

Question:	Question to:	Question:	Response:
Q1.1.6	Lincolnshire County Council	<p>Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Review</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Can Lincolnshire County Council please provide an update in respect of the progress of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Review and its progress towards adoption? 2) Should this change during the Examination Lincolnshire County Council should inform the Examining Authority (ExA) of any change in status at its earliest convenience. 	<p>Whilst this question is more appropriate to West Lindsey District Council it is confirmed that the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan was adopted in April 2023.</p>
Q1.1.21	Lincolnshire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, West Lindsey District Council, Bassetlaw District Council, Environment Agency, Natural England, Historic England, Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust, and any other Interested Party.	<p>Management Plans</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted the following outline management plans:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [APP-222] ii) Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (fCEMP) [APP-224] iii) Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan (foEMP) [APP-225] iv) Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [APP-226] v) Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP)[APP-231] vi) Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [APP-228] 	<p>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan</p> <p>The management plan appears to consider all points raised by LFR in the initial position/requirements statement shared with the developer.</p> <p>Section 2 Consultation – 2.1.2 contains a table where points highlighted by LFR are considered with a proposed solutions outlined. There are a number of references to sections within the document for further information, but the references do not correspond with additional relevant information.</p> <p>There is further work to be carried out to ensure that water requirements can be satisfied. The plan outlines that work is being carried out with Anglian Water – Confirmation is required to ensure arrangements will meet minimum requirements outlined in LFR’s position statement.</p>

- vii) Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-212]
- viii) Outline Soil Management Plan [APP-233]
- ix) Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [APP-229]
- x) Archaeology Mitigation Strategy Part 1 [APP-227]

Comment as appropriate to your interests on any of these outline plans. This should include any potential amendment that may, in your view, be required in order to secure appropriate environmental outcomes and mitigation of effects.

Further work will be required to develop an agreed ERP – The document considers points to include, but no details at this stage

The *Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan Document Reference: EN010131/APP/7.10* provides information regarding the establishment and maintenance of the planting associated with the Development (as shown on Figure 10-23: Outline Landscape Masterplan).

The success of the landscape mitigation to meet the objectives laid out in the management plan to integrate and screen proposals, promote conservation and protection of the environment and ecological and habitat diversity is highly dependent upon the successful management and maintenance of the new planting, as well as protection of exiting trees and hedgerows. The maintenance operations provide an initial overview of operations; however we would expect the management plan be developed further and also last well beyond the initial 5 year period, particularly if landscape and visual effects are being assessed at 15 years: the reduction in landscape and visual effects presented in the LVIA are based on the success of landscape mitigation. Similarly, any early planting should be secured and implemented at the earliest opportunity as effects are also reduced in the LVIA based upon the assumption these are in place and have established as planned.

			<p>Prior to any construction activities, all tree and hedgerow protection methods associated with that phase of construction should also be clarified and subsequently agreed with the appropriate authority. This would be to BS:5837 Trees in Relation to Construction and any subsequent arboricultural method statements, again which should be approved by the appropriate discharging authority. In particular this should ensure existing trees, and associated root protection areas, are suitable protected throughout the entire construction period. This would likely include areas within the order limits but away from construction activity as storage of materials or tracking over of plant will likely damage tree root protection areas.</p> <p>Skills, Supply and Employment Plan</p> <p>Skills Opportunities</p> <p>Opportunity 1 – request details as how the apprenticeship programme is to be delivered and would expect details of the sorts of standards offered. This does feel light on information.</p> <p>Opportunity 2 –. Similar to the above would expect something definite about offering vocational qualifications.</p> <p>Opportunity 1: Apprenticeships Apprenticeships can help fulfil labour and skills requirements for employers in a cost-effective way, while also providing paid employment, training, and potential pathways into employment for apprentices.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Apprenticeship providers in the area include: • Gainsborough College • Lincoln Art College • Lincoln College • Lincoln University Technical College • Ridgeway College • Riseholme College • University of Lincoln</p> <p>Why referencing initial engagement with Boston College when there are more accessible Apprenticeship Providers in the area. Boston College isn't included in the list of Apprenticeship Providers!</p> <p>The information on Opportunities 3 and 4 is much stronger than for Opportunities 1 and 2. Request more information in regard to the areas covered by opportunities 3 and 4. Also needs to be a social value element such as providing volunteer hours for a local community project or work experience for specific cohorts.</p> <p>Finally, on Opportunity 4, Local recruitment, would expect some sort of Sector Based Work Academy to be included, ie working with JCP, a training programme linked to a definite job opportunity, for the benefit of the local community.</p> <p>Construction Traffic Management Plans</p> <p>Document APP-212 is Traffic Regulation Measures Plans.</p> <p>These are acceptable in principle, subject to Streetworks and Permitting approval at implementation stage.</p> <p>Soli Management Plan</p> <p>On balance content with planned implementation and the overall strategy. The comments and corrections seem only to reflect those made by Natural England, but</p>
--	--	--	--

