



Mallard Pass

Solar Farm

Mallard Pass Solar Farm

**Applicant's Response to
Interested Parties' Deadline 2
Submissions - Public Rights of
Way and Permissive Paths**

Deadline 3 - June 2023

EN010127

EN010127/APP/9.14

Applicant's Response to Interested Parties' Deadline 2 Submissions on Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
<p>REP2-051(LIR), REP2-052(FWQ), REP2-053(WR), REP2-100, REP2-101, REP2-073, REP2-060, REP2-096, REP2-056, REP2-218, REP2-224 REP2-138, REP2-181, REP2-213, REP2-134, REP2-190, REP2-168, REP2-169, REP2-156, REP2-061, REP2-232, REP2-133, REP2-107, REP2-059, REP2-118, REP2-160</p>	<p>Impact on PRoWs</p>	<p>There remains a significant concern in the local community associated with recreational impacts from the perspective of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) that pass in and around the Order limits.</p>	<p>The impacts to PRoW both within the Order Limits and in the vicinity has been assessed with the Amenity and Recreation Assessment (ARA) [APP-058] which forms Appendix 6.5 to the LVIA [APP-036]. The ARA was informed by desktop analysis and fieldwork that entailed walking the PRoW network within the Order limits and local area and considers the potential impact to the recreational amenity to each route as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The ARA concludes there would be Major-Moderate adverse effects (significant) during construction and decommissioning to Bridleways E182 (BrAW/1/1) and E169 that traverse through the Solar PV Site reducing to Moderate Adverse effects (not significant) post maturation of planting at year 15.</p> <p>All other PRoW within the Order Limits and locality would experience effects no greater than Slight adverse (not significant) reducing to Minimal Adverse (not significant) post maturation of planting at year 15.</p> <p>The consideration of PRoW has been a key Design Principle as detailed within the Design and Access Statement (DAS) [REP2-018] which has driven the spatial design response as illustrated in the Green Infrastructure (GI) Strategy Plan [APP-173].</p> <p>The plans at Appendix B, submitted at Deadline 3, illustrates the PROWs and minor roads both within the Site and the locality which are adjacent to the Proposed Development during the operational phase. The plans illustrate the network of public rights of way and identified local walking routes within the locality in relation to the Solar PV site.</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>The 'Access, PRoW and Local Walking Routes' plan indicates that the PROWs in the locality are largely unaffected as only 3 of the 11 identified local walking routes would run adjacent to the Solar PV Areas. Ryhall Walk No.1 would be most affected with 32% of the route adjacent to the Proposed Development, either running directly between or to the side of the Solar PV area. The other two routes, Wills Walk: Pickworth and the Drift and Wills Walk: Stamford and Uffington would have 8.1% and 0.4% of the route adjacent to the Solar PV Site respectively.</p> <p>The table at the bottom of this response builds on this plan and with reference to it, and sets out the corresponding viewpoint to the identified routes used for assessment in the LVIA [APP-036]. The Applicant notes that the scale of visual effect (noting that the interrelated 'significance' judgements in the LVIA were not done on an individual viewpoint level, but as visual receptor groups), the view points that do correspond to relevant walking routes would be at most moderate scale of effect post maturation of planting. The Applicant considers that this is important context to the submissions made by Interested Parties.</p> <p>The 'Routes Directly Adjacent to Solar PV Site' plan illustrates the network of local roads and PRoW within the locality adjacent to the Solar PV Site. The plan demonstrates a relatively small number of the routes would be located adjacent to (orange lines) or within (magenta lines) the Solar PV Area and that an extensive network of routes would remain and provide access to the countryside where the Proposed Development would not be encountered (green lines).</p> <p>Combined, the plans and table, considered in light of the ARA and the Green Infrastructure Strategy, illustrate that Non Motorised Users have been duly considered and assessed by the Applicant as part of the DCO submission and that impact to them would be limited to those routes within, or in close proximity to the Solar PV area. The plans</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response															
