

Longfield Solar Farm

Braintree District Council

Unique Reference: LOSF – 0003

ExQ1 - Responses to Written Questions

ExQ	Respondent	Question	BDC Response
Air Quality			
1.1.3	Applicant and Host Authorities	ES Chapter 14 (Air Quality) [APP-046] states that dust monitoring will be carried out during construction and decommissioning activities in order to confirm the assessment conclusions. ES Chapter 9 explains that this will be outlined in the Dust Management Plan (DMP). Table 3-9 of the oCEMP[APP-214] includes a commitment to develop and implement a DMP, which "...may include monitoring of dust deposition...". Can the Applicant and local authorities comment on the extent to which monitoring of dust deposition as part of a DMP is adequately secured in the application documents?2.Biodiversity, Ecology and the Natural Environment; Habitats Regulations Assessment	<p>Braintree District Council (BDC) has no objection in principle to the use of a Dust Management Plan (DMP) to ensure appropriate monitoring of dust deposition. This document would need to be submitted to and approved by the Host Authorities at the appropriate time. It may be more appropriate for the DMP to be a freestanding document rather than being incorporated within a wide ranging CEMP. The wording should also be changed to 'should' rather than 'may' to make the required detail of the DMP more certain/robust.</p> <p>As highlighted above the Outline CEMP does include the following paragraph:</p>

			<p><i>'The DMP may include monitoring of dust deposition, dust flux, real-time PM10 continuous monitoring and/or visual inspections'.</i></p> <p>Good practice guidance for controlling dust is available within the IAQM 'Guidance on the Assessment of dust from demolition and construction' (2014).</p> <p>BDC Environmental Health requires that any CEMP or DMP must contain clear statements of intent and absolute requirements rather than optional ones. The measures and controls undertaken must be in line with appropriate guidance and the submission makes reference to adopting good practice for high risk sites (as detailed within the aforementioned IAQM guidance) as being embedded within the mitigation. As the DMP is developed then the applicant will need to confirm what emissions to air monitoring is to be carried out and it will need to be agreed with the local</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>authorities for specific activities/incidents. Appropriate monitoring would be a combination of that highlighted in bold above but as a minimum there would be the expectation of documented visual inspections to assess any emissions beyond the boundary of the site.</p> <p>From the Ecology perspective BDC would comment as follows:</p> <p>A 'Dust Risk Assessment' (DRA) has been undertaken based on the IAQM guidance¹ and has been included within the Air Quality ES Chapter 14 (Air Quality) [APP-046]. This has identified the River Ter SSSI and five Ancient Woodlands as being High sensitivity receptors, as the ecological sites are Nationally designated or are sensitive ecosystems situated within 20m of the Order Limits.</p> <p>Therefore, a Dust Management Plan (DMP) has been prepared</p>
--	--	--	---

¹ Holman et al (2014). IAQM Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction, Institute of Air Quality Management, London.



			<p>for the construction, operation and decommissioning of the solar farm, which includes all relevant mitigation measures which are highly recommended for High sensitivity receptors, in line with IAQM guidance. This has been outlined within the Outline CEMP [EN010118/APP/7.10], Outline OEMP [EN010118/APP/7.11] and Decommissioning Strategy [EN010118/APP/7.12].</p> <p>Therefore, from the Ecology perspective BDC are satisfied that proposed measures are adequately secured to avoid impacts upon Nationally designated sites or sensitive ecosystems and are in line with best practice methodology.</p> <p>In terms of impacts of dust upon European sites, the Habitats Regulations Assessment [EN010118/APP/6.7] outlines that the nearest European site is over 9km from the Order Limits. Therefore, given that IAQM guidance outlines airborne dust is unlikely to adversely effect</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>habitat from up to 200m from the source, BDC agree that there is no risk of impacts upon European Sites from airborne dust emissions and that this impact can be scoped out.</p> <p>Furthermore, given the distance of the European sites, BDC also agree that any dust pollution upon any water courses will likely be well below detectable levels and therefore a Likely Significant Effect can be ruled out upon the European site. However, any potential impacts will be further avoided via the proposed dust control measures for the River Ter SSSI and other watercourses within the site.</p>
4. Battery Storage Technology			
1.4.3	<p>Host Authorities HSE Essex County Fire and Rescue Service Environment Agency</p>	<p>Please comment on the suitability and content of the Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [APP-210].</p>	<p>BDC consider that the Outline Battery Safety Management Plan is a comprehensive document which appears to provide a robust set of safety management measures.</p> <p>BDC understand that the applicant has been pursuing this matter directly with Essex County Fire and Rescue and the HSE. BDC defers to these</p>