			nevertheless the proposal is comprehensive and should meet the needs, particularly during construction of the site and when working on the cable route.
Q1.1.22	Local Planning Authorities	<p>Working hours outside regular working hours</p> <p>Are the Local Planning Authority(ies) (LPAs) satisfied with the Applicant's approach to securing working hours outside of the regular working hours in the fCEMP?</p>	The County Council does not wish to raise any issue with this approach.
Q1.1.25	Local Planning Authorities	<p>Cumulative effects assessment</p> <p>Do the LPAs agree with the developments identified in the cumulative assessments within each aspect chapter? If not, identify any additional developments which should have been included and explain why they should be included?</p>	The Council agrees with those developments and does not have any further comment to make in this respect.
Q1.2.3	West Lindsay District Council, Bassetlaw District Council, Lincolnshire County Council Nottinghamshire County Council	<p>Construction Road Traffic Emissions</p> <p>Are the relevant Local Authorities satisfied that construction phase traffic emissions have been scoped out of the Air Quality Assessment (see paragraph 15.3.31 ES Chapter 15 (Other Environmental topics) [APP-024])?</p>	From a highways viewpoint at LCC don't consider emissions so can accept that this has been scoped out.
Q1.2.4	West Lindsay District Council, Bassetlaw District Council, Lincolnshire County Council, Nottinghamshire	<p>fCEMP Mitigation measures</p> <p>Are the relevant Local Authorities and Statutory Bodies content that the mitigation measures identified in the fCEMP are sufficient to address any potential air quality effect and are sufficiently secured through the DCO? And are sufficient to address any dust effects on Ancient Woodland?</p>	No comment

	County Council, Natural England, Environment Agency		
Q1.4.1	West Lindsay District Council, Bassetlaw District Council, Lincolnshire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council	Local Plan Policies Are the Local Plan policies identified in table 6-1 of ES Chapter 6 (Climate Change) [APP-015] up to date and relevant and have there been any updates or changes (in particular with regard to draft policies) that the relevant Local Authorities would wish to draw attention to?	No comment.
Q1.6.16	Applicant, Lincolnshire County Council , Nottinghamshire County Council	dDCO - Article 9 - Power to alter layout etc of streets Article 9 (2) allows for the undertaker to alter the layout of any street. Can the Applicant confirm why such a wide power is necessary and whether additional schedules cannot be used to identify the traffic routes or streets that may be affected. Can the relevant Highway Authorities comment on the breadth of this power and whether it raises any issues for them.	This part appears to remove the obligation to enter a Section 278 Agreement under the Highways Act 1980, for any temporary or permanent highway works, which is not acceptable to the Local Highway Authority(LHA). There is insufficient information and detail within this application that would allow the LHA to accept highway works without further detail, under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980. A provision must be included within the dDCO to ensure the applicant submits an application under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 to allow the LHA to technically review the detail and inspect the highway works throughout. Furthermore, the LHA must have the ability to require remedial works where necessary and charge a fee to cover the associated costs of the applications This should not be permitted by the DCO. Works in the highway need to follow S278 and Street Works and Permitting procedures.
Q1.6.36	West Lindsey District Council, Basset law District Council, Lincolnshire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Historic England	dDCO – Schedule 2 Requirements Can the relevant Local Authorities and Historic England (HE) confirm they are satisfied with Requirement 11 and that it safeguards archaeological interests.	The wording currently is: <i>‘The authorised development must be implemented in accordance with the archaeological mitigation strategy.’</i> Recommend it include <i>‘as agreed with Lincolnshire County Council and Historic England.’</i>

