



Mallard Pass

Solar Farm

Mallard Pass Solar Farm

**Applicants Response to
Interested Parties' Deadline 2
Submissions - Traffic and
Transport**

Deadline 3 - June 2023

EN010127

EN010127/APP/9.26

Applicant's Response to Applicant's Response to Interested Parties' Deadline 2 Submissions on Transportation and Traffic

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
REP2-048 (LIR), REP2-047(WR) REP2-050(FWQ) REP2-138 REP2-195 REP2-196	Construction impacts.	Concerns that the proposed wheel wash systems are not satisfactory and have the potential to result in a significant negative impact through the deposition of mud and detritus on the highway.	The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-212] at Section 4.9 proposes to incorporate a wheel washing system with rumble grids to dislodge accumulated dust and mud prior to leaving the Order limits access points where reasonably practicable. However, if due to unforeseen circumstances this is not possible, then other alternative methods will be utilised such as manual cleaning of the wheels and undercarriage to ensure there is no transfer of dust and mud onto the local highway network. This method of wheel washing aligns with industry standards and is a widely accepted practice.
REP2-048 (LIR), REP2-047(WR) REP2-050(FWQ)	Traffic generation during operation	The Local Highways Authority has indicated that the operational phase of the development will result in a negligible impact in respect of traffic generation, both in terms of the number of trips generated and the size of vehicles involved.	Noted. This accords with the findings of the Transport Assessment [APP-074] which found the operational transport impacts of the Proposed Development are likely to be negligible.
REP2-048 (LIR), REP2-047(WR) REP2-050(FWQ) REP2-160	Negative impact due to accesses to the Site.	The LHA considers that in its current form, this access at the junction of the Drift with the B1176 would result in a high negative impact due to concerns relating to highway safety.	<p>A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) was carried out concerning the B1176 / The Drift access junction, following the auditor's suggestion (as set out in Appendix D of the Transport Assessment, in Appendix 9.4 of the ES [APP-074]). As a result, the hedgerows and verges will undergo regular maintenance and inspection throughout the construction period as set out in Section 4.2 of the oLEMP [REP2-022]. This will be secured by way of requirement in the DCO and through the respective CTMP and Landscaping and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP).</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken further consultation with RCC's highways officer who has confirmed via email on 20 June 2023 that they do not have any concerns regarding the proposed</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			access works at the B1176 / The Drift junction given the RSA did not raise any concerns and appropriate visibility splays can be provided in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) requirements.
REP2-044(LIR), REP2-045(FWQ), REP2-046(WR) REP2-090	Impacts on the Local highways network	The negative impacts arising from this development, in terms of increased traffic, disruption to road users and a result of junction improvement works, would not be expected to result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety or a severe residual cumulative impact upon the capacity of the existing local highway network within Lincolnshire.	Noted and accepted.
REP2-138 REP2-153 REP2-060 REP2-117 REP2-165 REP2-230 REP2-108 REP2-104 REP2-237 REP2-183 REP2-054 REP2-090	Negative impact on local roads	<p>Concerns around transport movements and the increasing traffic negatively impacting the local road network around the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Concerns around potential local road closures, changing speed limits during construction, the quality of the local roads being in poor condition, the size of the rural roads and having to travel through small villages to access the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The local infrastructure, including the highways infrastructure, are not of high enough standard and will not cope with the increased traffic movements.</p>	<p>As set out in ES Chapter 9: Highways and Access [APP-039], the Proposed Development will result in a negligible increase in traffic on the majority of the local network, with less than a 2% increase in the daily vehicle flows. Where there is a greater impact on Uffington Lane, mitigation is proposed in the form of passing places and widening at the junction with the A6121.</p> <p>Highway condition surveys will be undertaken to determine the state of the existing highway prior to commencement of construction, the scope of which will be agreed with RCC and LCC. The Applicant will repair any highways that may be damaged as a result of construction traffic to a standard set out in the pre-construction surveys. Enabling works will also be carried out at the access points across the Order limits to upgrade the existing access points to an appropriate standard.</p> <p>Further details of the mitigation measures for managing construction traffic can be found within the oCTMP [APP-212].</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
REP2 - 057,058 REP2-129 REP2-138 REP2-146 REP2-190 REP2-214 REP2-235 REP2-141 REP2-183 REP2-114 REP2-128 REP2-172 REP2-176 REP2-216 REP2-066 REP2-059 REP2-161 REP2-090	Road safety impacts on the local network	Concerns around the safety of the local transport network due to the increased HGV and traffic numbers on the narrow village road. Where many local roads not having public footpaths installed traversing roads with increased construction traffic creates an unsatisfactory risk for both driver and pedestrian, cyclist or horseback rider.	<p>Construction vehicles will only use the permitted routes to access the Order Limits. The routes to the primary construction compound are Routes 1 and 3 as shown on Figure 3-1 in the oCTMP [REP2-025]. These routes have been selected as they form the most direct, suitable means of access to the Order Limits from the Strategic Road Network (SRN), which are considered to be appropriate to accommodate HGV traffic given there is already an existing level of HGV traffic identified on these roads. Overall, there will typically be a daily uplift in vehicles of around 2%.</p> <p>Use of these roads exclusively will limit the impact on the wider road network, ensuring that only the roads identified as being suitable are used and, in turn, reducing any potential adverse effects. This will be secured through the final CTMP by way of requirement in the DCO, which requires the CTMP to be prepared substantially in accordance with the oCTMP [REP2-025] (these routes are described in detail within the oCTMP). Breaching the requirements of the DCO is a criminal offence.</p> <p>Whilst there is no data for pedestrians or equestrians on the access routes, the traffic data that supported the ES Chapter 9 [APP-039] included cyclist flows on Uffington Lane, Carlby Road and Ryhall Road from the week commencing 11th October 2021 in fine and dry conditions.</p> <p>The level of demand by cyclists on these routes is considered to be low, as there would be around just under two cyclists per hour based on the peak demand of 35 cyclists per day (observed on Carlby Road). Whilst there are no baseline pedestrian or equestrian flows available, using professional judgement it is predicted that the daily demand for cyclists would be comparable to the pedestrian/equestrian demand, in that it would reflect routes that are used recreationally outside of the peak hours by non-motorised users, with the cycle demand providing a suitable benchmark for comparison and observing any trends.</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>As the demand for cyclists is low and consistent across both weekdays and weekends, it is assumed that this would also be applicable to the pedestrian and equestrian demand and that there is not a significant enough demand from such users on these routes for any conflict to arise.</p>
<p>REP2-090 REP2-130</p>	<p>Road Safety - Impacts of HGVs on walking routes, cycling routes, and bridleways</p>	<p>Concern about the risk of accidents and injury on Uffington Lane, Ryhall Road and other roads and lanes which go through the proposed site from HGVs.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of accidents and road safety across the Order limits and construction vehicles access routes is provided within ES Chapter 9 Highways and Access [APP-039] and Transport Assessment [APP-074]. The assessment concludes that the impacts of the Proposed Development on these matters will be negligible and that there are no existing collision clusters or hotspots within the study area that has been assessed, which includes both Uffington Lane and Ryhall Road, as well as the remainder of the local road network around the Order limits.</p>
<p>REP2-109 REP2-060 REP2-057 REP2-129 REP2-212 REP2-138 REP2-134 REP2-108 REP2-169 REP2-061 REP2-232 REP2-211 REP2-128 REP2-054 REP2-059 REP2-090</p>		<p>A concern of risk of injury to those who utilise public routes due to HGV movements during the construction period.</p>	<p>It should be noted that as detailed within ES Chapter 9 Highways and Access [APP-039], the Proposed Development will result in a negligible increase in traffic on the majority of the local network, with less than a 2% increase in the daily vehicle flows. Where there is a greater impact on Uffington Lane, mitigation is proposed in the form of passing places and widening at the junction with the A6121. Considering that the projected increase in traffic flow is very low, it is considered that the effects on accidents and road safety will be non-significant.</p> <p>Whilst the effects on accidents and road safety are considered to be non-significant, further mitigation has been proposed which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access locations: the access points chosen are sufficient to accommodate HGVs and the provision of appropriate visibility splays. The use of existing access points has been prioritised to minimise the environmental impacts associated with the creation of

