

West Burton Solar Project

Consultation Report Appendix 5.12: Section 47 Applicant Response

Prepared by: Counter Context
March 2023

PINS reference: EN010132
Document reference: APP/WB5.12
APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)



Contents

1	<u>APPLICANT RESPONSE IN REGARD TO SECTION 47 CONSULTATION FEEDBACK</u>	2
2	<u>TABLE 5.12.1: FEEDBACK RECEIVED TO QUESTION 3B: PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY YOU THINK THIS [LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR THE SCHEME].</u>	1
3	<u>TABLE 5.12.2: FEEDBACK RECEIVED TO QUESTION 4B: WHY DO YOU THINK THESE THINGS [ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES] ARE MOST IMPORTANT?</u>	72
4	<u>TABLE 5.12.3: FEEDBACK RECEIVED TO QUESTION 5B: PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON THE SITE DESIGN FOR THESE AREAS</u>	167
5	<u>TABLE 5.12.4: FEEDBACK RECEIVED TO QUESTION 6: PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON THE REFINED CABLE ROUTES.</u>	295
6	<u>TABLE 5.12.5: FEEDBACK RECEIVED TO QUESTION 7: WE HAVE PRESENTED PROPOSALS IN THE PEIR FOR MITIGATING IMPACTS ON THE LOCAL ECOLOGY AND DELIVERING BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ON THESE PROPOSALS OR DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING ELSE YOU WOULD LIKE US TO CONSIDER?</u>	412
7	<u>TABLE 5.12.6: FEEDBACK RECEIVED TO QUESTION 8: IN THE PEIR WE HAVE SHOWN PHOTOGRAPHS LOOKING TOWARDS THE SITES TAKEN FROM PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE VIEWPOINTS. PLEASE SHARE WITH US SUGGESTIONS YOU HAVE ON YOUR PREFERRED LANDSCAPING MEASURES, INCLUDING FOR EXAMPLE THE POSITIONING OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE AND LOCATION OF TREE PLANTING. PLEASE INDICATE WHICH SITE YOUR COMMENTS REFER TO.</u>	456
8	<u>TABLE 5.12.7: FEEDBACK RECEIVED TO QUESTION 9: DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ON OUR TRAFFIC ACCESS ROUTES AND THE PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES IN THE PEIR BEING CONSIDERED WHEN PREPARING FOR THE CONSTRUCTION PHASE OF THE PROJECTS?</u>	516
9	<u>TABLE 5.12.8: FEEDBACK RECEIVED TO QUESTION 10.C: DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER COMMENTS ON OUR PROPOSED COMMUNITY BENEFIT OPPORTUNITIES OR ANY SUGGESTIONS YOU WOULD LIKE US TO CONSIDER FURTHER?</u>	557
10	<u>TABLE 5.12.9: FEEDBACK RECEIVED TO QUESTION 13: DO YOU HAVE ANY FURTHER COMMENTS ON OUR PHASE TWO CONSULTATION FOR THE COTTAM AND WEST BURTON SOLAR PROJECTS?</u>	625
11	<u>TABLE 5.12.10: FEEDBACK RECEIVED DURING PHASE TWO CONSULTATION EXTENSION DUE TO AVAILABILITY OF UPDATED AGRICULTURAL LAND CLASSIFICATION DATA PERTAINING TO WEST BURTON 4</u>	679
12	<u>TABLE 5.12.11: SECTION 47 FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM NOTABLE ORGANISATIONS.</u>	686
13	<u>TABLE 5.12.12: SECTION 47 FEEDBACK TO TARGETED CONSULTATION ON UPDATED PROPOSALS FOR THE WEST BURTON 3 SITE AREA.</u>	709

1 Applicant response in regard to Section 47 consultation feedback

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This Appendix presents written feedback responses received by the Applicant to consultation carried out under Section 47 of the Planning Act 2008.
- 1.1.2 It also sets out how the Applicant has had regard to these responses in accordance with their duty under Section 49 of the Planning Act 2008 to take account of responses received to consultation under Section 47 of the Planning Act 2008.
- 1.1.3 For completeness and ease of reference, the feedback is categorised in line with the open questions published in the Applicant's phase two consultation feedback form.
- 1.1.4 Where an open answer was linked to a closed question, responses may have been grouped by sub-theme of the closed question response.
- 1.1.5 The following tables present the Applicant's response to the feedback received, including how comments have informed the Scheme or the evidence provided in the Applicant's DCO application.

2 **Table 5.12.1: Feedback received to Question 3b: Please explain why you think this [Level of support for the Scheme].**

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Topic area: Strongly support the solar proposals			
FFCAWB0206025 FFCAWB0202030 FFCAWB0202007 FFCAWB0201022 FFCAWB0201011	Respondents expressed their belief that progression towards renewable energy sources is the way forward.	N/A	Noted.
FFCAWB0203014 FFCAWB0206025 FFCAWB0202016 FFCAWB0201021	Respondents expressed belief that the project will help in combatting the climate crisis/climate change/global warming.	N/A	Noted.
FFCAWB0206025	Both sites are already used for power production and can be utilised with less disruption than using entirely new sites. The visual impact of solar panels is less than the existing cooling towers and associated buildings.	N/A	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0203004	There is no alternative to clean energy on a large scale such as solar panels. Obviously in mountainous locations, hydro-powered stations using water also provide clean energy. On flat locations such as Lincolnshire, this appears to be the best alternative. Also, a wish to see areas where the panels are located being used for other innovative projects.	N/A	Noted.
FFCAWB0202021	Belief that clean energy is the way forward and that [the Applicant] will respect everyone's needs.	N/A	Noted.
FFCAWB0202009	A belief that with the energy crisis that we now have in this country, it is vital that renewable energy projects go ahead as fast as possible and are not the delayed by minor issues.	N/A	Noted.
FFCAWB0201032	It cuts down harmful emissions.	N/A	Noted.
FFCAWB0201024	Clean, green, renewable energy. Excellent proposal which has full support.	N/A	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0201003	Belief that it's great to do what the Chinese would, get on and build.	N/A	Noted.
Topic area: Support the solar proposals			
FFCAWB0202027	It will produce cheaper electricity.	N/A	Noted.
FFCAWB0202027 FFCAWB0202031 FFCAWB0202026 FFCAWB0202020 FFCAWB0202013 FFCAWB0201028 FFCAWB0201012 FFCAWB0202038	Respondents expressed belief in the need to move towards greener energy sources and away from emissions-based sources. Solar power is needed due to limited resources, pollution and a need for constant energy.	N/A	Noted.
FFCAWB0205001 FFCAWB0204007 FFCAWB0202029	Respondents expressed concern towards wind power and its drawbacks whilst also considering solar power as a preferable alternative.	N/A	Noted.
FFCAWB0205001	As a country we need more diverse renewable energy production- wind turbines are an eye-sore and noisy. Solar	N/A	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>should be quiet, with the exception of battery storage and the substation. We would suggest that this infrastructure is placed well away from residential properties.</p>		
<p>FFCAWB0204005 FFCAWB0202026</p>	<p>Respondents indicated that while they supported the proposals overall, they had reservations regarding land use and perceived impacts to food security and comments on the scale of the Scheme.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes these comments and that further relevant information has been provided through the DCO application. For example, the Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] explains the reasons for the Scheme being large scale solar generation. It is not considered that small scale generation is an alternative to this, rather it complements it. The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1].</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme. Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resources & Farming Circumstances) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.19.1]. The vast majority of the Scheme is located on lower quality agricultural land with only 26.24% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land). See Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] which sets out the design evolution of the Scheme. This includes justification for removal of certain fields from</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			the Scheme and retention of other limited areas of BMV.
FFCAWB0202013	Concern that large areas of solar panels will cause loss of habitat for our birds and other wildlife.	Yes	Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] considers the potential impacts and mitigations regarding the Scheme and birds and wildlife. The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%. The

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The landscape measures also include the preparation of a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives.</p>
FFCAWB0202012	Cannot think of an acceptable alternative but would like assurance on several issues.	N/A	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0201028	Already have the energy distribution infrastructure in this area and should de-commission the West Burton power plant.	N/A	Noted.
FFCAWB0201012	Respondent's home is a bungalow with a large roof and thinks local government should enquire if tenants would have solar panels fitted.	N/A	Noted.
Topic area: Neither supportive or unsupportive			
FFCAWB0203012	Respondent stated they understand the need for a reduction in fossil fuels and use of alternative sources.	N/A	Noted.
FFCAWB0206005	Concern about the density of proposed solar farms in this area. The Scheme and Cottam Solar Project are not standalone projects. In the middle of this area is the proposed Gate Burton Energy Park. There is now another organisation coming forward with the Tillbridge solar park.	No	The Applicant is cognisant of other projects being proposed in the area and has undertaken assessments to consider the potential cumulative effect of this. Cumulative impacts of the Scheme have been addressed as a whole within the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.1 – WB6.2.21] . Each

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>topic chapter considers the impacts of Scheme; and the impact of the Scheme in conjunction with other large scale solar proposals and other committed developments within the County. The Applicant has engaged with developers cooperatively to explore opportunities to reduce potential cumulative impacts. Consultation activities between the Scheme, Cottam Solar Project, and Gate Burton Energy Park were coordinated to reduce risks of consultation confusion and fatigue.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0202010 FFCAWB0201033 FFCAWB0206005 FFCAWB0202017</p>	<p>Respondents commented the Scheme's use of agricultural land.</p> <p>Concern was expressed regarding quality and scale of land to be used and the potential effect on food supply and prices.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes these comments and that further relevant information has been provided through the DCO application. For example, the Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] explains the reasons for the Scheme being large scale solar generation. It is not considered that small scale generation is an alternative to this, rather it complements it.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme. Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resources & Farming Circumstances) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.19.1]. The vast majority of the Scheme is located on lower quality agricultural land with only 26.24% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land). See Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] which sets out the design evolution of the Scheme. This includes justification for removal of certain fields from the Scheme and retention of other limited areas of BMV. The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality. In addition, some agricultural land may be retained during</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			the operational phase, such as with pasture grazed by sheep, for example.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0204002	Respondent commented that the local environment will suffer negatively from the visual impact of solar panels.	Yes	<p>Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] considers the potential impacts and mitigations regarding the Scheme and birds and wildlife. The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%. The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8]. The landscape measures also include the preparation of a Landscape and Environmental Management</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Plan (LEMP) which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives.</p>
FFCAWB0203012	<p>Scepticism of the figure of 'up to 324,000 UK homes' being powered by the Scheme.</p>	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes that the figure of 324,000 homes, as quoted by the respondent, was communicated during the pre-application phase to provide context to the capacity of the grid connections agreed between the Applicant and National Grid for both the Scheme and Cottam Solar Project. The Applicant notes that the actual number of homes powered by the Scheme will be determined by final technology, design, and household consumption. A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, setting out context, requirement and</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.
FFCAWB0202017	The alternative you [the Applicant] have made to placement of items and boundaries are understood and appreciated	N/A	Noted.
FFCAWB0202005	The project is at an early stage and lacks adequate information.	N/A	The Applicant acknowledges this comment but remains confident in the level of consultation undertaken and information presented throughout the pre-application stage, as described in the Consultation Report [EN010132/APP/WB5.1] . For example, as part of the six-week phase two consultation on the Scheme, the Applicant presented consultees with as detailed information as possible by publishing a PEIR. A non-technical summary was published to accompany the PEIR, with public information events and free-to-use communications channels open to help aid accessibility and understanding of the Scheme.
FFCAWB0201033	As time moves on so does the technology developing new ideas for generating	N/A	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	electricity. It is the only "saving grace" as far as the respondent is concerned.		
Topic area: Do not support the solar proposals			
FFCAWB0206052 FFCAWB0203005 FFCAWB0201034 FFCAWB0202011 FFCAWB0201013	Respondents expressed concern regarding the scale of the Scheme and other developments in the vicinity. Some respondents expressed scepticism regarding the efficiency of solar technology in the UK.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes these comments and that further relevant information has been provided through the DCO application. For example, the Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] explains the reasons for the Scheme being large scale solar generation and sets out the context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply. It is not considered that small scale generation is an alternative to this, rather it complements it.</p> <p>The Applicant is cognisant of other projects being proposed in the area and has undertaken assessments to consider the potential cumulative effect of this. Cumulative impacts of the Scheme have been addressed as a whole within the Environmental Statement</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.2.1 – WB6.2.21]. Each topic chapter considers the impacts of Scheme; and the impact of the Scheme in conjunction with other large scale solar proposals and other committed developments within the region.</p> <p>Regarding efficiency, the Applicant notes that single-axis tracking technology may be used as part of the Scheme. The axis will be oriented North-South, with modules rotating East-West tracking with backtracking strategy for tracking arrays: when the mutual shadings begin, the tracking angle does not follow the sun anymore, but it instead goes back (decreases) so that no shading occurs. Generally, a solar panel system with a single-axis solar tracker installed sees a performance gain of anywhere between 10 to 30 percent compared to a fixed mounting system.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206052 FFCAWB0203024 FFCAWB0202008 FFCAWB0203003 FFCAWB0203024 FFCAWB0201031 FFCAWB0201016 FFCAWB0201013 FFCAWB0201008 FFCAWB0203024 FFCAWB0202011	<p>Respondents expressed concern regarding a loss of arable land, and commented on the increasing importance of food security due to world events. Comments raised that the Scheme should use existing industrial land. Comments raised regarding the siting of solar panels in Lincolnshire despite the power stations being in Nottinghamshire.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and appreciates the importance of agricultural land.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Resources & Farming Circumstances) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.19.1].</p> <p>The vast majority of the Scheme is located on lower quality agricultural land with only 26.24% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land). The Applicant notes that The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality. Agricultural land may also be retained during the operational phase, such as pasture grazed by sheep, for example.</p>
<p>FFCAWB0203003 FFCAWB0203005 FFCAWB0201013</p>	<p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the use of local roads considered to be unsuitable and subsequently causing increases in traffic.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and has presented relevant assessment and mitigation in Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.14].</p> <p>The Construction Traffic Management Plan, provided as Appendix 14.2 [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2] considers road</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>users' safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the development. The Applicant notes that mitigation measures are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) the Construction Traffic Management Plan, and the Public Rights of Way Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.3 [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.3].</p>
FFCAWB0203003 FFCAWB0202011	Too close to existing properties, villages and settlements.	Yes	<p>The Applicant has assessed the visual impact upon neighbouring properties as part of the Environmental Statement, Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p>
FFCAWB0203003 FFCAWB0201013	Respondents expressed anticipation of a loss of value to nearby properties.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and acknowledges this as a concern for neighbouring residents. Throughout the pre-application stage the Applicant has sought to assess potential effects to neighbouring properties and consult with local residents. The results of these assessments, along with proposed mitigations, are presented in the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2].</p> <p>The Applicant is confident that there is no empirical evidence to suggest that solar farms adversely affect nearby property values.</p>
<p>FFCAWB0203003 FFCAWB0202011</p>	<p>Respondents expressed health concerns resulting from the Scheme, including in regard to battery technology.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 21 (Other Environmental Matters) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.21] assesses the impacts of the Scheme upon human health and also considers major accidents and disasters.</p> <p>The outline battery storage safety management plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.9] sets out firefighting and safety measures in the event of a fire or explosion. This has been informed through consultation with the local Fire and Rescue authority.</p>
<p>FFCAWB0203024</p>	<p>Respondent supports affordable solar projects.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0202011 FFCAWB0201034	Respondents expressed concern that the project would create an eyesore.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, such as presented in Section 8.6 and Table 8.22 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], takes embedded mitigation into account to include the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Panels to be set a minimum of 3m from Site boundaries. - Panels to be set minimum of 20m from major watercourses and minimum of 8m from minor watercourses. - Panels to be set 50m (min) from boundary curtilage to outer edge of solar panel. - Site boundary fencing to be set back 5m from adjacent existing hedgerows to allow for proposed thickening and growth. - Let existing hedges grow out and managed at 5m.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encourage hedgerow trees to grow out within existing hedges to add further thickening and growth within the field boundaries. <p>Additional secondary mitigation has also been designed into the Scheme, consisting of new planting proposals, details of which can be found on Figures 8.18.1-8.18.3 [EN010132/APP/WB6.4.8.18.1 – WB6.4.8.18.3] and is further described within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010132/APP/WB7.3]</p>
FFCAWB0202003	<p>Respondent feels they do not have enough information.</p> <p>They state that it is not clear which homes will benefit from the energy and how does this compare to the number of homes that won't benefit.</p>	No	<p>The Applicant is confident that the information presented during the statutory phase of consultation provided sufficient detail to consultees.</p> <p>As set out in The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017), “preliminary environmental information” means information which is</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>reasonably required for the consultation bodies to develop an informed view of the likely significant environmental effects of the development (and of any associated development). The Applicant is confident the PEIR delivered on this commitment.</p> <p>The Applicant remains confident in the level of consultation undertaken and information presented throughout the pre-application stage, as described in the Consultation Report [EN010132/APP/WB5.1]. For example, as part of the six-week phase two consultation on the Scheme, the Applicant presented consultees with as detailed information as possible by publishing a PEIR. A non-technical summary was published to accompany the PEIR, with public information events and free-to-use communications channels open to help aid accessibility and understanding of the Scheme.</p>
FFCAWB0201034	Respondent wants engagement but also adjustment on your proposal.	N/A	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0201013	There will be damage to wildlife.	N/A	<p>Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] considers the potential impacts and mitigations regarding the Scheme and birds and wildlife. The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme.</p> <p>The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%. The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The landscape measures also include the preparation of a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives.</p>
FFCAWB0201013	<p>Concern of dependence on Chinese equipment to provide panels.</p>	Yes	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Applicant is seeking opportunities to develop the local skill base through practicable means during the construction and operational phase of development. Opportunities to support skill training in locally-based companies, and construction-based apprenticeships or educational opportunities have been explored in the Skills and Supply Chain Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.10].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Topic area: Strongly oppose the solar proposals			
FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0204010 FFCAWB0206055 FFCAWB0206019 FFCAWB0205019 FFCAWB0202037 FFCAWB0206040 FFCAWB0206032 FFCAWB0206031 FFCAWB0206030 FFCAWB0206042 FFCAWB0206029 FFCAWB0206023 FFCAWB0203025 FFCAWB0203017 FFCAWB0203016 FFCAWB0202042 FFCAWB0202040 FFCAWB0203010 FFCAWB0202023	<p>Land use and quality of agricultural land</p> <p>A significant number of respondents expressed concern regarding a perceived loss of high-value agricultural land, considered inappropriate to use for a solar farm.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this feedback and appreciates the importance of agricultural land.</p> <p>Impacts upon agricultural land have been assessed within Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19], which includes detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites.</p> <p>The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land from the Scheme. Table 5.6-5.9 of Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] details the design evolution that has led to the majority of BMV land being removed from the Scheme. The finalised Scheme contains only 26.24% Best and Most Versatile land and clear justification</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0202006 FFCAWB0201029 FFCAWB0206057 FFCAWB0206021 FFCAWB0206041 FFCAWB0206048 FFCAWB0206033 FFCAWB0206034 FFCAWB0205020 FFCAWB0205013 FFCAWB0205008 FFCAWB0204011 FFCAWB0203020 FFCAWB0202041 FFCAWB0202039 FFCAWB0205016 FFCAWB0206049 FFCAWB0206016 FFCAWB0206015 FFCAWB0206013 FFCAWB0206009 FFCAWB0205018			<p>for why these small areas remain within the Scheme is set out in Tables 5.6 - 5.9 of Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that the Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality, and that some agricultural land could be retained during the operational phase, for example pasture grazed by sheep.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0205006 FFCAWB0204009 FFCAWB0203008 FFCAWB0202025 FFCAWB0202002 FFCAWB0201023 FFCAWB0201009 FFCAWB0201007 FFCAWB0206012 FFCAWB0206050 FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0206038 FFCAWB0201002 FFCAWB0205011 FFCAWB0205009 FFCAWB0205010 FFCAWB0204012 FFCAWB0202014 FFCAWB0201018 FFCAWB0202022 FFCAWB0203006 FFCAWB0206017			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206010 FFCAWB0202037 FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0203019 FFCAWB0206063 FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056			
FFCAWB0206020 FFCAWB0206029 FFCAWB0202033 FFCAWB0205016 FFCAWB0202025 FFCAWB0206047 FFCAWB0201007 FFCAWB0205011 FFCAWB0205009 FFCAWB0203002 FFCAWB0202023 FFCAWB0206012 FFCAWB0201030 FFCAWB0201035	<p>Food security</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern regarding potential impacts to national food security as result of the Scheme being sited on agricultural land. External pressures on food security and prices, such as the ongoing war in Ukraine, were cited. A number of respondents expressed a preference for agricultural land to be utilised for food production over energy generation.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant has undertaken detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites, as presented in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19].</p> <p>The Scheme has been amended on the basis of the detailed reports to ensure that the vast majority of the Scheme is located on lower quality agricultural land with only 26.24% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land).</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0201015 FFCAWB0201010 FFCAWB0204003 FFCAWB0201001 FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0203016 FFCAWB0205012 FFCAWB0205005 FFCAWB0206003 FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206037 FFCAWB0205013 FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0203017 FFCAWB0203022			<p>Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] states at paragraphs 19.5.2- 3 (in respect of food security):</p> <p><i>"It should be noted that the above Lincolnshire County Council consultation response is incorrect when it states that "... all arable land of whatever agricultural classification produces food, whether for animal feed or human consumption..." Arable land can be and is used for growing energy crops. Examples include fuel crops such as biodiesel and miscanthus grass, and energy substrate crops such as maize for anaerobic digestion, or grain for ethanol manufacture. There are no food security or planning policy constraints on growing these energy crops on arable land, just as there are no food security policy constraints on the use of agricultural land for solar PV. Studies have shown solar PV also produces more kWh per hectare than other renewable energy crops. This is also</i></p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p><i>achieved with land remaining in agricultural production, fattening lambs, and without the environmental and land degradation hazards of the most popular energy crop, maize.</i></p> <p><i>Arable land is also used to produce non-food crops for markets including industrial oils, cosmetics, pharmaceuticals and Christmas trees. Food security is not a material planning consideration. The relevant assessment for policy purposes is the ALC grade of the agricultural land, not its current use or the intensity of that use."</i></p> <p>Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] concludes that the 40-year lifetime of the project will facilitate a recovery in topsoil organic matter. This will enhance the functional capacity of the soil resource for future arable production.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0203021 FFCAWB0202033 FFCAWB0206013 FFCAWB0201025 FFCAWB0202022 FFCAWB0204003 FFCAWB0206032 FFCAWB0206031 FFCAWB0206009 FFCAWB0206054 FFCAWB0205020 FFCAWB0205018 FFCAWB0205019 FFCAWB0203016 FFCAWB0203006 FFCAWB0202002 FFCAWB0202036 FFCAWB0202006 FFCAWB0204011 FFCAWB0206021 FFCAWB0206030 FFCAWB0204008	<p>Alternatives and site Selection</p> <p>Respondents requested that alternative Sites are considered. RAF Scampton was cited as an example of this. Reference was made to the Applicant's site selection criteria.</p> <p>This included siting solar panels on brownfield sites or rooftops (commercial and residential) instead of on agricultural land.</p> <p>A number of respondents indicated support for solar PV as a technology, but did not support the Scheme in this location.</p> <p>Other respondents indicated a preference for a continued use of fossil fuels to generate energy, other alternatives such</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application. In reviewing the policies and information available regarding solar generation and the need to decarbonise, it is the Applicant's view that large-scale solar must be considered as additional to, as opposed to instead of, the need for continued development in distribution connected, smaller scale solar, and this includes the development of rooftop solar.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0204006 FFCAWB0206040 FFCAWB0206050 FFCAWB0206047 FFCAWB0205005 FFCAWB0202041 FFCAWB0202001 FFCAWB0206049 FFCAWB0201027 FFCAWB0201030 FFCAWB0202040 FFCAWB0203025 FFCAWB0206053	as fracking, and some scepticism regarding the validity of seeking to achieve net-zero.		and the design evolution process for the Scheme.
FFCAWB0206018 FFCAWB0205021 FFCAWB0206029 FFCAWB0205014 FFCAWB0206003 FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206026 FFCAWB0205022 FFCAWB0206037	<p>Solar technology and efficiency</p> <p>Respondents expressed scepticism regarding the efficiency of solar panels in generating energy, particularly when sited in the UK. Concerns were raised regarding the reliability of solar PV in different seasons and weather conditions, and the scale of land required for a solar farm to</p>	Yes	<p>In addition to the information shared through consultation materials at the pre-application stage, a Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB 7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, explaining the reasons for the Scheme being large scale solar generation, and setting out the context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206024 FFCAWB0206007 FFCAWB0204010 FFCAWB0206004 FFCAWB0205010 FFCAWB0204006 FFCAWB0203015 FFCAWB0203013 FFCAWB0205008 FFCAWB0201009 FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0201035 FFCAWB0206032 FFCAWB0206016 FFCAWB0206015 FFCAWB0206030 FFCAWB0206028 FFCAWB0206023 FFCAWB0203011 FFCAWB0201029 FFCAWB0201010	<p>generate a significant amount of energy. A number of respondents indicated that they did not consider solar to be a suitable technology for the UK and that they did not expect the Scheme to make a meaningful contribution of renewable energy. Support was indicated for other forms of energy generation, such as nuclear, instead of solar PV.</p>		<p>Regarding efficiency, the Applicant notes that single-axis tracking technology may be used as part of the Scheme. The axis will be oriented North-South, with modules rotating East-West tracking with backtracking strategy for tracking arrays: when the mutual shadings begin, the tracking angle does not follow the sun anymore, but it instead goes back (decreases) so that no shading occurs. Generally, a solar panel system with a single-axis solar tracker installed sees a performance gain of anywhere between 10 to 30 percent compared to a fixed mounting system.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0201017			
FFCAWB0205008 FFCAWB0204008 FFCAWB0202014 FFCAWB0201009 FFCAWB0205020 FFCAWB0206032 FFCAWB0205017	<p>Embedded carbon and energy policy</p> <p>Respondents disputed whether the Scheme represented a 'green' project, given the materials and transportation required for the construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>Specific concern was raised regarding the potential for panels to be imported from China.</p> <p>Respondents commented that they did not consider the Scheme to be sustainable or to form part of a wider, joined-up energy policy.</p>	Yes	<p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, setting out context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p> <p>Local and national planning policy has been identified in Chapter 6 (Energy Need, Legislative Context and Energy Policy) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.6].</p> <p>Chapter 7 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.7] presents the findings of the Environmental Impact</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Assessment concerning the potential impacts of the Scheme on the Climate during the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning stages. The resilience of the Scheme to physical impacts caused by climate change has also been considered. Section 7.10 (Residual Effects) explains that while there will be inevitable greenhouse gas emissions during the transport, energy and fuel associated with the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme, overall, the Scheme itself will provide major beneficial impacts and a net reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Section 7.5 (Assessment Assumptions and Limitations) sets out the assumptions applied to the assessment. It is noted it has assumed the PV panels being sourced from China or a country of similar distance from the UK, and there will therefore be an increase in embodied</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>carbon and transport emissions, which would otherwise be lower if sourced from Europe.</p> <p>The Applicant has also submitted a Skills and Supply Chain Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.10] as part of the DCO application.</p>
<p>FFCAWB0201030 FFCAWB0201029 FFCAWB0201014 FFCAWB0201015 FFCAWB0201010 FFCAWB0201009 FFCAWB0201007 FFCAWB0206009 FFCAWB0205012 FFCAWB0201035 FFCAWB0203001 FFCAWB0201035 FFCAWB0201023 FFCAWB0203008 FFCAWB0204001 FFCAWB0206040</p>	<p>Landscape and visual impact</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that the Scheme will cause visual impact, describing the proposals as an eyesore and as ruining the landscape.</p> <p>A number of respondents commented that local residents had chosen to live in an area of countryside and open fields, and that this environment would be altered by the Scheme.</p> <p>The potential height of solar panels was cited as being difficult to mitigate and therefore a concern for potential visual</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8] set outs the ways in which the Applicant has considered the potential visual and landscape impacts to local residents and visitors, potential effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the impacts and effects on the fabric of the landscape are taken into account as well as the views and visibility.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0205019 FFCAWB0206038 FFCAWB0206029 FFCAWB0204008 FFCAWB0203020 FFCAWB0202040 FFCAWB0203006 FFCAWB0202002 FFCAWB0206012 FFCAWB0206017 FFCAWB0206014 FFCAWB0206011 FFCAWB0205005 FFCAWB0205018 FFCAWB0205013 FFCAWB0206057 FFCAWB0203009 FFCAWB0201017 FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0206035	<p>impact. Other elements of the Scheme, such as fencing, were described as unsightly and perceived as industrialising the landscape.</p>		<p>The assessment includes a suite of viewpoints that cover a wide range of visual receptors, including public locations such as transport routes, public rights of way, and residential properties. These viewpoints have been discussed and agreed with the competent authority.</p> <p>Mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>This mitigation has been informed by feedback received and visits undertaken by the Applicant's landscape consultants throughout the surrounding landscape to satisfy themselves that the extent of embedded and</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>secondary mitigation is appropriate to mitigate the effects of the Scheme on the nearby properties.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, such as presented in Section 8.6 and Table 8.22 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], takes embedded mitigation into account to include the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Panels to be set a minimum of 3m from Site boundaries. - Panels to be set minimum of 20m from major watercourses and minimum of 8m from minor watercourses. - Panels to be set 50m (min) from boundary curtilage to outer edge of solar panel. - Site boundary fencing to be set back 5m from adjacent existing hedgerows to