Q1.7.1	West Lindsey District Council, Bassetlaw District Council, Lincolnshire County Council , Nottinghamshire County Council, Historic England	<p>Heritage Assets</p> <p>Are the relevant Local Authorities and HE satisfied that the Applicant has identified all relevant designated and non-designated heritage assets including any archaeological interest?</p>	Yes
Q1.7.2	West Lindsey District Council, Bassetlaw District Council, Lincolnshire County Council , Nottinghamshire County Council, Historic England	<p>Archaeological surveys</p> <p>Are the relevant local authorities and HE satisfied that the Archaeological surveys are sufficient and that any identified gaps due to restricted access etc are sufficiently explained or justified. (eg paragraph 3.6.3 Appendix 7-A in Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment [APP-117]) ?</p>	Yes
Q1.7.3	West Lindsey District Council, Bassetlaw District Council, Lincolnshire County Council , Nottinghamshire County Council, Historic England	<p>Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS)</p> <p>Can the relevant Local Authority and HE confirm whether the AMS part 1 [APP-227] and Part 2 fully secure the appropriate mitigation required to address the impacts of the Propose Development?</p>	Yes
Q1.7.4	West Lindsey District Council, Bassetlaw District Council, Lincolnshire County Council,	<p>Roles and responsibilities and implementation of AMS</p> <p>Are the relevant Local Authorities and HE satisfied that the dDCO and AMS sets out sufficient controls in respect of overseeing the monitoring and mitigation of the archaeological impact including</p>	The Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (EN010131/APP/7.6) both Parts 1 and 2 section 1.5.2 Roles and Responsibilities states that <i>'The Applicant will appoint an Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW) for the Scheme. The ACoW will be responsible for ensuring mitigation measures are correctly implemented, monitored and maintained during the construction phase of the works.'</i>

	Nottinghamshire County Council, Historic England	the Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW) and the approval/ decision making processes?	<p>The Archaeological Clerk of Works will undertake those tasks and those of approval and sign-off (section 4.6) on behalf of their client.</p> <p>It should be made clear that it is the relevant local authority Lincolnshire County Council's Archaeological Advisors who have responsibility for ensuring that the requirements of the Development Consent Order are met in accordance with its archaeological condition. This includes ensuring that works are undertaken in accordance with the agreed mitigation strategy including implementation, monitoring of compliance and standards, approval and sign-off.</p> <p>While the roles of Lincolnshire County Council's Archaeological Advisors are included in sections 4.3 Stakeholders and Statutory Roles and 4.6 Approvals and Sign-Off of Archaeological Mitigation Sites, the role of the Archaeological Advisors needs updating particularly in the Roles and Responsibilities section 1.5 in the AMS Parts 1 and 2 to make role of the local authority clearly defined and that the Archaeological Advisors' responsibilities are defined as above and in relation to the Development Consent Order requirements regarding the Archaeological Condition.</p>
Q1.7.5	West Lindsey District Council, Bassetlaw District Council, Lincolnshire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Historic England	<p>Variations to scheme design in the AMS</p> <p>Paragraph 7.7.1 of the AMS [APP-227] sets out a procedure for addressing changes to the scheme design. However, this does not make it clear the process for and authority to agree or approve such changes. <i>"The review will identify any changes to previously identified impacts and will identify the requirement for an appropriate mitigation response in consultation with the Archaeological Advisor to the relevant Local Planning Authority. The Archaeological Mitigation Strategy will be updated and submitted to the Archaeological Advisor to the relevant Local Planning Authority."</i></p> <p>Can the relevant Local Authority confirm that they are content that this suitably safeguards any effects</p>	Yes