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>new points of vehicular access, such as the removal of hedgerows. Where there is not a reasonable access location within the vicinity of the relevant area of the Solar PV Site, a new vehicle access has been proposed that complies with all relevant highway safety requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consolidation: deliveries will go directly to the primary compound, providing additional means of control and management. From the primary compound, materials will be distributed to the secondary compounds via smaller, local vehicles reducing the likelihood of any conflict. • Internal routing: internal access routes will be provided within the Order limits to minimise vehicles needing to use the local road network. • Vehicle routing: construction vehicles will only utilise the permitted access routes, secured by a requirement in the DCO. It is a criminal offence to breach this requirement. • Shuttle service: a staff shuttle service will be deployed from the primary construction compound to transport staff to the relevant area where works are required, which will be subject to phasing. There will also be a shuttle service to the primary compound to reduce the number of staff trips to the Order limits in the morning and evening, further details of which will be provided within the Travel Plan secured by way of requirement on the DCO. • Restricted delivery hours: the delivery hours of HGVs to the primary compound will be restricted to avoid morning and evening peak hours, as well as avoiding school drop-off and pick up hours – meaning on weekdays HGV deliveries to the primary compound will only take place between 09:00-15:00 – minimising

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>the impacts to users of the local road network. This will be secured by way of requirement in the DCO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management plans: a number of supporting management plans are proposed including an oCEMP [REP2-020], oCTMP [REP2-025] and oTP [APP-215] which will be secured by way of requirement on the DCO. • Temporary speed limits: temporary speed limits will also be put in place to reduce any adverse impacts as set out in Section 4.7 of the oCTMP [REP2-025]. The Temporary Regulation Measures Plans - Temporary Measures [AS-008] set out the locations where it is considered likely that speed limit restrictions would be necessary.
<p>REP2-048 (LIR), REP2-047(WR) REP2-050 (FWQ) REP2-193 REP2-153 REP2-138 REP2-134 REP2-169 REP2-211</p>		<p>Concern about the risk for horse riders during the construction period.</p>	<p>Construction vehicles will only use the permitted routes to access the Order Limits. The routes to the primary construction compound are Routes 1 and 3 as shown on Figure 3-1 in the oCTMP [REP2-025]. These routes have been selected as they form the most direct, suitable means of access to the Order Limits from the Strategic Road Network (SRN), that are considered to be appropriate to accommodate HGV traffic given there is already an existing level of HGV traffic identified on these roads which would already influence use by equestrians.</p> <p>Use of these roads exclusively will limit the impact on the wider road network and the PRoW, ensuring that only the roads identified as being suitable are used and in turn reducing any potential adverse effects. This will be secured by way of requirement in the DCO through the final CTMP. Breaching the requirements of the DCO is a criminal offence. These routes are described in detail within the oCTMP [REP2-025].</p> <p>Whilst there is no data on use of the local road network or PRoW by equestrians, the traffic data that supported the ES Chapter 9 [APP-039] included cyclist flows on Uffington Lane</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>and Carlby Road from the week commencing 11th October 2021.</p> <p>The level of demand by cyclists is generally observed to be low across the Order limits. Whilst there are no baseline equestrian flows available, using professional judgement it is predicted that the daily demand for cyclists would be comparable to the pedestrian/equestrian demand, in that it would reflect routes that are used recreationally outside of the peak hours by non-motorised users, with the cycle demand providing a suitable benchmark for comparison and observing any trends.</p> <p>As the demand for cyclists is low and consistent across both weekdays and weekends, it is assumed that this would also be applicable to the equestrian demand, suggesting that there is not a significant enough baseline demand for any conflict to arise when the proposed vehicle access routes are already used by HGVs.</p>
<p>REP2-220 REP2-158 REP2-155 REP2-182 REP2-129 REP2-212 REP2-167 REP2-205 REP2-149 REP2-223 REP2-117 REP2-213 REP2-136 REP2-134</p>	<p>Construction traffic</p>	<p>The increase in traffic numbers within the area and the narrow road are not suitable for large HGVs. Creating an unsafe environment for local uses.</p> <p>The increased traffic levels, extensive roadworks and traffic controls planned outside residential properties will cause huge inconvenience to our everyday lives.</p> <p>Concern that construction traffic, local HGVs, and quarry trucks to take shortcuts through neighbouring villages to avoid traffic.</p>	<p>Construction vehicles will only use the permitted routes to access the Order Limits. This will be secured by way of requirement in the DCO through the final CTMP. Breaching the requirements of the DCO is a criminal offence. These routes are described in detail within the oCTMP [REP2-025] and will prevent construction traffic taking any shortcuts that are not part of the allowed routes.</p> <p>Condition surveys will be undertaken to determine the state of the existing highway, the scope of which will be agreed with RCC and LCC. The Applicant will repair any highways that may be damaged as a result of construction traffic to a standard set out in the pre-construction surveys. Enabling works will also be carried out at the access points across the Order limits to upgrade the existing access points to an appropriate standard.</p> <p>The construction traffic impact assessment (set out in Chapter 9: Highways and Access of the ES [APP-039]) identified that</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
REP2-185 REP2-190 REP2-230 REP2-194 REP2-097 REP2-189 REP2-108 REP2-187 REP2-104 REP2-064 REP2-235 REP2-169 REP2-061 REP2-232 REP2-105 REP2-123 REP2-114 REP2-211 REP2-197 REP2-128 REP2-126 REP2-188 REP2-172 REP2-176 REP2-059 REP2-090			<p>the Proposed Development will result in a negligible increase in traffic on the majority of the local network, with a 2% or lesser increase in the daily vehicle flows. Where there is a greater impact on Uffington Lane from increased numbers of HGVs, mitigation is proposed in the form of passing places and widening at the junction with the A6121 to help facilitate two-way HGV flows. The impacts of the Proposed Development in terms of driver delay will similarly be non-significant, as set out in the assessment within ES Chapter 9: Highways and Access [APP-039], due to (for example) restrictions in timings for construction vehicle movements and the short-term and temporary nature of any traffic management works.</p> <p>Further mitigation of transport impacts is also provided through the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access locations: the access points chosen are sufficient to accommodate HGVs and the provision of appropriate visibility splays. The use of existing access points has been prioritised to minimise the environmental impacts associated with the creation of new points of vehicular access, such as the removal of hedgerows. Where there is not a reasonable access location within the vicinity of the relevant area of the Solar PV Site, a new vehicle access has been proposed that complies with all relevant highway safety requirements. • Consolidation: deliveries will go directly to the primary compound, providing additional means of control and management. From the primary compound, materials will be distributed to the secondary compounds via smaller, local vehicles reducing the likelihood of any conflict. • Internal routing: internal access routes will be provided within the Order limits to minimise vehicles needing to use the local road network.

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicle routing: construction vehicles will only utilise the permitted access routes, secured by a requirement in the DCO. It is a criminal offence to breach this requirement. • Shuttle service: a staff shuttle service will be deployed from the primary construction compound to transport staff to the relevant area where works are required, which will be subject to phasing. There will also be a shuttle service to the primary compound to reduce the number of staff trips to the Order limits in the morning and evening, further details of which will be provided within the Travel Plan secured by way of requirement on the DCO. • Restricted delivery hours: the delivery hours of HGVs to the primary compound will be restricted to avoid morning and evening peak hours, as well as avoiding school drop-off and pick up hours – meaning on weekdays HGV deliveries to the primary compound will only take place between 09:00-15:00 – minimising the impacts to users of the local road network. This will be secured by way of requirement in the DCO. • Management plans: a number of supporting management plans are proposed including an oCEMP [REP2-020], oCTMP [REP2-025] and oTP [APP-215] which will be secured by way of requirement on the DCO. • Temporary speed limits: temporary speed limits will also be put in place to reduce any adverse impacts as set out in Section 4.7 of the oCTMP [REP2-025]. The Temporary Regulation Measures Plans - Temporary Measures [AS-008] set out the locations where it is considered likely that speed limit restrictions would be necessary.