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>allow for proposed thickening and growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Let existing hedges grow out and managed at 5m. - Encourage hedgerow trees to grow out within existing hedges to add further thickening and growth within the field boundaries. <p>Additional secondary mitigation has also been designed into the Scheme, consisting of new planting proposals, details of which can be found on Figures 8.18.1-8.18.3 [EN010132/APP/WB6.4.8.18.1 – WB6.4.8.18.3] and is further described within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010132/APP/WB7.3]</p> <p>Regarding the heights of the solar panels, the Environmental Statement employs a maximum design scenario approach reflecting the principle of the 'Rochdale Envelope'. This</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>approach allows for a project to be assessed on the basis of maximum project design parameters for example, the worst-case scenario in order to provide flexibility and take advantage of technological improvements, assessing all potentially significant effects (positive or adverse) within the EIA process and reported in the Environmental Statement. Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], clearly sets out the details of the design elements including extents and parameters, such as heights and locations that have been used in the assessment.</p> <p>The full details/parameters of the elements that have been modelled (Solar Arrays, substation etc.) are set out in the Concept Design Parameters and Principles document [EN010132/APP/WBC7.13] and Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.4], which accompany the DCO application.
FFCAWB0203006 FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0206065	<p>Cumulative impacts</p> <p>Respondents' comments on the number of solar projects proposed in the region, namely the Scheme, Cottam Solar Project, and Gate Burton Energy Park. Concern was expressed regarding the potential cumulative impacts of these projects.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant is cognisant of other projects being proposed in the area and has undertaken assessments to consider the potential cumulative effect of this.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts of the Scheme have been addressed as a whole within the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.1 – WB6.2.21].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Each topic chapter considers the impacts of Scheme; and the impact of the Scheme in conjunction with other large scale solar proposals and other committed developments within the region.
FFCAWB0206040 FFCAWB0206050 FFCAWB0206032 FFCAWB0206028 FFCAWB0203010 FFCAWB0202025 FFCAWB0206008 FFCAWB0206042 FFCAWB0206023 FFCAWB0206038 FFCAWB0206014 FFCAWB0206029 FFCAWB0204008 FFCAWB0203020 FFCAWB0202040 FFCAWB0203008 FFCAWB0203006	<p>Scale</p> <p>Respondents expressed opposition to the Scheme due to its scale.</p> <p>It was commented that the scale would cause the Scheme to be 'overbearing' to local communities. Some respondents perceived the scale as a means of bypassing local planning authorities.</p>	Yes	<p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application. In reviewing the policies and information available regarding solar generation and the need to decarbonise, it is the Applicant's view that large-scale solar must be considered as additional to, as opposed to instead of, the need for continued development in distribution connected, smaller scale solar, and this includes the development of rooftop solar.</p> <p>The Applicant has followed a step-by-step site selection process which confirms the location of the Scheme is suitable for a large-scale solar farm. This has included the avoidance of sensitive landscape and environmental</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0203001 FFCAWB0202002 FFCAWB0206012 FFCAWB0206057 FFCAWB0204012 FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056			<p>designations in confirming site suitability and consideration of alternative sites.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>The LVIA provides comments on alternative technologies and design alternatives within Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>As the output of the Scheme is to exceed 50 MW, the Scheme is considered a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). As a result, the Applicant is required to submit Development Consent Order to The Planning Inspectorate (PINS). Local Planning Authorities and communities play an important role in the process. Engagement and consultation with them are described in the Consultation Report [EN010132/APP/WB5.1].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0205018 FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0203008 FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0206053 FFCAWB0202041 FFCAWB0206020 FFCAWB0206033 FFCAWB0202002 FFCAWB0206037	<p>Recreation, amenity and wellbeing</p> <p>Respondents commented on a perceived loss of amenity as result of the Scheme.</p> <p>Respondents commented on the importance of the landscape and existing green space, including its appearance and opportunities for cycling and walking, for health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern for the physical and mental health and well-being of local residents and the many visitors by the proposals who will lose current amenities.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.18] considers environmental effects arising as a result of the Scheme, in relation to topics including population health, tourism and accessibility and desirability of recreational facilities. This involves considering the amenity value of the existing footpath network.</p> <p>Visual amenity is assessed and considered in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, as described in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], looks to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the public footpath, permissive footpath and green</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>lane network, which is aimed to benefit the community as a whole as well as tourists, visiting walkers, local residents, ornithologists and cyclists. The landscape mitigation measures will seek to provide new planting which will include new native hedgerows and tree cover, and this will also include their management and maintenance.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the LVIA has carried forward from the PEIR, to Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], the intention to enhance the footpath network associated with the Sites, where appropriate, noted as secondary mitigation for Public Rights of Way. These measures potentially recommend increasing accessibility and connectivity of public rights of way, but also measures to increase understanding of the local landscapes and the solar project. The LVIA promotes, for</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			example, information boards at vantage points, where appropriate. The LVIA also draws out ecological enhancement measures to provide a wider public understanding of the Scheme and encourage public access to nature.
FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0206054 FFCAWB0206020 FFCAWB0206019 FFCAWB0206038 FFCAWB0205014 FFCAWB0205008 FFCAWB0204008 FFCAWB0202043 FFCAWB0202042 FFCAWB0202040 FFCAWB0203011 FFCAWB0202025 FFCAWB0202014 FFCAWB0201035 FFCAWB0206012	<p>Ecology and biodiversity</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern regarding a loss of wildlife, biodiversity and habitats for animals.</p> <p>Respondents reported that the area around the Scheme is presently abundant with wildlife.</p> <p>A number of respondents commented that while they do not oppose solar farms or renewables, they believe development must not be at the expense of the environment and biodiversity.</p>	Yes	<p>Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9] sets out the baseline information available at the time of writing and considers the likely effects of the Scheme on ecological features during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out a series of mitigation and landscape management improvements to improve biodiversity in its Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.3].</p> <p>Regarding potential impacts to habitats and local wildlife, these are assessed and presented</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0205012 FFCAWB0206018 FFCAWB0205022 FFCAWB0205021 FFCAWB0206024 FFCAWB0206004 FFCAWB0203015 FFCAWB0202001 FFCAWB0202006 FFCAWB0202002 FFCAWB0202037			<p>in Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9].</p> <p>Appendix 12 to Chapter 9 [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units. All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Net Gain assessment report also sets out how these calculations are based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010132/APP/WB7.3] which will be secured under a requirement of the DCO for the life of the Scheme (approximately 40 years).</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206003 FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206037 FFCAWB0205005 FFCAWB0202002	<p>Ecology and biodiversity: Birds</p> <p>Specific comments were made regarding potential impacts to migratory birds.</p>	Yes	<p>Regarding potential impacts to bird life, consultation with Natural England and a full suite of bird surveys have been undertaken and inform this assessment, as presented in Sections 9.7.160 - 9.7.199 of Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9].</p>
FFCAWB0202001	<p>Ecology and wildlife: Deer</p> <p>Respondent commented on the solar panels will directly interfere with the local deer population that have routes around Willingham by Stow.</p>	No	<p>Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] considers the potential impacts and mitigations regarding the Scheme and wildlife.</p> <p>The chapter reports that no deer species receive special legal protection or are considered priority species of conservation concern. Fallow deer, muntjac and roe deer all occur in Lincolnshire. The arable fields are of little value to deer, which would be expected to keep more closely to woodland, pasture and field boundaries. Considering the highly open nature of the Scheme's habitats and general</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>absence of woodland or dense habitats, as well as a very low coverage of permanent pasture, deer are considered to be of Site Importance.</p> <p>This means that deer are present or potentially present at the site, but the conservation of the feature is of relatively low value in the context of the wider landscape.</p> <p>Deer are likely to be dissuaded from the Scheme by the installation of fencing, although deer have been known to surmount or crawl under fencing where ground undulations permit them. As deer are wide-ranging in their habits and movements, it is not considered that changes in deer movements brought about by perimeter fencing is of conservation concern.</p>
<p>FFCAWB0206003 FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206037</p>	<p>Heat Respondents expressed concern regarding a perceived increase in heat</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that it is likely that some heat will be generated by the panels. However, the heat is not predicted to be significant when compared to nearby features.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	caused by reflection from the solar panels.		
FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0206016 FFCAWB0206015	<p>Cable routes</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern regarding potential disruption and impacts caused by the cable routes connecting the Sites.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant has followed a step-by-step site selection process which confirms the location of the Scheme is suitable for a large-scale solar farm. This has included the avoidance of sensitive landscape and environmental designations in confirming site suitability and consideration of alternative sites.</p> <p>Details of the process are set out in Appendix 5.1: Site Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Table 5.13: Main Stages of Refinement for the Cable Route Corridor within Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement</p> <p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains how the cable route has been refined. The initial cable corridor search area included whole fields with multiple river crossing options. This was then narrowed to a target route, predominantly 100m in width, which was fully surveyed by geophysical surveys, ecological surveys, and landscape assessments to generate options within the target route. The final cable corridor is 50m in width over the majority of its length.</p> <p>The Applicant initially presented a cable route search corridor, which has been refined through engagement and consultation with landowners.</p> <p>Regarding the assessment of potential landscape and visual impacts resulting from</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>the bale route, extensive consultation has been undertaken as a number of meetings and workshops as set out in Section 8.2 and Appendix 8.4 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>This consultation has enabled a consensus on the approach to the assessment over aspects of the developing Scheme, in particular the cable routes and substations. The assessment of both the landscape and visual effects of the substations and the cable route/s is set out within the LVIA within the detailed receptor sheets at Appendix 8.2 and Appendix 8.3 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The significant gains in biodiversity, as reported in the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment provided as Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			(Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12], will offset any minimal impacts from the cable route.
FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0206014 FFCAWB0202002 FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056	<p>Cultural heritage</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that the proposal would erode the local historical and heritage fabric of the area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.13] presents an assessment of the effects of the Scheme on cultural heritage and archaeological receptors. This includes an assessment of the Scheme's effect on heritage, historic landscape and archaeology arising from likely impacts alongside proposed appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>The assessment identifies and evaluates heritage assets within and surrounding the Study Area and assesses how the Scheme may potentially affect those heritage assets.</p> <p>The Heritage Statement (ES Appendix 13.5) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.13.5] assesses the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			potential impact of the Scheme on the historic setting of the area.
FFCAWB0202001	<p>Landowner engagement</p> <p>Respondent commented negatively on the Applicant's approach to gain access to land for the Scheme.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant has prepared a Consultation Report [EN010132/APP/WB5.1] and Book of Reference as part of their application, setting out how they have referenced and consulted with landowners and occupiers.</p> <p>The Site areas for panels have been determined through agreement with landowners.</p> <p>The Applicant initially presented a cable route search corridor, which has been refined through engagement and consultation with landowners.</p>
FFCAWB0202006 FFCAWB0205012 FFCAWB0202002	<p>Flood risk and water contamination</p>	Yes	Chapter 10 (Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.10] sets out the likely