		that may arise from potential changes to the scheme design?	
	West Lindsey District Council, Basset law District Council, Lincolnshire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, UK Health Security Agency, Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust	EMF Are the relevant Local Authorities and Health Authorities satisfied that the Applicant suggests EMF impacts have been scoped out given the justification at paragraph 14.8.2 of the ES? If not please explain the basis of your concerns?	Yes
Q1.9.3	Applicant, West Lindsey District Council, Basset law District Council, Lincolnshire County Council , Nottinghamshire County Council.	Design principles The National Infrastructure Strategy (November 2020) states that: <i>“All infrastructure projects to have a board level Design Champion in place by the end of 2021 at either the project, programme or organisational level, supported ... by design panels”.</i> 1)Comment on the desirability of implementing the following measures to ensure that good quality sustainable design and integration of the proposed development, particularly the solar panels, BESS and substations, into the landscape is achieved in the detailed	1. We would support the measures outlined. It is important at the detailed design stages that the design principles utilised within the application, particularly in regards to the layout and appearance, mitigation areas and planting, are carried through into the next stage and not lost or diluted. Any significant deviations from the design information utilised, such as landscape mitigation or location of large elements such as sub stations, may bring about more adverse, and potentially significant, effects that currently assessed, particularly in regards to landscape and visual matters. An approved Design Code/Guide would assist with this, which would be guided by a Design Champion or panel who may be able to act in an “intelligent customer” function or as an “intelligent client”. For example, while the submission includes landscape proposals (Figure 10-23 Outline Landscape Masterplan – 6 sheets), these are of a high level and would expect much more detailed plans to be submitted at the detailed design stage to satisfy requirements. This would include the types of planting (species), as well as number, density and specification of

design, construction and operation of the projects.

- A Design Champion to advise on the quality of sustainable design and the spatial integration of energy infrastructure structures, buildings, compounds, security fences, landscape, heritage, woodland, new landscape features, public rights of way and visual amenity.
- A 'design review panel' to provide informed 'critical-friend' comment on the developing sustainable design proposals;
- An approved 'design code', 'design guide' or 'design approach document' (as approved in the Hinkley Point C Connector Project) to set out the approach to delivering the detailed design specifications to achieve good quality sustainable design;
- An outline, including timeline, of the proposed design process, including consultation with stakeholders and a list of proposed consultees.

2) What qualifications and experience should the Design Champion have?

3) How might the above measures be secured? and:

4) Are any further measures needed? and

planting. The types and areas of planting would be initially indicated within an approved design code or guide, and the champion or panel would be able to guide the detailed implementation of this through to detailed design information.

2. A multi-skilled professional that is able to play a significant role in the design of new infrastructure projects would be appropriate for a Design Champion, ideally with experience in solar, particularly at a large scale. The role needs to have an overarching view, combining and integrating different disciplines to ensure multi-functional spaces (e.g. greenspace that resolves landscape/visual, ecological and drainage matters) and not be too focussed on specific technical matters of solar equipment. They should understand the context to good design and place making and be a resource for the design team.

4. Once detailed designs have been developed, they may be endorsed by the Design Champion or Design Panel and subsequently agreed and approved with the relevant authorities in regards to suitability and adherence to the Design Guide.


5. This would assist in the process, and ensure a joined-up and consistent approach across multiple authority boundaries.

LCC Highways do not see this as a real benefit, each Authority has different S278 processes. Proposals for highways will usually be to national DMRB standards, so no need to create new design principles for highways.