			<p>also indicate there would a number of local alternative routes that would remain unaffected by the Proposed Development. As such, the Applicant considers that the Proposed Development does not cause a significant effect to recreational use of the PRowS or recreational use of the countryside as a community resource more generally.</p> <p>Walking Routes and Viewpoints Table</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1272 464 1834 1375"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1272 464 1491 528">Walk</th> <th data-bbox="1491 464 1608 528">VP</th> <th data-bbox="1608 464 1834 528">Scale of effect</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1272 528 1491 783">Will's Walk: Stamford, Tolethorpe, Ryhall and Belmesthorpe (10.4km)</td> <td data-bbox="1491 528 1608 783">VP10</td> <td data-bbox="1608 528 1834 783">Year 1 – negligible and neutral Year 15 – negligible and neutral</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1272 783 1491 1038">Will's Walk: Pickworth and The Drift (6.7km)</td> <td data-bbox="1491 783 1608 1038">VP13</td> <td data-bbox="1608 783 1834 1038">Year 1 – medium and adverse Year 15 - small and adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1272 1038 1491 1246">Will's Walk: Ryhall, Tolethorpe and The Drift (8.1km)</td> <td data-bbox="1491 1038 1608 1246">n/a</td> <td data-bbox="1608 1038 1834 1246">n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1272 1246 1491 1375">Will's Walk: The Witham Five (12.6km)</td> <td data-bbox="1491 1246 1608 1375">n/a</td> <td data-bbox="1608 1246 1834 1375">n/a</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Walk	VP	Scale of effect	Will's Walk: Stamford, Tolethorpe, Ryhall and Belmesthorpe (10.4km)	VP10	Year 1 – negligible and neutral Year 15 – negligible and neutral	Will's Walk: Pickworth and The Drift (6.7km)	VP13	Year 1 – medium and adverse Year 15 - small and adverse	Will's Walk: Ryhall, Tolethorpe and The Drift (8.1km)	n/a	n/a	Will's Walk: The Witham Five (12.6km)	n/a	n/a
Walk	VP	Scale of effect																
Will's Walk: Stamford, Tolethorpe, Ryhall and Belmesthorpe (10.4km)	VP10	Year 1 – negligible and neutral Year 15 – negligible and neutral																
Will's Walk: Pickworth and The Drift (6.7km)	VP13	Year 1 – medium and adverse Year 15 - small and adverse																
Will's Walk: Ryhall, Tolethorpe and The Drift (8.1km)	n/a	n/a																
Will's Walk: The Witham Five (12.6km)	n/a	n/a																

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response		
			Will's Walk: Stamford and Uffington (10.7km)	VP07	Year 1 – medium and adverse Year 15 - small and adverse
				VP18	Year 1 – large and adverse Year 15 - medium and adverse
			Will's Walk: Braceborough, Greatford and Shillingthorpe (5.1km)	VP17	Year 1 – negligible and neutral Year 15 – negligible and neutral
			Will's Walk: Wilsthorpe and Braceborough (3.5km)	n/a	n/a
			Will's Walk: Little Casterton and Tolethorpe (3.6km)	n/a	n/a
			Will's Walk: Carlby and The	VP03	Year 1 – small and adverse

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response			
			West Glen River (3.3km)		Year 15 – negligible and neutral	
			Ryhall Walk Number 2 (6.1km)	n/a	n/a	
			Ryhall Walk Number 1 (6.6km)	VP12	Year 1 – large and adverse Year 15 - medium and adverse	
REP2-051(LIR), REP2-052(FWQ), REP2-053(WR), REP2-047, REP-048, REP2-138, REP2- 168, REP2-169, REP2-156, REP2- 193, REP2-160, REP2-044(LIR), REP2-045(FWQ), REP2-046(WR)	Permissive Paths	<p>The Proposed Development includes the provision of new permissive footpaths, which is a potential positive area of mitigation, although there are concerns about the mechanism for securing these over the lifetime of the development. The requests for future information on the planning conditions will be used to ensure implementation.</p> <p>Concern that permissive paths can be withdrawn at any time by land owners.</p>	<p>The provision of permissive paths as illustrated on the GI Strategy Plan [APP-173] would be maintained for the entire operational period of the Proposed Development as set out in the outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [APP-208]. Requirement 12 of the draft DCO [REP2-006] requires that the operational environmental management plan must sustainably in accordance with the oOEMP and be submitted and approved by the relevant planning authority and the operation of the authorised development must be carried out in accordance with the approved operation environmental management plan. Requirement 7 of the draft DCO requires that the landscape and ecology management plans must include details of the final routing, specification and maintenance regime for each permissive path. Requirement 7(4) ensures that the requirements of the LEMP are maintained throughout the operation of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>These control mechanisms will ensure that the permissive paths cannot be withdrawn by the landowners during the operational phase of the Proposed Development.</p>			
REP2-047(WR), REP2-048(LIR),		Concern that new permissive paths are likely to be significantly diminished by their	All proposed permissive paths would have an offset of at least 15m from them to the boundary fencing of the Proposed			

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
<p>REP2-050(FWQ), REP2-100, REP2-101, REP2-138, REP2-124</p>		<p>location in and amongst the proposed solar farm itself.</p> <p>Providing questionable opportunities for walking routes through the power station is no alternative and will be adversely affected by the constant low-level noise created as well as the disastrous visual impact.</p>	<p>Development and additional planting as set out in Design Guidance V5.3 and 50m offset for solar stations and storage containers under Design Guidance PE4.2 within the DAS [REP2-018]. The Design Guidance is secured through requirements 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the DCO. This will provide suitable mitigation for users of these routes.