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the Scheme causing increasing the risk of flooding or water contamination.</p>		<p>significant environmental effects of the Scheme on the local hydrology during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.10.1] has been produced for each of the solar Sites which demonstrate that flood risk will not be exacerbated as a result of their installation and is likely to provide betterment over the existing surface water regime due to the reintroduction of natural land cover beneath the panels. Where additional infrastructure is proposed (e.g. battery sites), additional Drainage Strategies have been produced which indicate how sustainable drainage systems will be provided on-Site to attenuate any increased runoff to greenfield rates.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0206016 FFCAWB0206015 FFCAWB0206032 FFCAWB0204008 FFCAWB0203008 FFCAWB0202002 FFCAWB0205017	<p>Construction traffic</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern regarding construction traffic routes and volumes causing disruption.</p> <p>Concern was raised that construction vehicles could present danger to pedestrians and other road users.</p> <p>Opposition was raised regarding the use of single-track green lanes for construction traffic.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction.</p> <p>The Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2] also considers road users safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the development.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that mitigation measures are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) the Construction Traffic Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.2 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14]. and the Public Rights of Way Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.3 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0202002 FFCAWB0206036 FFCAWB0204010 FFCAWB0204009 FFCAWB0202040 FFCAWB0204012 FFCAWB0204009	<p>Local house prices</p> <p>Reduces house sales due to many risks involved in a solar farm. Four members of the community expressed concern that the installation of solar panels on the rural landscape will negatively affect the setting of the area and values of housing.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and acknowledges this as a concern for neighbouring residents.</p> <p>Throughout the pre-application stage the Applicant has sought to assess potential effects to neighbouring properties and consult with local residents. The results of these assessments, along with proposed mitigations, are presented in the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2].</p> <p>The Applicant is confident that there is no empirical evidence to suggest that solar farms adversely affect nearby property values.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the LVIA provides comments on alternative technologies and design alternatives within Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0202002	<p>Electromagnetic fields</p> <p>Respondent expressed concern for potential health impacts from electromagnetic radiation.</p>	Yes	<p>Chapter 21 (Other Environmental Matters) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.21] assesses the impacts of the Scheme upon human health and also considers major accidents and disasters. Section 21.2 considers electromagnetic fields.</p>
FFCAWB0201035	<p>Decommissioning</p> <p>Legacy. It's unclear what happens when the technology is antiquated.</p>	Yes	<p>The operational life of the Scheme is anticipated to be 40 years. Once the Scheme ceases to operate, the development will be decommissioned. A 40-year period for the operational phase of the development has been assessed in the EIA and reported in the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2] which accompanies the DCO application. However, as is typical for energy generation NSIPs, the DCO Application does not seek a temporary or time limited consent.</p> <p>At decommissioning, the 400kV and 132kV cables may be left in situ, depending on which method is likely to have the least</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>environmental impact at the time but are likely to be removed. It is considered generally desirable to remove the cables where possible, for both recycling purposes and to leave the land as close to its previous use state as possible. The cables would be removed by pulling the cables out from the ducts without the subsequent removal of the ducts themselves, thereby minimising surface disturbances.</p> <p>An Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.2] is provided as part of the DCO application.</p>
FFCAWB0201014 FFCAWB0201017 FFCAWB0201023 FFCAWB0203009 FFCAWB0204012 FFCAWB0206057 FFCAWB0205017	<p>Viability and cost</p> <p>Respondents commented on the financial viability of the Scheme, noting that Applicant was financially incentivised for the Scheme to be granted consent.</p>	N/A	<p>Noted.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, setting out context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>Respondents commented on the pricing of electricity in the UK and the Scheme's relationship with this.</p> <p>Respondents noted the energy storage element of the Scheme, and how this would allow electricity to be supplied to the National Grid for a fee.</p>		
FFCAWB0201005	I have no further comments to make but would like to ensure that my note of strong opposition to your proposals is duly noted as part of your consultation process.	N/A	Noted.
FFCAWB0201002	<p>Ethical supply chain</p> <p>You use Chinese made solar panels made in inhumane factories.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant unequivocally condemns and opposes the use of forced labour in any context in the strongest possible terms.</p> <p>The Applicant fully supports the steps already being taken by the UK government and solar industry to ensure the highest possible levels of transparency and to rid human rights abuses from the global supply chain for UK solar</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>developments. This includes developing an industry-led traceability protocol in line with internationally recognised standards.</p> <p>The Applicant also supports the independent auditing of all UK solar supply chains. While procurement has not been confirmed for the Scheme, the Applicant has prepared a Skills and Supply Chain Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.10], submitted as part of the DCO application.</p> <p>The Applicant is seeking opportunities to develop the local skill base through practicable means during the construction and operational phase of development. Opportunities to support skill training in locally-based companies, and construction-based apprenticeships or educational opportunities have been explored in the Skills and Supply Chain Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.10].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206033 FFCAWB0206046 FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0206020 FFCAWB0206041 FFCAWB0206038 FFCAWB0206028 FFCAWB0206006 FFCAWB0205014 FFCAWB0205013 FFCAWB0205010 FFCAWB0205008 FFCAWB0204008 FFCAWB0202039 FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0206035 FFCAWB0206018 FFCAWB0205022 FFCAWB0206026	<p>West Burton 4 site area</p> <p>Respondents expressed specific opposition the Scheme due to the inclusion of the West Burton 4 site area. Respondents cited concerns regarding topics including agricultural land, conservation and heritage, recreational amenity, flood risk and visual impacts.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure has been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206007 FFCAWB0205010 FFCAWB0206033 FFCAWB0203017 FFCAWB0203022 FFCAWB0201002 FFCAWB0206035 FFCAWB0206018 FFCAWB0205022 FFCAWB0206026 FFCAWB0206007 FFCAWB0205010 FFCAWB0206028			
FFCAWB0206006	Respondent expressed concern that the content of the PEIR is substandard in many key areas particularly the hydrology, drainage and flooding section.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.
FFCAWB0201028	Already have the energy distribution infrastructure in this area and should de-commission the West Burton power plant.	N/A	The Applicant notes this response.
FFCAWB0206061 FFCAWB0206045	We are commenting particularly regarding the West Burton Solar Farm Project and more specifically on location 2. There are significant potential safety issues associated with the project's location, particularly with regard to road safety, aircraft and flooding. Although some mitigation has been made in Phase 2 to avoid the DMV monument of North Ingleby (NHLE 1003570, MLI 50391, MLI 54225), this does not go far enough and contradicts assurances made in the Scoping and PEIR submissions. Avoidance of development of ML 54225 (which includes the area of MLI 50391), as stated in the PEIR (p.433), does not mean avoidance of development of parts of MLI	Yes	Pasture fields containing earthwork remains associated with the deserted medieval villages of North and South Ingleby have been removed from the Scheme. This includes the Scheduled Monument: deserted village of North Ingleby (NHLE 1003570).

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>54225 it infers avoidance of all of MLI 54225. This is an example of a contradiction in your proposal relating to the DMV, there are many others which I highlighted to the IP team at the Saxilby information event (23/6/22).</p>		
FFCAWB0206062	<p>The proposals are massively intrusive in the rural landscape of West Lindsey and Bassetlaw.</p> <p>The land falls under the best and most valuable (BMV) category according to George Eustace MP, Secretary of State DEFRA at an Environmental Audit Committee Meeting on the on 29th Jun 2022.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and appreciates the importance of agricultural land.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>When the combined effect of the 4, large projects is taken into account, many thousands of acres of arable land, currently producing food or fuel will be removed from agriculture for the inefficient production of electricity using equipment shipped from China.</p> <p>While the Battery Storage equipment may possibly add some utility to the Solar Panels, the clear intention is to store lower priced, off-peak electricity from the grid for resale, at a profit, during periods of high demand.</p>		<p>detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resources & Farming Circumstances) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.19.1].</p> <p>The vast majority of the Scheme is located on lower quality agricultural land with only 26.24% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land).</p> <p>The Applicant notes that The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality. Agricultural</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			land may also be retained during the operational phase, such as pasture grazed by sheep, for example.
FFCAWB0206064	Evidence from your technical manuals has not swayed our opinion from phase 1 to phase 2 to convince us otherwise. All arable land grade 1 to 3b is vital for agriculture. Farm workers, agricultural businesses will stand to lose huge amounts of money and loss of employment. Have you consulted with any of the local agricultural businesses e.g. suppliers of farm machinery, seed growers and contract workers about this proposal? From a socio-economic point of view this a great concern. All arable land is important to food security and that includes 3b. In light of different proportions of ALC for parts of the land within West Burton 4, we believe that no decision should be made, never made,	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>because sequential testing will prove the same in other areas over time and we feel that soil quality should be improved rather than deemed unviable. We would like to see independent companies test for soil quality. The County News for Lincolnshire (Summer 2022) front cover states "Feeding the Nation. Lincolnshire's harvest helps food security" and this how we want to remain.</p> <p>There is nothing in these documents to explain how you chose these consultants to draw up these documents, whether they have done previous work for your company, whether there was a tender process etc to reassure us, the communities affected that there is a fair and balanced process in drawing up this EIA for the Government to scrutinize and make a decision on.</p>		

3 Table 5.12.2: Feedback received to Question 4b: Why do you think these things [environmental issues] are most important?

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Topic area: Traffic, access and construction			
FFCAWB0206052 FFCAWB0206003 FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206041 FFCAWB0206040 FFCAWB0206050 FFCAWB0205016 FFCAWB0205001 FFCAWB0203024 FFCAWB0203021 FFCAWB0202020 CAWB0207017_WB	Respondents were sceptical that existing road infrastructure is capable of dealing with high numbers of HGV traffic due to condition and undulating nature.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and has presented relevant assessment and mitigation in Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.14].</p> <p>The Construction Traffic Management Plan, provided as Appendix 14.2 [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2], considers road users safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the Scheme. The Applicant notes the local highway network that makes up the construction vehicle routes to the Site will be managed in accordance with the Construction Traffic Management Plan to ensure appropriate use by the vehicle numbers forecast over a temporary period.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The Applicant notes that mitigation measures are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) the Construction Traffic Management Plan, and the Public Rights of Way Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.3 [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14.3].</p>
<p>FFCAWB0206055 FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0206052 FFCAWB0205015 FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206041 FFCAWB0206040 FFCAWB0206050 FFCAWB0206032 FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0206044 FFCAWB0204012 FFCAWB0204009 FFCAWB0203024 FFCAWB0203021</p>	<p>Respondents expressed general concern regarding additional traffic disruption in the area throughout both construction and site operation. They demand that disruption to transport in the area is minimised.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that the Construction Traffic Management Plan, provided as Appendix 14.2 [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2], considers road users safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the Scheme. The Applicant notes the local highway network that makes up the construction vehicle routes to the Site will be managed in accordance with the Construction Traffic Management Plan to ensure appropriate use by the vehicle numbers forecast over a temporary period. The aim of the Construction Traffic Management Plan is to minimise the effects of construction traffic on the local highway network.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0203002 FFCAWB0206057 FFCAWB0206059 CAWB0207017_WB			During the operational phase, there will be less than one trip to the Site per day on average.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206055 FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0206052 FFCAWB0205015 FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206041 FFCAWB0206040 FFCAWB0206050 FFCAWB0206032 FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0206044 FFCAWB0204012 FFCAWB0204009 FFCAWB0203024 FFCAWB0203021 FFCAWB0203002 FFCAWB0206057 FFCAWB0206059 CAWB0207017_WB	<p>Respondents expressed general concern regarding additional traffic disruption in the area throughout both construction and site operation. They demand that disruption to transport in the area is minimised.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that the Construction Traffic Management Plan, provided as Appendix 14.2 [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2], considers road users safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the Scheme. The Applicant notes the local highway network that makes up the construction vehicle routes to the Site will be managed in accordance with the Construction Traffic Management Plan to ensure appropriate use by the vehicle numbers forecast over a temporary period. The aim of the Construction Traffic Management Plan is to minimise the effects of construction traffic on the local highway network. During the operational phase, there will be less than one trip to the Site per day on average.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
CAWB0207017_WB FFCAWB0206063	We do not want the road developing or widening because this would encourage others to use it as a rabbit run between the A57 and A1500 as well. We certainly do not want temporary compounds whilst the site is developed.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.
FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056	A construction period of 29 weeks for WB4 is very optimistic. Please be realistic. Construction noise, road obstruction, mud and dust continuously for 11 hours a day +5.5hrs Saturdays will be destructively intrusive and damaging to mental health and well-being for all in Clayworth and surrounding	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>homesteads and many in Gringley. Why has no preliminary CEMP been prepared yet to be included in the PEIR? Who will police and what sanctions will encourage its compliance?</p>		<p>the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>You don't offer a tick-box for decommissioning - a convenient way to avoid due consideration of the African elephant in the room. "The land . . . will be returned to its original use after decommissioning". Where is the evidence (or even balanced argument) to justify this greenwashing statement? Decommissioning is effectively ignored.</p> <p>This is complacency of the highest order. 40 years (50 years including</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The operational life of the Scheme is anticipated to be 40 years. Once the Scheme ceases to operate, the development will be decommissioned. A 40-year period for the operational phase of the development has been assessed in the EIA and reported in the ES which accompanies the DCO application. The 40-year period is considered 'temporary' in nature given that, upon the lapse of the operational period, the Scheme is decommissioned thereby returning the landscape to its previous state; thus, giving the Scheme it's temporariness. However, as is typical for energy generation NSIPs, the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>construction and decommissioning if it is timely) is not "temporary" in anyone's book: it covers 2 or 3 generations, and most people alive now will be dead before the end of the project. The solar industrialisation of the land will change it for ever, in the same way as other industrial sites (gas works, coal mines, quarries).</p>		<p>DCO Application does not seek a temporary or time limited consent.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.2] as part of their application.</p>
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>The land will be compacted, contaminated, untilled, its land drains destroyed and its farms derelict: reinstatement to agriculture is a fantasy. It will have been permanently contaminated and forever unusable even if all of the structures are removed and the excavated topsoils replaced. That 50 years of "rest" will compensate for this and even improve</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Scheme has been amended on the basis of the detailed reports to ensure that the vast majority of the Scheme is located on lower quality agricultural land with only 26.24% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land).</p> <p>The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	(!) its value for arable farming is poppycock.		Some agricultural land may be retained during the operational phase, for example pasture grazed by sheep. Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] concludes that the 40-year lifetime of the project will facilitate a recovery in topsoil organic matter. This will enhance the functional capacity of the soil resource for future arable production.
FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056	The financial and logistical requirements for decommissioning a large solar site in the UK in the UK are unknown. But the huge size of the installation with hundreds of thousands of individual panels which need to be disposed of under Toxic Waste Regulations means that the costs will be huge, £millions. It is blandly assumed that there will be a reinstatement bond, but there is no	N/A	Noted. Details are provided in Chapter 20 (Waste) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.20] .