		5)In the opinion of the Local Authorities and other statutory parties, would the implementation of any or all of the above measures assist in determining post-consent approvals (including the discharge of requirements) in relation to achieving good design?	
Q1.9.10	Lincolnshire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council	<p>Residential Visual Amenity assessment: Can Lincolnshire County Council confirm that it agree that the Residential Visual Amenity Threshold (RVAT) was not reached and therefore a RVAA was not necessary to carry out as stated at 10.6.28 of the Landscape and Visual Amenity Chapter of the ES [APP-019]. Can Nottinghamshire County Council confirm whether they agree with this position.</p>	<p>RVAA and RVAT are summarised in paragraphs 10.6.23 to 10.6.28 of the LVIA. The process of assessing views from residential properties has been carried out, as evidenced within Appendix 10-G: Residential Visual Amenity Survey. The Residential Visual Amenity Survey has been carried out to determine potential significant visual effects on residents, which identified that following mitigation, the likelihood of significant adverse effects at Year 15 of operation on residents were not identified. As such the RVAT was not reached and therefore a RVAA has not been carried out.</p> <p>We are in agreement with this approach and the process has ensured views from residential properties have been considered, particularly those identified as having the potential to experience ‘Overwhelming’ visual effects. This has fed back into the layouts and mitigation proposals to reduce adverse visual effects, such as by increasing offsets to development and/or additional mitigation planting.</p>
Q1.9.11	Lincolnshire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council	<p>Zone of theoretical visibility and viewpoints. Can Lincolnshire County Council and Nottinghamshire County Council confirm that they are satisfied with the ZTV work and conclusions and that they are satisfied with the identification of viewpoints that have been assessed including the additional viewpoints LCC01-LCC10 referred to in the ES.</p>	<p>The process of modelling Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTVs) is presented within section 10.9 of Appendix 10-B. However, it is not explicit in the methodology to what parameters the proposals have been modelled to. Section 10.4.4 of the LVIA chapter identifies that photomontages have been presented to the maximum allowed parameter heights, therefore it has been assumed that the ZTV is generated upon the maximum parameters provided within Chapter 2: The Scheme, Document Reference: EN010131/APP/3.1, as this would provide a ‘worst case’ ZTV, however this needs to be clarified.</p> <p>Following fieldwork, utilising the information presented within the ZTVs: <i>“Visual receptors likely to experience views of the construction, operation or decommissioning of the Scheme were identified through interrogation of the ZTVs and fieldwork”</i>. Viewpoints were subsequently selected to represent views from these receptors. The selection of viewpoints formed part of the pre-application consultation and includes locations recommended as part of this process.</p>

			<p>Table 10-5 clearly lays out the identified receptor groups (e.g. residents) and subsequent associated representative viewpoints. Table 10-6 then goes on to clearly summarise the value of the view, susceptibility to change, and resultant sensitivity of each receptor and subsequently each representative viewpoint.</p> <p>Viewpoints representative of the identified visual receptors are identified. These were discussed and agreed upon through consultation. The baseline process resulted in identifying 38 viewpoints, including cumulative viewpoints, to represent the views of the visual receptors. Figures 10-16 to 10-18 illustrate these views.</p> <p>The following viewpoints (presented on Figures 10-16 to 10-18) are recommended to be reviewed as the assessment presented within the LVIA potentially underplays the Magnitude of visual effect, and subsequently Significance of effect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Viewpoint 1: The development is a prominent part of the view, and while mitigation planting to the right of the view provides screening, panels are conspicuous to the centre of the view. The screening of half the panels is unlikely to drop the magnitude of effect from High (at year 1) to Medium (year 15).• Viewpoint 4: The magnitude of effect is highly dependent upon the establishment of advanced planting. The height of new planting up to 3m seems unlikely with an assumed two to three years growth prior to construction starting or operation year 1.• Viewpoint 10-1: The magnitude of effect is highly dependent upon the establishment of advanced planting. The height of new planting up to 3m seems unlikely with an assumed two to three years growth prior to construction starting or operation year 1.
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Viewpoint 13: The view shows complete vegetation removal along the A156 and introduction of an access into the Development opening up views of the foreground and midground. This is a large change in view from a local rural road. It is unclear as to why effects would reduce after construction.• Viewpoint 16: Development is only visible to peripheries of the image – view would have benefitted from rotating to the right or addition of an extra sheet to illustrate extent of views of Development as it is not clear if these are extensive to the right of view.• Viewpoint 18: The magnitude of effect is highly dependent upon the establishment of advanced planting. The height of new planting up to 3.5m seems unlikely, with an assumed two to three years growth prior to construction starting or operation year 1. Vegetation growth/hedgerow management would screen views of panels, however at year 15 would shorten views which currently are across open landscape.• Viewpoint LCC VP02: The view is closer to the Site than that agreed at the pre-application stage. If the view was further back from the Site, more of the development would be evident through the open boundary, and potentially effects likely be assessed as greater. The Image below is what was presented and discussed at meeting held on 10/11/2022 which would provide a clearer view:
--	--	--	--