</p> <p>The noise assessment [APP-040] identifies that PRow receptors are at least 50 m from any central inverters and are located more than 800 m from the Onshore Substation. The modelling results of Appendix 10.5 [APP-081] shows that operational noise levels would not exceed 50 dB LAeq, which is therefore clearly below a precautionary threshold of 55 dB LAeq derived in Appendix 10.2 [APP-078]. This means that, although plant noise may be audible for transient users of the PRow, this will not be at a level likely to create significant disturbance. This would represent a low magnitude of impact on these receptors, which would result in a minor adverse significance of effect which is Not Significant.</p> <p>The proposed permissive paths are not intended to be alternatives to additional routes but seek to augment them creating continuous off-road routes connecting to the wider network as shown on the Existing PRow and Permissive Path Plans (Appendix B of the Applicant's Responses to ExA's First Written Questions [REP2-038]).</p>
<p>REP2-190</p>	<p>Permissive West Glen River Path</p>	<p>Concern that the new permissive West Glen River Path and wet woodland would probably be impassable in the winter.</p>	<p>The proposed permissive paths are not intended to be alternatives to additional routes but seek to augment them creating continuous off-road routes connecting to the wider network as shown on the Existing PRow and Permissive Path Plans (Appendix B of the Applicant's Responses to ExA's First Written Questions [REP2-038]). The permissive paths will be managed throughout the operational phase of the Proposed Development in accordance with the outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [APP-208]. They would be grassed (not surfaced) and not lit and would function in a similar way to existing paths.</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
<p>REP2-051(LIR), REP2-052(FWQ), REP2-053(WR), REP2-138, REP2-100, REP2-101, REP2-134, REP2-168, REP2-169</p>	<p>Impact on PRoWs</p>	<p>Ongoing access will be maintained with some temporary diversion. There is nonetheless a significant potential negative impact on the recreational value of various public rights of way as a result of the development, which will likely impinge upon the recreational value of these routes and may impact their usage during the construction and operational phases of development.</p>	<p>The impacts to ProW, both within the Order Limits and in the vicinity has been assessed with the Amenity and Recreation Assessment (ARA) [APP-058] which forms Appendix 6.5 to the LVIA [APP-036].</p> <p>The ARA concludes there would be Major-Moderate adverse effects (significant) during construction and decommissioning to Bridleways E182 (BrAW/1/1) and E169 that traverse through the Solar PV Site reducing to Moderate Adverse effects (not significant) post maturation of planting at year 15.</p> <p>All other PRoW within the Order Limits and locality would experience effects no greater than Slight adverse (not significant) reducing to Minimal Adverse (not significant) post maturation of planting at year 15.</p> <p>The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP2-020] provides details as to how potential impacts to PRoW during construction can be avoided or minimised.</p> <p>Appendix B submitted at Deadline 3 illustrates the PROWs and minor roads both within the Site and the locality which are adjacent to the Proposed Development during the operational phase. Please refer to the first row in this table” for a summary of what the plans show and the Applicant’s consideration of impacts to recreational usage.</p>
<p>REP2-047(WR), REP2-048(LIR), REP2-219, REP2-159, REP2-167, REP2-138, REP2-134, REP2-168, REP2-169, REP2-232, REP2-193, REP2-066, REP2-067, REP2-160</p>	<p>Negative impacts on the Users</p>	<p>The Proposed Development would be to discourage the use of the Public Rights of Way network in the vicinity of the application site and diminish the enjoyment of the existing green infrastructure network.</p>	<p>The impacts to PRoW both within the Order Limits and in the vicinity has been assessed with the Amenity and Recreation Assessment (ARA) [APP-058] which forms Appendix 6.5 to the LVIA [APP-036].</p> <p>The ARA concludes there would be Major-Moderate adverse effects (significant) during construction and decommissioning to Bridleways E182 (BrAW/1/1) and E169 that traverse through the Solar PV Site reducing to Moderate Adverse effects (not significant) post maturation of planting at year 15.</p> <p>All other PRoW within the Order Limits and locality would experience effects no greater than Slight adverse (not</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>significant) reducing to Minimal Adverse (not significant) post maturation of planting at year 15.</p> <p>The consideration of PRow has been a key Design Principle as detailed within the Design and Access Statement (DAS) [REP2-018] which has driven the spatial design response as illustrated in the Green Infrastructure (GI) Strategy Plan [APP-173].</p> <p>Appendix B submitted at Deadline 3 illustrates the PROWS and minor roads both within the Site and the locality which are adjacent to the Proposed Development during the operational phase. Please refer to the first row in this table” for a summary of what the plans show and the Applicant’s consideration of impacts to recreational usage.</p>