			organisations in terms of their specialist input to this document.
5. Draft Development Consent Order			
1.5.22	Applicant/Relevant IP	Article 43 –please provide further justification for the wide application of this power (and provide any additional examples of similar provisions in other made DCOs).Please provide further justification for the 6-week period referred to in Art 43(4).	BDC consider that an absolute minimum of an 8 week period is required. (Note that for major planning applications condition discharges are normally 13 weeks).
1.5.23	All IPs who fall within the definition of ‘consenting authority’ under art 43(7)	Please comment on this Art and in particular the deemed consent provisions set out in Art 43(4).	BDC consider that an absolute minimum of an 8 week period is required. (Note that for major planning applications condition discharges are normally 13 weeks).
1.5.26	Host Authorities	Schedule 2 (General) -Please comment on the requirements set out in Schedule 2 and highlight any proposed changes suggested by the Host Authorities.	A meeting is scheduled to be held on 5th September 2022 between the Applicant and Host Authorities to discuss the requirements and drafting changes. Please also refer to the LIR which comments on the adequacy of the DCO under the appropriate topic sections and the SoCG in relation to requirements.
1.5.29	Host Authorities Health and Safety Executive The Environment Agency Essex County Fire and Rescue Service.	Schedule 2, R8 –Please comment on the drafting of this requirement and overall approach to battery safety management set out in the outline battery safety management plan [APP-210].See also ExQ1.4.3 above.	A meeting is scheduled to be held on 5th September 2022 between the applicant and Host Authorities to discuss the requirements and drafting changes.

			<p>BDC consider that the overall approach to battery safety management as set out in the Outline Battery Safety Management Plan is comprehensive and appears to provide a robust set of safety management measures. However, BDC defer to ECC Fire & Rescue and the HSE with regard to their specialist expertise on the relevant areas of battery safety management.</p>
1.5.31	<p>Host Authorities Historic England</p>	<p>Schedule 2, R12 & R25 –please comment on the wording of these requirements and the approach to the WSI set out in the oCEMP [APP-214]. See also ExQ1.9.3 below.</p>	<p>BDC defers to Essex County Council in respect of archaeology.</p>
1.5.32	<p>Host Authorities The Environment Agency</p>	<p>Please confirm whether or not the wording of R13 and R14 and the contents of the oCEMP[APP-214] and oOEMP [APP-215] is agreed. If not, please provide further details.</p>	<p>BDC are currently content in principle with the wording of R13 and R14 and the contents of both OCEMPS. However, these remain under discussion and consideration with the applicant.</p> <p>A meeting is scheduled to be held on 5th September 2022 between the applicant and Host Authorities to discuss the requirements and drafting changes. A further update will be provided subsequent to the meeting.</p>