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>The assessment within ES Chapter 9 [APP-039] concludes that the overall highway and access effects of the Proposed Development will be negligible.</p>
<p>REP2-186 REP2-190 REP2-209</p>		<p>Concern about the construction traffic of over 60 lorries each day and pollution on small rural roads greatly impacting and destroying local wildlife.</p>	<p>As set out in ES Chapter 9: Highways and Access [APP-039], it is anticipated that construction of the Proposed Development will require a daily peak of up to 54 two-way HGV trips and 105 two-way LGV trips, being delivered within the extent of the Order limits. This will result in a negligible increase in traffic on the majority of the local network, with a 2% or lesser increase in the daily vehicle flows. Where there is a greater impact on Uffington Lane from increased numbers of HGVs, mitigation is proposed in the form of passing places and widening at the junction with the A6121 to help facilitate two-way HGV flows.</p> <p>In addition, as set out in the Air Quality section 15.2 of Chapter 15 Other Environmental Topics [APP-045] traffic flows are expected to be below the Environmental Protection UK and Institute of Air Quality Management thresholds (cumulative increase in annual average daily traffic flows of 1,000 vehicles on any one road link per day) for significant effects to air quality during the construction phase and so, by default, any potential pollution effects are negligible and not significant.</p> <p>With respect to the impacts on wildlife, the routing strategy, which includes a one-way routing of the construction vehicles to the primary compound, has been chosen to reduce the likelihood of any two-way conflicts, which in turn reduces the impact to any wildlife or verges along the construction access routes as vehicles will not overrun the carriageway. The removal of two-way flows also reduces the number of movements along certain access routes such as Ryhall Road.</p>
<p>REP2-133 REP2-211 REP2-126</p>		<p>The disruption that would be caused during construction has clearly not been adequately considered. Taking the junction at Great Casterton as</p>	<p>To mitigate against the impact of HGVs on the local schools, including those located closest to the B1081 / Ryhall Road</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
REP2-176		<p>just one example it is impossible not to understand the chaos and danger that will be created as children from 3 schools are dropped off/collected while construction traffic forces its way through.</p>	<p>junction in Great Casterton, there is a restricted window for deliveries to the primary compound.</p> <p>The two schools that have influenced the proposed delivery window for HGVs are Great Casterton Primary School and Great Casterton College, which are both located within Great Casterton along Ryhall Road. Ryhall Road is used by the proposed 'Route 1' from the Strategic Road Network (SRN) to the primary compound, via the A6121. The start/end times for each establishment have been confirmed and are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Casterton Primary School: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Start - 8:40 (with registration at 08:50); and ○ Finish - 3:20pm. • Great Casterton College: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Start - 8:30 (with registration at 8:40); and ○ Finish - 3:30pm. <p>The proposed delivery window for HGVs is 9am to 3pm, which avoids both the start and closing time of each establishment. The estimated drive time from Great Casterton to the primary construction compound along Route 1 is less than ten minutes, so it is unlikely that there will be much overlap between HGVs and school start time and drop-off, with the vast majority of drop-offs likely to be complete before HGVs enter the area. In addition, the use of a one-way routing arrangement limits interaction with the schools, as vehicles egressing the site will utilise Route 3 and the A6121, avoiding Great Casterton and the schools entirely. The location of the secondary construction compounds and their proximity of the primary construction compound also means that any deliveries between the two compounds will be away from the schools in Great Casterton.</p> <p>It is noted that, on Fridays, Great Casterton College finishes at 2:35pm, however this only gives a 25-minute window for any potential overlap. There is also no conflict at this time with the</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>Great Casterton Primary School which is considered to be a more sensitive receptor given the age range of the children.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there are other Schools within the wider area, such as Witham High School and those in Bourne, with Witham High School being the closest School to the routes to/from the primary compound and the Great Casterton junction. However, it is considered that these establishments are not in close enough proximity to the access routes (namely 'Route 3, the egress route from the primary compound towards Bourne) to be impacted by HGVs and these establishments will also finish post 3pm, giving a sufficient window to not result in any conflict or significant impact. Witham High School for example is located 1.7km away from Route 3 and there are no desire lines along Elm Avenue to Route 3 that would suggest there would be any conflict in the limited window for overlap.</p> <p>Further detail on the delivery window restrictions is provided within the oCTMP [REP2-025].</p> <p>The delivery window restrictions will be secured by way of Requirement 13 on the DCO through the final CTMP. Breaching the requirements of the DCO is a criminal offence.</p>
<p>REP2-117 REP2-169 REP2-061</p>	<p>Construction traffic route</p>	<p>Considers the unsuitable construction route and that the road cannot currently cope with the current traffic. Suggested that the minor works to the junction on Uffington Lane are not sufficient.</p> <p>The volume of traffic that currently utilises the A6121 has been underestimated, especially as that section of the road is still a 60mph zone.</p>	<p>The A6121 is a road that already accommodates a level of existing HGV activity, meaning there is a precedent already in place for its use by HGVs. A review of the Order limits has been undertaken with respect to accidents and road safety in the TA [APP-074] which has found that there are no existing highway safety concerns or collision hotspots.</p> <p>The proposed works to the A1621 / Uffington Lane junction have been discussed and agreed with the Local Highways Authority as being sufficient to enable two-way HGV flows at the access to remove the need for HGVs turning right to wait and block the A1621.</p> <p>The scope of the traffic surveys that were undertaken along</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>the A1621, as well as wider study area detailed in ES Chapter 9 Highways and Access [APP-039] were agreed with all relevant Local Highway Authorities, including RCC, LCC and National Highways, who confirmed that the surveys were representative. As such the conclusions in ES Chapter 9 Highways and Access remain valid and robust.</p>
<p>REP2-131 REP2-151 REP2-190 REP2-104 REP2-090</p>		<p>The proposed route for the construction of the solar farm will pass three schools. At a time when the UK is trying to reduce child deaths on our roads this proposed route is ill-advised and dangerous.</p>	<p>To mitigate against the impact of HGVs on the local schools, there is a restricted window for deliveries to the primary compound.</p> <p>The schools that have influenced the proposed delivery window for HGVs are Great Casterton Primary School and Great Casterton College, which are both located within Great Casterton along Ryhall Road. Ryhall Road is used by the proposed 'Route 1' from the Strategic Road Network (SRN) to the primary compound, via the A6121. The start/end times for each establishment have been confirmed and are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Casterton Primary School: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Start - 8:40 (with registration at 08:50); and ○ Finish - 3:20pm. • Great Casterton College: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Start - 8:30 (with registration at 8:40); and ○ Finish - 3:30pm. <p>The proposed delivery window for HGVs is 9am to 3pm, which avoids both the start and closing time of each establishment. The estimated drive time from Great Casterton to the primary construction compound along Route 1 is less than ten minutes, so it is unlikely that there will be much overlap between HGVs and school start time and drop-off , with the vast majority of drop-offs likely to be complete before HGVs enter the area. In addition, the use of a one-way routing arrangement limits interaction with the schools, as vehicles egressing the site will utilise Route 3 and the A6121, avoiding Great Casterton and the schools entirely. The location of the secondary</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>construction compounds and their proximity of the primary construction compound also means that any deliveries between the two compounds will be away from the schools in Great Casterton.</p> <p>It is noted that, on Fridays, Great Casterton College finishes at 2:35pm, however this only gives a 25-minute window for any potential overlap. There is also no conflict with the Great Casterton Primary School which is considered to be a more sensitive receptor given the age range of the children.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there other Schools within the wider area, such as Witham High School and those in Bourne, although it is not considered that these establishments are in close enough proximity to the access routes (namely 'Route 3, the egress route from the primary compound towards Bourne) to be impacted by HGVs and these establishments will also finish post 3pm, giving a sufficient window to not result in any conflict or significant impact. Witham High School for example is located 1.7km away from Route 3 and there are no desire lines along Elm Avenue to Route 3 that would suggest there would be any conflict in the limited window for overlap.</p> <p>Further detail on the delivery window restrictions is provided within the oCTMP [REP2-025].</p> <p>The delivery window restrictions will be secured by way of Requirement 13 on the DCO through the final CTMP. Breaching the requirements of the DCO is a criminal offence.</p>
<p>REP2-195 REP2-196</p>	<p>Construction hours</p>	<p>The suggested construction hours of 07.00-19.00 Monday to Saturday will create excessive traffic flows in the early morning and late evening, disrupting the lives of local residents. 8.00-17.00 is more acceptable.</p>	<p>The delivery hours of HGVs to the primary compound will be restricted to avoid morning and evening peak hours, as well as avoiding school drop-off and pick up hours – meaning on weekdays HGV deliveries to the primary compound will only take place between 09:00-15:00 – minimising the impacts to users of the local road network. This is set out in the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP2-025] and is secured by way of Requirement 13 in the DCO. On weekends,</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			the background traffic flows are lower meaning there is already less congestion on the local road network which in turn reduces the impact of any construction traffic.
REP2-195 REP2-196	Closure of local roads	No mention of temporary or long-term closure of local roads is made, which seems highly unlikely during the site access construction period.	<p>The following plans illustrate the proposed location of temporary road closures and temporary measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic Regulation Measures Plans – Temporary Road Closures [APP-015], • Traffic Regulation Measures Plans – Temporary Measures [APP-014] <p>There may be minor delays due to the proposed temporary traffic signals and partial closure works to cabling, however these would be short term and temporary in nature. A sensitivity test is provided within ES Chapter 9: Highways and Access [APP-039] which assesses the impact of road closures due to cabling on Uffington Lane and the resultant impact on the A1621, which concludes that the effects would remain non-significant as per the findings within the rest of the chapter.</p>
REP2-195 REP2-196	Carlby Village	Carlby Village seems to have been ignored as being impacted but its eastern access road runs by and through the development site. Carlby Village should, through its Parish Council, be part of the Traffic Management Group.	Carlby Parish Council will be included in the list of participants in the Traffic Management Working Group (TMWG) in the updated oCTMP submitted at Deadline 3. The participants in the TMWG will be secured by way of Requirement 13 on the DCO within the final CTMP.
REP2-134 REP2-176	Traffic accidents	Concern about the existing level of traffic accidents along the A6121 (Bourne to Stamford).	A detailed assessment of accidents and road safety across the Order limits and construction vehicles access routes is provided within ES Chapter 9 Highways and Access [APP-039] and Transport Assessment [APP-074]. The assessment concludes that there are no existing collision clusters or hotspots within the study area that has been assessed, which includes the A6121, as well as the remainder of the local road network around the Order limits. The assessment also