<p>REP2-047(WR), REP2-048(LIR), REP2-138, REP2-190, REP2-170, REP2-160</p>	<p>Impact on footpaths</p>	<p>Whilst such planting may have the desired effect in terms of screening the panels themselves, the resulting associated impact is that, in many cases, users of the footpaths will then feel like they are walking a corridor in the countryside, with little to benefit in terms of views or appreciation of the wider area as a result.</p> <p>Consequently, even considering the proposed screening of footpaths around the site, consider the impact of the scheme on the likely use of footpaths to be negative.</p>	<p>The impacts to PRow both within the Order Limits and in the vicinity has been assessed with the Amenity and Recreation Assessment (ARA) [APP-058] which forms Appendix 6.5 to the LVIA [APP-036].</p> <p>The ARA acknowledges the recreational amenity of PRow within the Solar PV area would change as a result of the Proposed Development, with the loss of some wider views across the Order limits that are currently possible. However, enclosed or more intimate views are also characteristic of the recreational experience of the PRow network (for example along the MacMillan Way along the northern edge of Fields 45, 46, 47 and 49 [APP-112]) and longer distance views from the PRow network will continue to exist, including from more elevated areas around Carlby and Ryhall. In any event, the Applicant has committed through the Design Guidance to 15m set off either side of PROWS to minimise ‘corridor’ effects.</p> <p>Enclosure by hedgerows and hedgerow trees is characteristic of the Kesteven Uplands and Rutland Plateau – Clay Woodlands landscape character areas as set out in the Rutland Character Assessment (2003) and South Kesteven Character Assessment (2007) which promote new woodland</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>and hedgerow planting and the use of new planting to minimise visual impacts. The Proposed Development therefore contributes positively towards these objectives.</p> <p>Appendix B submitted at Deadline 3 illustrates the PROWs and minor roads both within the Site and the locality which are located adjacent to or between areas of PV Arrays. Please refer to the first row in this table" for a summary of what the plans show and the Applicant's consideration of impacts to recreational usage.</p>
<p>REP2-044(LIR), REP2-045(FWQ), REP2-046(WR), REP2-168, REP2-169, REP2-193</p>	<p>Public rights of way</p>	<p>There are a number of Public Rights of Way in and around the Order limits and whilst these are to be retained and ongoing access maintained, albeit with some temporary diversion, there would nonetheless be a negative impact on the recreational value of various public rights of way as a result of the development.</p> <p>Concern about the level of disruption to PROWs and safety risks to users during the construction and decommissioning phases.</p>	<p>The impacts to PROW both within the Order Limits and in the vicinity has been assessed with the Amenity and Recreation Assessment (ARA) [APP-058] which forms Appendix 6.5 to the LVIA [APP-036].</p> <p>The outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP2-020] provides details as to how potential impacts to PROW during construction will be minimised and managed.</p>
<p>REP2-073</p>	<p>Assessment of impact upon Public Rights of Way</p>	<p>Concerned that due to the scale of the project, it will affect dozens of paths and tens of kilometres of walking routes across a wild rural landscape.</p> <p>The mitigation measure to offset solar arrays from the PROW will do little in terms of visual impact. Concerns that the planting will take a long time to establish to offer required screening and will impact the character and views of the open countryside.</p>	<p>The impacts to PROW both within the Order Limits and in the vicinity has been assessed with the Amenity and Recreation Assessment (ARA) [APP-058] which forms Appendix 6.5 to the LVIA [APP-036].</p> <p>The ARA acknowledges the recreational amenity of PROW within the Solar PV area would change as a result of the Proposed Development, with the loss of some wider views across the Order limits that are currently possible. However, enclosed or more intimate views are also characteristic of the recreational experience of the PROW network (for example along the MacMillan Way along the northern edge of Fields 45, 46, 47 and 49 [APP-112]) and longer distance views from</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>the PRoW network will continue to exist, including from more elevated areas around Carlby and Ryhall.</p> <p>Photomontage F (Appendix N [REP2-038]) provides an indication of the planting proposed to Bridlway E182 (BrAW/1/1) within the Solar PV Site for year 1 and year 15 timeframes based on Forestry Commission growth rates. The Photomontage indicates the proposed mitigation planting would have formed a considerable visual screen by year 15.</p> <p>Appendix B submitted at Deadline 3 illustrates the PROWs and minor roads both within the Site and the locality which are located adjacent to or between areas of PV Arrays. Please refer to the first row in this table for a summary of what the plans show and the Applicant's consideration of impacts to recreational usage of the countryside in the vicinity of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) [updated for Deadline 3 submission] provides guidance and controls for the management of planting to ensure that it provides effective mitigation. A 15m set off from PRoWs is also inbuilt into the Green Infrastructure Strategy Plans included in that document.</p> <p>Enclosure by hedgerows and hedgerow trees is characteristic of the Kesteven Uplands and Rutland Plateau – Clay Woodlands landscape character areas as set out in the Rutland Character Assessment (2003) and South Kesteven Character Assessment (2007) which promote new woodland and hedgerow planting and the use of new planting to minimise visual impacts. The Proposed Development therefore contributes positively towards these objectives.</p>