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>mention of this in the PEIR. In fact, there is no statement in the PEIR about any provision to ensure that the finances for decommissioning will be secured "up front", or adequate or protected. We are already seeing developers and constructors renege on financial agreements and assurances enshrined in the original consent when selling the business on to subsequent operators.</p> <p>What size of bond? Who will pay for it (IGP? The constructor who will buy it from IGP? A future operator who will buy it from the constructor?) When will it be deposited? Who will be responsible for it? With whom will it be deposited? What Regulations will safeguard it? Is all of this reliable and trustworthy? In 45 years' time?</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0206060</p>	<p>The size of the bond will be a pure guess and likely minimised by the investor; such bonds are commonly accrued over the lifetime of the project. Energy prices are notoriously volatile: witness the current explosive rises. What if, over time, the price drops, on-shore wind and/or nuclear takes off (as they have to) and the irregularity and small output of solar becomes "uneconomic"? If the investor operating the project simply closes the site early, ceases trading or is declared bankrupt? If the bond proves too small, or its establishment reneged upon or not established at the time of closure, or it is pillaged by the company responsible for it, or it is just lost in the jungle of the investment world?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010133/APP/C7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, setting out context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p>
<p>Topic area: Air Quality</p>			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0203003; FFCAWB0202038	Respondents expressed concern over the impact that the construction process will have on air pollution. Specifically, the impact of construction and operational traffic on the health of the potentially impacted population.	Yes	Chapter 17 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.17] assesses the effects of the Scheme on air quality at nearby sensitive receptors during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases. The aim of this assessment is to predict the levels of air quality pollutants and assess them to determine whether there are any likely significant effects, taking account of relevant policy, guidelines and best practice.
FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056	The main issue discussed here is fire risk - a very real risk with lithium-ion batteries as experience has shown. In summer with dry planting covering the site, a fire starting in a battery (or anywhere else on the solar site) would rapidly spread and could easily escalate into an uncontrollable wildfire similar to those seen in the UK within the last week.	Yes	Chapter 21 (Other Environmental Matters) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.21] assesses the impacts of the Scheme upon human health and also considers major accidents and disasters. The outline battery storage safety management plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.9] sets out firefighting and safety measures in the event of a fire or explosion.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>WB4 is a rural location along minor roads, its closest, local fire station (? 2 engines) being 7 miles away - 20-30 minutes minimum from alarm to deploying water hoses, longer if no-one is on site which would be locked which will be the normal case during operation.</p> <p>It is dismissively complacent to arbitrarily state that "it would be a short period before being extinguished". It is equally complacent only to consider the consequence of fire to be drifting smoke, and to completely ignore the direct risk of a spontaneous fire during the operational phase of the project.</p>		<p>This has been informed through consultation with the local Fire and Rescue authority.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
<p>Topic area: Noise and light pollution</p>			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206056; FFCAWB0206002; FFCAWB0203003; FFCAWB0206032; FFCAWB0205017; FFCAWB0202038; FFCAWB0203005; FFCAWB0202029; CAWB0207017_WB	Respondents were concerned about the amount of noise and vibration produced through both the construction and operation phases of the Scheme.	Yes	<p>Chapter 15 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.15] evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning. The aim of this assessment is to predict the levels of noise and assess these against relevant guidelines, and where necessary, identify any required mitigation measures to make effects acceptable.</p> <p>Worst-case noise and vibration activities associated with the proposed cabling have been assessed at the closest distances to nearby sensitive receptors to provide a robust assessment. Details of the noise assessment can be found in Chapter 15 (Noise) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.15].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>For the operational phase, tracker panels have been assessed given that fixed solar panels do not have any moving parts and therefore have no noise emission associated with them.</p>
FFCAWB0205017	<p>Respondent were concerned about the light pollution generated by the facility at night time and the impact that this would have on general aesthetic and local wildlife.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that Lighting impacts on retained habitats, bats and freshwater fish are reduced through measures within the Outline Ecological Protection and Mitigation Strategy (EPMS) [EN010132/APP/WB7.17] to minimise the need for lighting and the timing of its usage, during all project phases.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>This is another theoretical section with the application of arbitrary distance intervals to GCSE optical physics to diminish significance. I contest that the threshold distances are irrelevant: irrespective of distance, the area of identically-aligned panels is so great that any direct reflection of the sun's rays to a human receptor will be incapacitating (instantly blinding, after-glare, permanently damaged retina). Solar panels must not be placed anywhere (at any distance from) where they might reflect into a dwelling, or directly at a road user, train driver or aircraft pilot. Full stop.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant has presented assessment of glint and glare in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.16]. This Chapter describes the baseline conditions, glint and glare guidelines, methodology, and the potential glint and glare effects from the Scheme with regard to road safety, residential amenity, aviation activity, and railway operations and infrastructure. Public Rights of Way have not been included within the assessment because they are receptors with "low" sensitivity which means the receptor is tolerant to change without detrimental effect, and is of low or local importance.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment looks to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the visibility of the Scheme from public vantage points including transport routes,</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			public footpaths, permissive footpaths and green lane network. This mitigation is aimed to benefit the community as a whole as well as tourists, visiting walkers, local residents, ornithologists and cyclists. The landscape mitigation measures will seek to provide new planting to mitigation the potential impacts and effects of glint and glare, which will include new native hedgerows and tree cover, and this will also include their management and maintenance.
FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056	This 50-page section in Vol 1 of the PEIR does nothing but record baseline levels of noise (which we know are very low for WB4) and regales the regulations and methodology for assessing its impact and that of vibration, with promises to consider this in future. Why could not real data from similar equipment operating in IGP's other	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	solar plants have been offered as an illustration of likely effects for WB4? This section is meaningless for us.		design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.
Topic area: Local heritage			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206018; FFCAWB0206003; FFCAWB0205022; FFCAWB0206041; FFCAWB0206037; FFCAWB0205017; FFCAWB0206034; FFCAWB0206042; FFCAWB0206024; FFCAWB0206026; FFCAWB0206007; FFCAWB0206004; FFCAWB0205014; FFCAWB0205013; FFCAWB0205008; FFCAWB0204007; FFCAWB0203017; FFCAWB0203015; FFCAWB0203013; FFCAWB0202038; FFCAWB0202026; FFCAWB0202012	<p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the effect that construction and operation of the proposed installations would have on rural heritage sites as the site contains places of particular heritage and conservation value including ancient bridleways and 16th century housing. Respondents commented on the importance of access to heritage spaces and conservation areas for residents of nearby villages.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.13] presents an assessment of the effects of the Scheme on cultural heritage and archaeological receptors. This includes an assessment of the Scheme's effect on heritage, historic landscape and archaeology arising from likely impacts alongside proposed appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>The assessment identifies and evaluates heritage assets within and surrounding the Study Area and assesses how the Scheme may potentially affect those heritage assets. The Heritage Statement (ES Appendix 13.5) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.13.5] assesses the potential impact of the Scheme on the historic setting of the area.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>The panels of WB4 would clothe the hill which is the WB4 site. Its pinnacle is Beacon Hill: the single most dominant feature of the landscape, the highest hill in the area and visible for 20 miles in all directions. It gives superb views down the hillside and for 20+miles across the flatlands to the south, and is directly in line with the mid-axis of WB4. Beacon Hill is a Scheduled Monument of national geologic and historical significance (bronze age, Roman, Saxon, Norman, Civil War).</p> <p>Beacon Hill is the central feature - the key landmark - of the whole area, the centre-piece of its well-used, high amenity value. The Trent Valley Way and many local walks lead up to it and circumnavigate it. Its topography, rising out of the flatlands to the north</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>and south, is everything, its raison d'être: its history and heritage derive from its prominence, visibility and outlook. Clothing it in solar panels would desecrate its setting, be contemptuous of its heritage, make a mockery of our protective heritage regulations; it would destroy its attraction and amenity for local residents and its many regional visitors.</p> <p>The clear 20+-mile sight lines across 3 counties to and from Beacon Hill, the primary local visual amenity, renders the arbitrarily-defined extensions of the study area to 2 & 5Km beyond the site boundary inappropriate.</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>There is no assessment of Beacon Hill in either Vol 1 or Vol 2 of the PEIR: it is stated that this will be the subject of a separate Heritage Statement. The absence of this from either Volume is a major deficiency in the PEIR.</p> <p>Throughout the Heritage Chapters, important heritage assets and context which are not Scheduled Monuments or Graded Buildings are ignored. The landscape of the WB4 site, the villages which adjoin it (Clayworth, Gringley, Wiseton) and the surrounding area is a rich, highly-treasured, beautiful, easily accessible, popular rural amenity for walkers, riders, cyclists, boaters, fishers and nature lovers. What gives this area its value is not just the beauty and variety of the countryside here, but the interweaving of ancient patterns of co-existence</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>between natural environment, farmed land and habitation. Wherever you go - open glaciated landscape, along country lanes, rural roads, beside farmed fields, down village streets and into their Churches and buildings - you walk through two thousand years of human history - and more.</p>		
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>Examples are the visible evidence of centuries' interdependence of farmland and villages, historic Churches (with the nationally recognised Traquair murals in Clayworth church - which, incidentally has Saxon origins, not as stated 12th century), attractive vernacular and manorial buildings, the early industrial archaeology of the Chesterfield canal (also an SSSI and nationally important long-distance walking route), the Roman Road through Clayworth (which kept the route between Lincoln</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>and York open in winter by avoiding the impassable salt marsh of the Humber Lake), the old Viking route between Bawtry and Gainsborough along Toftdyke Lane thence eastward through the centre of WB4 (which remained the principle coach road until the modern tarmac'd roads were built and passes by the mounds of the deserted village just south of Highfield Farm). Plant a square mile of solar panels in the middle of this, and the area ceases to draw you to it, the setting and integrity of the human and natural history of the area is lost, and with it goes its amenity value and the uplift, well-being and health it generates.</p> <p>All of this is totally ignored in the Chapter on heritage value. No planting, fencing or reduction of</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>site area can mitigate the lost connection between the countryside and our history when walking and riding through it. The statement in para 11.3.2 that ". . . with appropriate mitigation in place effects can be reduced or eliminated" is ignorant and fatuous, and displays the dangerous limitations of desk-top analyses. Even so, no specific proposals for mitigation are offered.</p>		
<p>Topic area: Water and Flood risk</p>			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0206055 FFCAWB0206018 FFCAWB0206003 FFCAWB0205022 FFCAWB0205021 FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0202027 FFCAWB0206041 FFCAWB0206040 FFCAWB0206037 FFCAWB0206035 FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0206017 FFCAWB0206011 FFCAWB0206024 FFCAWB0206007 FFCAWB0206006 FFCAWB0206004 FFCAWB0205014 FFCAWB0205013 FFCAWB0205012	<p>Respondents expressed general concern regarding the potential flood risk and commented on the impact this will have on house insurance for surrounding areas. They highlighted the need for sufficient mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 10 (Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.10] sets out the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme on the local hydrology during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.10.1] has been produced for each of the solar Sites which demonstrate that flood risk will not be exacerbated as a result of their installation and is likely to provide betterment over the existing surface water regime due to the reintroduction of natural land cover beneath the panels. Where additional infrastructure is proposed (e.g. battery sites), additional Drainage Strategies have been produced which indicate how sustainable drainage</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0205008 FFCAWB0204011 FFCAWB0204007 FFCAWB0204006 FFCAWB0203024 FFCAWB0203017 FFCAWB0203015 FFCAWB0203013 FFCAWB0202043 FFCAWB0203010 FFCAWB0202029 FFCAWB0202025 FFCAWB0201002 CAWB0207017_WB FFCAWB0206063			systems will be provided on-Site to attenuate any increased runoff to greenfield rates.

<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>This is one of the most critical areas of deficiency in the PEIR for the WB4 site. There is no experiential data on the effects of huge industrial-scale solar on the environment - especially in the UK with our topographies, latitude, climate and weather, and especially related to its effect on flood risks. The only way to assess this is to model it mathematically - a poor substitute for the real thing but the best we have. This not been done for WB4, and the PEIR states that there is no need for it to be done: this is nothing less than negligent complacency.</p> <p>The whole discussion regarding the WB4 site concentrates on the flood risk to the site itself, its panels and workers. It ignores the real risk: the flooding of Clayworth village from run-off waters from the WB4 site. Clayworth has suffered severe residential flooding twice in the last 20 years from run-off from the WB4 site with "normal" variations in the weather.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
--	--	------------	--

	<p>The PEIR states that it adopts the "Rochdale Principle" - of starting its assessments of harm and risk with the worst-possible case scenario and then working back from that to arrive at a balanced assessment of risk and proposals for its mitigation. The PEIR also states that it will consider climate change (which would be expected to increase the frequency and severity of extreme weather events) - but it does not.</p> <p>IGP have had 6 months to undertake a full hydrological and flood risk assessment but have failed to do so. The PEIR simply summarises the developers' legal and planning obligations and promises of future assessments to be given in the final submission: just not good enough for a project of this size and impact.</p>		
--	--	--	--

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>The PEIR fails to address the shortcomings and serious concerns identified by many statutory bodies (including those responsible for managing flood risk) in the Scoping Report (Table 10.1). The PEIR hydrology section refers to "a hydrological assessment has been undertaken to establish local drainage catchments and overland flow routes in Appendices 10.1-10.4" (para 10.3.4). These appendices (dated January 2022!!!) show and state the association of flood risk with the Chesterfield Canal (which is irrelevant for flood risk) and ignore the River Idle, Toftdyke and its culverts and downstream drainage channels into the R Idle, and the myriad of field drains and intermediate dykes which drain the whole WB4 hillside into Toftdyke. Is this their evidence-base</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>for "Maintenance of existing drainage infrastructure" which is "critical to avoid compaction of soils" (para 10.5.9)?</p> <p>Appendices 10.1-10.4 are simply reprints of contour and flood-risk maps available on-line, which contain substantive inaccuracies and errors (and admit this), uncritically accepted as fact without confirmation by a site visit or engagement with local experience (which requests were refused by the consultants but are belatedly promised). This all reflects the precipitate, inadequate and underprepared presentation of the PEIR.</p>		
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>The methodology for determining the "significance of effect" (para. 10.5.) is flawed on 3 counts: 1) it assumes that "the Scheme will be low impact with access roads and footways surfaced</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>with permeable surfacing and therefore assumed to be effectively permeable": this ignores the effect of years of construction compacting the clay sub-soil beneath the permeable surfacing which will increase run-off; if the construction proceeds, it will no longer be agricultural with the water absorption ("loss") that might give to slow run-off and reduce erosion (para 10.5.7); 2) that "any run-off from construction waste materials would be collected, contained and prevented from direct entry to local water sources" (which include 2 water SSSIs) (para 10.3.12): where are the plans and proposals for achieving this, and the assurances that this will be fully effective and policed? 3) "Analysis of flood extents is reliant upon the accuracy of the published EA Flood Map for Planning and EA flood data.</p>		<p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>No new hydraulic modelling has been undertaken as part of this study" (para10.3.12): these flood maps do not reference recorded history of floods, and themselves state that they are only indicative: it is negligent not to reference recent and documented local history, and to undertake detailed hydraulic modelling specific to the site.</p> <p>Re Baseline Conditions: West Burton 4 (section 10.4). The risk of long-term flooding derives from the whole of the 5.73 sq. Km of the Toftdyke catchment area, over 40% of which comprised by the WB4 site, not just the Clayworth Road. That Notts CC fail to maintain the camber drains is an added risk.</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>Without any evidence-base or modelling, the PEIR grades the significance of the risks of water course pollution and flood risk from increased run-off as "Major Adverse". Astonishingly, by just using permeable surfaces to the access roads during construction (ignoring the effect of compaction of the clay sub-soil by construction traffic), "suitable planting" under and between the solar panels, and drainage ditches around hard-standings and buildings - these become conveniently reduced to "negligible" and "unlikely to generate surface water runoff rates beyond the baseline scenario" (Para 10.8.22,24). Unbelievable.</p> <p>The only evidence cited to support this argument is the paper by Cook & McCuen (2013), which models the Hydrologic Response of Solar Farms</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>concentrating on their impact on water run-off (para 10.8.9). Delta-Simons' simple adoption of Cook & McCuen's conclusions are fallacious for 2 reasons: 1) Many of the assumptions about the design of the solar arrays, the topography of the land, and the nature of the soils and surfaces upon which they sit are contrary and inapplicable to the WB4 site; 2) Cook & McCuen's conclusion of no significant effect on run-off from rows of solar panels is critically dependent upon free drainage through sandy soils planted with quality grasses, actively maintained by an intensive ground management programme (which prevents soil erosion and the development of hard or bare surfaces under and/or between the panel rows). Failure of any of these factors greatly increases</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>run-off, but the worst scenario is the ground becoming bare, when the modelling shows that solar panels increase run-off by 73-100%. This finding is conveniently ignored in the PEIR, but is the one scenario in the model which is relevant to WB4: Clayworth particularly floods under 2 circumstances, when a heavy rainstorm follows a period of steady "normal" rain which saturates the clay soil so it cannot absorb any more, and a period of dry weather baking the clay hard followed by a flash rainstorm.</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>High-quality maintenance of the ground and planting beneath and between panels is not considered: in operation the site will be "unmanned", and the ONLY reference to this is a final sentence in a box in the summary Table 10.7: Mitigation: "any proposed drainage features such as permeable surfacing, infiltration trenches and wildflower planting should be designed to good practice standards and a robust maintenance plan should be implemented. Given that the project and its operation will be sold on - probably repeatedly - it is very relevant that a robust maintenance plan is NOT the experience of other UK solar sites where the grounds have become bare, hard and more or less derelict. In addition, Dave Elvin stated at Gringley that the plan was for sheep</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>to graze under/between the panels - tho' again, experience from other sites is that this often fails due to awkward logistics for the farmer and poor quality grass. Sheep grazing would aggravate water run-off as they would greatly reduce the volume and quality of grass and further compact the soil, both of which greatly reduce the soil's absorption capacity: sheep are the greatest "compactors" of farm animals.</p> <p>The specific attributes of Cook & McCuen's model for solar run-off which make it inapplicable to WB4 are their different: array dimensions, direction and steepness of the ground slope, soil type and drainage, 100-year event in US weather patterns.</p>		
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>The absence of maintaining the quality of surface soils and planting from the mitigation proposals is a</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>critical omission (paras. 10.8.9-10.8.25). Para 10.8.22 states that "The topography within the majority of the site is relatively flat" which is patently not true: the overall slope of the site is 1:46 (2.2%), which hides the fact that it is undulating and in many areas the slope is considerably greater and variously orientated. The conclusion of this paragraph that ". . . the ground cover is unlikely to generate surface water runoff rates beyond the baseline scenario" is a complacent and dangerously simplistic avoidance of the facts. Re maintenance: Dave Elvin stated that the panels are cleaned once a year at most, by a tractor (a typical farm tractor) fitted with a revolving brush at the back (like an automatic car wash); other operational</p>		<p>infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>maintenance (rarely if ever needed - not even regular inspections) would be by quad bike. He stated that with this negligible amount of traffic there will be no compaction of ground between the panel rows. The John Dere M6 is a typical utility farm tractor: it has a width of 2.25m and weighs c.6,000Kg/6 tons. A typical quad bike (e.g. Honda ATV) is 1,2m wide and weighs c. 300Kg. I contest that even with such a low maintenance/inspection regime (which Table 10.7 states should be "a robust maintenance plan") there will be compaction and settlement sufficient to degrade the soil and planting and increase rainwater runoff.</p>		
<p>Topic area: Landscape and views</p>			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206009 FFCAWB0204007 FFCAWB0204006</p>	<p>Glint and Glare</p> <p>Respondents raised concern regarding the impact of glint and glare on community members, road traffic and wildlife.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant has presented assessment of glint and glare in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.16]. This Chapter describes the baseline conditions, glint and glare guidelines, methodology, and the potential glint and glare effects from the Scheme with regard to road safety, residential amenity, aviation activity, and railway operations and infrastructure. Public Rights of Way have not been included within the assessment because they are receptors with “low” sensitivity which means the receptor is tolerant to change without detrimental effect, and is of low or local importance.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment looks to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the visibility of the Scheme from public vantage points including transport routes,</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>public footpaths, permissive footpaths and green lane network. This mitigation is aimed to benefit the community as a whole as well as tourists, visiting walkers, local residents, ornithologists and cyclists. The landscape mitigation measures will seek to provide new planting to mitigation the potential impacts and effects of glint and glare, which will include new native hedgerows and tree cover, and this will also include their management and maintenance.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0203003 FFCAWB0206040 FFCAWB0206036 FFCAWB0206035 FFCAWB0206049 FFCAWB0206047 FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0206045 FFCAWB0206034 FFCAWB0206042 FFCAWB0206011 FFCAWB0206008 FFCAWB0204012 FFCAWB0203020 FFCAWB0203012 FFCAWB0203002 FFCAWB0202022 FFCAWB0202012 FFCAWB0202001 FFCAWB0202002 FFCAWB0201034	<p>General visual impact concerns</p> <p>Respondents expressed general concern regarding the visual impact and aesthetic of the Scheme.</p> <p>Respondents object to views being obscured by the site.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that views will be screened in close-mid range proximity due to the new hedgerows and shelterbelt planting and the enhancement of existing hedgerows which will be managed to a height of 5m. These new and augmented hedgerows will provide a series of good quality field boundaries both formally strengthening the existing and historical field pattern and creating a multi-layered landscape. Scattered tree belts will also follow the routes of existing watercourses, strengthening their visibility in the wider landscape. Views of the longer distance, where hedgerows do not block these, will be of a layered, well treed landscape with a backdrop of some wooded vegetation in places on the horizon. Both new and existing vegetation will have established and begun to mature, creating a much stronger structure to the landscape, and retaining and enhancing the overall character of the area. Planting takes into</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0201012 FFCAWB0201011 FFCAWB0201007 FFCAWB0206057 FFCAWB0206059 CAWB0207017_WB FFCAWB0206061			<p>account the nature of the landscape and where applicable tree planting would be scoped out to preserve the open character of the landscape.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8] set outs the ways in which the Applicant has considered the potential visual and landscape impacts to local residents and visitors, potential effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the impacts and effects on the fabric of the landscape are taken into account as well as the views and visibility.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The assessment includes a suite of viewpoints that cover a wide range of visual receptors, including public locations such as transport routes, public rights of way, and residential properties. These viewpoints have been discussed and agreed with the competent authority.</p> <p>Mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>This mitigation has been informed by feedback received and visits undertaken by the Applicant's landscape consultants throughout the surrounding landscape to</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>satisfy themselves that the extent of embedded and secondary mitigation is appropriate to mitigate the effects of the Scheme on the nearby properties.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, such as presented in Section 8.6 and Table 8.22 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], takes embedded mitigation into account to include the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Panels to be set a minimum of 3m from Site boundaries. - Panels to be set minimum of 20m from major watercourses and minimum of 8m from minor watercourses. - Panels to be set 50m (min) from boundary curtilage to outer edge of solar panel. - Site boundary fencing to be set back 5m from adjacent existing hedgerows to allow for proposed thickening and growth.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>- Let existing hedges grow out and managed at 5m. Encourage hedgerow trees to grow out within existing hedges to add further thickening and growth within the field boundaries.</p> <p>Additional secondary mitigation has also been designed into the Scheme, consisting of new planting proposals, details of which can be found on Figures 8.18.1-8.18.3 [EN010132/APP/WB6.4.8.18.1 - WB6.4.8.18.3] and is further described within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010132/APP/WB7.3]</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>The PEIR is insufficiently advanced for meaningful consultation.</p> <p>Mitigation is impossible.</p> <p>The whole area around Clayworth and Gringley is a highly used, highly prized, rural amenity important for physical and mental health and well-being (walking, running, riding, boating, fishing, nature study in its many forms). Its combination of rural beauty, intimately accessible by a matrix of paths and bridleways offer an ever-changing kaleidoscope of ancient paths with diversely-populated hedgerows, coppices, long-distance views glimpsed through gaps and gateways, opening out into wide, distant views of open fields productively farmed. Deer, badgers, hares, small mammals; owls, hawks, rare and protected birds and</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this comment but remains confident in the level of consultation undertaken and information presented throughout the pre-application stage, as described in the Consultation Report [EN010132/APP/WB5.1].</p> <p>For example, as part of the six-week phase two consultation on the Scheme, the Applicant presented consultees with as detailed information as possible by publishing a PEIR. A non-technical summary was published to accompany the PEIR, with public information events and free-to-use communications channels open to help aid accessibility and understanding of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>songbirds, echelons of migrating fowl above are all part of the tapestry. WB4 proposes to fence this in with 2m security fencing and boundary hedges up to 25m thick, so instead of the wide beautiful natural paths and vistas we would be trammelled down an artificial tunnel of planted hedging, behind which would rise the threatening plates of glass 12' high and CCTV mounted on higher poles.</p>		<p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>Any planting would take 20 years to grow and mature, so the experience in that time would be immediate confrontation with unabated rows of tall black glass behind stock fencing. No planting, fencing or reduction of site area can mitigate the scar of 30 fields of solar panels. The value of this area as "Bassetlaw's lung", and all the well-being and</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units. All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	health it promotes, would be destroyed for ever.		<p>substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme.</p> <p>The BNG assessment report also sets out how these calculations are based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010132/APP/WB7.3] which will be secured under a requirement of the DCO for the life of the Scheme (approximately 40 years).</p>
Topic area: Local ecology and biodiversity			
FFCAWB0206054; FFCAWB0206056; FFCAWB0206053; FFCAWB0206052; FFCAWB0206018; FFCAWB0205022; FFCAWB0205021; FFCAWB0206002; FFCAWB0203003;	<p>Disruption to Biodiversity</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that the construction and operation of the installations would have a negative impact on biodiversity. This included the disruptive implications this would create for local ecology.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that the large-scale reversion from intensive arable to approximately 800ha of grassland is of significant benefit to local wildlife, particularly invertebrates such as bees and butterflies, but also small mammals, birds, bats, reptiles and amphibians.</p> <p>A mosaic of habitats will be created, formed</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206041; FFCAWB0206040; FFCAWB0206039; FFCAWB0206037 ; FFCAWB0206047; FFCAWB0206032; FFCAWB0206044; FFCAWB0206017; FFCAWB0206029; FFCAWB0206024; FFCAWB0206026; FFCAWB0206007; FFCAWB0206023; FFCAWB0206006; FFCAWB0206004; FFCAWB0205019; FFCAWB0205014; FFCAWB0205012; FFCAWB0204012; FFCAWB0204009; FFCAWB0204007; FFCAWB0204003;			<p>by fields with different grassland types under panels in combination with wide buffer zones around field margins. An additional c.20km of hedgerow will also be planted, to improve green infrastructure and corridors of dispersal for species such as bats, small mammals and invertebrates.</p> <p>Relatively few species will be adversely affected, with impacts being restricted mainly to ground nesting birds such as skylark, yellow wagtail and lapwing. However, mitigation and compensation has been put forward to provide alternative nesting habitats for these species, while it is considered likely that a large proportion of ground nesting birds will benefit from the improved foraging opportunities within the grassland beneath the arrays.</p> <p>Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0203024; FFCAWB0203017; FFCAWB0203015; FFCAWB0203013; FFCAWB0202026; FFCAWB0203002; FFCAWB0202025; FFCAWB0202013; FFCAWB0202001; FFCAWB0202002; FFCAWB0201024; FFCAWB0201017; FFCAWB0201012; FFCAWB0201002; FFCAWB0206057; v			<p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9] sets out the baseline information available at the time of writing and considers the likely effects of the Scheme on ecological features during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out a series of mitigation and landscape management improvements to improve biodiversity in its Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.3].</p> <p>Regarding potential impacts to habitats and local wildlife, these are assessed and presented in Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9].</p> <p>Appendix 12 to Chapter 9 [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units. All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Net Gain assessment report also sets out how these calculations are based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010132/APP/WB7.3] which will be secured under a requirement of the DCO for the life of the Scheme (approximately 40 years).</p>
FFCAWB0206053	Barn owls are nesting in a garden in Sturton by Stow. Respondents were concerned about the way in which their hunting would be affected by solar panels.	No	The Applicant notes there is no known evidence to show that solar panels present either a collision risk or an impediment to hunting barn owls. The Barn Owl Trust has information on their website to this effect and state that solar farms can improve hunting conditions for barn owls by

