity of the Order limits. The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) assesses the flood risk from all sources (e.g. fluvial, surface water, groundwater or from artificial sources). This indicates that flood risk is not increased on or off-site, and therefore no ecological and heritage receptors will be impacted by flooding relating to the Scheme.</p> <p>The Chelmsford Surface Water Management Plan [REF-3] confirms the site does not fall within a Critical Drainage Area (CDA).</p> <p>Further, an outline drainage strategy is provided within the <b>Appendix 9C Longfield SuDS of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b></p>	N



Topic	Comment	Response	Design change? Y or N
		detailing the approach to managing firewater runoff. Consultation with the ECC Fire and Rescue department has been undertaken during development of the strategy.	

## Appendix J-5: Regard had to statutory consultation responses from additional targeted consultation

**Table J-5.1** below sets out responses to the statutory consultation from additional targeted consultation and the regard had to them by the Applicant. It should be read in conjunction with Section 8.3 of the **Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]**. For consultees under s42(1)(d) of PA 2008 who responded, references are to **Table E-2.1** and **Table E-2.2** of the **Appendix E-2** of the **Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.6]** which list these consultees.

**Table J-5.1 Regard had to statutory consultation responses from additional targeted consultation**

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Consultees under s42(1)(a)</b>				
<b>Alternatives assessment</b>	Parishioners have commented that when the Secretary of State first approached the wider UK market seeking site proposals for a 50Mw solar farms and battery storage installations, it was clearly stated the sites proposed should already be in a single ownership or controlled by the	Terling and Fairstead Parish Council	The Solar Farm Site is within the control of a single landowner as set out in the <b>Book of Reference [EN010118/4.3]</b> and explained in the <b>Statement of Reasons [EN010118/APP/4.1]</b> . The Applicant is in discussions in relation to additional land and rights required in relation to the Grid Connection Route, Bulls Lodge Substation Extension and access to the Scheme, with a view to reaching agreement with relevant landowners. The Applicant seeks compulsory acquisition powers in the DCO in order that, should it not be able to reach agreement with landowners, this nationally significant infrastructure project may still be delivered in line with the proposed programme, in order to	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>respondents, evidently from the information supplied in the Longfield October letter this is not now the case.</p> <p>There is no confirmation the additional land has been acquired or rights acquired to deliver the Longfield proposal as has now become enlarged.</p> <p>There is commentary that the necessary land has to be so controlled (perhaps by compulsory purchase) but it appears there is no certainty given as to programme or agreement.</p> <p>The proposed revisions to the western access routes, the siting of the enlarged battery store closer to the A12 and the village of Boreham, require further justification and evidence to both the PEIA and PEIR (as these may require), to be updated and available</p>		<p>meet the urgent need for renewable energy in the UK. The approach taken is common amongst energy infrastructure schemes. <b>The Statement of Reasons [EN010118/APP/4.1]</b> includes more detail in respect of the powers sought over land and the status of discussions with affected landowners.</p> <p>The changes to the Scheme boundary that were subject to the additional consultation were in order to allow for our preferred grid connection route and to ensure we obtain the appropriate powers for access and to make highway improvements. The PEIR already envisaged using the access and undertaking the highway improvements and amendments to the cable route were only minor. These changes were not considered sufficient to change the conclusions of the PEIR. The completed assessments in the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> take into account the changes to the Scheme boundary.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>for wider community comment.                      Only when such reassessments and revised risks analysis, as appraised by the Longfield team, may be considered by this Council, can the next stage of the DCO application process be permitted to advance.</p>			
<p><b>Alternatives assessment</b></p>	<p>Changes to the scheme boundary to incorporate additional land making the site occupied by the scheme even larger and extending the boundary onto the property of multiple other landowners, many of whom do not support this scheme. The proposed boundary changes also confirm that the local road network is inadequate to support a scheme as large as Longfield Solar Farm at this site. It also appears</p>	<p>Boreham Parish Council</p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed impacts traffic in <b>Chapter 13 Access and Traffic of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. This confirms the appropriateness of the proposed access to the Bulls Lodge Substation Extension. It also confirms that, with proposed mitigation and road improvements in place, the road network is assessed as being adequate to support the Scheme.</p> <p>The Solar Farm Site is within the control of a single landowner as set out in the <b>Book of Reference [EN010118/4.3]</b> and explained in the <b>Statement of Reasons [EN010118/APP/4.1]</b>. The Applicant is in discussions in relation to additional land and rights required in relation to the Grid Connection Route, Bulls Lodge Substation Extension and access to the Scheme, with a view to reaching agreement with relevant landowners. The Applicant seeks compulsory acquisition powers in the DCO in order that,</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	that the access to the National Grid is more problematical than first thought.		<p>should it not be able to reach agreement with landowners, this nationally significant infrastructure project may still be delivered in line with the proposed programme, in order to meet the urgent need for renewable energy in the UK. The approach taken is common amongst energy infrastructure schemes. The <b>Statement of Reasons [EN010118/APP/4.1]</b> includes more detail in respect of the powers sought over land and the status of discussions with affected landowners.</p> <p>The changes to the Scheme boundary that were subject to the additional consultation were in order to allow for our preferred grid connection route and to ensure we obtain the appropriate powers for access and to make highway improvements. The PEIR already envisaged using the access and undertaking the highway improvements and amendments to the cable route were only minor. These changes were not considered sufficient to change the conclusions of the PEIR. The completed assessments in the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> take into account the changes to the Scheme boundary.</p> <p>A full Transport Assessment (TA) has been submitted as part of the DCO application, as <b>Appendix 13A of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. This has informed <b>Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. The chapter considers the potential effects of the Scheme on traffic and transport during the construction, operation and</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>decommissioning phases. This confirms the suitability of the accesses proposed through the Scheme and that, with proposed mitigation and road improvements in place, the the road network is assessed as being adequate to support the Scheme.</p>	
<b>BESS</b>	<p>The use of lithium-ion battery storage technology is deemed a high risk.</p>	<p>Boreham Parish Council</p>	<p>A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
-------	---------	--------	----------	-----------------------------------------

---

and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.

Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]** (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the **Outline Design Principles** submitted as an appendix to the **Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]**. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.

In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low. different to that assessed in the risk assessment

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>BESS</b>	The Council is now aware the proposed enlarged battery storage facility at Bulls Lodge substation is now being advanced as the preferred location. We continue to seek further information as to the safety of the proposed technology for battery storage, conversion (DC to AC and AC to DC). It appears the storage facility is now even closer to the A12 (which will be 6 lanes when widened). The battery storage is also closer to Boreham village.	Terling and Fairstead Parish Council	The Applicant is not proposing a BESS at this location. The BESS is proposed to be located alongside the Longfield Substation at a site near Toppinghoehall Wood.	N
<b>BESS</b>	The Council is increasingly concerned as to the size and installation of more battery technology and the explosion risk from such a concentration of battery enclosures. The Council is very uncomfortable about the robustness of the	Terling and Fairstead Parish Council	A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP)</b>	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	responses to its enquiries to the Fire Authorities and the Longfield team.		<p><b>[EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Consultation</b>	Should further consultation and Newsletters be produced by the Longfield team, we would request and encourage a more inclusive consultation process.	Terling and Fairstead Parish Council	<p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low. different to that assessed in the risk assessment</p> <p>The Applicant understands that this comment relates to the target consultation activity summarised in section 8.3 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/5.1]</b>. The changes to the Scheme boundary that were subject to the consultation were in order to allow for our preferred grid connection route and to ensure we obtain the appropriate powers for access and to make highway improvements.</p> <p>The PEIR already envisaged using the access and undertaking the highway improvements and amendments to the cable route were only minor. These changes were not considered sufficient to change the conclusions of the PEIR. The completed assessments in the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> take into account the changes to the Scheme boundary.</p> <p>Consultation was therefore focused on landowners affected by the changes and relevant prescribed consultees. The Applicant considers that the targeted consultation it conducted was proportionate to the changes proposed.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
Design	<p>The site is too big: Based on the information provided by the developer, Longfield Solar Farm will be the largest continuous, single site solar farm in the UK. The very large scale of this site is inappropriate to the area. This is a very large greenfield site, much of which is best and most versatile agricultural land (i.e. land which is Grade 1, 2 and 3a on the ALC scale) (“BMV”). We continue to request that the size of the scheme be significantly reduced before the Development Consent Order (DCO) application is submitted. There will be significant loss of productive farmland.</p>	<p>Boreham Parish Council</p>	<p>The size of the scheme is proportionate to the size and urgency of the national need, which is substantial. There is also a need to make the most of the connection to the Grid - this is a limited resource.</p> <p>Estimates from National Grid Electricity System Operator (NGESO), the National Infrastructure Commission and Energy Systems Catapult (ESC) of the capacities of new solar generation needed in order to meet Net Zero include 44 to 76GW of additional solar capacity by 2050, with approximately one quarter of this needed in the next ten years. In order to meet those projections (noting that, consistent with the NPSs, these capacities are not presented as a target, nor indeed a quota, and therefore could be gone further than) a very high proportion of (if not all) solar projects of any scale which come forward for consent will need to be approved. Falling short on solar development at any stage in the next decades will risk causing the UK falling behind on decarbonisation and will increase the magnitude of the task (and therefore the intolerable risk of failure) of meeting its 2050 legal commitments to achieve Net Zero. Please see Section 11.4 in the <b>‘Statement of Need’ document (EN010118/APP/7.1)</b> for further information. Figure 116 in this document shows the results of an analysis which illustrates that development of one large solar scheme brings carbon savings and economic benefits versus developing combinations of smaller independent schemes, each combination matching to the same total installed generation capacity. The analysis assesses the relative costs and</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>construction timeframes associated with the development of different sized independent solar schemes against the total cost and carbon benefit achievable through the development of one large solar scheme such as the proposed Scheme.</p> <p>In the context of there being a need for solar energy generation to be developed at scale, the Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) (Draft NPS EN-3) [REF-9] as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that is capable of producing a large amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of England, in close proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>The Solar Farm Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ecological constraints – SAC's, SPA's, SSSI's, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li><li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li></ul>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li><li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li><li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li><li>• Settlements;</li><li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li><li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li><li>• Green Belt; and</li><li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li></ul>	
			<p>The Applicant has also worked hard to ensure that the design of the site is as sensitive as it can be to the local area and where possible to reduce the amount of land used. Prior to arriving at the proposed Order limits, there were several stages of design evolution, during which the original area of the Longfield site was refined. That process of design evolution has been informed by ongoing environmental assessments, engineering and design considerations, as well as engagement with stakeholders. The surveys undertaken that influenced the reduction in the amount of land proposed to be within the Order Limits were:</p>	
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Agricultural Land Classification;</li><li>b. Landscape and Visual;</li><li>c. Cultural Heritage; and</li></ol>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>d. Ecology.</p> <p>Capacity was also a consideration as the Applicant's aim is to make efficient use of the land area in terms of generating the largest annual yield Megawatt hours (MWh) for the available developable area, once due consideration is given to environmental and social constraints.</p> <p>Following publication of the PEI Report and completion of statutory consultation, the PEI Boundary was further refined to the area now proposed as the Order limits, being an area of 453ha. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Ecology</b>	There will be significant negative impact on wildlife and biodiversity	Boreham Parish Council	The Scheme's biodiversity net gain has been calculated using the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 and is reported in the DCO application through the <b>Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b> . An overall gain of approximately 79% of habitat units and 20% of hedgerow habitats is predicted.	N
<b>Ecology</b>	We are disappointed that, in all the boundary changes proposed, there is no increase in the gap between the boundary of the scheme and the neighbouring ancient woodland which is a	Boreham Parish Council	<p>A buffer of at least 15m has been applied to all existing woodlands and ancient woodlands.</p> <p>This buffer has been integrated into the Scheme's Design Principles to protect trees located on, and adjacent to, the Order limits. Please see Section 10.7 and Figure 10-12 in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Impacts of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/6.1]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	particularly rich natural environment and there is no increased provision for local wildlife. The siting of the BESS installation so close to Toppinghoe hall Wood is a particular concern because of the impact on biodiversity and also because of the risk of fire as outlined in our initial response to the statutory consultation. The close proximity of the scheme boundaries and battery infrastructure to ancient woodland is unnecessary and should be increased		<p>Effects on ecology are assessed in Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]. The assessment confirms that there is no potential for likely significant adverse effects on the Local Wildlife Site at Toppinghoehall Woods.</p> <p>With regards the risk of fire, a plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the battery storage (BESS, Work No. 2) to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to Toppinghoehall Wood and flora and fauna would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details how the Applicant will use good industry practice to reduce risk to life, property, and the environment from the BESS.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning</p>	