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>identifies that the Proposed Development would result in a negligible impact on accidents and road safety.</p> <p>It should be noted that as detailed within ES Chapter 9 Highways and Access [APP-039], the Proposed Development will result in a negligible increase in traffic on the majority of the local network, with less than a 2% increase in the daily vehicle flows. Where there is a greater impact on Uffington Lane, mitigation is proposed in the form of passing places and widening at the junction with the A6121. Considering that the daily projected increase in traffic flow is very low, it is considered that the effects on accidents and road safety will be non-significant.</p> <p>Whilst the effects on accidents and road safety are considered to be non-significant, further mitigation measures have been proposed which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access locations: the access points chosen are sufficient to accommodate HGVs and the provision of appropriate visibility splays. The use of existing access points has been prioritised to minimise the environmental impacts associated with the creation of new points of vehicular access, such as the removal of hedgerows. Where there is not a reasonable access location within the vicinity of the relevant area of the Solar PV Site, a new vehicle access has been proposed that complies with all relevant highway safety requirements. • Consolidation: deliveries will go directly to the primary compound, providing additional means of control and management. From the primary compound, materials will be distributed to the secondary compounds via smaller, local vehicles reducing the likelihood of any conflict.

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal routing: internal access routes will be provided within the Order limits to minimise vehicles needing to use the local road network. • Vehicle routing: construction vehicles will only utilise the permitted access routes, secured by a requirement in the DCO. It is a criminal offence to breach this requirement. • Shuttle service: a staff shuttle service will be deployed from the primary construction compound to transport staff to the relevant area where works are required, which will be subject to phasing. There will also be a shuttle service to the primary compound to reduce the number of staff trips to the Order limits in the morning and evening, further details of which will be provided within the Travel Plan secured by way of requirement on the DCO. • Restricted delivery hours: the delivery hours of HGVs to the primary compound will be restricted to avoid morning and evening peak hours, as well as avoiding school drop-off and pick up hours – meaning on weekdays HGV deliveries to the primary compound will only take place between 09:00-15:00 – minimising the impacts to users of the local road network. This will be secured by way of requirement in the DCO. • Management plans: a number of supporting management plans are proposed including an oCEMP [REP2-020], oCTMP [REP2-025] and oTP [APP-215] which will be secured by way of requirement on the DCO. • Temporary speed limits: temporary speed limits will also be put in place to reduce any adverse impacts as set out in Section 4.7 of the oCTMP [REP2-025]. The Temporary Regulation Measures Plans - Temporary Measures [APP-015] set out the locations where it is

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>considered likely that speed limit restrictions would be necessary.</p>
<p>REP2-185 REP2-176</p>	<p>Access for construction vehicles</p>	<p>Concern about access being gained for construction traffic at the junction of the B1081 and Pickworth Lane heading north from Great Casterton. This congested narrow lane runs directly past Great Casterton Church of England Primary School, and we would question the safety of using this access. We see that a minor junction improvement is noted but this will not adequately address the tight access to Pickworth Lane or mitigate the inevitable issues associated with the school.</p> <p>The junction at B1081 and Ryhall Road is not large enough to facilitate HGVs or AILs. It is bounded by the Primary School, housing and a Pelican crossing, which means that the junction cannot be widened</p>	<p>The delivery hours of HGVs to the primary compound will be restricted to avoid morning and evening peak hours, as well as avoiding School drop-off and pick up hours – meaning on weekdays HGV deliveries to the primary compound will only take place between 09:00-15:00. This means there will be a limited impact on the B1081 / Ryhall Road junction during School drop off times. This is set out in the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP2-025] and is secured by way of Requirement 13 in the DCO.</p> <p>A comprehensive swept path analysis has been conducted at the junction of B1081 / Ryhall Road for AILs, which is included in the Transport Assessment [APP-074], and details the temporary enabling works required such as the removal of signage and reinforcement of kerbs to facilitate access for the AIL vehicle at the B1081 / Ryhall Road junction. Swept path analysis is also presented at Appendix J: 4990-2001-T-067-P0 (B1081 / Ryhall Road) which shows the vehicle tracking for an articulated vehicle turning left into Ryhall Road from the B1081. The swept path analysis assessment undertaken suggests that there are no issues with this access arrangement and there is no need to undertake any permanent improvement works to Pickworth Lane and the B1081 / Ryhall Road junction.</p> <p>In terms of HGVs, as previously noted and as identified in ES Chapter 9 Highways and Access [APP-039], the local road network has been observed as having a baseline level of HGV activity. This indicates that HGVs are already using this route, such that it is large enough to facilitate HGV movements associated with construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
<p>REP2-169</p>		<p>Concern that the site access on Carlby Road is located on a bend in the road making it dangerous.</p>	<p>The access onto Carlby Road is proposed to be relocated in order to ensure that appropriate visibility splays could be achieved in accordance with the DMRB requirements. A Stage</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) was carried out for this access proposal which raised no issues or concerns, other than the need for a cyclic and regular vegetation maintenance scheme as set out in the oLEMP [REP2-022], which will be secured by way of requirement on the DCO through the CTMP and LEMP. The access proposals in this location have also been discussed and agreed with the Local Highway Authority.</p>
REP2-169		<p>Concern over proposed access track running over existing drainage. Feels it would be better to maintain the existing track and make sure it is capable of taking the abnormal heavy loads (as it does today), than change the road layout to a more dangerous position on the bend which would require the removal of any trees and hedgerow on the north edge of Carlby Road.</p>	<p>The access junction onto Carlby Road has been relocated to ensure that there is sufficient visibility splays in accordance with the DMRB requirements for all vehicle types that will require it, which is an improvement from the existing position as the current arrangement does not comply with the DMRB visibility requirements. Highway safety is considered to be a priority in this instance and on that basis it is proposed to relocate the access, as per the current proposal.</p>
REP2-134 REP2-169	Road improvements	<p>The community needs an improved road system through Bourne, Essendine, Ryhall and Stamford.</p>	<p>The baseline review of the local road network conditions that are proposed to be used by construction vehicles, in particular related to accidents and road safety, is detailed within ES Chapter 9. The review of accidents and road safety found that there are no existing accident hotspots within the extent of the Order limits and there are no existing safety concerns that would be exacerbated by the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Condition surveys will be undertaken to determine the state of the existing highway, the scope of which will be agreed with RCC and LCC as the relevant LHAs. The Applicant will repair any highways that may be damaged as a result of construction traffic associated with the Proposed Development to a standard set out in the pre-construction surveys. Enabling works will also be carried out at the access points across the Order limits to upgrade the existing access points to an appropriate standard.</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>Further details of the mitigation measures for managing construction traffic can be found within the oCTMP [REP2-025].</p>
REP2-215	Alternatives to the road for material transport	Question regarding the option of rail being used as opposed to HGV for transport of material	<p>Stamford Station is the closest railway station to the Proposed Development, located approximately 7.4km from Essendine village, however it is located within the centre of the town, as such it is envisaged that this would still require the need for HGVS to be used between the station and the Order limits which would result in HGVs causing issues in the town centre where the impacts would be more significant.</p> <p>There are private sidings located at Tallington (approximately 6km away from the primary construction compound), although the use of these sidings would still require HGVs to transport material to the primary construction compound, which would be mainly routed along narrow country roads and through the centre of number of local villages.</p>
REP2-235	Restoration of access roads	Access to the site will involve the use of unclassified roads, some not surfaced. In winter conditions these will be destroyed by heavy traffic use. Will they be restored?	<p>Condition surveys will be undertaken to determine the state of the existing highway, the scope of which will be agreed with RCC and LCC. The Applicant will repair any highways that may be damaged as a result of construction traffic associated with the Proposed Development to a standard set out in the pre-construction surveys. Enabling works will also be carried out at the access points across the Order limits to upgrade the existing access points to an appropriate standard.</p> <p>Further details of the mitigation measures for managing construction traffic can be found within the oCTMP [REP2-025].</p>
REP2-061 REP2-090	Traffic management plan	The proposed traffic management plan does not sufficiently consider the ramifications of any roadworks or closures on the A6121 from Carlby through Essendine towards Ryhall and specifically the	<p>The following plans illustrate the proposed location of temporary road closures and temporary measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic Regulation Measures Plans – Temporary Road Closures [APP-015],