1.5.47	Host Authorities	Please comment on the provisions of Schedule 16 including on the 6-week period specified for the notification of decision.	<p>BDC consider that an absolute minimum of an 8 week period is required. (Note that for major planning applications condition discharges are normally 13 weeks).</p> <p>A meeting is scheduled to be held on 5th September 2022 between the applicant and Host Authorities to discuss the requirements and drafting changes.</p> <p>BDC wishes to undertake further review of Schedule 16 and will provide further response and agreement to the acceptability of the Schedule as part of on-going discussion with the Applicant to the SoCG.</p>
6. Environmental Statement General Matters			
1.6.9	Host Authorities and NE	Please confirm whether you are content that all other developments, plans and projects which have potential to result in cumulative or in combination effects together with the Proposed Development have been identified by the Applicant (Appendix 5A [APP-055]) and appropriately assessed in the Environmental Statement and Habitats Regulations Assessment?	BDC are content with the approach to cumulative impacts in principle and that all relevant developments/plans/projects have been identified. Please also refer to the LIR and the SoCG where cumulative impacts are further considered under the appropriate topic sections.
7. Historic Environment			

1.7.3	Historic England Host Authorities	The Applicant considers there is no further mitigation that can be implemented to minimise the effect on the setting of the Grade I listed Ringers Farmhouse, which is assessed as significant adverse. Do Historic England and the Host Authorities consider there are any additional mitigation measures which could reduce the significant of effect on Ringers Farmhouse?	Yes, the DCO order site (developable area) could be further reduced so as not to not encroach as close to the listed building to the north (between Roll's Farm and Ringers).
8. Landscape and Visual Impacts			
1.8.1	Applicant/Host Authorities	A Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) has not been carried out, with the Applicant stating in paragraph 10.4.48 of E Chapter 10 (APP-042) that this was agreed with Wynne Williams Associates on behalf of Essex County Council, Chelmsford City Council and Braintree District Council via email on 15 October 2021. The Applicant is requested to provide the email dated 15 October 2021 agreeing to the methodology that excludes the RVAA and the Host Authorities are requested to provide conformation that that are content with the approach adopted or / record the position within the SoCGs.	BDC can confirm that we are content with the methodology.
1.8.3	Host Authorities	Could the relevant Host Authorities confirm whether they are in agreement with the proposed landscaping mitigation measures and (as relevant) monitoring proposals, as set out in the Outline Landscape Masterplan [APP-179], the oCEMP [APP-214], oOEMP [APP-215] and the oLEMP[APP-217]?	BDC confirm it is content in principle subject to further discussion on the following three items: 1. Approach to vegetation removal / management on

			<p>Noakes Farm Lane (Protected Lane)</p> <p>2. Screening of view from Viewpoint 45 (Essex Way north of River Ter)</p> <p>3. Advance planting of PDA 1 scrub area</p>
1.8.5	Host Authorities	Please provide confirmation that the visual receptors and representative viewpoints identified in ES Chapter 10 (Landscape and Visual Resources) [APP-042] been agreed. See also ExQ 1.10.1 above.	BDC can confirm that these have been agreed.
9. Land Use, Agriculture and Socio -economics			
1.9.2	Applicant/Host Authorities	Please provide an update on the section 106 agreement (as referenced in the planning statement [APP-204]) and provide expected timescales for its completion. Please confirm that an executed agreement will be provided prior to the close of the Examination.	The S106 agreement is under discussion with the applicant, and they will provide an update on timescales. BDC confirms that an executed agreement will be provided prior to the close of the Examination.
10. Noise and Vibration			
1.10.1	Host Authorities	Please state whether the Host Authorities agree with the assessment methodology and conclusions set out in ES Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration [APP-043]).	BDC agree – although it is noted that there is the possibility of a ‘continuous hum’ and whilst this is taken into account by a relevant correction factor in accordance with BS4142 methodology within the noise assessment any further information that becomes available on the likelihood of this phenomenon and its

			control/prevention would be of interest.
1.10.2	Host Authorities	Do the Host Authorities agree that the locations set out in Figure 11-1 [APP-187] and Table 11-3 [APP-043] are representative of the nearest NSR's?	BDC accepts the monitoring locations and the applicants reasoning for those locations relative to the noise sensitive receptors.