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
-------	---------	--------	----------	-----------------------------------------

---

authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.

Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]** (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the **Outline Design Principles** submitted as an appendix to the **Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]**. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.

In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local community would be very low.

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>EIA process</b>	The site selected for preferred grid connection route was not included in the Preliminary Environmental Information and this is an omission which needs to be addressed.	Boreham Parish Council	The preferred grid connection route broadly accorded with the alignment of the corridor assessed in the PEIR. These changes were not considered sufficient to change the conclusions of the PEIR. The completed assessments in <b>the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> take into account the changes to the preferred grid connection route.	N
<b>EIA process</b>	The site selected for preferred grid connection route was not included in the Preliminary Environmental Information and this is an omission which needs to be addressed. The impact of the inclusion of Cranham Road/Wheelers Hill may affect the outcomes of the environmental impact assessment but insufficient information has been provided regarding the scope and location of the road widening which has been agreed between the	Boreham Parish Council	<p>At the statutory consultation launched on 1 June 2021, the Applicant said that the Scheme would be likely to require off-site highway improvements at Cranham Road. These could involve small scale road widening to accommodate construction traffic, within the existing highway boundary. Following the consultation and further engagement with Essex County Council, the Applicant clarified the road widening requirements in this location. The Applicant has also agreed with Essex County Council to include this work within the Scheme boundary so that consent for the work is obtained as part of the Development Consent Order, rather than relying on additional consents under other regimes. This approach helps minimise delays to the delivery of the Scheme, reflecting its national importance and the urgent national need for renewable energy.</p> <p>The PEIR already envisaged using the access and undertaking the highway improvements and amendments to the cable route were only minor. These changes were not considered sufficient to change the conclusions of the PEIR.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	developer and Essex County Council.		The completed assessments in the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> take into account the changes to the Scheme boundary.	
<b>EIA process</b>	The proposed revision to the DCO application boundary now includes Wheelers Hill and Cranham Road but only to the extreme width of the carriageway and footpath as may be extended. There is no supporting data supplied, and certainly the Longfield communications of 25 October 2021 does not include reference to any residential properties that continued amenity is set to be impacted by this proposed revision.	Terling and Fairstead Parish Council	<p>At the statutory consultation launched on 1 June 2021, the Applicant said that the Scheme would be likely to require off-site highway improvements at Cranham Road. These could involve small scale road widening to accommodate construction traffic, within the existing highway boundary. Following the consultation and further engagement with Essex County Council, the Applicant clarified the road widening requirements in this location. The Applicant has also agreed with Essex County Council to include this work within the Scheme boundary so that consent for the work is obtained as part of the Development Consent Order, rather than relying on additional consents under other regimes. This approach helps minimise delays to the delivery of the Scheme, reflecting its national importance and the urgent national need for renewable energy.</p> <p>The PEIR already envisaged using the access and undertaking the highway improvements and amendments to the cable route were only minor. These changes were not considered sufficient to change the conclusions of the PEIR. The completed assessments in the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> take into account the changes to the Scheme boundary.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>General</b>	The amendment does not affect our position, and as such have no additional comments to make, further to our previous response (attached for reference).	Natural England	This is noted.	N
<b>Grid connection</b>	Additionally, the existing HV pylons and distribution infrastructure is already in excess of 60 years old, and the expected life cycle of the existing pylons suggests replacement during the expected period of operation of the Longfield installation; should, even now, an underground network of cables to future proof the facility, be advanced for public consultation?	Terling and Fairstead Parish Council	This is a matter for National Grid, which manages the National Electricity Transmission System including the 400kV line referred to in the comment.	N
<b>LVIA</b>	There will be a significant and negative visual impact: The large scale will make this a significant and unwelcome feature of the local landscape. The	Boreham Parish Council	The effect on landscape character and visual amenity has been considered by the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Impacts of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . Mitigation of potential adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity has been incorporated into the design,	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	proposed mitigations are inadequate.		including the conservation and enhancement of the existing vegetation pattern across the Order limits and careful siting of the scheme in the landscape to limit adverse effects to people's views. Given the mitigation embedded in the design, the Scheme was found to result in major adverse effects on only 10 receptors, and these were found to be only temporary once mitigation measures are in place.. Please see the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) (Appendix 10G of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> , for more information and the Outline Landscape Masterplan Figure 10-12 in <b>Chapter 10 - Landscape and Visual Impacts in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	
<b>Need</b>	The Council has been monitoring the proposed solar farm and battery storage scheme at Links Farm to the south of Braintree (BDC ref 21/01878, 9 June 2021). This is c163acres and stated to be capable of producing 35Mw and is pending consideration by Braintree District Council at the time of writing. Observation has been made that if c163 acres of	Terling and Fairstead Parish Council	This does not reflect the expected generating capacity of the Scheme, which would be significantly more than 50MW. Unlike a conventional power station, the environmental impacts of a solar farm are not a direct result of the amount of electricity it can generate. For this reason, the Applicant is not proposing that the Longfield Solar Farm is restricted by imposing a limit on how much electricity it can generate. Instead the Applicant is seeking a DCO that would restrict the aspects of the solar farm which have potential environmental impacts.	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	land at Links farm is stated as producing 35Mw of generated power, why is the Longfield site (as now enlarged and re-stated as being c1172 acres) only capable of producing 50Mw?			
<b>Transport</b>	Is it the intention that these changes to the roads will be permanent or will Longfield reinstate to present configurations on operation of the Longfield facility?	Terling and Fairstead Parish Council	<p>The road widening proposals to Cranham Road/ Waltham Road and Wheelers Hill are proposed to be permanent and will become part of the adopted highway.</p> <p>There are some temporary street works being undertaken and these are noted in the Environmental Statement and the DCO. In respect of these works it will be the Applicant's responsibility to reinstate the streets after construction/decommissioning.</p>	N
<b>Transport</b>	The revision to this application is silent in relation to Drakes Lane, which the Council suggests is set to become an alternative route of access to the western approaches to the Terling settlement, via Birds Farm Lane and Noakes Farm	Terling and Fairstead Parish Council	The proposed access strategy for the Solar Farm Site consists of a single-point of access on Waltham Road and an agreed routing strategy for large construction vehicles to access the Solar Farm Site from the west via A130, Wheelers Hill and Cranham Road (with supporting improvements to the carriageway). The single access point and routing strategy has been advised (and therefore agreed) with ECC highways and has been identified as a way to limit the usage of Protected Lanes (i.e. Boreham Road) and local roads through	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	Lane (which combine to Waltham Road).		<p>Boreham and Hatfield Peverel to the south (i.e. Waltham Road to the South and Main Road).</p> <p>Construction staff will be advised to take the most direct route to the site using 'higher' order roads, such as A and B classified roads i.e. the SRN and PR1/ PR2 routes. It is envisaged that workers would use the routes set out above to access Waltham Road from the north, or the B1137 Main Road to access Waltham Road from the south if travelling via the A12(T).</p> <p>It has been assumed that it has therefore been assumed that shuttle buses would travel via the A130 and A131 towards Braintree to the north (30%), the A130 towards Chelmsford to the south (40%), or alternatively via the B1137 Main Road towards Boreham (20%) or Hatfield Peverel (10%) to the east.</p> <p>The Bulls Lodge Substation Extension Site (Bulls Lodge Area) will be accessed via the A12(T), Boreham Interchange, RDR and finally a Private Road, not via Wheelers Hill/ Cranham Road as detailed above for the Solar Farm Site itself.</p> <p>Further information on construction vehicle routing is presented in the <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) included at Appendix 13B of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2].</b></p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Transport</b>	<p>The Council's Planning Committee held a public meeting on 10 November 2021 and invited all parishioners via its website and village hub to respond to both the above letter and Newsletter via the Clerk of the Council. The Council's formal response now includes those expressed opinions of the wider community. The Council is aware of two major infrastructure schemes that will affect and impact the subject application proposals namely:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A12 widening proposals being advanced by a DCO application by National Highways and presently before the Planning Inspectorate, which may now be registered.</li> <li>- Chelmsford NE bypass being advanced by Essex</li> </ul>	<p>Terling and Fairstead Parish Council</p>	<p>The Applicant has held pre-application and scoping discussions with the local authority, ECC Highways and National Highways to discuss the routing and transport strategy for the Scheme. Cumulative impacts between the construction phase of the Scheme and other committed developments / highway improvements including the A12 widening scheme have been considered as part of the <b>Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and <b>Transport Assessment (TA) Appendix 13A of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. It is assumed within these assessments that the CNEB will be completed by the time the Scheme is in constructed, and it is therefore considered as part of the future baseline. Phase 2 of the CNEB is considered within the cumulative assessments in Chapter 13. The TA include details of the embedded mitigation that will be implemented to reduce the traffic impacts of the Scheme during the construction phase. It is acknowledged that the construction A12 widening team sees no objection to the plans presented by the Applicant. The proposed A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening Scheme will be supported by a CTMP. Detailed CTMPs will also be prepared in due course for the Solar Farm Site and Bulls Lodge Substation which will include further details of the A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening Scheme where relevant. Chapter 13 demonstrates that the Scheme would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety and that the residual cumulative impacts of</p>	<p>N</p>