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
		<p>alternate routes drivers may take in order to avoid the delays associated with roadworks and road closures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic Regulation Measures Plans – Temporary Measures [APP-014] <p>A sensitivity test is provided within ES Chapter 9: Highways and Access [APP-039] which assesses the impact of road closures due to cabling on Uffington Lane and the resultant impact on the A1621, which concludes that the effects would remain non-significant as per the findings within the rest of the chapter.</p> <p>There may be minor delays due to the proposed temporary traffic signals, roadworks and partial closure works to any cabling along the A1621, however these would be short term and temporary in nature. Overall, as per the assessments within ES Chapter 9: Highways and Access [APP-039] the effects of construction of the Proposed Development on driver delay would be non-significant.</p> <p>In the unlikely event that one of the access routes is closed fully due to unforeseen circumstances, then HGVs would utilise the alternate open route to return to the SRN (e.g. in the event that Route 1 is closed, HGVs could route via Route 3). Interim traffic management will be implemented in these instances to hold traffic internally within the Order limits for as long as possible to reduce the likelihood of any conflicts. Further details on the alternate routes in the event of any issues would be secured by way of Requirement 13 in the final CTMP.</p>
<p>REP2-170 REP2-124</p>	<p>Increase of traffic</p>	<p>Opposed to the plans on the basis of there being major traffic increase on already poorly maintained and unsuitable roads and through villages both during construction and future maintenance of the development.</p>	<p>As detailed within ES Chapter 9 Highways and Access [APP-039], the Proposed Development will result in a negligible increase in traffic on the majority of the local network, with less than a 2% increase in the daily vehicle flows. Where there is a greater impact on Uffington Lane, mitigation is proposed in the form of passing places and widening at the junction with the</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
		<p>This will create serious safety problems as well as major inconvenience for residents across a much larger area than the proposed generating plant.</p>	<p>A6121. Considering that the projected increase in traffic flow is very low, it is considered that the effects on accidents and road safety will be non-significant.</p> <p>Condition surveys will be undertaken to determine the state of the existing highway, the scope of which will be agreed with RCC and LCC. The Applicant will repair any highways that may be damaged as a result of construction traffic associated with the Proposed Development to a standard set out in the pre-construction surveys. Enabling works will also be carried out at the access points across the Order limits to upgrade the existing access points to an appropriate standard.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of accidents and road safety across the Order limits and construction vehicles access routes is provided within ES Chapter 9 Highways and Access [APP-039] and Transport Assessment [APP-074]. The assessment concludes that there are no existing collision clusters or hotspots within the study area that has been assessed, which includes the extent of the access routes and wider Order limits – to capture the wider area rather than only the Proposed Development itself.</p> <p>Whilst the effects on accidents and road safety are considered to be non-significant, further mitigation against the highways and access effects includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access locations: the access points chosen are sufficient to accommodate HGVs and the provision of appropriate visibility splays. The use of existing access points has been prioritised to minimise the environmental impacts associated with the creation of new points of vehicular access, such as the removal of hedgerows. Where there is not a reasonable access location within the vicinity of the relevant area of the Solar PV Site, a new vehicle access has been

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>proposed that complies with all relevant highway safety requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consolidation: deliveries will go directly to the primary compound, providing additional means of control and management. From the primary compound, materials will be distributed to the secondary compounds via smaller, local vehicles reducing the likelihood of any conflict. • Internal routing: internal access routes will be provided within the Order limits to minimise vehicles needing to use the local road network. • Vehicle routing: construction vehicles will only utilise the permitted access routes, secured by a requirement in the DCO. It is a criminal offence to breach this requirement. • Shuttle service: a staff shuttle service will be deployed from the primary construction compound to transport staff to the relevant area where works are required, which will be subject to phasing. There will also be a shuttle service to the primary compound to reduce the number of staff trips to the Order limits in the morning and evening, further details of which will be provided within the Travel Plan secured by way of requirement on the DCO. • Restricted delivery hours: the delivery hours of HGVs to the primary compound will be restricted to avoid morning and evening peak hours, as well as avoiding school drop-off and pick up hours – meaning on weekdays HGV deliveries to the primary compound will only take place between 09:00-15:00 – minimising the impacts to users of the local road network. This will be secured by way of requirement in the DCO. • Management plans: a number of supporting management plans are proposed including an oCEMP [REP2-020], oCTMP [REP2-025] and oTP [APP-215]