REP2-073, REP2-172, REP2-175	PRoWs and Permissive Paths	Concerned that mitigation planting alongside PRoWs and Permissive paths will offer limited screening provision of the development for the first several years.	The impacts to PRoW both within the Order Limits and in the vicinity has been assessed with the Amenity and Recreation Assessment (ARA) [APP-058] which forms Appendix 6.5 to

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>the LVIA [APP-036]. The assessment has assessed Year 1, prior to the establishment of the mitigation planting.</p> <p>Photomontage F [(Appendix N [REP2-038])] provides an indication of the planting proposed to Bridleway E182 (BrAW/1/1) within the Solar PV Site for year 1 and year 15 timeframes. The photomontage indicates the proposed mitigation planting would have formed a considerable visual screen by year 15</p> <p>These photomontages consider mitigation based on Forestry Commission growth rates which would also apply to all planting for the Proposed Development.</p> <p>As a general rule of thumb these growth rates are approximately 0.4m per year and means planting would therefore start to provide a developing level of screening before year 15 given those growth rates (e.g. by Year 5, this would be 2 metres high, which is the equivalent of a 6.5 foot human).</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that planting will take time to mature hence the year 1 and year 15 assessments within the LVIA and will provide increasing visual screening value year on year as planting matures. For the duration of the operation of the Proposed Development, planting will be managed for visual screening and biodiversity objectives as set out within the oLEMP [updated for Deadline 3] submission]</p>
<p>REP2-167, REP2-193, REP2-172, REP2-175</p>	<p>Amenity</p>	<p>Small groups of trees, pathways and landscaped areas do not compensate for the amenity that the general community have lost.</p>	<p>The impacts to PRoW both within the Order Limits and in the vicinity has been assessed with the Amenity and Recreation Assessment (ARA) [APP-058] which forms Appendix 6.5 to the LVIA [APP-036].</p> <p>The ARA acknowledges the recreational amenity of PRoW within the Solar PV area would change as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Appendix B submitted at Deadline 3 illustrates the PROWs and minor roads both within the Site and the locality which are located adjacent to or between areas of PV Arrays.</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>Please refer to the first row in this table for a summary of what the plans show and the Applicant's consideration of impacts to recreational usage of the community resources of the countryside (and therefore amenity).</p> <p>The GI Strategy Plan [APP-173] illustrates the landscape scale planting that is proposed. This includes 112ha of tussocky grassland with wildflowers, 3.7ha of wet woodland planting, 8.1km of new permissive paths, 7.5km of new tree belts and 13.9km of new hedgerow planting. This would provide mitigation to potential impacts and bring substantial biodiversity benefits.</p>
REP2-117	Permissive Paths	<p>A permissive footpath is planned to go along our boundary, which we object to due to the increase in trespassing and the risk of vandalism. We requested if the proposed permissive path is to be on track or in the field, to which we have not had a response. We have a right of way along the track.</p> <p>Secondly, it is not safe for people to cross the road from the pavement at the corner to access the permissive path. Numerous accidents have occurred here, including fatalities over the last few years.</p>	<p>The final routing specification and maintenance regime for each permissive path are required to be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in accordance with Requirement 7 of the DCO [REP2-006].</p> <p>The GI Strategy Plan [APP-173] indicates a thick treebelt and hedgerow planting along the western edge of Field 27 providing an effective visual and physical barrier. Species including hawthorn, blackthorn and holly are proposed as set out within the oLEMP [updated submission for D3] creating a dense thorny thicket at ground level. The Applicant is of the view that will prevent acts of trespassing and vandalism.</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 local road network around the Order limits.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant notes that its proposals at this location have been developed in line with the guidance in LTN 1/95. Applying that guidance to the expected usage of the permissive path (as based on the usage of PRoWs in the</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>surrounding area) would not necessitate the installation of a crossing. It is also noted that at the informal crossing location that the permissive path users would use, there are sufficient pedestrian visibility splays in accordance with Manual for Streets and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges requirements to see the oncoming traffic.</p>