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>Highways (ref cc/ChI/85/21) to Essex County Council.</p> <p>The Council is concerned by the apparent lack of reported public engagement to demonstrate joined-up thinking between these separate applications and the Longfield team, with its consequent effects on the loss of amenity and enjoyment to the lives of our parishioners.</p> <p>The Council is aware that National Highways is commencing a further series of public consultations on its proposals to widen the A12. The Council will be making representations to National Highways regarding the need for a joined-up approach for these proposals, to allay its concerns and encourage a</p>		<p>the development on the road network would not be significant.</p> <p>It is anticipated that any cumulative effects arising from other developments would be focussed around the SRN, including the A12(T), Boreham Interchange and the A130. Given the proposed construction phase of the Scheme is expected to result in limited increases in traffic on these parts of the network (see Table 13-8 in Chapter 13, as above), it is expected that there would be no additional cumulative effects on these parts of the highway network additional to those already identified for the Scheme in isolation.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
-------	---------	--------	----------	-----------------------------------------

---

comprehensive and inclusive approach to these major infrastructure schemes.  
The stated construction programmes for the separate schemes appear to have become combined and will seriously impact on many residents and parishioners, especially to the west of the community.

---

### Consultees under S42(1)(b)

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Climate change</b>	Chapter 6 – Climate Change Chapter 6 (page 5) makes reference to the ECC Adaptation Action Plan 2011. Although this Plan is still relevant, it has been superseded by an Essex wide Climate Change Plan. It is recommended that this report and the recommendations made by the Essex Climate Action Commission, especially in relation to Land use and GI are referenced in the PEIR. The Commission published a report in July 2021 - Net Zero: Making Essex Carbon Neutral report.	Essex County Council	Essex County Council – Net Zero: Making Essex Carbon Neutral, the report of the Essex Climate Action Commission (2021) [REF-16], is reflected in <b>Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN01011/APP/6.1]</b> .	N
<b>Consultation</b>	The consultation leaflet cuts off prior to reaching the final section of Wheelers Hill heading west to the A130 Essex Regiment Way when it is	Chelmsford City Council	This comment was submitted during the first period of additional consultation, which took place from took place between 26 October 2021 and 23 November 2021. Since the consultation, it came to the Applicant’s attention that the plan showing the changes to the Scheme boundary	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>understood that at least one area of carriageway widening is located along this stretch of road. While further detailed plans have been shared with ECC Highways, outside of this consultation process, which appear to indicate the red line runs further west to include the final section of Wheelers Hill the red line on this drawing appears to only cover the southern section of Wheelers Hill/Cranham Road when some widening has also been identified on the northern side of the carriageway. This highlights the need for further detailed plans to be included as part of the consultation itself as it remains unclear which part of the road is to be included in the scheme and therefore very difficult</p>		<p>omitted a small part of the new boundary at its western edge. This was due to a formatting error. The Applicant therefore wrote to consultees with a corrected Scheme boundary plan to provide the opportunity to respond to the consultation on the basis of the corrected plan included with this letter. The period for responding to the consultation lasted from 11 January 2022 until 8 February 2022. Further information is set out in section 8.3 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/ 5.1]</b>.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>for CCC to comment fully on this aspect of the proposal.</p> <p>If the proposal is to continue to amend the red line to include this area further detailed plans should be provided at a scale to clearly show the areas to be included. These should be drawn to cover both sides of Cranham Road/ Wheelers Hill to the full extent of where carriageway widening has been identified.</p> <p>As set out above, without this it is unclear which land is to be included within the red line boundary and landowners within/adjacent to the red line may be prejudiced if it is unclear which land is included in the proposals.</p>			

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>The three host authorities, ECC, Braintree District Council (BDC) and Chelmsford City Council (CCC) are working in close collaboration on this Proposed Development and have provided separate but aligned responses to this additional targeted statutory consultation. Whilst ECC recognises refinements to the Scheme design are being made in the light of consultee responses to statutory consultation and subsequent technical engagement, and welcomes this, it is disappointing that the host authorities were unaware of this additional consultation, until received.</p>	<p>Essex County Council</p>	<p>The Applicant provided advanced notice of the consultation at a meeting with CCC, ECC and BDC on 20 September 2021. While the Applicant was not able to share the anticipated start date of the consultation at this time, this provided the local authorities with notice that it planned to consult with them on the Scheme boundary changes in Autumn 2021. However, the Applicant took this feedback on board and made the local authorities aware ahead of the further period of consultation in January 2022.</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>ECC welcomes the proactive steps taken by Longfield Solar Farm Ltd. to actively engage with the host authorities in the final pre application stages before the submission of the Development Consent Order (DCO) at the end of February. Regular DCO meetings with the host authorities since December 2021 have been valuable in providing updates on the scheme design, following statutory consultation and in taking forward outstanding technical discussions. There are however technical studies, as identified as unavailable at the statutory consultation stage, that have either just been circulated to the host authorities or are still awaited, for example the Glint and Glare Report and</p>	Essex County Council	<p>This is noted. The Applicant conducted significant engagement with local authorities following the statutory consultation as set out in <b>Table 8-3 of the Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>. The Applicant provided advanced sight of a number of application documents, including <b>Appendix 10G: Glint and Glare Assessment of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>, to support this engagement. These were provided in draft when the Applicant was in a position to share them. The Applicant will continue discussions with the local authorities on the other documents and topics mentioned.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>the Decommissioning Strategy. This is unfortunate and will mean that ECC will not be able to form a view on these technical reports before submission of the DCO. Also, whilst discussions with the host authorities on matters covering jobs and skills and community benefits/ownership, have begun, it is unfortunate also that these discussions are not further advanced.</p>			
<p><b>Consultation</b></p>	<p>It is noted and welcomed that a corrected plan has now been provided to show the new scheme boundary at the western edge. This has addressed the issue raised in ECC's response letter, dated 23rd November 2021 regarding the plan cutting off prior to reaching the final section of Wheelers Hills heading west. This plan, whilst now</p>	<p>Essex County Council</p>	<p>The Applicant consulted on the basis of the updated Scheme boundary and included a plan showing this in its communications with consultees. Consultation letters included contact details for the Applicant. The Applicant provided more detailed information or plans to consultees when requested and continues to maintain dialogue to ensure the LLFA's requirements are adhered to including through liaison with ECC as the LLFA set out in table 8.1 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/6.1]. Please refer to Appendix 9A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) [EN010118/APP/6.2].</b></p>	<p>N</p>