			 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viewpoint LCC VP08: The view of the Development would likely be clearer further west along PROW KNAI/44/2. Image of photography was not available at the meeting held with AECOM on 10/11/2022, and therefore was not able to be agreed.
Q1.9.12	Applicant, West Lindsey District Council, Lincolnshire County Council	<p>Assessment of Likely Significant Effects: The assessment includes reference to an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) however has any consideration been given as to whether any part of the Order Lands or study area is or contributes to a 'valued landscape' as a specific area? If so, what conclusions have been reached and why? What are the views of the Relevant LPAs as to whether any of the area constitutes a 'valued landscape'?</p>	<p>The locally designated Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV), within the western section of the Site, has not been identified as a receptor in its own right within the baseline. However, the AGLV within the Site is acknowledged within the LVIA, having been taken into account when defining the value of character areas within the assessment. This is clarified in paragraph of the LVIA, which states: <i>"The effect of the Scheme on the ALGV have been considered in this assessment by taking the designation into account when defining the value of landscape character areas and views of the designated landscape."</i></p> <p><i>Appendix 10-C: Landscape Baseline, and Appendix 10-D: Landscape Assessment</i> do identify that several landscape character areas (e.g. Trent Valley LCA, Gate Burton Estate, and Ancient Woodland Ridge) contain the AGLV, and imply this has been an attributing factor to assessing the value of these landscape receptors. However, the value and susceptibility of the AGLV has not been assessed in its own right and it is unclear how the assessment has judged the value and susceptibility of the AGLV, which the LVIA at paragraph 10.9.15, states as being of medium value and susceptibility, and subsequently medium sensitivity.</p>

			<p>We would expect this local AGLV designation would increase the value and susceptibility of landscape character within these areas, and it is not clear or transparent within the LVIA baseline if this has been fully identified and considered.</p> <p>At a local level, Local Landscape Character Area 01: Gate Burton Estate and LLCA 02 Ancient Woodland Ridge are located within the AGLV and have subsequently been identified as being, respectively, of a high and medium value, susceptibility and sensitivity. This is an acknowledgement of this part of the Site and Study Area contribute to the value of this landscape through increased vegetation cover, structure and condition. These are valued landscapes, and it is evident on Site that these areas have different characteristics and features of value, are more susceptible to change, and subsequently are more sensitive than other areas to the east of the railway line.</p> <p>Sections 10.9.14 and 10.9.15 (Construction), and 10.9.56 and 10.9.57 (Operation) of the LVIA do assess the level of effects on the AGLV which are assessed as minor adverse.</p>
Q1.9.15	Lincolnshire County Council	<p>Cumulative effects Assessment Confirm that LLC are in agreement with the short list of projects that have been included in the cumulative effects assessment for ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-019]?</p>	<p>Yes, the projects listed are appropriate. Schemes that are considered for the cumulative assessment are identified within <i>Chapter 16: Cumulative effects</i>. The identified schemes relevant to potential cumulative Landscape and Visual Amenity effects are identified within Chapter 16, and these are: Cottam Power Station Redevelopment, Tillbridge Solar Project, Cottam Solar Project and West Burton Solar Project. These schemes have been assessed cumulatively with the Development, both individually (with Gate Burton Solar Project) and all together, which is appropriate to understand how the local area may potentially change through the development of large scale solar over an extensive area.</p> <p>The cumulative effects of the Development will bring about significant landscape and visual effects, particularly when assessed alongside the proposed Cottam, West Burton and Tillbridge Solar schemes. The mass and scale of these projects combined would lead to adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity over an extensive area. The</p>