<p>REP2-100, REP2-101, REP2-168, REP2-169</p>	<p>Impact on PRoW</p>	<p>The concern of the “Enclosure” of the Macmillan Way long distant path by solar panels where it crosses the proposed development.</p> <p>There is a safety risk to PRoW users from flooding on the river crossing.</p>	<p>The impacts to PRoW both within the Order Limits and in the vicinity has been assessed with the Amenity and Recreation Assessment (ARA) [APP-058] which forms Appendix 6.5 to the LVIA [APP-036].</p> <p>The Macmillan Way traverses within the Order limits for approximately 700m, following an existing local road. The road has wide grass verges either side and established hedgerows that would be allowed to grow out further providing additional screening properties. The Solar PV site is set back on the south side of the route alongside the northern edge of Field 49 [APP-112] by an existing field which further separates the Solar PV Site from the MacMillan Way where it passes through the Order Limits. Given this set back and the wider grass verges it is not considered that the section of the MacMillan Way that passes through the Order Limits will create a sense of enclosure.</p> <p>It is worth noting that a section of the MacMillan Way (located along the northern edge of Fields 45, 46, 47 and 48 [APP-112]) is already enclosed by vegetation that contributes positively to its recreational experience.</p> <p>The crossing of the West Glen River by Bridleway E182(BrAW/1/1) lies outside of the Order limits and the Flood Risk Assessment [APP-086] has demonstrated that there would be no greater flood risk than the current scenario as a result of the Proposed Development. Therefore, the Proposed Development is not exacerbating the position and the crossing remains as it currently is.</p>
<p>REP2-168, REP2-169</p>	<p>Closure of PRoWs</p>	<p>Concern that works requiring the closure of PRoW 2A-2B and 3A – 3b are sites</p>	<p>The temporary diversion of the PRoW is to allow for the construction of the internal access tracks and installation of</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
		<p>opposite the secondary construction compound. Both the closure areas are not on flat land rendering the passage of 80-tonne cranes impractical and potentially dangerous.</p> <p>Figure 3 PRoW 2A - 2B is an extremely long stretch of closure, and there is no explanation for why this is necessary.</p> <p>Questions why the closures and likely track sited adjacent to the woodland, which no doubt has the largest biodiversity habitats. The construction process will cause unnecessary displacement when it could be sited in a flatter, more open area.</p>	<p>the internal access tracks. These temporary diversions are required to allow the construction of a network of internal access tracks that are required to provide access to each field within the Solar PV Site and the installation of a 33kV cable network that connects back to the Onsite Substation. As a result of PV Arrays being located either side of the PRoW within the Order Limits, temporary diversion are required to allow these crossings to be constructed.</p> <p>The alignment / routing of the internal access tracks nor the cable corridor routes have not been determined at this stage. However as set out in the Design Guidance (PL4.3) within the Design and Access Statement, the use of the existing (agricultural) internal tracks will be maximised to reduce the total length of internal access tracks that need to be constructed. Some of these existing access tracks are located adjacent to areas of woodland and large agricultural machinery currently cross the PRoW using these existing internal access tracks.</p> <p>Therefore, flexibility is sought to close sections of the BrAW/1/1 which is located between Field 34/35 and 36 to allow for the construction of internal access tracks and installation of. The details of the internal access track and cable alignment will be submitted and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority in accordance with Requirement Number 6 of the DCO [REP2-006]. As set out in the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP2-019] during construction of the internal access tracks these PRoW will be temporarily diverted. Each minor diversion will be clearly marked out, along with appropriate signage at either end of the diversion which will take the most direct route possible. The diversion routes will be agreed with the relevant local authority for each diversion prior to construction of the Proposed Development.</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>Once complete the proposed crossing points will be carefully managed to allow all users to safely pass through these areas as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Providing manned controls at each crossing point (such as marshals/ banksmen and gates as appropriate), with a default priority that construction traffic will give-way to other users; b. Providing advanced signage to warn users of the potential presence of construction vehicles; and c. Maximising visibility between construction vehicles and other users at the crossing points (through vegetation pruning for example).