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>helpfully provided at scale, could however be usefully supplemented by more detailed plans to help clearly distinguish land within the red line boundary.</p> <p>In all other respects ECC's previous comments remain as submitted in November 2021. Further, and for clarity, comments made previously in November 2021 by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) should apply for any area under road widening works to accommodate construction traffic within the DCO order limits.</p>			
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>With regard to the realigned scheme boundary, the red lines as drawn in the consultation leaflet are not clear, with more detailed plans at scale required to be able to fully respond. The line</p>	<p>Essex                      County                      Council</p>	<p>This comment was submitted during the first period of additional consultation, which took place from took place between 26 October 2021 and 23 November 2021. Since the consultation, it came to the Applicant's attention that the plan showing the changes to the Scheme boundary omitted a small part of the new boundary at its western edge. This was due to a formatting error.</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>drawn on the Longfield Leaflet 2510 cuts off prior to reaching the final section of Wheelers Hill heading west to the A130 Essex Regiment Way and at least one area of carriageway widening is located along this stretch of road.</p>		<p>The Applicant therefore wrote to consultees with a corrected Scheme boundary plan to provide the opportunity to respond to the consultation on the basis of the corrected plan included with this letter. The period for responding to the consultation lasted from 11 January 2022 until 8 February 2022. Further information is set out in <b>section 8.3 of the Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>As host authorities, CCC, Essex County Council and Braintree District Council, have signed a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) with the developers of this scheme which has generally assisted all parties in understanding the scheme and communicating concerns or potential changes to the proposals at an early stage. It is therefore disappointed that, as a host authority for this scheme, it was not given prior notice of this</p>	<p>Chelmsford City Council</p>	<p>The Applicant provided advanced notice of the consultation at a meeting with Chelmsford County Council, Essex County Council and Braintree District Council on 20 September 2021. While the Applicant was not able to share the anticipated start date of the consultation at this time, this provided the local authorities with notice that it planned to consult with them on the Scheme boundary changes.</p> <p>While the Applicant was not able to share the anticipated start date of the consultation at this time, this provided the local authorities with notice that it planned to consult with them on the Scheme boundary changes in Autumn 2021. However, the Applicant took this feedback on board and made the local authorities aware ahead of the further period of consultation in January 2022</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>consultation ahead of the formal notification letter despite the repeated requests for host authorities to be better informed about what was coming when at numerous core meetings that have taken place with the authorities.</p>			
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>The amended red line plan is welcomed in respect of previous concerns raised by CCC regarding the fact the red line boundary previously went off the page along Wheelers Hill/Cranham Road. Given the plans scale it is still slightly unclear where exactly the boundaries of these changes are, even when zoomed in, and more detailed plans at a scale which can clearly distinguish which land is within the red line boundary for these</p>	<p>Chelmsford City Council</p>	<p>The Applicant consulted on the basis of the updated Scheme boundary and included a plan showing this in its communications with consultees. Consultation letters included contact details for the Applicant. The Applicant provided more detailed information or plans to consultees when requested.</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>changes would still be useful.</p> <p>While this latest consultation satisfies part of CCC's concerns raised in their previous response, with the full extent of the red line boundary now being included on a plan, the comments relating to more detailed plans showing these boundary changes being available to ensure all associated landowners within/adjacent to the red line can clearly establish the land proposed to be included in the scheme, remain.</p>			
<b>Consulation</b>	<p>The error has been rectified and BDC acknowledge that the current Site Location Plan now shows the red line of the site boundary in its entirety. Previously the Council also advised that the map could be clearer</p>	Braintree District Council	<p>The Applicant consulted on the basis of the updated Scheme boundary and included a plan showing this in its communications with consultees. Consultation letters included contact details for the Applicant. The Applicant provided more detailed information or plans to consultees when requested.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>insofar as it is not easy to see where the previous and current scheme boundaries lie i.e., there isn't a plan which makes a direct visual comparison. This matter has not been addressed; however, the overall red line error/omission has been which is welcomed and is likely to have been the more critical issue. For clarity, BDC's previous comments in relation to other matters as set out in the Council's previous consultation response remain.</p>			
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>The consultation to BDC consists of a leaflet and a covering letter. It is unfortunate that this consultation was launched with no proper prior notification to any of the host authorities despite the</p>	<p>Braintree District Council</p>	<p>The Applicant provided advanced notice of the consultation at a meeting with CCC, ECC and BDC on 20 September 2021. While the Applicant was not able to share the anticipated start date of the consultation at this time, this provide the local authorities with notice that it planned to consult with them on the Scheme boundary changes.</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>existence of a Planning Performance Agreement which is designed to ensure consistent and early communication between the parties.</p>		<p>While the Applicant was not able to share the anticipated start date of the consultation at this time, this provided the local authorities with notice that it planned to consult with them on the Scheme boundary changes in Autumn 2021. However, the Applicant took this feedback on board and made the local authorities aware ahead of the further period of consultation in January 2022</p>	
<p><b>Consulation</b></p>	<p>In terms of the consultation itself, the general nature of the boundary changes, including the rationale behind them is set out in both the covering letter and the leaflet and is understood. However, the map contained within the leaflet does not set the changes out clearly or in any detail. There is no visual comparison between previous and current site boundaries; the scale of the map makes it very difficult to actually see where the boundary lies and the red line along Whelers Hill/Cranham Road actually runs</p>	<p>Braintree District Council</p>	<p>This comment was submitted during the first period of additional consultation, which took place from took place between 26 October 2021 and 23 November 2021. Since the consultation, it came to the Applicant’s attention that the plan showing the changes to the Scheme boundary omitted a small part of the new boundary at its western edge. This was due to a formatting error. The Applicant notes that the leaflet accompanying the plan set out the nature of the changes and included labelling on the plan to help identify these. The Applicant therefore wrote to consultees with a corrected Scheme boundary plan to provide the opportunity to respond to the consultation on the basis of the corrected plan included with this letter. The period for responding to the consultation lasted from 11 January 2022 until 8 February 2022. Further information is set out in <b>section 8.3 of the Consultation Report [EN010118/5.1]</b>.</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>completely off the map meaning that it is not possible to see where it terminates. BDC are concerned that this is not particularly satisfactory in terms of actually enabling consultees to clearly see the changes and understand the actual detail of the boundary amendments and question whether this can actually be considered to be a comprehensive consultation approach. BDC therefore can only make high level comment rather than any detailed response.</p>			
<p><b>EIA                      process</b></p>	<p>Overall, the general reasons for the boundary changes are understood. It is noted that you consider that the changes to the site boundary would not affect the outcomes of the environmental impact</p>	<p>Braintree District Council</p>	<p>At the statutory consultation launched on 1 June 2021, the Applicant said that the Scheme would be likely to require off-site highway improvements at Cranham Road. These could involve small scale road widening to accommodate construction traffic, within the existing highway boundary. Following the consultation and further engagement with Essex County Council, the Applicant has clarified the road widening requirements in this location. The Applicant also</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>assessment set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report. BDC reserve judgement on this and whether the PEIR should in fact have taken into account an assessment of these changes, their potential impacts and any necessary mitigation.</p>		<p>agreed with Essex County Council to include this work within the Scheme boundary so that consent for the work is obtained as part of the Development Consent Order, rather than relying on additional consents under other regimes. This approach helps minimise delays to the delivery of the Scheme, reflecting its national importance and the urgent national need for renewable energy.</p> <p>The changes to the Scheme boundary that were subject to the consultation were in order to allow for our preferred grid connection route and to ensure we obtain the appropriate powers for access and to make highway improvements. The PEIR already envisaged using the access and undertaking the highway improvements and amendments to the cable route were only minor. These changes were not considered sufficient to change the conclusions of the PEIR. The completed assessments in the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> take into account the changes to the Scheme boundary.</p>	
<p><b>EIA process</b></p>	<p>The Longfield Consultation Leaflet states that the changes to the red line boundary would not affect the outcomes of the EIA, as set out in the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report during the statutory consultation stage. However, ECC</p>	<p>Essex County Council</p>	<p>At the statutory consultation launched on 1 June 2021, the Applicant said that the Scheme would be likely to require off-site highway improvements at Cranham Road. These could involve small scale road widening to accommodate construction traffic, within the existing highway boundary. Following the consultation and further engagement with Essex County Council, the Applicant has clarified the road widening requirements in this location. The Applicant also agreed with Essex County Council to include this work within the Scheme boundary so that consent for the work is</p>	<p>N</p>



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>seeks clarification on this conclusion. The current proposals see an increase and change in the site boundary. As such ECC would expect there to be an assessment of these changes and the potential impacts on the landscape, surface water/flood water management, green infrastructure features, ecology, etc. ECC expects there to be an assessment of these changes included in the PEIR; as part of the formal submission of the DCO.</p> <p>It is noted that the PEIR has been updated following consultee responses at the statutory consultation stage and will continue to be updated up until DCO submission. In reviewing the documentation relating to</p>		<p>obtained as part of the Development Consent Order, rather than relying on additional consents under other regimes. This approach helps minimise delays to the delivery of the Scheme, reflecting its national importance and the urgent national need for renewable energy.</p> <p>The changes to the Scheme boundary that were subject to the additional consultation were in order to allow for our preferred grid connection route and to ensure we obtain the appropriate powers for access and to make highway improvements. The PEIR already envisaged using the access and undertaking the highway improvements and amendments to the cable route were only minor. These changes were not considered sufficient to change the conclusions of the PEIR. The completed assessments in the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> take into account the changes to the Scheme boundary.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>this additional statutory consultation, the following updates are suggested for the PEIR.</p>			
<p><b>EIA process</b></p>	<p>As set out above CCC would also question the assumption that the conclusions in the PEIR used to support the previous statutory consultation remain unchanged. The current proposals see an increase and change in the site boundary in this location. CCC would therefore expect to see some further assessment of these changes to be considered within the PEIR. Without these having been included the site boundary and its impact have not been properly assessed. CCC</p>	<p>Chelmsford City Council</p>	<p>At the statutory consultation launched on 1 June 2021, the Applicant said that the Scheme would be likely to require off-site highway improvements at Cranham Road. These could involve small scale road widening to accommodate construction traffic, within the existing highway boundary. Following the consultation and further engagement with Essex County Council, the Applicant has clarified the road widening requirements in this location. The Applicant also agreed with Essex County Council to include this work within the Scheme boundary so that consent for the work is obtained as part of the Development Consent Order, rather than relying on additional consents under other regimes. This approach helps minimise delays to the delivery of the Scheme, reflecting its national importance and the urgent national need for renewable energy. The changes to the Scheme boundary that were subject to the consultation were in order to allow for our preferred grid connection route and to ensure we obtain the appropriate powers for access and to make highway improvements. It The PEIR already envisaged using the access and undertaking the highway improvements and amendments to</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>will expect to see an assessment of these changes included in the PEIR and other supporting information and assessments as part of the formal submission of the DCO to ensure appropriate mitigation is included within the scheme if found to be necessary. Until such time as this is available CCC reserves judgment on the conclusions in the environmental impact of these particular changes as well as the overall scheme.</p>		<p>the cable route were only minor. These changes were not considered sufficient to change the conclusions of the PEIR. The completed assessments in the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> take into account the changes to the Scheme boundary.</p>	
<p><b>Longfield Substation</b></p>	<p>In relation to the Chelmsford NE Bypass (CNEB) and its proposed alignment, the first phase of CNEB utilises the southern sections of the RDR up to roundabout 4. (at the north eastern corner of the Beaulieu site), it then continues</p>	<p>Essex County Council</p>	<p>This is noted. Interactions with the CNEB Phase 2 are considered in section 13.11 of <b>Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>northwards to join the A131. The southern section of the RDR, from roundabout 4 to Boreham Interchange therefore will remain in place forming part of the bypass route until the dual carriageway section of the bypass is constructed in the future. As yet there is only a safeguarded corridor for phase 2 of the CNEB route, no design, and no date for implementation. It is therefore very unlikely that the phase 2 CNEB would have any impact on Longfield Solar Farm unless it is delayed until around 2035/36. Access to the private road to Bulls Lodge Quarry and the substation will be from RDR roundabout 5 and will remain unchanged by the bypass at this stage.</p>			