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>increasing the abundance of prey items (voles) due to the creation of grassland under panels. arable environments are not optimal for field voles which rely on grassland with a litter layer of no less than 70mm, which means that barn owls typical expend more energy hunting over a wider area compared to hunting over tussocky grassland. Consequently, the Scheme is likely to be of substantial benefit to hunting barn owls.</p>
CAWB0207017_WB	<p>There are families of swans that nest on the Till and in the surrounding fields, so as a protected species it is not acceptable to change their habitat. Fences will hamper other wildlife from their natural paths</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes that nesting habitats within the River Till corridor will remain unchanged following the development, with access to the river unimpeded. Deer are likely to be dissuaded from the Scheme by the installation of fencing, although deer have been known to surmount or crawl under fencing where ground undulations permit them. As deer are wide-ranging in their habits and movements, it is not considered that changes in deer movements</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			brought about by perimeter fencing is of conservation concern.
FFCAWB0206063	There are families of swans that nest on the Till and in the surrounding fields, so as a protected species it is not acceptable to change their habitat	Yes	<p>The outline LEMP [EN010132/APP/WB7.3] sets out that the habitat creation prescriptions have been prepared with the contribution to the objectives of the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping (BOM) in mind, and through consideration of GLNP's Practical Application Principles for development within land assigned as "Opportunity for Creation".</p> <p>Further input will be sought on specific habitat creation in preparing the detailed LEMP.</p>
Topic area: Energy needs and climate change			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0201033; FFCAWB0206061	Respondents commented that the general environmental impact of these installations is too damaging when compared with any benefits that it might bring.	Yes	<p>An Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2] has been prepared as part of the DCO application to present the assessment and mitigations of potential effects associated with the Scheme. This is informed by a full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) which has been undertaken by the Applicant.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, setting out context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0206023 FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060</p>	<p>Respondents expressed concern surrounding the Carbon cost and emissions involved in the construction and development of the Scheme.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, setting out context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p> <p>Local and national planning policy has been identified in Chapter 6 (Energy Need, Legislative Context and Energy Policy) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.6].</p> <p>Chapter 7 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.7] presents the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment concerning the potential impacts of the Scheme on the Climate during the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning stages. The resilience of the Scheme to physical impacts caused by climate change has also been considered.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Section 7.10 (Residual Effects) explains that while there will be inevitable greenhouse gas emissions during the transport, energy and fuel associated with the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme, overall, the Scheme itself will provide major beneficial impacts and a net reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Section 7.5 (Assessment Assumptions and Limitations) sets out the assumptions applied to the assessment. It is noted it has assumed the PV panels being sourced from China or a country of similar distance from the UK, and there will therefore be an increase in embodied carbon and transport emissions, which would otherwise be lower if sourced from Europe.</p>
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>The lifetime carbon footprint of a solar installation is negative: more greenhouse gases are produced in manufacture, transport, construction,</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 7 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.7] presents the findings of the Environmental Impact</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>operation and decommissioning than are saved by not burning fossil fuels. Recent research shows that climate change will cause increasing coastal and river flooding, which will selectively remove huge areas of agricultural land (and highest quality land at that) from food production. It is ever more important to preserve our UK food production capacity and not squander it on inefficient energy production.</p>		<p>Assessment concerning the potential impacts of the Scheme on the Climate during the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning stages. The resilience of the Scheme to physical impacts caused by climate change has also been considered. Section 7.10 (Residual Effects) explains that while there will be inevitable greenhouse gas emissions during the transport, energy and fuel associated with the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme, overall, the Scheme itself will provide major beneficial impacts and a net reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>The Applicant notes this feedback and appreciates the importance of agricultural land. Impacts upon agricultural land have been assessed within Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19], which includes</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites.</p> <p>The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land from the Scheme.</p> <p>Table 5.6-5.9 of Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] details the design evolution that has led to the majority of BMV land being removed from the Scheme. The finalised Scheme contains only 26.24% Best and Most Versatile land and clear justification for why these small areas remain within the Scheme is set out at Tables 5.6 - 5.9 of ES Chapter 5.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that the Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality, and that some agricultural land could be retained during the operational phase, for example pasture grazed by sheep.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Topic area: Land quality and use			
FFCAWB0206020 FFCAWB0206019 FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0206045 FFCAWB0205020 FFCAWB0204008 FFCAWB0203020 FFCAWB0206061	<p>Brownfield Sites</p> <p>Respondents contended that brownfield sites should be seriously considered.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p>
FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0204001	<p>Respondents were concerned about contamination of land by BESS and metal leaching as a consequence of the installation of solar panels.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the influences of ground conditions and contamination on the development in Chapter 11 (Ground Conditions and Contamination) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.11].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0206053 FFCAWB0206021 FFCAWB0206020 FFCAWB0206019 FFCAWB0206018 FFCAWB0205022 FFCAWB0205021 FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206037 FFCAWB0206032 FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0206044 FFCAWB0206017 FFCAWB0206031 FFCAWB0206016 FFCAWB0206015 FFCAWB0206014 FFCAWB0206013 FFCAWB0206012 FFCAWB0206024 FFCAWB0206026	<p>Land Use</p> <p>Respondents believe that land should be retained for agriculture. This included concerns regarding food security.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this feedback and appreciates the importance of agricultural land. Impacts upon agricultural land have been assessed within Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19], which includes detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites.</p> <p>The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land from the Scheme.</p> <p>Table 5.6-5.9 of Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] details the design evolution that has led to the majority of BMV land being removed from the Scheme. The finalised Scheme contains only 26.24% Best and Most Versatile land and clear justification for why these small</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206007 FFCAWB0206006 FFCAWB0206004 FFCAWB0205019 FFCAWB0205014 FFCAWB0205013 FFCAWB0205012 FFCAWB0204011 FFCAWB0204008 FFCAWB0204007 FFCAWB0204005 FFCAWB0204003 FFCAWB0203025 FFCAWB0203024 FFCAWB0203018 FFCAWB0203017 FFCAWB0203016 FFCAWB0203013 FFCAWB0203005 FFCAWB0203002 FFCAWB0202025 FFCAWB0202023			<p>areas remain within the Scheme is set out at Tables 5.6 - 5.9 of Chapter 5.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that the Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality, and that some agricultural land could be retained during the operational phase, for example pasture grazed by sheep.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0202022 FFCAWB0202011 FFCAWB0202014 FFCAWB0202008 FFCAWB0202006 FFCAWB0202001 FFCAWB0202002 FFCAWB0201025 FFCAWB0201023 FFCAWB0201015 FFCAWB0201002 FFCAWB0206057 FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206063 FFCAWB0206059			
FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0202001	Respondents expressed concern regarding the decommissioning of the land and whether it will be adequately restored. Evidence of this procedure was requested.	Yes	The operational life of the Scheme is anticipated to be 40 years. Once the Scheme ceases to operate, the development will be decommissioned. A 40-year period for the operational phase of the development has been assessed in the EIA and reported in the Environmental Statement

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.2] which accompanies the DCO application. However, as is typical for energy generation NSIPs, the DCO Application does not seek a temporary or time limited consent.</p> <p>At decommissioning, the 400kV and 132kV cables may be left in situ, depending on which method is likely to have the least environmental impact at the time but are likely to be removed. It is considered generally desirable to remove the cables where possible, for both recycling purposes and to leave the land as close to its previous use state as possible. The cables would be removed by pulling the cables out from the ducts without the subsequent removal of the ducts themselves, thereby minimising surface disturbances.</p> <p>An The Outline Decommissioning Plan</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			[EN010132/APP/WB7.2] is provided as part of the DCO application.
FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056	<p>ALL THE LAND OF WB4 IS AT LEAST A GRADE BETTER THAN THIS: 3.7%-Grade 1, 14.7%-Grade 2, 81.6%-Grade 3a. This confirms our longstanding knowledge of the land, and is consistent with its high yields year on year of a wide variety of crops (wheat, barley, corn, rape, potatoes, beans, linseed, and more) most of which go straight into the local human food chain.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that solar developments should avoid using BMV land. Given that 100% of the site is BMV, this means that the whole WB4 site directly contravenes the</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>NPPF and the national interest. In your (IGP's) own words, the final soil analysis "has the potential to have a significant negative impact" by the loss of BMV land. There is no alternative but to gracefully and immediately withdraw WB4 from the West Burton Solar Project on this criterion alone.</p> <p>The WB4 site has no place in the West Burton DCO.</p>		
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>The 2 farmers who currently tenant WB4 are both retiring; the adjacent farmers have been pressing the landlord - the Henry Smith Charity - for years, for more land, to no avail. WB4 would continue in high-yield human food production without a break.</p> <p>There are at least 8 live large solar projects on both sides of the Trent</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>within an 8.5mile radius of Gainsborough: West Burton, Cottam, Gate Burton, Saundby, Hecklington Fen, Sturton by Stow, Wood Lane Sturton le Steeple, Tillbridge. Together, they would take 4,320 Ha (10,575 acres, 16.6 sq. miles) out of food production and amenity use. This is equivalent to the loss of 35,000 tons of wheat production annually. In addition, there are at least a further 5 proposals for large development of agricultural land within the same area. This voracious consumption of our best farmland for this most inefficient and unreliable source of energy production has to stop. If it's cold I can put on another jumper, if it's dark I can light a candle. I can't eat what's not in the larder.</p>		<p>design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts of the Scheme have been addressed as a whole within the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.1 – WB6.2.21].</p> <p>Each topic chapter considers the impacts of Scheme; and the impact of the Scheme in conjunction with other large scale solar proposals and other committed developments within the County.</p>
<p>Topic area: Other</p>			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0206032 FFCAWB0206045 FFCAWB0206030 FFCAWB0206013 FFCAWB0202011 FFCAWB0201027 FFCAWB0206061	<p>Solar Power Concerns</p> <p>Respondents were concerned about the long-term viability of Solar as an energy source. This was raised as an issue in conjunction with concerns regarding the efficiency of the panels.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>In addition to the information shared through consultation materials at the pre-application stage, a Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, explaining the reasons for the Scheme being large scale solar generation, and setting out the context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p> <p>Regarding efficiency, the Applicant notes that single-axis tracking technology may be used as part of the Scheme. The axis will be oriented North-South, with modules rotating East-West tracking with backtracking strategy for tracking arrays: when the mutual shadings begin, the tracking angle does not follow the sun anymore, but it instead goes back (decreases) so that no shading occurs. Generally, a solar panel system with a single-axis solar tracker installed sees a</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>performance gain of anywhere between 10 to 30 percent compared to a fixed mounting system.</p> <p>Early signs from other Solar Farms suggests panels are lasting longer than original expected lifespan of 25 years, therefore it is expected that the majority of panels will remain efficient for at least 40 years.</p>
<p>FFCAWB0206020 FFCAWB0205015 FFCAWB0206012 FFCAWB0205006</p>	<p>The community expressed a belief that there are other more appropriate locations for these solar installations.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The decommissioning of the West Burton coal fired power stations presents an opportunity to utilise existing grid connection infrastructure. This reduces the potential new impacts of a solar project and the Applicant has secured an agreement with National Grid for this.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application. In reviewing the policies and information available regarding solar generation and the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>need to decarbonise, it is the Applicant's view that large-scale solar must be considered as additional to, as opposed to instead of, the need for continued development in distribution connected, smaller scale solar, and this includes the development of rooftop solar.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0203003 FFCAWB0206037 FFCAWB0206044 FFCAWB0206017 FFCAWB0206029 FFCAWB0206008 FFCAWB0205020 FFCAWB0205011 FFCAWB0205009 FFCAWB0203017 FFCAWB0203013 FFCAWB0202036 FFCAWB0202003 FFCAWB0201017	<p>Respondents commented that green spaces and footpaths should be retained for the purposes of community health and wellbeing and because these have historically been green spaces.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.18] considers environmental effects arising as a result of the Scheme, in relation to topics including population health, tourism and accessibility and desirability of recreational facilities. This involves considering the amenity value of the existing footpath network.</p> <p>Visual amenity is assessed and considered in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, as described in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], looks to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>the public footpath, permissive footpath and green lane network, which is aimed to benefit the community as a whole as well as tourists, visiting walkers, local residents, ornithologists and cyclists. The landscape mitigation measures will seek to provide new planting which will include new native hedgerows and tree cover, and this will also include their management and maintenance.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the LVIA has carried forward from the PEIR, to Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], the intention to enhance the footpath network associated with the Sites, where appropriate, noted as secondary mitigation for Public Rights of Way. These measures potentially recommend increasing accessibility and connectivity of public rights of way, but also measures to increase understanding of the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			local landscapes and the solar project. The LVIA promotes, for example, information boards at vantage points, where appropriate. The LVIA also draws out ecological enhancement measures to provide a wider public understanding of the Scheme and encourage public access to nature.
FFCAWB0206025 FFCAWB0203014 FFCAWB0202016 FFCAWB0201022 FFCAWB0201011	Respondents expressed satisfaction with the proposal and general approval of a move towards reliance on renewables in order to ensure sustainability.	N/A	Noted.
FFCAWB0206005; FFCAWB0202041	Respondents felt that the concentration of solar developments in the surrounding area was too high.	N/A	The Applicant is cognisant of other projects being proposed in the area and has undertaken assessments to consider the potential cumulative effect of this. Cumulative impacts of the Scheme have been addressed as a whole within the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.1 – WB6.2.21].