REP2-061	Impact on Greatford impact Bridleways and PRoW.	The changes to the only local bridleway within easy reach of Greatford, a route with open views and year-round accessibility, will be a great loss to the local community and is not being sufficiently compensated for.	<p>Bridleway E182 (BrAW/1/1) will be retained and offset by at least 15m either side forming a strategic green corridor as part of the Proposed Development. It lies approximately 2.3km to the west of Greatford and can only be accessed at present by using the local road network (i.e. there is no connecting offroad link to it from Greatford). The local road network will continue to offer open views and year round accessibility.</p> <p>Table 3-10 of the oCEMP [REP2-021] provides details of how disruption to PRoW within the Order limits will be minimised. A second bridleway (Lgft/4/1) lies approximately 2km to the east of Greatford and would remain accessible.</p> <p>As set out in the oLEMP, which has been updated at Deadline 3, approximately 8.1km of new permissive paths are proposed with the aim of creating offroad links for walkers and horse riders that complement the existing PRoW network.</p> <p>Appendix B submitted at Deadline 3 illustrates the extent of PROWs and minor roads both within the Site and will continue to provide access to the countryside. The plan illustrates the extent of PROW and minor roads that are not routed through or alongside the Solar PV Site. Please refer to the first row in this table for a summary of what the plans show and the Applicant's consideration of impacts to</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			recreational usage of the countryside in the vicinity of the Proposed Development.
REP2-193	Bridleways	<p>What engagement has been made with either local riders or BHS representatives to secure an informed understanding of the approach to be taken to ensure the safety of all?</p> <p>I also understand that the road running between Essendine and Uffington will be closed to non-project traffic. This will greatly impact the local horse rider's ability to ride within the local area.</p>	<p>The Applicant has not received any correspondence from the British Horse Society but the Applicant has reviewed and incorporated the measures set out within the 'Advice on Solar Farms' guidance document that has been published by The British Horse Society. Fencing of the Solar PV Site will be offset by 15m to the existing bridleways and permissive paths (which horse riders will be able to use) within the Order Limits, as per Design Guidance (V5.3) set out within the Design and Access Statement (REP2-018). This far exceeds the 'preferable 5m' stated in the BHS guidance. The Applicant has specified wire mesh fencing as recommended. The guidance also says that large development are opportunities for increasing access which the Applicant has delivered through the inclusion of 8.1km of permissive paths, whilst the guidance recognises that 'even very short links can have important effects by enabling greater or safer use of existing routes in an area'.</p> <p>Horse riders will be able use the permissive path that connects Essendine Road (A6121) with Bridleway BrAW/1/1, this will provide an alternative route whilst the road between Essendine and Uffington is temporarily closed to enable the installation of cabling as outlined within the Traffic Regulation Measures (Temporary Road Closures) Plans [AS-007]. The full details of all the temporary traffic measures will be detailed within the CTMP once the scope of the works is confirmed by the contractor. Any road closures will be kept to a minimum in order to minimise disruption.</p> <p>The outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [PDA-005] provides details as to how potential impacts to PRow during construction can be minimised and managed.</p>
REP2-047(WR), REP2-048(LIR), REP2-138	Horse riding	The extended working days are also likely to make horse riding in the area problematic during construction.	The outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP2-020] provides details as to how potential impacts to PRow during construction can be minimised and managed,

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>including working hours for construction. The British Horse Society's guidance titled 'Advice on Solar Farms' recognises the temporary nature of construction phase impacts.</p> <p>The Proposed Development includes 8.1km of permissive paths that provide alternative routes to the local roads that are being used by construction vehicles to access the primary construction compound.</p> <p>The Applicant highlights that if DCO consent is secured the Proposed Development would be built out in phases so that not all areas of within the Solar PV Site adjacent to the PRowS would be affected by construction at any one time nor for the entire duration of the construction period.</p>