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>LVIA</b>	Chapter 10 – Landscape and Visual Chapter 10 (page 6) should also reference the Essex Green Infrastructure Strategy, 2020, which aims to enhance the urban and rural environment, through creating connected multi-functional GI that delivers multiple benefits to people and wildlife. It meets the County Council’s aspirations to improve GI and green spaces in our towns, city and villages, especially close to areas of deprivation.	Essex County Council	This is referenced in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> .	N
<b>Minerals and Waste</b>	Whilst these reports are not the subject to this additional consultation, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority (MWPA) would like to take this opportunity to place those comments on record.	Essex County Council	The Applicant has carried out a <b>Mineral Infrastructure Impact Assessment (MIIA) [EN010118/APP/7.8]</b> . This concludes that the Scheme would not experience significant adverse effects as a result of the on-going operations at Bulls Lodge Quarry and that the quarry would not experience significant adverse effects as a result of the construction and operation of the Scheme other than the potential sterilisation of a small quantity of mineral at Brick Farm as a result of the permanent land take associated with the Bulls Lodge	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>In summary, the MWPA raises an objection to the proposed development, for the reason, that based on its current configuration, the proposed development will result in the sterilisation of mineral that is currently consented for extraction.</p> <p>With over 5ha of the proposed development being situated within a Minerals Safeguarding Area, in compliance with Policy S8 of the Essex Minerals Local Plan 2014, an MRA is being drafted to assess the practicality and environmental feasibility of extraction.</p> <p>At paragraph 6.1.1 the MRA concludes that 'The Solar Farm is temporary and reversible in nature, with an expected operational lifespan of</p>		<p>substation extension. As such, no additional mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>The <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b> sets out that</p> <p>the point of connection to the NETS at Bulls Lodge Substation is located adjacent to an existing consented sand and gravel quarry. The Applicant has carefully designed the Scheme, including careful siting of the Grid Connection Route, to avoid and minimise impact on the operation of the quarry. A small area of permanent land take from within the quarry will be required in order to construct the Bulls Lodge Substation Extension as part of the Scheme. This will result in the sterilisation of a small amount (c.18,000 m<sup>3</sup>) of consented mineral. The Applicant has prepared assessments to consider the impact of the Scheme on safeguarded and consented minerals and considers that the small amount of mineral sterilised would not impact the viability of the quarry or the supply of minerals to the local market. The Applicant has also considered prior extraction of the sterilised minerals and concluded that this would be unlikely to be viable or warranted given the very small volume affected.</p> <p>Away from the Bulls Lodge Substation Extension, the Applicant has also considered the impact of the Scheme on safeguarded mineral and has concluded that no sterilisation of mineral within the Solar Farm Site or the Grid Connection Route would result, as no impediment to mineral extraction would remain after the Scheme has been decommissioned.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>circa 40 years. At the end of the Solar Farm's lifespan (i.e. circa 40 years), the solar panels and associated infrastructure would be removed, and the Longfield Site restored. No permanent installations are proposed in this area, although a section of redundant cable maybe left in situ at a depth of approximately 1.5m. This would not be expected to prevent extraction of mineral in the future. As such, no mineral resources (which are not already permitted or allocated for extraction) within or adjacent to the Longfield Site would be permanently sterilised by the Scheme'. The MWPA agrees that the temporary nature of the development means that any underlying mineral is</p>			

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>not at risk of permanent sterilisation and therefore there is no need to consider prior extraction of that mineral which is not already consented for extraction. Given this conclusion, the MWPA can accept the MRA as competent without the inclusion of borehole information. It is also agreed that the redundant cabling that would be left behind following decommissioning is unlikely to be a barrier to future extraction.</p>			
	<p>The site of the proposed development lies within a Minerals Consultation Area associated with Bulls Lodge Quarry and a coated roadstone plant situated within the quarry. In compliance with Policy S8 of the Essex Minerals</p>			



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>Local Plan 2014, an MIIA is being drafted to assess the potential impacts that may result from the proposed development being located within and in close proximity to existing permitted mineral extraction and associated plant.</p> <p>At paragraph 4.1.2 of the Mineral Infrastructure Impact Assessment (MIIA) it is noted that the proposed development, as currently configured, would permanently sterilise 18,000 m<sup>3</sup> of minerals with planning permission for extraction in the south-west of the Brick Farm area of Bulls Lodge Quarry (CHL/1890/87). Whilst it is noted that this is a small proportion of the wider Bulls Lodge Quarry, the MWPA objects in principle to the loss of mineral with</p>			

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>planning permission for extraction. It is requested that alternative ways of delivering the proposed scheme are explored to either avoid the need for this sterilisation, minimise it further, or justify why such sterilisation is required to take place, and these should be explained within the MIIA.</p> <p>With respect to the Agent of Change principle, paragraph 4.2.4 states that 'The principle of Agent Change could also be extended to potential impacts of dust soiling on solar panels.' The MWPA however contends that the principle of Agent of Change does extend to potential dust impacts. In the absence of any information justifying that energy generation at the proposed development</p>			

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>would not be compromised by any dust originating as a consequence of the working and wining of material at Bulls Lodge Quarry, the MWPA requests an acknowledgement from the developer that any such impacts are the responsibility of the future managers of the proposed solar farm to mitigate, such as through an enhanced cleaning schedule, and not the responsibility of the operators of Bulls Lodge Quarry.</p> <p>The MWPA is satisfied with all other aspects of the MIIA.</p>			
<b>Transport</b>	<p>It is questionable as to whether there is a requirement for extension of the red line to cover Wheelers Hill and Cranham Road</p>	<p>Chelmsford City Council</p>	<p>The Applicant has agreed with the local highways authority Essex County Council to include this work within the Scheme boundary so that consent for the work is obtained as part of the Development Consent Order, rather than relying on additional consents under other regimes. This also ensures that the effects of undertaking these works are fully assessed</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>or whether the Highway Authority Permitted Development Order would suffice however understandably Longfield wish to be clear and transparent regarding their proposals including any offsite mitigation.</p>		<p>in the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> which accompanies the Application. This approach also helps minimise delays to the delivery of the Scheme, reflecting its national importance and the urgent national need for renewable energy.</p>	
<b>Water resources</b>	<p>Given that some additional land now forms part of the Proposed Development, there could potentially be an increase in overall surface water runoff from the site. ECC as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) reiterates the need for any additional green areas, incorporated into the Proposed Development, to follow SuDS Design principles, with drainage proposals in accordance with Essex's SuDs Design Guide.</p>	<p>Essex County Council</p>	<p>An outline drainage strategy provided within the Appendix 9C SuDS Strategy in <b>Chapter 9 Water Environment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> detailing the approach to managing drainage during both the construction and operational phases of the Scheme. Please also refer to <b>Appendix 9D Bulls Lodge Substation Extension: Drainage Strategy [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. Consultation with the ECC Fire and Rescue department has been undertaken during development of the strategy.</p> <p>Please also refer to <b>Appendix 9C: SuDS Strategy [EN010118/APP.6.2]</b>. Section 4 of that document sets out an outline drainage strategy and delivery of this will be secured under the DCO. An impact assessment of potential effects of operational runoff on the water environment, taking account of the SuDs Strategy is provided in section 9.8.</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>It is noted that the additional areas are at risk of flooding ranging from low to high risk, either due to overland flood routes or the presence of ordinary water courses in the vicinity. The LLFA recommends the applicant should take appropriate measures to manage flood routes and flood volumes in a way that will not cause flooding to any areas outside of the red line boundary. Further, the potential impacts on water quality and temporary drainage arrangements should be in place to mitigate potential risk of flooding and pollution.</p>		<p>According to the assessment undertaken in the Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 9A in Chapter 9 Water Environment of the Environment Statement [EN010118/6.1]) the Scheme will not alter the current flood risk baseline. The drainage strategy will seek to ensure no detrimental impact relating to the surface water runoff from the Scheme following its construction. Therefore, no significant adverse changes to current baseline conditions are predicted for the future baseline, and so the impact assessment is undertaken against existing baseline conditions.</p> <p>Mitigation measures for environmental effects on the water environment are outlined in section 9.6 Embedded Design Mitigation and taken into account in the assessment of effects (Section 9.7) in <b>Chapter 9 Water Environment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Specific flood risk measures are discussed in further detail in Appendix 9A: FRA. Given these embedded mitigation measures, no significant effects have been identified.</p> <p>The Chelmsford Surface Water Management Plan [REF-3] confirms the site does not fall within a Critical Drainage Area (CDA).</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
-------	---------	--------	----------	-----------------------------------------

