

RCC Comments and Summary - Issue Specific Hearing 4

Water and Flood Risk
RCC through Justin Johnson noted that it would be beneficial for the oEMP to include a need for recording of any flooding events, the reasons why flooding is considered to have occurred, measures that were taken to overcome it and any additional mitigation that may be required to prevent future such events. This could also be added in the Surface Water Drainage Strategy.
Archaeology
RCC through Richard Clark made the case that it considers the archaeological investigation undertaken to be inadequate and therefore the proposed outline strategy is premature.
Land Use and Soils
RCC through Justin Johnson noted that in terms of policy regarding minimising the use of BMV land then proportionate surveys beyond the site boundary may have revealed sites of lower agricultural value, allowing consideration of locating panels on lesser value land.
Landscape and Visual
RCC through Justin Johnson confirmed that it is satisfied that if details of requirements aren't acceptable then the DCO has an appeals process to address this.
Biodiversity and Ecology
RCC through Justin Johnson confirmed that it understood the position regarding biodiversity net gain to be that the relevant documents set out the required BNG improvements and that changes to the Defra metric would therefore not impact on the requirement for BNG provision.
RCC through Julie Smith confirmed that it had no evidence of overrunning of verges causing harm to Ryhall Pasture and Little Warren Verges SSSI.
Socio-economics
RCC through Justin Johnson stated that the management group discussing the planting proposals is likely to have a limited effect, specifically that the proposed planting will either result in a corridor effect, or it won't be adequate in screening the panels.

Issue Specific Hearing 5

Draft DCO
Article 2
RCC through Justin Johnson confirmed that it welcomed the limit to 5HGV movements per day, but retained concerns that there is no mechanism for approval of the maintenance program (panel replacement), which if covering a 12-month period would have sufficient time within it to allow such approval and agreement over whether or not this remained below the threshold for falling within the existing Environmental Statement. Only recourse beyond this would be enforcement action.
RCC through Julie Smith identified concern that if there were to be wholesale replacement of the panels part way through the lifetime of the project then passing bays would need to be re-established and therefore may as well be permanent. If HGV movements were limited to 5 per day as indicated this would not be the case.
Article 8
RCC through Julie Smith confirmed that it appears controls for booking road space for works appear to still be in place and RCC is therefore satisfied.
Article 13
RCC through Julie Smith confirmed there are no outstanding concerns with this article.
Article 14
RCC through Julie Smith agreed that the provision to enter into legal agreements doesn't go beyond what has already been described (specifically that there is nothing to prevent the applicant from entering into such agreements even without this provision).

Article 16

RCC through Julie Smith confirmed that the addition of paragraph 7 has addressed its previous concern.

Schedule 1

RCC through Justin Johnson noted that it had some concern around how the reference to 'any further associated development' may be used, and that it gave scope for significant changes to the scheme provided they had only limited environmental impacts.

Schedule 16

RCC through Justin Johnson confirmed it was seeking clarity from the applicant around the proposed fees, as the current wording appears to relate to the fees equivalent for the discharge of planning conditions, not the consideration of reserved matters. He then clarified that concern surrounded fees where detailed design assessment was required. RCC are waiting for the applicant to clarify the fees structure for the approval of details.