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Each topic chapter considers the impacts of Scheme; and the impact of the Scheme in conjunction with other large scale solar proposals and other committed developments within the County.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with developers cooperatively to explore opportunities to reduce potential cumulative impacts. Consultation activities between the Scheme, West Burton Solar Project, and Gate Burton Energy Park were coordinated to reduce risks of consultation confusion and fatigue. The Applicant's site selection process (See Site Selection Assessment)</p> <p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1] explains the reasons for locating the Scheme in this location where there is grid capacity available at West Burton Power Station. It includes further detail on the alternatives</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.
FFCAWB0203002 FFCAWB0202003 FFCAWB0201034	Respondents expressed concern regarding the impact the Scheme development would have on house prices.	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and acknowledges this as a concern for neighbouring residents. Throughout the pre-application stage the Applicant has sought to assess potential effects to neighbouring properties and consult with local residents. The results of these assessments, along with proposed mitigations, are presented in the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2].</p> <p>The Applicant is confident that there is no empirical evidence to suggest that solar farms adversely affect nearby property values.</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed the visual impact upon neighbouring properties as part of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].
FFCAWB0206038 FFCAWB0206028	Because the solar does not protect or improve any of the above	No	Noted.
FFCAWB0206033	The local effect of these issues is clear	No	Noted.
FFCAWB0202042	Ruins people's lives	No	Noted.
FFCAWB0201031	Common Sense	No	Noted.
FFCAWB0202005	To ensure the residential environment is maintained	No	Noted.
FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056	There is risk from ordnance in WB4. The A613 Gringley by-pass was bombed by the Germans in the WW2: unexploded bombs were found during reconfiguration of the junction with Clayworth Road. Bombs were jettisoned over Toftdyke Lane south of Highfield Farm in WW2: the crater of 1 of them is still clearly visible. The risk of contamination of the ground and water courses from the minor but highly toxic components of	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>solar panels are completely ignored in the PEIR.</p> <p>Research shows that rain water will slowly leach the toxic chemicals from solar panels (Lead, Cadmium, Selenium, Arsenic), and that this is likely to increase as the panels age. Any damage or defect in the structural integrity of a solar panel will lead to escape of toxic components and environmental contamination, and the need for a safe (and expensive) clean-up. The greatest risk for WB4 would be at the time of building and decommission.</p>		<p>design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>Wholesale destruction of utility solar installations has been caused by hurricanes, tornados and earthquakes, rare (but not unknown) occurrences in the UK. The frequency of very severe storms with gale- and storm-force winds is increasing here, and a mild earthquake was widely felt in the Clayworth-Gringley area a few years ago. Solar arrays have also been damaged by hailstorms, which is more likely here. Much more common is damage during transportation, construction and replacement when life-expired.</p> <p>There will be a risk of land contamination for WB4, worse at the times of initial construction, interval renewals and final decommission. Contaminants will soak into the water table (which is always high here) and risk water extraction for human (Anglian Water boreholes) and animal use, and absorption by crops and to enter the food chains in this way, too. At times of heavy rain, contamination</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
--	---	------------	--

	<p>would be swept along with the water run-off and thence via Toft Dyke to the River Idle. This would risk contamination of the whole Idle valley and its habitats, wildlife and farmland, up to its entry into the River Trent above West Stockwith.</p> <p>We are very familiar with the insidious contamination that has ruined the sites of old gas works, mines, power stations, chemical works etc, and the difficulty and sometimes impossibility of de-contaminating them (and forcing the owner to actually do it and pay for it). Should this be the case for WB4, it will be far from temporary (however that is defined): it will be permanently unusable for anything. To insult us by dismissing WB4 as temporary and thus inconsequential is an insult to our intelligence.</p>		
--	--	--	--

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>Recycling of glass, silicon, aluminium, silver and copper from solar panels is possible, but the toxic elements are not recyclable and have to be disposed of as toxic waste (expensive). Recovery of materials from solar panels is not cost-effective: with current technologies, using recovered materials is up to 10x more costly than using new. Thus, at the present time there is no commercial incentive to recycle panels.</p> <p>The Area around WB4 was a coal-mining area, and still continues extraction of oil. It has rich resources of shale gas though test drilling and fracking hereabouts are currently suspended. All of these give a risk of ground settlement with damage of solar panels and consequent ground and water contamination by their</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>At decommissioning the 400kV and 132kV cables may be left in situ, depending on which method is likely to have the least environmental impact at the time but are likely to be removed. It is considered generally desirable to remove the cables where possible, for both recycling purposes and to leave the land as close to its previous use state as possible.</p> <p>Following consultation with typical battery suppliers, for the purpose of the calculation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the batteries have been assessed as being replaced once over the anticipated 40-year lifespan of the Scheme. The batteries will be recycled insofar as practical and with the technology available at the time of replacement.</p> <p>The Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.2] explains that this</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	toxic components. This is ignored in the PEIR.		<p>will be secured via the Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>It is highly contemptuous of the communities (and the nation) to lump these topics into a single chapter. These are major individual areas of impact, each deserving of detailed assessment. Another attempt to diminish the negative aspects of the project.</p> <p>How many construction workers would be drawn from the local communities? In other sections the PEIR expects them to be imported with the contractors, live in hostels and be bussed in to the sites. In this section, it "is anticipated to increase (local) employment and skills opportunities" with a "moderate to major-moderate beneficial effect". You can't have it both ways.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this comment but remains confident in the level of consultation undertaken and information presented throughout the pre-application stage, as described in the Consultation Report [EN010132/APP/WB5.1].</p> <p>For example, as part of the six-week phase two consultation on the Scheme, the Applicant presented consultees with as detailed information as possible by publishing a PEIR. A non-technical summary was published to accompany the PEIR, with public information events and free-to-use communications channels open to help aid accessibility and understanding of the Scheme.</p> <p>Direct and indirect impacts on employment have been assessed by the Applicant in Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.2.18] based on estimated construction numbers, and standard methodology for indirect and induced employment. Employment impacts on existing industries (i.e. agriculture) are included in the baseline conditions.</p>
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>How on earth can human health NOT warrant its own chapter in the PEIR? See above re the mis-information and dismissal in the PEIR of the risks of flood, fire, loss of recreational amenity, contamination, road and constructional accident, glint and glare, socio-economic cost - all of which are serious adverse effects the significance of which is dismissed out-of-hand. This is greenwashing in the extreme.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Chapter 21 (Other Environmental Matters) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.21] assesses the impacts of the Scheme upon human health and also considers major accidents and disasters.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>The benefits of using "green" areas - especially natural and rural countryside - are evidenced by much research. They are incorporated into UK government planning advice, and their preservation is a thread running through every section of the Bassetlaw Local Plan. Having access to a beautiful natural environment brings measurable improvements in the morbidity and mortality of cardiovascular disease, stroke, diabetes, obesity, cancer, arthritis and physical fitness, as well as the more predictable benefits for mental health of less depression, anxiety and stress. Physical exercise, especially in an outdoor natural environment, is a principle therapeutic agent in the treatment of depression, anxiety and stress, and the opportunity to do it locally benefits self-confidence,</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, as described in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], will look to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the public footpath, permissive footpath and green lane network, which is aimed to benefit the community as a whole as well as tourists, visiting walkers, local residents, ornithologists and cyclists. The landscape mitigation measures will seek to provide new planting which will include new native hedgerows and tree cover, and this will also include their management and maintenance.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	loneliness and social skills for the elderly and young alike.		
FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0206060	<p>The value of attractive, easily-accessible and local rural environments has never been better illustrated than during the recent coronavirus pandemic. The destructive impact of personal illness and loss from the disease, and of the social isolation and economic compromise of the lock-downs, generated unhappiness for all, worry, stress and anxiety for many, and frank mental illness and suicide in some. The critical and often only therapeutic avenue for many was exercise and re-connecting with nature, and the critical importance of this in the last 2 years particularly is well-evidenced. Again, the positive effects of the rural environment in Covid on public health</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, as described in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], will look to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the public footpath, permissive footpath and green lane network, which is aimed to benefit the community as a whole as well as tourists, visiting walkers, local residents, ornithologists and cyclists. The landscape mitigation measures will seek to provide new planting which will include new native hedgerows and tree cover, and this will also include their management and maintenance.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>will have been tangible - less demand on NHS services, and less worker absenteeism due to mental distress. With every lost walk, every countryside vista, every lost experience of wildlife, the health and economic costs rise.</p>		
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>It is also evidenced that the closer and more accessible an area of natural environment is, the more it is used and the more health benefit accrues. This is reflected in the "20-minute rule" adopted in local planning guidelines: that everyone should have access to an area of natural environment within a 20-minute walk or cycle ride is an accepted (and local) planning target. At a public health level, this has a real impact: on the demand, provision and costs of community services and general</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, as described in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], will look to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the public footpath, permissive footpath and green lane network, which is aimed to benefit the community as a whole as well as tourists, visiting walkers, local residents, ornithologists and cyclists. The landscape mitigation measures will seek to provide new planting which will include new native hedgerows and tree cover, and this</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	practice, on mental health services, and on out- and in-patient hospital services. Remove any one "green" amenity, and the health of the local population suffers and health costs rise.		will also include their management and maintenance.
FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056	Social care provision would also be impacted: the elderly, those with disability, anyone needing assisted living. They will inevitably be less mobile, and more than anyone will be affected by the loss of a nearby varied natural environment amenity. Rose Keys is a residential home for young adults on the Gringley Road bypass which would be surrounded by solar panels. Its residents suffer from learning disability, brain injury, autism and mental health conditions, and can display unpredictable, aggressive and challenging behaviour. Rose Keys would be imprisoned by the WB4	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>perimeter fence and behind it, hundreds of yards of imposing, apparently threatening, solar panels: what impact would this have on these residents?</p>		
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>The rich co-incidence of environment and heritage centred on the WB4 site is at the hub of recreation and visitor attraction in Bassetlaw, offering a natural complement to the range of attractions stated in the PEIR. The Chesterfield Canal and Idle Valley Nature Reserve SSSIs are specific attractions whose setting and attraction would be damaged by WB4, and an established event venue would be destroyed. This is arbitrarily, summarily dismissed as "not significant".</p> <p>It is not true to say that construction will have a negligible impact on</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>recreation venues. No-one will come to WB4 to walk through a building site and play chicken along the ancient footpaths which remain open.</p> <p>As discussed above, the prospect of returning the land to productive agriculture after 45 years of compaction, neglect and dereliction is just pie-in-the-sky.</p>		
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>The only mitigation of the impact on farming, food production, health and recreation can be not to put any solar panels on WB4, to withdraw WB4 completely from the Scheme. To say that "No other mitigation measures . . . are required to avoid or minimise the socio-economic, agriculture, and tourism and recreation effects identified in this chapter" is utterly disingenuous: none are possible.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056	Electromagnetic impacts are summarily "scoped out". Cellular service in Clayworth is poor, telephone and broadband cables are still aluminium for many with slow download speeds (5MB/sec is very good for here). The smallest electromagnetic effect could be terminal for some: this needs to be properly assessed. Electromagnetic effects do not just arise from cables: there are many other components in the solar chain which produce electromagnetic fields and for which screening needs to be assessed.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>The main concern is contamination, which is largely dismissed as a serious issue in the PEIR. It is not: contamination by escape of toxic chemicals from the panels and other infrastructure is a very real risk during construction, operation and decommission. Recycling solar panels is possible, some companies quoting 90-95% recovery for the glass, silicon, aluminium, silver and copper, but there are no reports of recovery of the toxic chemical components. Recovery of materials from solar panels is not cost-effective: with current technologies, using recovered materials is up to 10x more costly than using new. Thus, at the present time there is no commercial incentive to recycle panels. The EU, UK (currently) and some American states</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.2] explains that this will be secured via the Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>have regulations that require disposal of solar panels as toxic waste which is expensive; many poorer countries do not, and so the attractive business option for disposal is to export old panels to those countries where they would be dumped into landfill and contaminate their soil and water supplies.</p> <p>The real concern is that the operating company will cease trading and decommissioning will fail completely, leaving the landscape full of decaying panels and infrastructure contaminating the water and soils of the Idle valley.</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>Contaminants would soak into the water table (which is always high here) and risk water extraction for human (Anglian Water boreholes) and animal use, and absorption by crops and thus enter the food chains in this way, too. At times of heavy rain, contamination would be swept along with the water run-off and thence via Toft Dyke to the River Idle. This would risk contamination of the whole Idle valley and its habitats, wildlife and farmland, up to its entry into the River Trent above West Stockwith.</p> <p>We are very familiar with the insidious contamination that has ruined the sites of old gas works, mines, power stations, chemical works etc, and the difficulty and sometimes impossibility of de-contaminating them (and forcing the owner to actually do it and pay for</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>it) to make them safe for farming or human use again. Should this prove to be the case for WB4, then it will be far from temporary (however that is defined), it will be permanently unusable for anything. To insult us by dismissing WB4 as temporary is an insult to our intelligence.</p> <p>The PEIR is devoid of any proposals (practical or financial) to ensure safe, timely and complete decommissioning.</p>		
<p>FFCAWB0203006 FFCAWB0206065</p>	<p>There is too high a concentration of solar panels being put forward in this area. Cable route construction will cause considerable disruption.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The cumulative impacts of the Scheme together with other relevant projects in the area are assessed within the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.1].</p> <p>The Applicant initially presented a cable route search corridor, which has been</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>refined through engagement and consultation with landowners.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that mitigation measures are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) the Construction Traffic Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.2 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14]. and the Public Rights of Way Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.3 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14].</p>

4 **Table 5.12.3: Feedback received to Question 5b: Please provide your specific comments on the site design for these areas**

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Topic area: West Burton 1			
FFCAWB0206053 FFCAWB0206013 FFCAWB0204009 FFCAWB0203015 FFCAWB0201017 FFCAWB0201015 OF_CAWB02_016 OF_CAWB02_019 OF_CAWB02_032 OF_CAWB02_051 OF_CAWB02_110 OF_CAWB02_140 OF_CAWB02_262	<p>Visual Impact Concerns</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the visual impact that the solar panels will have on the site and surrounding area. Some respondents felt that they would be surrounded by panels.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure such as fencing and cameras, and substation and battery storage are presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the impacts and effects on the fabric of the landscape are taken into account as well as the views and visibility.</p> <p>The assessment includes a suite of viewpoints that cover a wide range of visual</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>receptors, including public locations such as transport routes, public rights of way, and residential properties. These viewpoints have been discussed and agreed with the competent authority.</p> <p>Mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>This mitigation has been informed by feedback received and visits undertaken by the Applicant's landscape consultants throughout the surrounding landscape to satisfy themselves that the extent of embedded and secondary mitigation is appropriate to mitigate the effects of the Scheme on the nearby properties.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, such as presented in Section 8.6 and Table 8.22 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], takes embedded mitigation into account to include the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Panels to be set a minimum of 3m from Site boundaries. - Panels to be set minimum of 20m from major watercourses and minimum of 8m from minor watercourses. - Panels to be set 50m (min) from boundary curtilage to outer edge of solar panel. - Site boundary fencing to be set back 5m from adjacent existing hedgerows to allow for proposed thickening and growth. - Let existing hedges grow out and managed at 5m. Encourage hedgerow trees to grow out within existing hedges to add further

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>thickening and growth within the field boundaries.</p> <p>Additional secondary mitigation has also been designed into the Scheme, consisting of new planting proposals, details of which can be found on Figures 8.18.1-8.18.3 [EN010132/APP/WB6.4.8.18.1 – WB6.4.8.18.3] and is further described within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010132/APP/WB7.3]</p> <p>Additional secondary mitigation has also been designed into the Scheme, consisting of new planting proposals, details of which can be found on Figures 8.18.1-8.18.3 [EN010132/APP/WB6.4.8.18.1 – WB6.4.8.18.3] and is further described within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010132/APP/WB7.3]</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Regarding the heights of the solar panels, the Environmental Statement employs a maximum design scenario approach reflecting the principle of the 'Rochdale Envelope'. This approach allows for a project to be assessed on the basis of maximum project design parameters for example, the worst-case scenario in order to provide flexibility and take advantage of technological improvements, assessing all potentially significant effects (positive or adverse) within the EIA process and reported in the Environmental Statement. Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], clearly sets out the details of the design elements including extents and parameters, such as heights and locations that have been used in the assessment.</p> <p>The full details/parameters of the elements</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			that have been modelled (Solar Arrays, substation etc.) are set out in the Concept Design Parameters and Principles document [EN010132/APP/WB7.13] and Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.4] , which accompany the DCO application.
FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0206016 FFCAWB0206015 FFCAWB0204009 FFCAWB0203016 OM_CAWB02_008 OM_CAWB02_009 OF_CAWB02_032 OF_CAWB02_036 OF_CAWB02_039 OF_CAWB02_048 OF_CAWB02_051 OF_CAWB02_058 OF_CAWB02_132 OF_CAWB02_146	<p>Land Use</p> <p>Respondents believe that this site should be retained for agriculture. This included concerns regarding food security.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this feedback and appreciates the importance of agricultural land. Impacts upon agricultural land have been assessed within Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19], which includes detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites.</p> <p>The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land from the Scheme.</p> <p>Table 5.6-5.9 of Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] details</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_157 OF_CAWB02_160 OF_CAWB02_168 OF_CAWB02_201 OF_CAWB02_209 OF_CAWB02_215 OF_CAWB02_239 OF_CAWB02_240 OF_CAWB02_241 OF_CAWB02_246 OF_CAWB02_251 OF_CAWB02_259 OF_CAWB02_262 OF_CAWB02_300			<p>the design evolution that has led to the majority of BMV land being removed from the Scheme. The finalised Scheme contains only 26.24% Best and Most Versatile land and clear justification for why these areas remain within the Scheme is set out at Tables 5.6 - 5.9 of ES Chapter 5.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that the Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality, and that some agricultural land could be retained during the operational phase, for example pasture grazed by sheep.</p>
OF_CAWB02_262	Respondent expressed concern about the loss of farming jobs.	Yes	<p>A full assessment of the economic impact of the Scheme is presented in Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.18], with quantitative results for numbers of employment opportunities anticipated vs. agricultural sector jobs lost.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Skills and training opportunities, where practicable are explored, and given in more detail in the Skills and Supply Chain Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.10] .
FFCAWB0202006	Respondent felt that the site was too big.	Yes	<p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application. In reviewing the policies and information available regarding solar generation and the need to decarbonise, it is the Applicant's view that large-scale solar must be considered as additional to, as opposed to instead of, the need for continued development in distribution connected, smaller scale solar, and this includes the development of rooftop solar.</p> <p>The Applicant has followed a step-by-step site selection process which confirms the location of the Scheme is suitable for a</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			large-scale solar farm. This has included the avoidance of sensitive landscape and environmental designations in confirming site suitability and consideration of alternative sites.
OF_CAWB02_039 OF_CAWB02_047 OF_CAWB02_058 OF_CAWB02_132 OF_CAWB02_140 OF_CAWB02_166 OF_CAWB02_191	<p>Ecology and Biodiversity Concerns</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that the construction and operation of the installations would have a negative impact on ecology and biodiversity.</p>	Yes	<p>Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9] sets out the baseline information available at the time of writing and considers the likely effects of the Scheme on ecological features during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out a series of mitigation and landscape management improvements to improve biodiversity in its Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.3].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Regarding potential impacts to habitats and local wildlife, these are assessed and presented in Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9]. Appendix 12 to Chapter 9 [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units . All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Net Gain assessment report also sets out how these calculations are based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010132/APP/WB7.3] which will be secured under a requirement</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			of the DCO for the life of the Scheme (approximately 40 years).
FFCAWB0206057	The proposals are hugely inappropriate for the rural area, creating physical barriers across currently relatively open areas between small, rural settlements.	Yes	<p>The Applicant has followed a step-by-step site selection process which confirms the location of the Scheme is suitable for a large-scale solar farm. This has included the avoidance of sensitive landscape and environmental designations in confirming site suitability and consideration of alternative sites.</p> <p>The Applicant has considered a range of factors in developing the design of the Scheme. This included consultation feedback, the results from environmental assessments, and the advancement of technical design, all of which have informed the design refinement process. Decisions to remove areas and amend the design within the Scheme have been carefully considered on a location-specific basis.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The Applicant has provided justification for the selection of land for the Scheme, as well as evidence of the consultation and engagement they have undertaken consistent with relevant legislation and guidance.</p> <p>Details of the process are set out in Appendix 5.1: Site Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>The potential effects associated with installing solar panels on this Site area, along with proposed appropriate mitigation,</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			are detailed in the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2] .
FFCAWB0206064	In West Burton 1, these panels are not buffered adequately from the boundaries of the homes. The height of the panels will destroy any views out across the countryside from the village towards the cliff, and it will give the feeling of traveling through a corridor when entering the village from the South. The permanency of these row upon row structures will create a claustrophobic feeling for those in the village who border on them, which may lead to issues affecting residents' mental health deteriorating with time. The site extends onto the Till which is concerning given the issues around the biodiversity opportunities identified by the County Council.	Yes	The Applicant notes that, as set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010132/APP/WB7.3] , development free buffer zones have been established around all field boundaries and measure between 5 and 50m in width. In the majority of cases, these measure 8-12m. The widths were carefully chosen on the basis of the relative ecological importance of each boundary feature depending on the presence of ditches, species-rich hedgerows, trees with potential as bat roost and so forth. All buffer zones will be managed to provide valuable grassland habitats which will be of greater width and ecological value than almost all existing arable field margins.
Topic area: West Burton 2			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206053 FFCAWB0206013 FFCAWB0201017 OF_CAWB02_016 OF_CAWB02_032 OF_CAWB02_051 OF_CAWB02_110 OF_CAWB02_140 OF_CAWB02_262	<p>Visual Impact Concerns</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the visual impact that the solar panels will have on the site and surrounding area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure such as fencing and cameras, and substation and battery storage are presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the impacts and effects on the fabric of the landscape are taken into account as well as the views and visibility.</p> <p>The assessment includes a suite of viewpoints that cover a wide range of visual receptors, including public locations such as transport routes, public rights of way, and residential properties. These viewpoints</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>have been discussed and agreed with the competent authority.</p> <p>Mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>This mitigation has been informed by feedback received and visits undertaken by the Applicant's landscape consultants throughout the surrounding landscape to satisfy themselves that the extent of embedded and secondary mitigation is appropriate to mitigate the effects of the Scheme on the nearby properties.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, such as</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>presented in Section 8.6 and Table 8.22 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], takes embedded mitigation into account to include the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Panels to be set a minimum of 3m from Site boundaries. - Panels to be set minimum of 20m from major watercourses and minimum of 8m from minor watercourses. - Panels to be set 50m (min) from boundary curtilage to outer edge of solar panel. - Site boundary fencing to be set back 5m from adjacent existing hedgerows to allow for proposed thickening and growth. - Let existing hedges grow out and managed at 5m. Encourage hedgerow trees to grow out within existing hedges to add further thickening and growth within the field boundaries.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Additional secondary mitigation has also been designed into the Scheme, consisting of new planting proposals, details of which can be found on Figures 8.18.1-8.18.3 [EN010132/APP/WB6.4.8.18.1 – WB6.4.8.18.3] and is further described within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010132/APP/WB7.3]</p> <p>Regarding the heights of the solar panels, the Environmental Statement employs a maximum design scenario approach reflecting the principle of the 'Rochdale Envelope'. This approach allows for a project to be assessed on the basis of maximum project design parameters for example, the worst-case scenario in order to provide flexibility and take advantage of technological improvements, assessing all potentially significant effects (positive or adverse) within the EIA process and</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>reported in the Environmental Statement. Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], clearly sets out the details of the design elements including extents and parameters, such as heights and locations that have been used in the assessment.</p> <p>The full details/parameters of the elements that have been modelled (Solar Arrays, substation etc.) are set out in the Concept Design Parameters and Principles document [EN010132/APP/WB7.13] and Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.4], which accompany the DCO application.</p>
FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0206016 FFCAWB0206015 FFCAWB0203016 FFCAWB0201012 OM_CAWB02_008	<p>Land Use</p> <p>Respondents believe that this site should be retained for agriculture. This included concerns regarding food security.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this feedback and appreciates the importance of agricultural land. Impacts upon agricultural land have been assessed within Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19], which includes</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OM_CAWB02_016 OM_CAWB02_017 OF_CAWB02_032 OF_CAWB02_035 OF_CAWB02_036 OF_CAWB02_039 OF_CAWB02_048 OF_CAWB02_051 OF_CAWB02_058 OF_CAWB02_146 OF_CAWB02_157 OF_CAWB02_160 OF_CAWB02_168 OF_CAWB02_201 OF_CAWB02_209 OF_CAWB02_239 OF_CAWB02_240 OF_CAWB02_241 OF_CAWB02_246 OF_CAWB02_251 OF_CAWB02_259			<p>detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites.</p> <p>The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land from the Scheme.</p> <p>Table 5.6-5.9 of Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] details the design evolution that has led to the majority of BMV land being removed from the Scheme. The finalised Scheme contains only 26.24% Best and Most Versatile land and clear justification for why these small areas remain within the Scheme is set out at Tables 5.6 - 5.9 of ES Chapter 5.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that the Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality, and that some agricultural land could be</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_262 OF_CAWB02_300			retained during the operational phase, for example pasture grazed by sheep.
OF_CAWB02_262	Respondent expressed concern about the loss of farming jobs.	Yes	<p>A full assessment of the economic impact of the Scheme is presented in Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.18], with quantitative results for numbers of employment opportunities anticipated vs. agricultural sector jobs lost.</p> <p>Skills and training opportunities, where practicable are explored, and given in more detail in the Skills and Supply Chain Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.10].</p>
FFCAWB0202026	Respondent felt that the site would disproportionately impact on Marton and Brampton	No	Noted.
FFCAWB0202005	Traffic information has been requested for Sturton Road.	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>OM_CAWB02_010 OM_CAWB02_014 OF_CAWB02_219</p>	<p>Respondents were concerned that the solar panels are proposed to be situated in too close proximity to homes.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered a range of factors in developing the design of the Scheme. This included consultation feedback, the results from environmental assessments, and the advancement of technical design, all of which have informed the design refinement process. Decisions to remove areas and amend the design within the Scheme have been carefully considered on a location-specific basis.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided justification for the selection of land for the Scheme, as well as evidence of the consultation and engagement they have undertaken consistent with relevant legislation and guidance.</p> <p>Regarding potential visual and landscape impacts to local residents and visitors, potential effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure are presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact)</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed the visual impact upon neighbouring properties as part of the Environmental Statement, Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8]. The Applicant's landscape consultants have visited the Scheme area and surrounding landscape, including a number of neighbouring properties, to satisfy themselves that the extent of embedded and secondary mitigation is appropriate to mitigate the effects of the Scheme near neighbours.</p>
<p>OM_CAWB02_011 OM_CAWB02_014 OM_CAWB02_015 OM_CAWB02_016</p>	<p>Respondents highlighted that WB2 is a site of archaeological significance. They request that this be evaluated before construction work begins.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The potential impacts of the Scheme are assessed in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement: Cultural Heritage [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.13], together with an overview of the programme of mitigation required to remove or reduce such impacts.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OM_CAWB02_013	With regards to the DMV monument of North Ingleby (NHLE 1003570, MLI 50391, MLI 54225), there should be no panels, tracks or any other development within this area.	Yes	Pasture fields containing earthwork remains associated with the deserted medieval villages of North and South Ingleby have been removed from the Scheme. This includes the Scheduled Monument: deserted village of North Ingleby (NHLE 1003570).
OF_CAWB02_001	Respondents were satisfied with the proposed site design.	No	Noted.
OF_CAWB02_010	Respondent requested that permissive footpaths within the site are upgraded to permissive bridleways which would allow for horse and bike access.	No	The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, as described in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8] , looks to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the public footpath, permissive footpath and green lane network, which is aimed to benefit the community as a whole as well as tourists, visiting walkers, local residents, ornithologists and cyclists. The landscape mitigation measures will seek to provide new planting which will include new native