**Consultees under S42(1)(d)**

<b>Alternatives</b>	<p>The unprecedented size and industrial nature of the development is far too large and inappropriate for the location proposed. A more balanced and controlled development would make it easier to reach a compromise rather than the massive change proposed. Longfield Solar Farm will not be the only solar farm in this part of Essex, there are a large number of vastly smaller solar farms in this area that have been approved or in the planning stage. The Longfield Solar Farm proposal should be of a similar size. The motivation for this solar farm proposal to be of this size and in this</p>	E217 AND E218	<p>It is correct that the availability of a single, willing landowner for the Solar Farm Site has been a relevant consideration. This significantly minimises / avoids impacts on third party landowners and the extent to which the Applicant has to seek compulsory acquisition powers.</p> <p>However, it is not the case that this was the Applicant's sole consideration. The Applicant selected the Solar Farm Site following a process to identify land which is suitable from a technical, environmental and planning perspective. This is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. It references each of the matters identified by section 2.48 of Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3) (Draft NPS EN-3) as factors influencing solar farm site selection by the Applicant.</p> <p>Essex represents a good location within the UK to construct a solar farm. This is because it benefits from high levels of solar irradiance compared to other parts of the UK and is characterised by a generally low lying and flat topography, which increases the likelihood of being able to identify a suitable site that is capable of producing a large amount of electricity. Essex is in the South East of England, in close</p>	N
---------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>location is purely due to their being one willing landowner who owns all of the land not because it is the best location for a solar farm, no other sites were considered.</p>		<p>proximity to London, which means it is near to high demand centres for electricity. The location of electricity generation infrastructure close to areas of high demand helps to minimise losses associated with the transfer of electricity over long distances. The Applicant therefore sought a suitable generation site and point of connection to the electricity network in this area.</p> <p>The Solar Farm Site is suitable for a solar farm development insofar as it is located within an area of high irradiance and is of suitable topography. Within the parameters of the search for suitable sites for the Scheme, several alternative sites were considered, which were of comparative size and location with close proximity to the National Grid. The Point of Connection of the Scheme was a key criterion, with a target 5km radius from existing National Grid infrastructure (beyond which the environmental effects could increase and the Scheme becomes less financially viable).</p> <p>The 400kV overhead line that stretches from Braintree Substation to the north of the Order limits to Rayleigh Substation located to the east of Basildon, 19km to the south of the Order limits, was identified as having capacity to allow a connection from a potential solar farm, and a variety of constraints were mapped and used to exclude unsuitable areas and identify potential alternative sites. Constraints included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecological constraints – SAC's, SPA's, SSSI's, Ramsar Sites, National Nature Reserves,</li> </ul>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ancient Woodland;</li><li>• Heritage constraints – Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments,</li><li>• Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields;</li><li>• Landscape Designations – National Parks, AONB, Country Parks, Special Landscape Areas;</li><li>• Settlements;</li><li>• Land designated for other uses in the Councils Local Plan, for example open space and employment land;</li><li>• Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, although this is not necessarily a key constraint for solar PV;</li><li>• Green Belt; and</li><li>• Grade 1 and Grade 2 ALC.</li></ul> <p>The Applicant has also worked hard to ensure that the design of the site is as sensitive as it can be to the local area and where possible to reduce the amount of land used. Prior to arriving at the proposed Order limits, there were several stages of design evolution, during which the original area of the Longfield site was refined. That process of design evolution has been informed by ongoing environmental assessments, engineering and design considerations, as well as engagement with stakeholders. The surveys undertaken that influenced the reduction in the amount of land proposed to be within the Order Limits were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Agricultural Land Classification;</li><li>b. Landscape and Visual;</li><li>c. Cultural Heritage; and</li></ol>	



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>d. Ecology.</p> <p>Capacity was also a consideration as the Applicant's aim is to make efficient use of the land area in terms of generating the largest annual yield Megawatt hours (MWh) for the available developable area, once due consideration is given to environmental and social constraints.</p> <p>Following publication of the PEI Report and completion of statutory consultation, the PEI Boundary was further refined to the area now proposed as the Order limits, being an area of 453ha. Further information is presented in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Alternatives</b>	<p>Brownfield sites and industrial areas are more suited to a development of this immense size and nature. Other renewable energies are looking at developing modular units and placing them in brownfield locations and industrial areas. This idea should be pursued rather than trying to maximise profits by constructing a massive solar farm on one site. Regeneration of existing sites should have</p>	E217 AND E218	<p>The land we have identified for Longfield is ideal for grid scale solar because it has a rare combination of factors. Those are:</p> <p>The land sits directly under existing 400Kv electricity transmission lines and in close proximity to the Bulls Lodge Substation, which allows for direct connection to the National Grid and the quick distribution of the energy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The location is also key to the wider National Grid, as demand in this zone is very high and still growing.</li> <li>· The local topography (with broken views, expansive woodlands and high hedgerows) lends itself to solar technology.</li> <li>· With the land being open and allowed to grow grass, and in some cases "wild", this forms a temporary natural carbon-sink in volume, again addressing the wider climate need for safer, purer, breathable clean air.</li> </ul>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>had far more focus and discussion but this has been dismissed by the developer with no consideration due to the cost involved in assessing and reclaiming brownfield sites. It is cheaper and easier to destroy an area of countryside rather than regenerate a more appropriate site.</p>		<p>We reduced the amount of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land that we are proposing to use as part of the Scheme by 60% following the non-statutory consultation and have minimised the inclusion of BMV land where feasible. For further information regarding the site selection process, please see <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Estimates from NGESO, NIC and ESC of the capacities of new solar generation needed in order to meet Net Zero include 44 to 76GW of additional solar capacity by 2050, with approximately one quarter of this needed in the next ten years. In order to meet those projections (noting that, consistent with the NPSs, these capacities are not presented as a target, nor indeed a quota, and therefore could be gone further than) a very high proportion of (if not all) solar projects of any scale which come forward for consent will need to be approved. Falling short on solar development at any stage in the next decades will risk causing the UK falling behind on decarbonisation and will increase the magnitude of the task (and therefore the intolerable risk of failure) of meeting its 2050 legal commitments to achieve Net Zero. Please see <b>Section 11.4 in the Statement of Need (EN010118/APP/7.1)</b> for further information. Figure 116 in this document shows the results of an analysis which illustrates that development of one large solar scheme brings carbon savings and economic benefits versus developing combinations of smaller independent schemes, each</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>combination matching to the same total installed generation capacity. The analysis assesses the relative costs and construction timeframes associated with the development of different sized independent solar schemes against the total cost and carbon benefit achievable through the development of one large solar scheme such as the proposed Scheme.</p>	
<b>BESS</b>	<p>There are huge safety concerns regarding the lithium battery storage unit and the potential for fire explosion and emission of toxic gases. Our concern is that these battery storage facilities which have the potential for explosion (and have exploded in the past) are not covered by COMA regulations. These battery storage facilities are as dangerous as the cladding was on Grenfell Tower in their capacity to take lives. There is a lack of a critical impact plan in place for emergency procedures or potential evacuation of local residents in the event</p>	E217 AND E218	<p>In developing the Scheme, the Applicant has consulted with both the HSE and Essex Fire and Rescue and adopted advice as appropriate. The Applicant's approach has also been developed to follow the HSE's hierarchy of controls and HSE Operational Guidance document OG86.</p> <p>A plume assessment has been undertaken with respect to the BESS to assess the likelihood of a fire occurring, and the level of impact on receptors in the unlikely event a fire occurs. The assessment demonstrates that under day to day operation there is a low risk of an incident, and in the event of an incident the credible hazards are understood and have been evaluated to demonstrate that the risk to the local population would be very low. The Applicant has prepared an <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> which details design measures and controls for the BESS to minimise the risk of a fire and includes a framework for responding to an incident.</p> <p>The design of the BESS and its impacts are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>of fire or explosion. The scale and size of the battery storage is in direct correlation to the size of the development. The battery storage should be scaled down by removing the higher quality agricultural land from the scheme, a compromise for safety, the environment and to mitigate risk.</p>		<p>BESS, a Battery Safety Management Plan (in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> submitted with the Application) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Further, pursuant to a requirement of the DCO, the detailed design of the BESS must be in accordance with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [EN010118/APP/7.6]</b> (which includes safety requirements for the BESS design) and the <b>Outline Design Principles [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b> submitted as an appendix to the <b>Design Statement [EN010118/APP/7.3]</b>. The Outline Design Principles contain controls over the BESS, which include: 1) that the chemistry of the BESS will be lithium ion, and 2) that an assessment will be undertaken, based on the detailed design for the BESS, to demonstrate that the risk of fire and impacts from such a fire will be no worse than as assessed in the plume assessment submitted with the Application.</p> <p>In this way, the Applicant can confirm that if the BESS constructed is different to that assessed in the risk assessment, its impacts in the event of a fire would be no worse than those assessed in the plume assessment, and therefore the risk to the local population would be very low.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Consultation</b>	<p>The proposal for this solar farm will have an overwhelming effect on our lives, yet the information provided is vague, speculative and lacking in detail. There is no consideration for the local community.</p> <p>The developer's representatives have been poorly prepared and lacked knowledge. Their manner has come across as dismissive of the local community's concerns and that any webinars, questionnaires or consultations are nothing but a boring, time consuming 'tick box exercise', a process that has to be gone through to achieve the end goal.</p> <p>Answers to questions relating to Longfield are exactly the same, word for word, as for other solar</p>	E217 AND E218	<p>The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Applicant has conducted a comprehensive programme of pre-application consultation as set out in <b>the Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>. Information provided in support of the consultation has been bespoke to the Scheme. It is also not the case that the consultation is a 'tick box exercise': the Applicant has had due regard to comments submitted through consultation as demonstrated in <b>Appendices J-1 to J-5 of the Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>farms the developers have been involved with, information provided is not specific to this project. Purely on size alone this solar farm is not the same as others the developers have been in and should not be treated as such.</p>			
<p><b>Consultation</b></p>	<p>1 I note that, in the letter (Ref: 125724.005 Longfield / s42 015) to me concerning this consultation, it is stated that “Any comments received will be analysed and had regard to by Longfield Solar Energy Farm Ltd. and any of its appointed agents. Copies may be made available in due course to the Secretary of State, the Planning Inspectorate and other relevant statutory authorities so that feedback can be considered as part of the</p>	<p>E2115</p>	<p>Section 49 of PA 2008 requires that, ‘the applicant must, when deciding whether the application that the applicant is actually to make should be in the same terms as the proposed application, have regard to any relevant responses.’ This is reflected in the language in the consultation letter referred to in this case.</p> <p><b>The Consultation Report [EN010118/APP/5.1]</b> and this appendix demonstrate the regard had to responses to the consultation. The Applicant has noted copies of responses may be made available in due course to the Secretary of State, the Planning Inspectorate and other relevant statutory authorities to allow for the fact that these may be requested by these bodies following the submission of the DCO application, not because it intends to withhold information in the manner described.</p> <p>As evidenced in <b>Appendices J-1 to J-5</b> of the Consultation Report, the Applicant has reported on consultation responses</p>	<p>N</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>process.                      .....Responses will also form the basis of a Consultation Report that will be one of the factors taken into consideration by the Secretary of State when deciding whether the Application can be accepted for examination.                      .....”                      a) I am most uncomfortable that the words “had regard to” are used; the implication is that Comments may be looked at by Longfield Solar Energy Farm or its agents, but arbitrarily discarded from further consideration if they are substantive in their content against the Application. This is not a process that should be used by professional people.</p>		<p>received, both positive and negative, and responded to them. In some cases the Applicant has made amendments to the Scheme in response to comments made, and where it has not done this, it has explained why. As requested by the consultee, the Applicant has set out their comments here without any alteration or redaction so that they can be viewed by the Planning Inspectorate. Members of the public will have a further opportunity to be involved in the examination of the application by making representations directly to the Examining Authority and appearing at hearings.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>b) I am most uncomfortable that the word “may” is used; the implication is that it is at the arbitrary discretion of Longfield Solar Energy Farm Ltd. whether or not the Comments are made available to the final decision makers, the Secretary of State, the Planning Inspectorate, and other statutory authorities. This too, obviously makes it available to the Applicant to fail to pass content to those decision-makers where the Comments are substantive and against the Application. This would not be a process that should be used by professional people.</p>			
	<p>c) I am most uncomfortable that the words “form the basis of” are used; this too holds the implication that</p>			