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>which will be secured by way of requirement on the DCO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary speed limits: temporary speed limits will also be put in place to reduce any adverse impacts as set out in Section 4.7 of the oCTMP [REP2-025]. The Temporary Regulation Measures Plans - Temporary Measures [APP-015] set out the locations where it is considered likely that speed limit restrictions would be necessary.
<p>REP2-169 REP2-090</p>	<p>Cumulative impact</p>	<p>The cumulative impact of the traffic generated by key local and national infrastructure projects in the pipeline has not been considered.</p>	<p>A review of the surrounding cumulative sites has been undertaken and it is considered that there are no relevant existing or approved developments that would overlap with the construction traffic of the Proposed Development, due to the limited overlap in construction programme and construction vehicle routing. In any case, it is considered that the assessment in ES Chapter 9: Highways and Access [APP-0039] with use of TEMPRO growth factors in the assessment of the 2026 future baseline would account for any cumulative impacts of other schemes of local and national infrastructure projects. This approach was agreed with the Local Highway Authorities.</p>
<p>REP2-236</p>	<p>Road safety concerns posed by displaced wildlife</p>	<p>Other major concerns for many of us are the conditions for residents during construction and wider road safety concerns due to the displacement of traditional animal herds.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of accidents and road safety across the Order limits and construction vehicles access routes is provided within ES Chapter 9 Highways and Access [APP-039] and Transport Assessment [APP-074]. The assessment concludes that there are no existing collision clusters or hotspots within the study area that has been assessed, which includes the A6121, as well as the remainder of the local road network around the Order limits. The assessment also identifies that the Proposed Development would result in a negligible impact on accidents and road safety.</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>As set out within ES Chapter 9 Highways and Access [APP-039], the Proposed Development will result in a negligible increase in traffic on the majority of the local network, with less than a 2% increase in the daily vehicle flows. Where there is a greater impact on Uffington Lane, mitigation is proposed in the form of passing places and widening at the junction with the A6121. Considering that the daily projected increase in traffic flow is very low, it is considered that the effects on accidents and road safety will be non-significant. This level of uplift is also likely to lead to a negligible impact on the displacement of animal herds given the uplift is very low and unlikely to lead to any material change in animal movement patterns given that the proposals provide permeable routes for species.</p> <p>The permeability of the Proposed Development has been a key consideration in the design process as identified in Design Guidance V5.4 of the Design and Access Statement [REP2-018] that allows for the movement of species as well as strengthening it through new planting and habitat connections as shown on the Green Infrastructure strategy Plan [APP-173]. Design Guidance identified within the DAS, including offset from existing woodlands and hedgerows and creation of new linkages, will ensure species can continue to move through the Order Limits.</p>
REP2-122	ExQ1 - Q1.0.19 - interests on any of the submitted outline plans.	The route between the primary construction compound and the A6121 is particularly constrained and likely to see significant construction traffic. Therefore, there would be a significant benefit if the proposed permissive paths on both sides of the East Coast Mainline are suitable for cyclists. This would enable more users to avoid potential conflicts with construction vehicles.	<p>The traffic data that supported the ES Chapter 9 [APP-039] included cyclist flows on Uffington Lane (the link from the primary compound to the A1621) from the week commencing 11th October 2021. A summary of the daily two-way cyclists flows extracted from the data along Uffington Lane is provided below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday - 17 cyclists; • Tuesday - 8 cyclists; • Wednesday - 16 cyclists; • Thursday - 7 cyclists; • Friday - 13 cyclists;

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
		<p>Therefore, these routes should be surfaced with MOT Type 1 or similar, to provide a surface that will be suitable for a wide range of bikes and in all weathers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Saturday - 8 cyclists; and • Sunday - 14 cyclists. <p>Based on the recorded data, the level of demand by cyclists along Uffington Lane is considered to be low, as there would be just over one cyclist per hour based on the peak demand of 17 cyclists per day during the window that the deliveries to the primary compound can take place within (9am to 3pm).</p> <p>Based on professional judgement, it is not considered that there is sufficient demand for cyclists along Uffington Lane to lead to any significant impacts on amenity, as the likelihood for any conflict with construction traffic is low (due to the low numbers of cyclist flows) and the available data suggests that this is not a well-used route by cyclists.</p> <p>The permissive paths constructed as part of the Proposed Development will be able to be used by walkers, (off road) cyclists and horse riders.</p> <p>The existing PRoW, which the permissive paths will complement, would comprise of grassed surfaces with appropriate signage/waymarking. The routes would be maintained regularly.</p>
REP2-201	ExQ1 – Q11.0.4 – Traffic movements and impacts during operational phase.	<p>Removing and then re-installing the panels and so on would require the re-construction of the site. This would involve substantially more traffic than the original construction. It would also have a negative impact on the output of Mallard Pass Solar Farm, a significant impact on any carbon savings, a disruption of habitats and wildlife and, of course, the residents who will be subjected to a considerable upheaval.</p> <p>In spite of studying the Documentation, I have seen no reference by the Applicant to the replacement of panels and the inevitable consequences.</p>	<p>The ES assumes that there will be a need to repair or replace components of the Proposed Development in the event that they fail or break. It is anticipated that maintenance and servicing would include the inspection, removal, reconstruction, refurbishment or replacement of faulty or broken equipment, and adjusting and altering the components of the Proposed Development. These measures are set out within the outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [APP-208].</p> <p>In any event, any maintenance or repair works would be on an ad-hoc basis only, meaning it would be much less significant in traffic terms and over a much shorter timeframe than the construction phase. It has also been agreed with the Local Highway Authorities as part of the assessments within ES</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>Chapter 9: Highways and Access [APP-039] that the primary impacts of the Proposed Development would be during construction, with decommissioning no worse than construction and to be assessed in the future and secured by way of requirement on the DCO. It was agreed with the Local Highway Authorities that the operational effects could be scoped out of the assessment on the basis that it would be a nominal level of activity associated with minor replacements and staff trips. PINS also confirmed that these effects could be scoped out in (see Item 3.3.3 in the Scoping Opinion [APP-050]).</p>
<p>REP2-048 (LIR), REP2-047(WR) REP2-050(FWQ)</p>	<p>ExQ1 – Q11.0.1 relation to pedestrian and cyclist amenity during the construction phase</p>	<p>There is no formal data available with regard to the usage of Uffington Lane by cyclists, although anecdotal evidence provided by Officers of Rutland County Council based on personal experience is that the route is popular and well used by cyclists, particularly at weekends.</p>	<p>Refer to the Applicant's response to ExQ1 Q11.0.1 [REP2-037]. The traffic data that supported the ES Chapter 9 [APP-039] included cyclist flows on both weekdays and weekends from the week commencing 11th October 2021 under fine and dry conditions. A summary of the daily two-way cyclists flows extracted from the data along Uffington Lane is provided below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday - 17 cyclists; • Tuesday - 8 cyclists; • Wednesday - 16 cyclists; • Thursday - 7 cyclists; • Friday - 13 cyclists; • Saturday - 8 cyclists; and • Sunday - 14 cyclists. <p>The data suggests that there is no increase in the use of Uffington Lane on weekends, with it being fairly consistent across the duration of the week.</p> <p>In any event, the level of demand by cyclists is considered to be low, as there would be just over one cyclist per hour based on the peak demand of 17 cyclists per day during the window that the deliveries to the primary compound can take place within (9am to 3pm).</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			Based on professional judgement, it is not considered that there is sufficient demand for cyclists along Uffington Lane to lead to any significant impacts on amenity, as the likelihood for any conflict with construction traffic is low (due to the low numbers of cyclist flows) and the available data suggests that this is not a well-used recreational route. As demonstrated by the available data on daily two-way cyclist flows along Uffington Lane, impacts on cyclist amenity due to construction works would be no different on weekends to any other day of the week, as the data collected suggests that flows are typically consistent across weekdays and weekends, with no clear distinction or peak across the surveys. Furthermore, through the addition of the permissive paths, which provide additional offroad recreational routes for pedestrians and cyclists to utilise, it is considered that the impact of construction works on Saturdays would not be significant.
REP2-048 (LIR), REP2-047(WR) REP2-050(FWQ)	ExQ1 – Q11.0.4 operational effects	HGV's and abnormal loads would not be expected during the operational stage of the development. RCC considers that any abnormal load required would be due to unforeseen issues relating to the operational status of the equipment at the site and would therefore need to be considered in the way any such abnormal load is treated.	The responses from LCC and RCC are noted and the Applicant agrees that the need for any abnormal loads deliveries during the operational phase would be on an ad-hoc basis only and considered in the usual manner that any such delivery is assessed, in that it would be coordinated as part of its own application and agreement process with the relevant Local Highway Authorities and parties, including the Police and National Highways.
REP2-044(LIR), REP2-045(FWQ), REP2-046(WR)		HGV's and abnormal loads would not be expected during the operational stage of the development. If needed (for example a transformer breaking and needs replacing) it would be a rare event and could be planned for in the usual manner for any abnormal load on the network.	
REP2-044(LIR), REP2-045(FWQ), REP2-046(WR)	ExQ1 – Q11.0.06 Transport Assessment	LCC is content that the past 3 years is sufficient. There are no problematic accident "blackspots" on the sections of the network proposed to be used.	The LCC response is noted and the Applicant agrees that the collision data assessment presented within the TA [APP-074] is sufficient and does not identify records of any collision hotspots.
REP2-048 (LIR), REP2-047(WR)	ExQ1 – Q11.0.12 Transport	Great Casterton Parish Council – the proposed route to access the site from the southbound A1 passes through the Parish.	Great Casterton Parish Council will be included in the list of participants in the Traffic Management Working Group (TMWG) in the updated oCTMP submitted at Deadline 3. The