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>hedgerows and tree cover, and this will also include their management and maintenance.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the LVIA has carried forward from the PEIR, to Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], the intention to enhance the footpath network associated with the Sites, where appropriate, noted as secondary mitigation for Public Rights of Way. These measures potentially recommend increasing accessibility and connectivity of public rights of way, but also measures to increase understanding of the local landscapes and the solar project. The LVIA promotes, for example, information boards at vantage points, where appropriate. The LVIA also draws out ecological enhancement measures to provide a wider public understanding of the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Scheme and encourage public access to nature.
OF_CAWB02_035 OF_CAWB02_039 OF_CAWB02_047 OF_CAWB02_058 OF_CAWB02_140 OF_CAWB02_166 OF_CAWB02_191	<p>Ecology and Biodiversity Concerns</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that the construction and operation of the installations would have a negative impact on ecology and biodiversity.</p>	Yes	<p>Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9] sets out the baseline information available at the time of writing and considers the likely effects of the Scheme on ecological features during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out a series of mitigation and landscape management improvements to improve biodiversity in its Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.3].</p> <p>Regarding potential impacts to habitats and local wildlife, these are assessed and presented in Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Appendix 12 to Chapter 9 [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units . All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Net Gain assessment report also sets out how these calculations are based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010132/APP/WB7.3] which will be secured under a requirement of the DCO for the life of the Scheme (approximately 40 years).</p>
OF_CAWB02_037	Respondents have requested a buffer zone in the field on Sykes Lane, opposite Hardwick Scrub community nature site	Yes	The Applicant has been liaising with Saxilby Nature Project regarding the creation of a habitat management area in the south western corner of West Burton 2 for future

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			community activities and biodiversity mitigation.
FFCAWB0206057	The proposals are hugely inappropriate for the rural area, creating physical barriers across currently relatively open areas between small, rural settlements.	Yes	<p>The Applicant has followed a step-by-step site selection process which confirms the location of the Scheme is suitable for a large-scale solar farm. This has included the avoidance of sensitive landscape and environmental designations in confirming site suitability and consideration of alternative sites.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the impacts and effects on the fabric of the landscape are taken into account as well as the views and visibility.</p> <p>The assessment includes a suite of viewpoints that cover a wide range of visual receptors, including public locations such as transport routes, public rights of way, and residential properties. These viewpoints have been discussed and agreed with the competent authority.</p> <p>Mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8] .
FFCAWB0206061	Remove all panels from the layout in area N14, since they are incongruous and contradictory to numerous statements in both your Scoping and PEIR documents (and documented discussions with other stakeholders such as Historic England) regarding the avoidance of any development in the monument areas associated with the designated DMV monument of North Ingleby (NHLE 1003570, MLI 50391, MLI 54225). This would include the removal of all fencing, access, maintenance/construction tracks, distribution cables and all associated solar project infrastructure from the	Yes	Pasture fields containing earthwork remains associated with the deserted medieval villages of North and South Ingleby have been removed from the Scheme. No development is proposed for Fields N14, N15 and N18, or the scheduled area of North Ingleby deserted medieval village (NHLE 1003570).

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>proposed design.</p> <p>2. For the same reason as outlined in point 1. Remove the proposed maintenance/construction track leading to areas N19 and N20, and crossing areas N14, N15 and N18, from the design, essentially leaving these areas in their current `undeveloped' state. This would include the removal of all fencing, access, maintenance/construction tracks, distribution cables and all associated project infrastructure from the design.</p>		
<p>Topic area: West Burton 3</p>			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206013 FFCAWB0204005 FFCAWB0201023 FFCAWB0201017 FFCAWB0201015 OF_CAWB02_016 OF_CAWB02_032 OF_CAWB02_051 OF_CAWB02_110 OF_CAWB02_142 OF_CAWB02_217 OF_CAWB02_221 OF_CAWB02_262	<p>Visual Impact Concerns</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the visual impact that the solar panels will have on the site and surrounding area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered a range of factors in developing the design of the Scheme. This included consultation feedback, the results from environmental assessments, and the advancement of technical design, all of which have informed the design refinement process. Decisions to remove areas and amend the design within the Scheme have been carefully considered on a location-specific basis.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided justification for the selection of land for the Scheme, as well as evidence of the consultation and engagement they have undertaken consistent with relevant legislation and guidance.</p> <p>Regarding potential visual and landscape impacts to local residents and visitors, potential effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure are presented</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed the visual impact upon neighbouring properties as part of the Environmental Statement, Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8]. The Applicant's landscape consultants have visited the Scheme area and surrounding landscape, including a number of neighbouring properties, to satisfy themselves that the extent of embedded and secondary mitigation is appropriate to mitigate the effects of the Scheme near neighbours.</p> <p>Regarding the heights of the solar panels, the Environmental Statement employs a maximum design scenario approach reflecting the principle of the 'Rochdale</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Envelope'. This approach allows for a project to be assessed on the basis of maximum project design parameters for example, the worst-case scenario in order to provide flexibility and take advantage of technological improvements, assessing all potentially significant effects (positive or adverse) within the EIA process and reported in the Environmental Statement. Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], clearly sets out the details of the design elements including extents and parameters, such as heights and locations that have been used in the assessment.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0206016 FFCAWB0206053 FFCAWB0206016 FFCAWB0206015 FFCAWB0203016 OM_CAWB02_008 OF_CAWB02_032 OF_CAWB02_035 OF_CAWB02_036 OF_CAWB02_039 OF_CAWB02_048 OF_CAWB02_051 OF_CAWB02_058 OF_CAWB02_142 OF_CAWB02_143 OF_CAWB02_146 OF_CAWB02_157 OF_CAWB02_160 OF_CAWB02_168 OF_CAWB02_201 OF_CAWB02_215	<p>Land Use</p> <p>Respondents believe that this site should be retained for agriculture. This included concerns regarding food security.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this feedback and appreciates the importance of agricultural land. Impacts upon agricultural land have been assessed within Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19], which includes detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites.</p> <p>The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land from the Scheme.</p> <p>Table 5.6-5.9 of Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] details the design evolution that has led to the majority of BMV land being removed from the Scheme. The finalised Scheme contains only 26.24% Best and Most Versatile land and clear justification for why these small</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_221 OF_CAWB02_239 OF_CAWB02_240 OF_CAWB02_241 OF_CAWB02_246 OF_CAWB02_251 OF_CAWB02_259 OF_CAWB02_262 OF_CAWB02_300			<p>areas remain within the Scheme is set out at Tables 5.6 - 5.9 of ES Chapter 5.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that the Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality, and that some agricultural land could be retained during the operational phase, for example pasture grazed by sheep.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application. In reviewing the policies and information available regarding solar generation and the need to decarbonise, it is the Applicant's view that large-scale solar must be considered as additional to, as opposed to instead of, the need for continued development in distribution connected, smaller scale solar, and this includes the development of rooftop solar.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p>
OF_CAWB02_262	Respondent expressed concern about the loss of farming jobs.	Yes	<p>A full assessment of the economic impact of the Scheme is presented in Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.18], with quantitative results for numbers of employment opportunities anticipated vs. agricultural sector jobs lost.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Skills and training opportunities, where practicable are explored, and given in more detail in the Skills and Supply Chain Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.10] .
FFCAWB0205015 FFCAWB0206005 OF_CAWB02_089 FFCAWB0206065	Respondents commented that the visual impact of solar panels on Tillbridge Lane will be visible for a considerable distance due to the geographical layout of the land in this area.	Yes	<p>The Applicant has considered a range of factors in developing the design of the Scheme. This included consultation feedback, the results from environmental assessments, and the advancement of technical design, all of which have informed the design refinement process. Decisions to remove areas and amend the design within the Scheme have been carefully considered on a location-specific basis.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided justification for the selection of land for the Scheme, as well as evidence of the consultation and engagement they have undertaken consistent with relevant legislation and</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>guidance.</p> <p>Regarding potential visual and landscape impacts to local residents and visitors, potential effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure are presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed the visual impact upon neighbouring properties as part of the Environmental Statement, Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The Applicant's landscape consultants have visited the Scheme area and surrounding landscape, including a number of neighbouring properties, to satisfy themselves that the extent of embedded and secondary mitigation is appropriate to</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>mitigate the effects of the Scheme near neighbours.</p> <p>Regarding the heights of the solar panels, the Environmental Statement employs a maximum design scenario approach reflecting the principle of the 'Rochdale Envelope'. This approach allows for a project to be assessed on the basis of maximum project design parameters for example, the worst-case scenario in order to provide flexibility and take advantage of technological improvements, assessing all potentially significant effects (positive or adverse) within the EIA process and reported in the Environmental Statement. Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], clearly sets out the details of the design elements including extents and parameters,</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			such as heights and locations that have been used in the assessment.
FFCAWB0205015 FFCAWB0203003 FFCAWB0202017 OF_CAWB02_005 OF_CAWB02_106 OF_CAWB02_143	<p>Site Location</p> <p>Respondents contend that this site is too close to existing dwellings. Some of which are within conservation villages.</p>	Yes	The Applicant has followed a step-by-step site selection process which confirms the location of the Scheme is suitable for a large-scale solar farm. This has included the avoidance of sensitive landscape and environmental designations in confirming site suitability and consideration of alternative sites.
FFCAWB0203003	Respondents commented that planned walkways need better structures.	N/A	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0202008 FFCAWB0202006	Respondents felt that the site was too big.	Yes	<p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application. In reviewing the policies and information available regarding solar generation and the need to decarbonise, it is the Applicant's view that large-scale solar must be considered as additional to, as opposed to instead of, the need for continued development in distribution connected, smaller scale solar, and this includes the development of rooftop solar.</p> <p>The Applicant has followed a step-by-step site selection process which confirms the location of the Scheme is suitable for a large-scale solar farm. This has included the avoidance of sensitive landscape and environmental designations in confirming site suitability and consideration of alternative sites.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>OF_CAWB02_298 OF_CAWB02_299</p>	<p>The environmental impact is huge, bringing in equipment and materials from other countries. The devastation to wildlife during construction is just too much. The construction will disturb nests, dens etc, prevent many of the buzzards in the area from catching prey and generally disturb the wildlife daily lives.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The effect of the Scheme on species, including bats, birds, polecat, hedgehog, badger, otter and water vole, is presented in Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9].</p> <p>Section 9.7 identifies and characterises construction and operation phase impacts on each Important Ecological Feature of the Scheme considered possible according to baseline data and Scheme designs. Embedded mitigation measures to avoid and mitigate for these impacts are considered, and any additional mitigation required is set out. Thereafter, an assessment is made of the significance of any residual effects after all mitigation measures have been accounted for. Ecological enhancements which will or may be adopted are also outlined.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>An Outline Ecological Protection and Mitigation Strategy (EPMS) [EN010132/APP/WB7.17] has been produced to support the Environmental Statement. The Outline EPMS summarises the measures and approaches to be adopted which will limit the likelihood of impacts occurring upon retained habitats through damage, pollution and disturbance during the construction phase in order to enact the mitigation requirements set out in Chapter 19.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units . All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme.</p> <p>The BNG assessment report also sets out how these calculations are based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010132/APP/WB7.3] which will be secured under a requirement of the DCO for the life of the Scheme (approximately 40 years).</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>OF_CAWB02_035 OF_CAWB02_039 OF_CAWB02_047 OF_CAWB02_058 OF_CAWB02_166 OF_CAWB02_191 OF_CAWB02_221</p>	<p>Ecology and Biodiversity Concerns</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that the construction and operation of the installations would have a negative impact on ecology and biodiversity.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The effect of the Scheme on species, including bats, birds, polecat, hedgehog, badger, otter and water vole, is presented in Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9].</p> <p>Section 9.7 identifies and characterises construction and operation phase impacts on each Important Ecological Feature of the Scheme considered possible according to baseline data and Scheme designs. Embedded mitigation measures to avoid and mitigate for these impacts are considered, and any additional mitigation required is set out. Thereafter, an assessment is made of the significance of any residual effects after all mitigation measures have been accounted for. Ecological enhancements which will or may be adopted are also outlined.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>An Outline Ecological Protection and Mitigation Strategy (EPMS) [EN010132/APP/WB7.17] has been produced to support the Environmental Statement. The Outline EPMS summarises the measures and approaches to be adopted which will limit the likelihood of impacts occurring upon retained habitats through damage, pollution and disturbance during the construction phase in order to enact the mitigation requirements set out in Chapter 19.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%,</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units . All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme.</p> <p>The BNG assessment report also sets out how these calculations are based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010132/APP/WB 7.3] which will be secured under a requirement of the DCO for the life of the Scheme (approximately 40 years).</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206057	The proposals are hugely inappropriate for the rural area, creating physical barriers across currently relatively open areas between small, rural settlements.	Yes	<p>The Applicant has followed a step-by-step site selection process which confirms the location of the Scheme is suitable for a large-scale solar farm. This has included the avoidance of sensitive landscape and environmental designations in confirming site suitability and consideration of alternative sites.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken (See Site Selection Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1] and explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>impacts and effects on the fabric of the landscape are taken into account as well as the views and visibility.</p> <p>The assessment includes a suite of viewpoints that cover a wide range of visual receptors, including public locations such as transport routes, public rights of way, and residential properties. These viewpoints have been discussed and agreed with the competent authority.</p> <p>Mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206065	West Burton 3 site has proposed panels in the north west corner adjacent to stow park road- too close to existing buildings	No	<p>The Applicant has considered a range of factors in developing the design of the Scheme. This included consultation feedback, the results from environmental assessments, and the advancement of technical design, all of which have informed the design refinement process. Decisions to remove areas and amend the design within the Scheme have been carefully considered on a location-specific basis.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided justification for the selection of land for the Scheme, as well as evidence of the consultation and engagement they have undertaken consistent with relevant legislation and guidance.</p> <p>Regarding potential visual and landscape impacts to local residents and visitors, potential effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure are presented</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed the visual impact upon neighbouring properties as part of the Environmental Statement, Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The Applicant's landscape consultants have visited the Scheme area and surrounding landscape, including a number of neighbouring properties, to satisfy themselves that the extent of embedded and secondary mitigation is appropriate to mitigate the effects of the Scheme near neighbours.</p>
<p>Topic area: West Burton 4</p>			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206018 FFCAWB0205022 FFCAWB0205021 FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206037 FFCAWB0206029 FFCAWB0206024 FFCAWB0206004 FFCAWB0204006 FFCAWB0203013 FFCAWB0202041 OM_CAWB02_018 OM_CAWB02_019 OM_CAWB02_020 OF_CAWB02_013 OF_CAWB02_027 OF_CAWB02_029 OF_CAWB02_044 OF_CAWB02_045 OF_CAWB02_072 OF_CAWB02_073 OF_CAWB02_075	<p>Idle Valley Nature Reserve</p> <p>Respondents raised concern regarding the impact that this site would have on the Idle Valley Nature reserve.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_093 OF_CAWB02_095 OF_CAWB02_098 OF_CAWB02_133 OF_CAWB02_134 OF_CAWB02_176 OF_CAWB02_212 OF_CAWB02_239 OF_CAWB02_240 OF_CAWB02_241 OF_CAWB02_253 OF_CAWB02_274 OF_CAWB02_275 OF_CAWB02_297			
FFCAWB0206053 FFCAWB0206041 FFCAWB0206040 FFCAWB0206050 FFCAWB0206047 FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0206016 FFCAWB0206015	<p>BMV Land</p> <p>Respondents believe that this site should be retained for agriculture since it is graded BMV. This included concerns regarding food security. They contend that brownfield sites should be utilised instead.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206029 FFCAWB0206028 FFCAWB0205006 FFCAWB0203016 FFCAWB0203013 FFCAWB0202042 FFCAWB0202039 OM_CAWB02_017 OF_CAWB02_013 OF_CAWB02_025 OF_CAWB02_026 OF_CAWB02_027 OF_CAWB02_028 OF_CAWB02_029 OF_CAWB02_032 OF_CAWB02_035 OF_CAWB02_036 OF_CAWB02_038 OF_CAWB02_039 OF_CAWB02_043 OF_CAWB02_045 OF_CAWB02_048			<p>of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_051 OF_CAWB02_055 OF_CAWB02_058 OF_CAWB02_072 OF_CAWB02_079 OF_CAWB02_087 OF_CAWB02_092 OF_CAWB02_094 OF_CAWB02_095 OF_CAWB02_096 OF_CAWB02_097 OF_CAWB02_100 OF_CAWB02_107 OF_CAWB02_112 OF_CAWB02_115 OF_CAWB02_117 OF_CAWB02_118 OF_CAWB02_119 OF_CAWB02_120 OF_CAWB02_123 OF_CAWB02_128 OF_CAWB02_130			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_131 OF_CAWB02_133 OF_CAWB02_134 OF_CAWB02_138 OF_CAWB02_146 OF_CAWB02_150 OF_CAWB02_152 OF_CAWB02_154 OF_CAWB02_155 OF_CAWB02_156 OF_CAWB02_157 OF_CAWB02_158 OF_CAWB02_160 OF_CAWB02_162 OF_CAWB02_164 OF_CAWB02_168 OF_CAWB02_178 OF_CAWB02_179 OF_CAWB02_180 OF_CAWB02_186 OF_CAWB02_188 OF_CAWB02_189			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_194 OF_CAWB02_196 OF_CAWB02_197 OF_CAWB02_198 OF_CAWB02_201 OF_CAWB02_202 OF_CAWB02_203 OF_CAWB02_207 OF_CAWB02_208 OF_CAWB02_209 OF_CAWB02_228 OF_CAWB02_229 OF_CAWB02_230 OF_CAWB02_235 OF_CAWB02_236 OF_CAWB02_237 OF_CAWB02_239 OF_CAWB02_240 OF_CAWB02_241 OF_CAWB02_243 OF_CAWB02_244 OF_CAWB02_246			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_251 OF_CAWB02_253 OF_CAWB02_259 OF_CAWB02_262 OF_CAWB02_264 OF_CAWB02_266 OF_CAWB02_267 OF_CAWB02_277 OF_CAWB02_279 OF_CAWB02_280 OF_CAWB02_284 OF_CAWB02_294 OF_CAWB02_296 OF_CAWB02_298 OF_CAWB02_300			
OF_CAWB02_284	The WHOLE site is graded 3a BMV agricultural land and therefore fails to meet the test in the NPPF.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.
OF_CAWB02_295	Current events such as those between Russia and the Ukraine have highlighted the importance of being as self-sufficient as possible in producing our own food in this country. Repurposing good farmland is counter intuitive.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_262; OF_CAWB02_296	Respondent expressed concern about the loss of farming jobs.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