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>Longfield Solar Energy Farm Ltd. and its agents have abrogated to themselves the right to filter out comments that are substantive in their content against the Application. This would not be a process that should be used by professional people.</p>		<p>d) Overall, what the words in the quoted paragraph are saying is that Longfield Solar Energy Farm Ltd. may plan to filter out any substantive comments that are against the Application such that they will never be seen by the decision-making authorities. I request that these comments here in this message are passed to the decision-making authorities without any alteration or redaction.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>e) It must be obvious to any objective observer that it is an exceedingly bad way to proceed to give the right to the Applicant for a Planning Permission to editorialise the (probably negative) comments that he receives from those who will be most affected by his plans. To the contrary, such comments should be required to be passed unchanged directly to the decision-makers.</p>			
<b>Construction</b>	<p>We would expect that the only entrance to the site will be the one that will be used by construction traffic near Cranham Road. We do not expect this land to be accessed by a secondary entrance and any such entrance should be removed from the plans.</p>	E217 AND E218	<p>The proposed access strategy for the Solar Farm Site consists of a single-point of access on Waltham Road and an agreed routing strategy for large construction vehicles to access the Solar Farm Site from the west via A130, Wheelers Hill and Cranham Road (with supporting improvements to the carriageway). The single access point and routing strategy has been devised (and therefore agreed) with ECC highways and has been identified as a way to limit the usage of Protected Lanes (i.e. Boreham Road) and local roads through Boreham and Hatfield Peverel to the south (i.e. Waltham Road to the South and Main Road).</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>We would expect that construction traffic do not try and 'shortcut' the preferred transport route and use this section of Boreham Road. Boreham Road is a rural road and is totally unsuitable and extremely dangerous for use by construction vehicles.</p>			
<b>Construction</b>	<p>Construction hours should not be 7am – 7pm, 6 days a week. These hours of working are not allowed in built up areas and are totally unacceptable. Our mental health will be badly affected by the stress caused from noise, light and dirt pollution. The construction workers will not be local people and will be travelling workers with no connection or empathy with the area and our concern is the level of respect that will be shown</p>	E217 AND E218	<p>The Applicant has set out details of its approach to managing impacts from construction in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) [EN010118/7.10]</b> and <b>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) included at Appendix 13B of the ES [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. Implementation and compliance with both management plans is proposed to be secured by a requirement to the DCO. This includes managing impacts from noise, light and dust.</p> <p>HGVs associated with construction will only travel to/ from the Order limits between 09:00-17:00, to avoid the traditional network peak hours of 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00 and so no HGVs associated with the development will access the site before 09:00. All construction HGV traffic will have a designated route via Wheelers Hill / Cranham Road, avoiding the Waltham Road/ Main Road junction in Boreham, Boreham</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>for the people living in the properties next to the development. Enormous number of construction workers, 600 at the peak. This is a massive construction project totally inappropriate for the area and infrastructure. The working hours of 7am – 7pm, 6 days a week, are to entice travelling labour.</p>		<p>village itself, Hatfield Peverel village and the protected lanes (such as Boreham Rd) in the area. The designated route and access strategy has been specified by/ agreed with ECC highways. The working hours set out in the CEMP are to enable the timely delivery of the Scheme.</p> <p>No on-site residential accommodation is proposed within the Order limits and as previously mentioned measures to reduce the numbers of staff vehicle trips (local and non-local) arriving/ departing the site are proposed.</p> <p>With regards relationships with residents, the Considerate Constructors Scheme (CCS) will be adopted to assist in reducing pollution and nuisance from the Scheme, by employing good practice measures which go beyond statutory compliance. In addition, the Applicant intends to institute a Community Liaison Group (CLG) that will enable local community representatives to have a formal channel for monitoring and influencing developments at the site. This will provide a structured framework to exchange views and better understand and resolve issues where it is appropriate to do so.</p> <p>It is expected that an average of 380 jobs will be created during the construction period. During the operational phase, 8 full time staff would be employed on the site.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>A local skills and employment plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of construction. This will set out measures that the Applicant will implement in order to advertise and promote employment opportunities associated with the Scheme in construction and operation locally. The Applicant will also make a skills and education contribution. This will assist and encourage local people to access apprenticeships and training. Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 12 Socioeconomics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	
<b>Decommissioning</b>	<p>No detail relating to decommissioning of the site. As the developer's motivation is purely financial, we are concerned that the cost of decommissioning will encourage the site to be left to deteriorate.</p>	E217 AND E218	<p>Solar farms typically have a design lifespan of 40 years. The DCO will require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP), and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. <b>A Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12]</b> has been prepared as part of the DCO application. This provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement to prepare and approve of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Decommissioning Strategy, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is also enforceable via the Planning Act 2008.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>We have kites, owls, deer, foxes, bats etc. which regularly visit our garden. Our enjoyment of seeing these animals in close proximity will be lost due to the noise and disruption of construction followed by them being fenced out. The information provided relating to biodiversity is speculative and inconclusive.</p>	E217 AND E218	<p>The Scheme includes provisions to ensure wildlife can continue to move around the site. Badger gates will be used in the fence design to allow passage of Badger and other mammals such as small deer, rabbits and hare. Large species of deer will be able to move through the Order limits along verges, hedges and tracks. See <b>Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and refer to the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) included as Appendix 10G of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme's biodiversity net gain has been calculated using the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 and is reported in the DCO application through the <b>Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN010118/APP/6.5]</b>. An overall gain of approximately 79% of habitat units and 20% of hedgerow habitats is predicted.</p>	N
<b>General</b>	<p>We are aware of the proposed development and have been kept informed throughout by the landowner whose land and property we occupy leading to rights over part of the proposed development and have</p>	E2110	This is noted.	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	nothing further to add at this stage.			
<b>General</b>	I am aware of the proposed development and have been kept informed throughout by the landowner whose land and property we occupy leading to rights over part of the proposed development, and have nothing further to add at this stage.	E2112	This is noted.	N
<b>General</b>	As a Non-Ministerial Government Department, we provide no opinion supporting or objecting to an application.	E2135	This is noted.	N
	It is Government policy to refuse development that will result in the loss or deterioration of			

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodland, unless “there are wholly exceptional reasons, and a suitable compensation strategy exists” (National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 175 amended July 2018).</p> <p>Having read Chapter 8, The Preliminary Environmental Information Report it is clear that ‘Precautionary 20 metre buffer zones’ for the ancient woodlands are included in the design. Assuming that the buffer zones apply to the solar panels and all associated cabling, we have no further comment to make.</p>			
<b>Grid Connection</b>	<p>Grid Connection Route - We object to the proposed width of the Grid Connection route across</p>	E2118	<p>The cable corridor will be reduced after construction – typically to a width extending 5 metres both directions outwards from the centre line of the trench. The corridor is needed to allow access for any inspection of jointing pits, and</p>	N