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
REP2-050(FWQ)	Other organisations that should be included in TMWG		participants in the TMWG will be secured by way of Requirement 13 on the DCO within the final CTMP.
REP2-051(LIR), REP2-052(FWQ), REP2-053(WR),	ExA Q1 – Q1.0.19 comments on outline Plans and potential amendments that may require to secure appropriate environmental outcomes and mitigation	<p>Response: SKDC have not yet had the opportunity to review all of the above outline plans but do wish to reserve the opportunity to do so, (particularly as they may be developed throughout the examination) as these plans are one of various areas that seek to manage the mitigating impacts of the proposed development during the construction and operational phases of development. In respect of the Outline Traffic Management Plan and Outline Travel plan, we would make the following initial observations.</p> <p>F) Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan</p> <p>Section 2.4 Staff and Parking – The proposals outline that an average of 150 staff could be on-site at any one point with a maximum potential of up to 400 staff. The proposals only outline that a car park for up to 150 spaces would be provided, however this would not account for the 250 additional staff that could be employed if the site was working at its full potential.</p> <p>a) Can up to 400 spaces be accommodated within the primary compound?</p> <p>b) What measures would be in place to stop staff parking on local surrounding roads?</p> <p>c) Can the local roads accommodate up to 400 staff arriving in the morning and departing in the evening?</p> <p>d) What routing strategy would be in place for staff arriving / departing the site to ensure that construction workers do not 'rat'-run' using unclassified local roads?</p>	<p>In response to the SKDC comments on the oCTMP [APP-212]:</p> <p>a) The primary compound could accommodate car parking for up to 150 spaces. However, as outlined in the oTP [APP-215], during the peak of construction the Applicant will investigate the feasibility of and seek to utilise a shuttle service from the location of accommodation (or nearby rail station) to the primary compound to remove the need for staff to travel individually as part of a single occupancy car trip. There will also be a shuttle service which transports staff from the primary compound to the relevant phase of work across the Order limits. Details of any shuttle service will be secured by way of requirement on the DCO through the Travel Plan.</p> <p>b) The shuttle service will be incentivised and staff will be encouraged to use it, such as providing it at no cost to staff. Staff will be discouraged to drive to the Order limits (unless car sharing) and will only be allowed to park within the designated parking areas. Any staff parking outside of these locations without good reason will be penalised - with the CTMP review process, Travel Plan Coordinator and Traffic Management Working Group providing a suitable forum to report any instances of staff not adhering to the agreed strategy. Further details on parking and compliance will be secured by way of requirement through the final CTMP.</p> <p>c) As noted above, the majority of staff will arrive via shuttle service. Any staff driving will also arrive outside of the morning and evening peak hours</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
		<p>Section 2.6 Vehicle Numbers – The proposals will generate circa 159 two-way deliveries per day split 54 HGVs and 105 LGVs.</p> <p>a) What mitigation has been proposed on the local roads / through villages where increase of good vehicles is significant?</p> <p>b) Can the current local junctions accommodate this level of increased traffic in addition to the construction staff trips? Section</p> <p>3.2 Routing – All HGV deliveries would be routed in via Route 1 (via A1 at Great Casterton / Rutland) and out via Route 3 (via A15 at Bourne / Lincolnshire). However, no assessment regarding the suitability of the B1081 / Ryhall Road or B1176 / A6121 T-junctions have been undertaken.</p> <p>a) Can a 16.5m articulated lorry turn left onto Ryhall Road whilst a car(s) is waiting to turn out of the junction? There could be safety implications to local residents who use the junction if two vehicles collide as it could result in rear end shunts on a major road.</p> <p>b) Can a 16.5m articulated lorry turn right then left from Ryhall Road to the A6121 without blocking a car turning left off the A6121. There could be safety implications to local residents who use the junction if two vehicles collide as it could result in rear end shunts on a major road.</p> <p>Section 3.2 Routing – There are no definitive plans of the local roads provided confirming the recommended HGV construction routes to and from the site or existing weight and height limit restrictions. This could lead to confusion for delivery drivers approaching / leaving the site, resulting in HGVs on unsuitable roads.</p>	<p>(08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00) so are unlikely to have any impacts on the local road network when it is the busiest.</p> <p>d) Construction staff would be advised that they would need to utilise Routes 1-3, as identified in the oCTMP [APP-212]. Appropriate action would be taken against any staff who fail to comply with the requirements, with the Traffic Management Working Group again providing a suitable forum to report against any non-compliance.</p> <p>In response to the SKDC comments on the proposed vehicle numbers:</p> <p>a) As set out in ES Chapter 9: Highways and Access [APP-039], the Proposed Development will result in a negligible increase in traffic on the majority of the local network, with less than a 2% increase in the daily vehicle flows. Where there is a greater impact on Uffington Lane, mitigation is proposed in the form of passing places and widening at the junction with the A6121. This approach has been agreed with the Local Highway Authorities.</p> <p>b) In relation to the impacts on junction capacity, during pre-submission discussions all Local Highway Authorities (RCC, LCC and National Highways) referred to a severity threshold of 30 two-way vehicle trips in the AM or PM peak hours (08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00), as discussed in ES Chapter 9: Highways and Access [APP-039]. As the impact of the Proposed Development fell below this threshold, it was agreed with all Local Highway Authorities that there was no need for localised junction capacity assessments.</p> <p>In response to the SKDC comments on routing:</p> <p>a) Appendix E: 4990-2001-T-067-P0 (B1081 / Ryhall Road) presents the swept path analysis for a 16.5m</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
		<p>Section 3.3 Access – There are 10 access points onto the local highway network to serve the development, with 1 primary compound and 9 secondary compounds. Of these, 5 would be located within South Kesteven boundaries with drawings confirming that visibility splays would be achieved in line with the speed of the road.</p> <p>a) Whilst swept path analysis has been provided at the access points, no assessment of how the tractors and trailers, 16.5m articulated lorries (carrying the inverters that cannot be broken down), or cranes would be able to travel to / from the primary and secondary compounds on the local roads.</p> <p>b) No assessment of whether the above vehicles could pass a car along the route has been demonstrated and therefore residents who use these roads on a daily basis may meet an oncoming delivery and get stuck given the size of the vehicle and narrowness of the carriageway. What mitigation would be in place?</p> <p>Section 3.8 Working / Delivery Hours – HGV deliveries will be restricted to only deliver to the compound between 0900 to 1500. However, the Great Casterton C of E Primary School is also located in close proximity of the B1081 / Ryhall Road T-junction and therefore no deliveries should take place during drop-off / pick-up times. This location is circa 10 mins drivetime from the site and therefore extended restricted delivery hours should take this into account.</p> <p>l) Outline Travel Plan</p> <p>Section 3.2 Objectives – How realistic is a target to promote walking and cycling to / from the site given the nature of the development.</p>	<p>articulated vehicle turning left from the B1081 onto Ryhall Road whilst a car is waiting at the junction to join onto the B1081, with no conflict occurring.</p> <p>b) Appendix E: 4990-2001-T-068-P0 (Ryhall Road / A6121) presents the swept path analysis for a 16.5m articulated vehicle turning through the Ryhall Road / A1621 junction whilst a car is turning left from the A6121 towards Ryhall Road, with no conflict occurring.</p> <p>c) As part of the final CTMP, secured by way of Requirement 13 on the DCO, signage plans will be provided which details on the location of advisory and informative signage for HGV drivers driving to and from the Order limits. The appointed logistics contractor will be provided with a copy of the final agreed CTMP and will be advised on the need to comply with it and the requirements of the DCO – with breach of the DCO being a criminal offence.</p> <p>In response to the SKDC comments on access:</p> <p>a) It is noted and accepted that visibility splays are achievable at all access junctions in accordance with the speeds of the road.</p> <p>b) The following drawings have been prepared to present the swept path analysis for a tractor and trailer travelling to/from the primary construction compound to the secondary compounds whilst a large car passes in the opposite direction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix E: 4990-2001-T-069-P0 (Access H Access); • Appendix E: 4990-2001-T-070-P0 (Access H Egress); • Appendix E: 4990-2001-T-071-P0 (Access E Access); and