REP2-089, REP2-090	Degrading of PRow	<p>PRowS surrounded by solar panels, fencing, and solar stations, even with the extra permissive paths are not seen as a benefit by locals. Retaining the PRowS which already exist is not a benefit of the scheme. Moreover, the PRow will be substantially degraded as a result of the physical impacts of the proposed development, including impacts on the landscape, visual amenity, and tunnelling effects caused by the extensive fencing and built features. It is a disbenefit of the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>The impacts to PRow both within the Order Limits and in the vicinity has been assessed with the Amenity and Recreation Assessment (ARA) [APP-058] which forms Appendix 6.5 to the LVIA [APP-036].</p> <p>The ARA concludes there would be Major-Moderate adverse effects (significant) during construction and decommissioning to Bridleways E182 (BrAW/1/1) and E169 that traverse through the Solar PV Site reducing to Moderate Adverse effects (not significant) post maturation of planting at year 15.</p> <p>Photomontage F [(Appendix N [REP2-038])] provides an indication of the planting proposed to Bridleway E182 (BrAW/1/1) within the Solar PV Site for year 1 and year 15 timeframes and indicates the proposed mitigation planting would have formed a considerable visual screen by year 15.</p> <p>Enclosure by hedgerows and hedgerow trees is characteristic of the Kesteven Uplands and Rutland Plateau – Clay Woodlands landscape character areas as set out in the Rutland Character Assessment (2003) and South Kesteven Character Assessment (2007) which promote new woodland and hedgerow planting and the use of new planting to minimise visual impacts. The Proposed Development therefore contributes positively towards these objectives.</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>Appendix B submitted at Deadline 3 illustrates the extent of PROWs and minor roads both within the Site and the locality which are located either through the Solar PV Site or alongside PV Arrays. Please refer to the first row in this table for a summary of what the plans show and the Applicant's consideration of impacts to recreational usage of the countryside in the vicinity of the Proposed Development. A network of permissive paths, totalling 8.1km, are also proposed as part of the Proposed Development. There are sections of the permissive paths that are routed through agricultural fields that will be retained in agricultural use during the operational phase of the project, offering access to the countryside.</p>
REP2-121	<p>ExQ1 - Question Q1.0.19 - interests on any of the submitted outline plans.</p>	<p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (APP-210) lacks detail about the permissive path design. The design of the permissive paths is important because it will influence the ability of the paths to mitigate the impact of the development, particularly during construction. The plan does not provide details of the design of the proposed permissive paths, nor indicate the categories of user which will be permitted which would guide their design. These matters are left to be approved by the relevant planning authority via requirement 7(h) of the draft DCO.</p>	<p>The Applicant has updated the oLEMP for Deadline 3 submission to provide further details on the permissive paths.</p> <p>Detailed design of permissive paths is a detailed design matter to be dealt with before construction commences. This is secured by requirement 7(2)(i) of the DCO [REP2-006]. Such details will need to be approved by the LPA should DCO consent be granted.</p> <p>Indicative sections for design treatments for existing PRoW are presented on page 39 of the DAS [REP2-018]. These principles would also be adopted for proposed permissive paths.</p>
		<p>I would like to see greater detail in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan to better guide the local planning authorities on what they should consider to be acceptable. This would also help to reduce the risk of inconsistencies in the approach of the planning authorities. It would be helpful if the plain included items such as:</p>	<p>The Applicant has updated the oLEMP for Deadline 3 submission to provide further details on the permissive paths.</p> <p>Detailed design of permissive paths is a detailed design matter to be dealt with before construction commences. This is secured by requirement 7(2)(i) of the DCO [REP2-006]. Such details will need to be approved by the LPA should DCO consent be granted.</p>

Parties Raised	Sub-Theme	Issues Raised	Applicant's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Surface treatments - Widths - Design of gates/stiles - Waymarking 	<p>Indicative sections for design treatments for existing PRoW are presented on page 39 of the DAS [REP2-018]. These principles would also be adopted for proposed permissive paths. The intention is permissive paths would be grassed and not surfaced.</p>
		<p>The preference would always be for the proposed permissive paths to be open to the most categories of users, including cyclists and equestrians. There are no technical challenges apparent that would prevent this. Providing paths suitable for cyclists and equestrians will help to mitigate some of the impact of the construction phase.</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.2.12 of the ARA [APP-058] confirms it is the intention equestrians and walkers will be able to use the proposed permissive paths and an updated oLEMP providing further details on the management and maintenance of permissive paths is submitted as part of Deadline 3.</p>