			landscape character of the local, and potentially regional area, may be completely altered, particularly when experienced sequentially while travelling through the landscape.
Q1.9.19	Lincolnshire County Council	<p>Monitoring of mitigation measures in the OLEMP</p> <p>Please confirm that are content with monitoring arrangements of mitigation measures outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) and ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-019]? If not, please explain why.</p>	<p>The maintenance operations provide an initial overview of operations; however, we would expect the management plan be developed further and also last well beyond the initial 5 year period, particularly if landscape and visual effects are being assessed at 15 years: the reduction in landscape and visual effects presented in the LVIA are based on the success of landscape mitigation. Similarly, any early planting should be secured and implemented at the earliest opportunity as effects are also reduced in the LVIA based upon the assumption these are in place and have established as planned.</p> <p>Monitoring of the proposals, as outlined in section 4 of the OLEMP, is a key aspect of the mitigation plan and is something which needs further development to ensure there is robustness to deal with the challenging climatic conditions when it comes to establishing new plantings. The regular updating of the management plan will go some way to ensuring that is kept valid and can respond to issues and trends effectively. The updating every 5 years following the initial establishment period will also ensure that the management plan can adapt to varying conditions.</p> <p>However, the monitoring is only beneficial if the management operations respond to the findings, and the implementation of any recommendations made need to be funded and secured throughout the 60 year period. It is also unclear as to who will be monitoring, and subsequently agreeing the changing management plan and subsequent operations. This would be more suitable if undertaken as an independent role.</p>
Q1.11.1	West Lindsey District Council, Basset law District Council, Lincolnshire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council.	<p>Sensitive Receptors</p> <p>Do the Host Authorities agree with the identified Zones of Influence and the Sensitive Receptors set out in table 11-2 and the locations set out in Figure 11-1 [APP-096] are representative of the nearest Sensitive Receptors?</p>	Yes

Q1.11.2	West Lindsey District Council, Basset law District Council, Lincolnshire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council.	<p>Noise and Vibration Assessment</p> <p>Please state whether the Host Authorities agree with the assessment methodology and conclusions set out in ES Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration [APP-020]).</p> <p>If not please explain where you disagree and why.</p>	No comment
Q1.12.13	Applicant, West Lindsey District Council, Basset law District Council, Lincolnshire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council.	<p>Tourism</p> <p>Although paragraph 12.6.20 of Chapter 12 Socio Economic and Land Use [APP-021] of the ES refers to <i>"Criteria for receptor sensitivity and impact magnitude have been set out below (Table 12-3 and Table 12-4) (although specific sensitivity values are not attributed to socioeconomic receptors as explained above), which have been grouped as follows: economic impacts, local amenities and land use impacts, and tourism impacts."</i> There is little further commentary on the potential effects on tourism.</p> <p>1)Can the Applicant either signpost the assessment of the effect on tourism or provide further evidence with regard to effects on tourism and comment on the Relevant Representations many of which refer to the potential for adverse effects on tourism.</p> <p>2)Can the Host Local Authorities comment on its position in respect of the effects on Tourism?</p>	<p>There is little further commentary on the potential effects on tourism to assess. Other than either individually or combined with other projects that during the construction stage when upto 4 large solar projects are constructed at the same time would undoubtedly discourage people visiting the area due to the increase in numbers of heavy vehicles using narrow country lanes and the appearance and character of the area resembling a large construction site which is potentially going to continue for a number of years.</p> <p>For the operational phase, If the DCO is granted together with the other projects as outlined above the cumulative impacts of all the projects will change the landscape character of the area to an intensive energy production character, this is likely to discourage those who currently visit the area for the qualities this landscape currently offers and consequently will reduce the numbers of visitors who come to this area for recreational purposes.</p>
Q1.13.1	Lincolnshire County Council,	<p>Transport Assessment (TA) methodology conclusions and CTMP and CEMP</p>	<p>Yes, the methodology and conclusions is accepted.</p> <p>Mitigation is accepted in principle. Detail of highway works would need to be via normal S278 technical approval processes.</p>