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>CZ's land which will sterilise a wide corridor of land which is more than we consider is necessary. A revised corridor should be based on a justifiable and realistic need within which the detailed design to what is necessary can be accommodated.</p>		<p>to ensure the route is maintained free of trees or any new structures. Further information is available in the <b>Statement of Reasons [EN010118/APP/4.1]</b>.</p> <p>The grid connection route selected was considered by the Applicant to offer the best technical solution, minimises impact on the minerals safeguarding area, and has acceptable environmental and social impacts. Options for open trenching, moling, micro tunnelling and horizontal directional drilling (HDD) were explored for the watercourse crossings, with a technical preference for open trenching where possible, but a solution chosen to use HDD underground techniques was eventually agreed upon following further ecological survey work.</p> <p>For the type of cable two alternatives were considered; a single-circuit 400kV cable and a double-circuit 400kV cable. A single circuit cable was chosen to minimise the amount of below ground intrusion and because it offers a more economical solution.</p> <p>Further information on the selection of the grid connection route is set out in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b></p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Human health</b>	Our mental health will be severely impacted by this development.	E217 AND E218	A health and well-being assessment is presented in <b>Table 15-4 to Table 15-8 in Chapter 15 Human Health in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> . The assessment comprises an assessment of impacts during construction, operation and decommissioning on access to work and training, active travel, and social cohesion. Consideration is given to the potential for impacts on mental health through assessing an overall outcome in respect of each of these. No significant adverse effects are expected as a result of the Scheme.	N
<b>LVIA</b>	We have no information on relating to the proposed screening of the land. We require and expect the developer to plant suitable screening to maintain a responsible buffer between our property and the security fencing. We would expect and require the developer to plant suitable screening all the way around this field as any PV panels located behind our land will need to be screened to mitigate glare.	E217 AND E218	<p>A thorough review of views from residential properties was undertaken since the PEIR stage. The review resulted in further refinement to the Scheme design, including the removal of panels from part of fields and an extensive landscape planting strategy was developed.</p> <p>Advanced planting is being considered wherever possible, including in relation to the property in question, as a means of maximising the growth of proposed plants prior to operation of the Scheme. This will help reduce the visual impact of the Scheme and provide high quality habitat sooner.</p> <p>Please see the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) Appendix 10G of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, for more information and the <b>Outline Landscape Masterplan Figure</b></p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>10-12 in Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Impacts in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/6.1].</b>				
<b>LVIA</b>	The rural view from our property will be replaced by an industrial landscape consisting of large PV panels, security fencing, lighting and industrial buildings. The open view from the footpath in this field will be replaced by a walkway with industrial units either side.	E217 AND E218	<p>A thorough review of views from residential properties was undertaken since the PEIR stage. The review resulted in further refinement to the Scheme design, including the removal of panels from part of fields and an extensive landscape planting strategy was developed.</p> <p>Advanced planting is being considered wherever possible, including in relation to the property in question, as a means of maximising the growth of proposed plants prior to operation of the Scheme. This will help reduce the visual impact of the Scheme and provide high quality habitat sooner.</p> <p>Please see the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) Appendix 10G of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>, for more information and the <b>Outline Landscape Masterplan Figure 10-12 in Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Impacts in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>LVIA</b>	The scheme will have an extremely detrimental effect on the view provided by the current landscape and the wish to enjoy the open countryside. No enjoyment walking through a closed in walkway surrounded by industrial units and fencing. The rural landscape will be replaced by industrial units and fencing on a huge scale.	E217 AND E218	<p>The Applicant has assessed potential impacts on the landscape and visual amenity of users of the PROW network in <b>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>. Once screening and planting included as mitigation in the Scheme has matured, people walking on the Essex Way to the west or south of Fuller Street (VP45 and VP46) would experience minor adverse effects, which are not considered to be significant. The level of effect is reduced from year 1 because existing and proposed vegetation would be in leaf, filtering views of the PV Arrays such that the Scheme would be unobtrusive. People walking on the Essex Way on the south western corner of Sandy Wood would experience close range views of the Scheme, however this would be for a very short duration of the route such that the overall effect on people walking the Essex Way would remain minor adverse.</p> <p>Whilst additional breaks in the proposed solar arrays have been introduced since Statutory Consultation, people walking on PROW 213_19 and PROW 113_25 within the Order limits would experience major adverse effects because of close range views of the proposed PV Arrays in the immediate foreground. These effects are considered significant. People walking on the wider PROW network beyond the Order limits boundary would not experience significant effects resulting from operation during year 15.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<b>Operations</b>	Lack of information regarding the operation of the site i.e., will the site operate 24 hours with the potential for maintenance staff roaming and security lighting going on in the land next to us in the middle of the night.	E217 AND E218	<p>While the Scheme will function 24 hours a day, it is expected that any routine maintenance will take place during the day.</p> <p><b>The Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP), Appendix 2B in the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> outlines how maintenance of the site and panels will be undertaken.</p> <p>The visual impact of lighting has been assessed against Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Dark Skies mapping. The methodology followed is set out in <b>Appendix 10B of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>.</p> <p>Landscape and visual mitigation have been described in <b>Section 10.7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> and is shown on <b>Figure 10-12 Outline Landscape Masterplan [EN010118/APP/6.3]</b>. The proposed lighting has been designed to avoid and minimise the potential for adverse landscape and visual effects.</p>	N
<b>Socio-economics and land use</b>	Our comments relating to the 'area of interest' as shown on drawing number GH-125724005--S42-1008 This 'area of interest' is part of a development that is totally unsuitable for the area. The unprecedented size and industrial nature	E217 AND E218	<p>A sequential assessment re: agricultural land quality has been undertaken and is presented in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010118/APP/7.2]</b>. In summary, the vast majority of land within the area of search is of similar ALC to the site. The Order limits comprises approximately: 60% Grade 3b, 22% Grade 3a, 12% Grade 2 and 6% non-agricultural or unknown.</p> <p>All of the land within the area of search is either:</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>of the development is far too large and inappropriate for the location proposed. Chelmsford Council has designated this land as all Grade 2 agricultural land. You have graded this land as predominantly Grade 2, very good quality and 3a, good quality land. This land is therefore classified as Best &amp; Most Versatile agricultural land and should be removed from the development. The UK should look to becoming more self-sufficient in the production of food and not use good quality agricultural land for industrial use.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 2 (which is BMV and equal to the highest quality land within the site);</li> <li>• Grade 3 (which may also be BMV and no lower than the majority of the site);</li> <li>• Grade 4, but located within the Flood Plain of the River Chelmer, so unlikely to pass the flood risk sequential test; or</li> <li>• Urban land with no sites of comparable land available.</li> </ul> <p>There are therefore no alternative sites available meeting the Applicant’s search criteria that are clearly of a lower non-BMV ALC grade than the Order limits.</p> <p>There will be very little permanent loss of agricultural land. The soil will have undergone an expected 40 years of recovery through less intensive farming such as being left fallow, or sheep grazing and is expected to be the same or better quality as it is currently. Section 12.8 of <b>Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b> concludes this is not significant in EIA terms.</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
<p>Further assessment of agricultural land is included in <b>Chapter 12 Socio-economics of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>				
<b>Socio-economics and land use</b>	<p>We should receive compensation as individuals directly affected by the development, funds should not just be given to a central fund without compensation for those actually directly affected. This development will not make ANY positive contribution to our lives, to the contrary our lives will be severely adversely affected by this development. It will have a detrimental effect on the value of our property and investment to date.</p>	E217 AND E218	<p>The Applicant does not agree that the Scheme will lead to a reduction in property values. The Applicant is not proposing to offer compensation for any change in property values. The Scheme has where possible aimed to set back from residential dwellings and incorporate landscape mitigation and layout design measures to reduce the impact on residential dwellings.</p>	N
<b>Transport</b>	<p>Wheelers Hill and Cranham Road – we note</p>	E2118	<p>The Applicant has held pre-application and scoping discussions with the local authority, ECC Highways and</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
	<p>that the redline boundary has been extended to obtain approval for any road widening required under the DCO without the need for additional consents. This Road forms the northern boundary of the Chelmsford Garden Community which is allocated in the Local Plan and will be delivered by CZ and we request to be kept informed when the specific details of the road widening are available.</p>		<p>National Highways to discuss the routing and transport strategy for the Scheme. Cumulative impacts between the construction phase of the Scheme and other committed developments / highway improvements including the A12 widening scheme have been considered as part of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.1] and <b>Transport Assessment (TA) Appendix 13A of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>. It is assumed within these assessments that the CNEB will be completed by the time the Scheme is in constructed, and it is therefore considered as part of the future baseline. Phase 2 of the CNEB is considered within the cumulative assessments in Chapter 13. The TA include details of the embedded mitigation that will be implemented to reduce the traffic impacts of the Scheme during the construction phase. It is acknowledged that the construction A12 widening team sees no objection to the plans presented by the Applicant. The proposed A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening Scheme will be supported by a CTMP. Detailed CTMPs will also be prepared in due course for the Solar Farm Site and Bulls Lodge Substation which will include further details of the A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening Scheme where relevant. Chapter 13 demonstrates that the Scheme would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety and that the residual cumulative impacts of the development on the road network would not be significant.</p>	



Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
			<p>It is anticipated that any cumulative effects arising from other developments would be focussed around the SRN, including the A12(T), Boreham Interchange and the A130. Given the proposed construction phase of the Scheme is expected to result in limited increases in traffic on these parts of the network (see Table 13-8 in Chapter 13, as above), it is expected that there would be no additional cumulative effects on these parts of the highway network additional to those already identified for the Scheme in isolation.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the consultee with regards road widening.</p>	
<b>Transport and access</b>	<p>Access to Bulls Lodge substation extension - we note the redline has been extended along the Bulls Lodge Access Road to Generals Lane. As discussed at our meeting access to Generals Lane will no longer be possible along this route when it is required for the Proposed Scheme. The RDR and Roundabout 5 were opened to traffic on Monday 15th November and will form part of the wider adopted Highway</p>	E2118	<p>As part of the consultation process, a number of principles have been agreed with ECC Highways including that vehicles travelling to/ from Bulls Lodge Substation will utilise the RDR and the private road for the substation. Further details, including drawings showing the locations of access points, visibility splays and swept paths are held within <b>Appendix 13A Transport Assessment of the Environmental Statement [EN010118/APP/6.2]</b>.</p>	N

Topic	Comment	Author	Response	Has the design changed as a result? Y/N
-------	---------	--------	----------	-----------------------------------------

---

Network when needed for the Proposed Scheme (see attached reference Plan 2). The existing Bulls Lodge Access Road between Roundabout 5 and Generals Lane will no longer exist and should therefore be removed from the revised scheme redline as it is unnecessary.

## References

Reference	Document
REF-1	S.I. (2017); The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (No.1012)
REF-2	Department of Energy and Climate Change (2011): Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)
REF-3	Essex County Council and Chelmsford City Council (2014): Chelmsford Surface Water Management Plan
REF-4	MHCLG (2019): National Planning Policy Framework
REF-5	MHCLG (2014): National Planning Practice Guidance
REF-6	Climate Change Committee (2020): Sixth Carbon Budget (2033 – 2037)
REF-7	Essex County Council (2011): Development Management Policies
REF-8	Chelmsford City Council (2020): Local Plan 2013-2036
REF-9	Department of Energy and Climate Change (2011): National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3)
REF-10	The Planning Inspectorate (2018): Advice Note 9 Rochdale Envelope
REF-11	Braintree District Council (2013): Protected Lanes Assessments
REF-12	The Landscape Institute (2021): Technical Guidance Note 02/21 'Assessing Landscape Value Outside of National Designations'
REF-13	CIEEM (2018): Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine
REF-14	Historic England (2015): Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 2; Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment
REF-15	Historic England (2017): Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3; The Setting of Heritage Assets

REF-16	Essex County Council (2021): 'Net Zero: Making Essex Carbon Neutral', the report of the Essex Climate Action Commission
REF-17	Natural England (2009): Natural England Technical Information Note 049 - Agricultural Land Classification
REF-18	Braintree District Council (2021): Climate Change Strategy
REF-19	Essex Climate Action Commission (2021): Green Skills Infrastructure Review – Scoping Consultation Paper
REF-20	The Landscape Institute (2019): RVVA LI Technical Guidance Note 02/2019