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
		<p>Section 3.3 Actions – Again the provision of cycle parking facilities does not seem appropriate given the nature of the development and the high level of HGV deliveries.</p> <p>Section 4.2 Car Parking – It is understood that the development could generate up to 400 staff and therefore the proposed provision of 150 spaces at the primary compound could result in overspill parking on the local roads. It needs to be demonstrated that an area for up to 400 spaces could be provided should it be needed. Furthermore, no confirmation of whether parking of a similar scale could be achieved at the secondary compounds which would be a requirement given the large scale of the development meaning that staff cannot walk (with tools) between areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix E: 4990-2001-T-072-P0 (Access H Egress). <p>The drawing shows that in all areas there are suitable locations for a large car to pass this vehicle, with the exception of Uffington Lane (in its existing form). To mitigate against this, the passing places and widening are proposed along Uffington Lane and at the junction with the A1621 to enable two-way vehicle flows. It is also noted that this is an existing situation that is already taking place at present. The tractor (carrying trailer) is the most onerous vehicle that is expected to visit the site during construction, transporting materials from the primary compound to the secondary compounds. However, where feasible a smaller vehicle will be utilised.</p> <p>In response to the SKDC comments on the oTP [APP-215]:</p> <p>a) The objectives of the oTP [APP-215] as extracted from Section 3 are as follows:</p> <p><i>“Reduce the number of single occupancy car trips made to and from the extent of the Order limits;</i></p> <p><i>Increase awareness about health, environment and safety benefits of active forms of travel such as walking and cycling;</i></p> <p><i>Encourage car sharing and use of the shuttle bus service to and from the Order limits;</i></p> <p><i>Reduce traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Order limits and Local Road Network.”</i></p> <p>The aims of the oTP [APP-215] do not specifically seek to increase only walking and cycling but instead seek to reduce single occupancy car trips and promote sustainable incentives, such as the shuttle service and car sharing.</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>b) Cycle parking facilities are provided to accommodate any staff for who it is easier to cycle or would like to cycle to work. Staff would be cycling outside of operational HGV delivery hours so there is unlikely to be much conflict, although it is acknowledged that the proportion of staff cycling is likely to be very low. Nevertheless, cycle parking facilities are proposed to accommodate these users.</p> <p>The Proposed Development will investigate the feasibility of providing a shuttle service to the primary construction compound, as well as from the primary construction compound to the relevant phase of works, to be confirmed at a later stage as part of the detailed design and phasing. These services will likely shuttle the majority of staff to the Order limits. In addition, staff will be highly encouraged to car share where the shuttle is not suitable, with only a limited provision of up to 150 spaces provided at the primary compound. This is set out in the outline Travel Plan and will be considered further in the detailed Travel Plans to be approved.</p>
REP2-090	Cumulative effects from other housing projects	There is a high level of concern about the likely number of housing projects being constructed in and around Stamford at the same time (over 3,000 new homes for a population of 22,000). This will put immense pressure on the road network as there are limited suitable routes to use. If approved they will all use the same 'pinch point' through Great Casterton, the only recommended route in for MPSF HGV transport.	A review of the surrounding cumulative sites has been undertaken and it is considered that there are no relevant existing or approved developments that would overlap with the construction traffic of the Proposed Development, due to the limited overlap in construction programme and construction vehicle routing. In any case, it is considered that the assessment in ES Chapter 9: Highways and Access [APP-039] with use of TEMPRO growth factors in the assessment of the 2026 future baseline would account for any cumulative impacts of other schemes of local and national infrastructure projects, as well as housing developments. This approach was agreed with the Local Highway Authorities.
REP2-090	Access and Construction compound locations	The construction compound associated with site access H.	With respect to Access H, this access has been relocated to the south of the existing field access to ensure there are appropriate visibility splays in accordance with the DMRB requirements and the vertical gradient of the B1176. The access was subject to a Stage 1 RSA which helped inform

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is only catering for part of field 4 on the site. This solar area will make a tiny contribution as a proportion of the total solar area. - Field 4 is cut off from other parts of the site by the B1176 4-way crossroads junction. - The access is also problematical at the top of the hill with restricted views requiring additional road alterations to manage traffic to and from the site - The compound itself is situated directly opposite residential properties at Barber's Hill showing no acknowledgment of the proximity to sensitive residential receptors. <p>There are 2 access locations either side of Main St next to BrAW1/1 on the Belmesthorpe/ Greatford road. These 2 access points and construction compound are very close to Banthorpe lodge, a recognized heritage asset and the public bridleway. Access point E on Carlby Road is to be moved from its current farm entrance a few yards down the road. Whilst the swept path analysis has identified a better turning angle on paper, it has failed to notice it is placing the access more into the oncoming bend in the road where the visibility is limited. Currently all types of agricultural traffic successfully manage to navigate the farm entrance, it seems unnecessary street works to make a new one.</p>	<p>the revised location and had been deemed as acceptable by the Local Highway Authority. The highway works to deliver these works, as shown in the Works Plans [REP2-004], do not lead to any impacts to the residential properties along Barber's Hill.</p> <p>The PV Arrays within located within Field 4 and along with all the other fields make a valuable contribution to the overall production of renewable energy from PV Arrays within the Solar PV Site.</p> <p>In regard to the two access locations close to Belmesthorpe / Greatford Road ('Access I' as presented in TA [APP-074]), the location of this access has been chosen to ensure there is no conflict between vehicles passing internally through the Order limits across Main Street and users of BrAW1/1. There is also sufficient visibility along Main Street in accordance with the DMRB requirements. The Cultural Heritage Assessment [APP-038] has assessed the effects on Banthorpe Lodge and recognises that the Proposed Development would alter the setting, the key elements of the asset's value is derived from its surviving historic fabric and form, and from where they are experienced, would be preserved.</p> <p>In response to the points raised regarding Access E, the access onto Carlby Road is proposed to be relocated in order to ensure that appropriate visibility splays could be achieved in accordance with the DMRB requirements. The current arrangement does not have satisfactory visibility splays. A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) was carried out for this access proposal which raised no issues or concerns, other than the need for a cyclic and regular vegetation maintenance scheme, which will be secured by way of requirement on the DCO through the CTMP and LEMP. The access proposals in this location have also been discussed and agreed with the Local Highway Authority.</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
REP2-090		<p>Mallard Pass both assumes and provides no phasing of HGV traffic over the 2 years, unlike Sunnica Solar Farm and Cleve Hill. It states in the oCTMP "the number of vehicles generated will be consistent across the construction programme." This is totally unrealistic, there will be different stages to the project which will require different transport types and frequency of trips. In order to correctly ascertain the forecast of 54 2-way HGV trips, surely there should be more data available to arrive at this conclusion, otherwise the reader has little confidence in the headline numbers.</p> <p>The LGV peak traffic of 105 2-way trips seems very low when there could be up to 400 workers at peak.</p>	<p>The oCTMP [REP2-025] does state that for the purposes of the assessments in ES Chapter 9: Highways and Access [APP-039] there is no construction phasing, although acknowledges that this is a robust assessment in paragraphs 2.6.2-2.6.3, stating:</p> <p><i>"For the purposes of the ES, it is proposed to assume that the peak in LGV trips and HGV trips overlap. The trip generation also includes two additional HGV trips to account for a shuttle bus that is proposed to transport staff from the primary compound to the place of work, which would be subject to phasing and detailed as part of the future iterations of the final CTMP.</i></p> <p><i>Whilst in reality there will be phasing and it is unlikely this number of vehicles will consistently be required, for the purposes of the ES it will be assumed there will be no phasing and the number of vehicles generated will be consistent across the construction programme. "</i></p> <p>In reality, there could be some phasing across the duration of the Proposed Development, which would be provided as part of the detailed design once this is confirmed. However, as the assessment in ES Chapter 9: Highways and Access [APP-039] assumes no phasing, it is likely to be robust and overestimate the level of daily vehicle activity. In any event, the assessment undertaken concluded that the effects of construction vehicles would be non-significant.</p> <p>Whilst up to 400 workers could be required during the peak in construction, the majority of these staff would travel to the site by way of a shuttle bus from their location of accommodation – which would be detailed within the final CTMP and Travel Plan, secured by way of requirement on the DCO.</p>