	Nottinghamshire County Council.	<p>1)Do NCC and LCC as Local Highway Authorities agree with the methodology and conclusions of the TA [APP-166] and as reported in the ES Chapter 13 Transport and access [APP-022]?</p> <p>2)If not ,please identify where issues arise and the reasons.</p> <p>3)Do NCC and LCC agree with the mitigation and output from the CTMP and CEMP will adequately address any residual effects and are they satisfied these are appropriately secured through the dDCO?</p>	
Q1.13.2	Lincolnshire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council.	<p>Abnormal Loads</p> <p>1)Are NCC and LCC as local Highway authorities satisfied with the arrangements for abnormal loads set out in the Framework CTMP [APP-167 & APP-168]?</p> <p>2)If not, please identify where issues arise and the reasons?</p>	<p>In principle, the assessment of the routing of abnormal loads is acceptable.</p> <p>Detailed approval will be needed from Streetworks and Permitting when the implementation is due to occur. Some consideration needs to be given to the cumulative impacts from a number of these solar projects which will all potentially require abnormal loads at a similar time and a mechanism for co-ordination of abnormal loads from this project and the others needs to be identified and put into place.</p>
Q1.13.3	Lincolnshire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council.	<p>Travel Plan</p> <p>Chapter 13 Transport and Access [APP-022] of the ES, paragraph 13.6.68, sets out that no travel plan will be provided for the construction or operational phases.</p> <p>1)Are NCC and LCC satisfied with this conclusion?</p> <p>2)If not, please identify where issues arise and the reasons?</p>	<p>Yes, the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan satisfactorily addresses transport for workers during the construction phase – avoiding peak hours and promoting sustainable modes (bus/ car sharing).</p> <p>Traffic in operational phase will be very minimal and does not need Travel Plan.</p>
Q1.14.7	Lincolnshire County Council	<p>CEMP details of areas of site to be made impermeable.</p>	<p>This requires a full Drainage Strategy and assessment of impermeable areas to ensure surface water flood risk is not worsened.</p>

Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) have stated in its RR that *"More detail would be needed on areas of the site which are proposed to be made impermeable and these could be conditioned using suitably worded requirements. Again, the Draft DCO includes an appropriate requirement (Schedule 2, Condition 10) to address this."*

Could LCC elaborate on what the additional detail that would be required would be and the wording of any suitably worded condition (requirement) that they consider would be necessary?

LCC standard condition wording is:
Highway Condition 33

The permitted development shall be undertaken in accordance with a surface water drainage scheme which shall first have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme shall:

- be based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development;
- provide flood exceedance routing for storm event greater than 1 in 100 year;
- provide details of how run-off will be safely conveyed and attenuated during storms up to and including the 1 in 100 year critical storm event, with an allowance for climate change, from all hard surfaced areas within the development into the existing local drainage infrastructure and watercourse system without exceeding the run-off rate for the undeveloped site;
- provide attenuation details and discharge rates which shall be restricted to XXX litres per second;
- provide details of the timetable for and any phasing of implementation for the drainage scheme; and
- provide details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed over the lifetime of the development, including any arrangements for adoption by any public body or Statutory Undertaker and any other arrangements required to secure the operation of the drainage system throughout its lifetime.

No dwelling/ no part of the development shall be brought into use until the approved scheme has been completed or provided on the site in accordance with the approved phasing. The approved scheme shall be retained and maintained in full, in accordance with the approved details.

			<p>Reason: To ensure that the permitted development is adequately drained without creating or increasing flood risk to land or property adjacent to, or downstream of, or upstream of, the permitted development.</p>
--	--	--	---