<p>FFCAWB0206054 FFCAWB0206018 FFCAWB0206003 FFCAWB0205022 FFCAWB0205021 FFCAWB0203007 FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206037 FFCAWB0206035 FFCAWB0206024 FFCAWB0206004 FFCAWB0204006 FFCAWB0203013 OM_CAWB02_012 OM_CAWB02_019 OM_CAWB02_020 OF_CAWB02_025 OF_CAWB02_026 OF_CAWB02_028 OF_CAWB02_043 OF_CAWB02_044 OF_CAWB02_055 OF_CAWB02_072 OF_CAWB02_073 OF_CAWB02_075 OF_CAWB02_079 OF_CAWB02_093</p>	<p>Conservation Village disruption</p> <p>Respondents highlighted that Gringley and Clayworth are conservation villages and therefore should be undisturbed by industrial developments.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
--	--	------------	--

OF_CAWB02_095 OF_CAWB02_098 OF_CAWB02_114 OF_CAWB02_122 OF_CAWB02_130 OF_CAWB02_131 OF_CAWB02_133 OF_CAWB02_139 OF_CAWB02_145 OF_CAWB02_151 OF_CAWB02_156 OF_CAWB02_164 OF_CAWB02_176 OF_CAWB02_189 OF_CAWB02_212 OF_CAWB02_227 OF_CAWB02_243 OF_CAWB02_253 OF_CAWB02_257 OF_CAWB02_274 OF_CAWB02_275 OF_CAWB02_282 OF_CAWB02_297			
---	--	--	--

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206020 FFCAWB0206019 FFCAWB0206037 FFCAWB0206050 FFCAWB0206047 FFCAWB0206044 FFCAWB0206030 FFCAWB0206042 FFCAWB0206018 FFCAWB0205022 FFCAWB0206038 FFCAWB0206036 FFCAWB0206035 FFCAWB0206031 FFCAWB0206014 FFCAWB0206029 FFCAWB0206009 FFCAWB0206028 FFCAWB0206026 FFCAWB0206007 FFCAWB0206006 FFCAWB0206004	<p>Visual Impact Concerns</p> <p>Respondents expressed general concern regarding the visual impact and aesthetic of this site. They object to views being obscured by industrial developments such as this and were dissatisfied that the topography of this area means that the development will be visible for considerable distances, no screening will be able to mitigate for the visual harm caused by the site.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0205020 FFCAWB0205014 FFCAWB0205013 FFCAWB0205012 FFCAWB0205011 FFCAWB0205008 FFCAWB0205009 FFCAWB0204011 FFCAWB0204006 FFCAWB0203017 FFCAWB0203013 FFCAWB0202002 FFCAWB0201017 FFCAWB0201015 OM_CAWB02_002 OM_CAWB02_018 OM_CAWB02_019 OM_CAWB02_020 OF_CAWB02_016 OF_CAWB02_025 OF_CAWB02_032 OF_CAWB02_042			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_044 OF_CAWB02_045 OF_CAWB02_051 OF_CAWB02_072 OF_CAWB02_073 OF_CAWB02_075 OF_CAWB02_092 OF_CAWB02_093 OF_CAWB02_094 OF_CAWB02_098 OF_CAWB02_099 OF_CAWB02_110 OF_CAWB02_112 OF_CAWB02_122 OF_CAWB02_128 OF_CAWB02_130 OF_CAWB02_131 OF_CAWB02_133 OF_CAWB02_134 OF_CAWB02_135 OF_CAWB02_137 OF_CAWB02_145			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_155 OF_CAWB02_164 OF_CAWB02_176 OF_CAWB02_178 OF_CAWB02_179 OF_CAWB02_180 OF_CAWB02_189 OF_CAWB02_190 OF_CAWB02_197 OF_CAWB02_200 OF_CAWB02_203 OF_CAWB02_204 OF_CAWB02_212 OF_CAWB02_225 OF_CAWB02_227 OF_CAWB02_228 OF_CAWB02_229 OF_CAWB02_243 OF_CAWB02_253 OF_CAWB02_257 OF_CAWB02_262 OF_CAWB02_266			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_267 OF_CAWB02_271 OF_CAWB02_274 OF_CAWB02_275 OF_CAWB02_282 OF_CAWB02_296 OF_CAWB02_297 OF_CAWB02_298 OF_CAWB02_299			
FFCAWB0206056 OM_CAWB02_012	Respondents were generally concerned regarding the adverse impacts created for the site in accordance with topics raised within the PEIR.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
<p>FFCAWB0205012 FFCAWB0203022 FFCAWB0202043 FFCAWB0201027 OF_CAWB02_025 OF_CAWB02_029 OF_CAWB02_035 OF_CAWB02_038 OF_CAWB02_102 OF_CAWB02_114 OF_CAWB02_128 OF_CAWB02_131 OF_CAWB02_133</p>	<p>Site Selection</p> <p>Respondents were sceptical of the energy potential of the panels and suitability of the site due to its topography.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_139 OF_CAWB02_151			results of a range of environmental assessments.
FFCAWB0206048 FFCAWB0206035 FFCAWB0206047 FFCAWB0206024 FFCAWB0206026 FFCAWB0205013 FFCAWB0202008 FFCAWB0202006 OF_CAWB02_041 OF_CAWB02_138 OF_CAWB02_139 OF_CAWB02_266 OF_CAWB02_275 OF_CAWB02_287	<p>Scale of Site</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern about the size of the site, commenting that it is too big</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206038 FFCAWB0206028 FFCAWB0206006 OF_CAWB02_043 OF_CAWB02_115 OF_CAWB02_133 OF_CAWB02_134 OF_CAWB02_139 OF_CAWB02_154 OF_CAWB02_164 OF_CAWB02_167 OF_CAWB02_189 OF_CAWB02_207 OF_CAWB02_228 OF_CAWB02_229 OF_CAWB02_253	<p>Flood Risk</p> <p>Respondents were concerned about the potential flood risk at this site. Clayworth is prone to flooding and the construction of the site will exacerbate this.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
FFCAWB0206047 FFCAWB0202039 FFCAWB0202025 FFCAWB0202002 OF_CAWB02_013 OF_CAWB02_026	<p>Ecology and Biodiversity Concerns</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that the construction and operation of the installations would have a negative impact on ecology and biodiversity.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_035 OF_CAWB02_039 OF_CAWB02_047 OF_CAWB02_058 OF_CAWB02_079 OF_CAWB02_087 OF_CAWB02_092 OF_CAWB02_094 OF_CAWB02_114 OF_CAWB02_115 OF_CAWB02_133 OF_CAWB02_134 OF_CAWB02_139 OF_CAWB02_151 OF_CAWB02_156 OF_CAWB02_158 OF_CAWB02_166 OF_CAWB02_179 OF_CAWB02_186 OF_CAWB02_189 OF_CAWB02_191 OF_CAWB02_194			<p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_224 OF_CAWB02_235 OF_CAWB02_253 OF_CAWB02_296 OF_CAWB02_298			
OF_CAWB02_270; OF_CAWB02_273; OF_CAWB02_292	<p>Construction A construction period of 29 weeks for WB4 is very optimistic. Please be realistic.</p> <p>Construction noise, road obstruction, mud and dust continuously for 11 hours a day +5.5hrs Saturdays will be destructively intrusive and damaging to mental health and well-being for all in Clayworth and surrounding homesteads and many in Gringley.</p> <p>Why has no preliminary CEMP been prepared yet to be included in the PEIR? Who will police and what sanctions will encourage its compliance?</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

<p>OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_273 OF_CAWB02_292</p>	<p>Decommissioning You don't offer a tick-box for decommissioning - a convenient way to avoid due consideration of the African elephant in the room. "The land . . . will be returned to its original use after decommissioning". Where is the evidence (or even balanced argument) to justify this greenwashing statement? Decommissioning is effectively ignored. This is complacency of the highest order. 40 years (50 years including construction and decommissioning if it is timely) is not "temporary" in anyone's book: it covers 2 or 3 generations, and most people alive now will be dead before the end of the project. The solar industrialisation of the land will change it for ever, in the same way as other industrial sites (gas works, coal mines, quarries). The land will be compacted, contaminated, untilled, its land drains destroyed and its farms derelict: reinstatement to agriculture is a fantasy. It will have been permanently contaminated and forever unusable</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
--	---	------------	--

	<p>even if all of the structures are removed and the excavated topsoils replaced. That 50 years of "rest" will compensate for this and even improve (!) its value for arable farming is poppycock. The financial and logistical requirements for decommissioning a large solar site in the UK are unknown. But the huge size of the installation with hundreds of thousands of individual panels which need to be disposed of under Toxic Waste Regulations means that the costs will be huge, £millions. It is blandly assumed that there will be a reinstatement bond, but there is no mention of this in the PEIR. In fact, there is no statement in the PEIR about any provision to ensure that the finances for decommissioning will be secured "up front", or adequate or protected. We are already seeing developers and constructors renege on financial agreements and assurances enshrined in the original consent when selling the business on to subsequent operators. What size of bond? Who will pay for it (IGP? The constructor who will buy it</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>from IGP? A future operator who will buy it from the constructor?) When will it be deposited? Who will be responsible for it? With whom will it be deposited? What Regulations will safeguard it? Is all of this reliable and trustworthy? In 45 years time?</p> <p>The size of the bond will be a pure guess and likely minimised by the investor; such bonds are commonly accrued over the lifetime of the project. Energy prices are notoriously volatile: witness the current explosive rises. What if, over time, the price drops, on-shore wind and/or nuclear takes off (as they have to) and the irregularity and small output of solar becomes "uneconomic"? If the investor operating the project simply closes the site early, ceases trading or is declared bankrupt? If the bond proves too small, or its establishment renèged upon or not established at the time of closure, or it is pillaged by the company responsible for it, or it is just lost in the jungle of the investment world?</p>		
--	--	--	--

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_273 OF_CAWB02_292</p>	<p>Climate Change The lifetime carbon footprint of a solar installation is negative: more greenhouse gases are produced in manufacture, transport, construction, operation and decommissioning than are saved by not burning fossil fuels. Recent research shows that climate change will cause increasing coastal and river flooding, which will selectively remove huge areas of agricultural land (and highest quality land at that) from food production. It is ever more important to preserve our UK food production capacity and not squander it on inefficient energy production.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>OF_CAWB02_270; OF_CAWB02_273; OF_CAWB02_292</p>	<p>The PEIR is insufficiently advanced for meaningful consultation. Mitigation is impossible. The whole area around Clayworth and Gringley is a highly used, highly prized, rural amenity important for physical and mental health and well-being (walking, running, riding, boating, fishing, nature study in its many forms). Its combination of rural beauty, intimately accessible by a matrix of paths and bridleways offer an ever-changing kaleidoscope of ancient paths with diversely-populated hedgerows, coppices, long-distance views glimpsed through gaps and gateways, opening out into wide, distant views of open fields productively farmed. Deer, badgers, hares, small mammals; owls, hawks, rare and protected birds and songbirds, echelons of migrating fowl above are all part of the tapestry. WB4 proposes to fence this</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>in with 2m security fencing and boundary hedges up to 25m thick, so instead of the wide beautiful natural paths and vistas we would be trammelled down an artificial tunnel of planted hedging, behind which would rise the threatening plates of glass 12' high and CCTV mounted on higher poles.</p> <p>Any planting would take 20 years to grow and mature, so the experience in that time would be immediate confrontation with unabated rows of tall black glass behind stock fencing.</p> <p>No planting, fencing or reduction of site area can mitigate the scar of 30 fields of solar panels.</p> <p>The value of this area as "Bassetlaw's lung", and all the well-being and health it promotes, would be destroyed for ever.</p>		

<p>OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_273 F_CAWB02_292</p>	<p>Water & Flood Risk</p> <p>This is one of the most critical areas of deficiency in the PEIR for the WB4 site. There is no experiential data on the effects of huge industrial-scale solar on the environment - especially in the UK with our topographies, latitude, climate and weather, and especially related to its effect on flood risks. The only way to assess this is to model it mathematically - a poor substitute for the real thing but the best we have. This not been done for WB4, and the PEIR states that there is no need for it to be done: this is nothing less than negligent complacency.</p> <p>The whole discussion regarding the WB4 site concentrates on the flood risk to the site itself, its panels and workers. It ignores the real risk: the flooding of Clayworth village from run-off waters from the WB4 site.</p> <p>Clayworth has suffered severe residential flooding twice in the last 20 years from run-off from the WB4 site</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
---	---	------------	--

	<p>with "normal" variations in the weather. The PEIR states that it adopts the "Rochdale Principle" - of starting its assessments of harm and risk with the worst-possible case scenario and then working back from that to arrive at a balanced assessment of risk and proposals for its mitigation. The PEIR also states that it will consider climate change (which would be expected to increase the frequency and severity of extreme weather events) - but it does not.</p> <p>IGP have had 6 months to undertake a full hydrological and flood risk assessment but have failed to do so. The PEIR simply summarises the developers' legal and planning obligations and promises of future assessments to be given in the final submission: just not good enough for a project of this size and impact.</p> <p>The PEIR fails to address the shortcomings and serious concerns identified by many statutory bodies</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>(including those responsible for managing flood risk) in the Scoping Report (Table 10.1). The PEIR hydrology section refers to "a hydrological assessment has been undertaken to establish local drainage catchments and overland flow routes in Appendices 10.1-10.4" (para 10.3.4). These appendices (dated January 2022!!!) show and state the association of flood risk with the Chesterfield Canal (which is irrelevant for flood risk) and ignore the River Idle, Toftdyke and its culverts and downstream drainage channels into the R Idle, and the myriad of field drains and intermediate dykes which drain the whole WB4 hillside into Toftdyke. Is this their evidence-base for "Maintenance of existing drainage infrastructure" which is "critical to avoid compaction of soils" (para 10.5.9)?</p> <p>Appendices 10.1-10.4 are simply reprints of contour and flood-risk maps available on-line, which contain substantive inaccuracies and errors (and admit this), uncritically accepted as fact without</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>confirmation by a site visit or engagement with local experience (which requests were refused by the consultants but are belatedly promised). This all reflects the precipitate, inadequate and underprepared presentation of the PEIR.</p> <p>The methodology for determining the "significance of effect" (para. 10.5.) is flawed on 3 counts: 1) it assumes that "the Scheme will be low impact with access roads and footways surfaced with permeable surfacing and therefore assumed to be effectively permeable": this ignores the effect of years of construction compacting the clay sub-soil beneath the permeable surfacing which will increase run-off; if the construction proceeds, it will no longer be agricultural with the water absorption ("loss") that might give to slow run-off and reduce erosion (para 10.5.7); 2) that "any run-off from construction waste materials would be collected, contained and prevented from direct entry to local water sources" (which include 2 water SSSIs) (para</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>10.3.12): where are the plans and proposals for achieving this, and the assurances that this will be fully effective and policed? 3) "Analysis of flood extents is reliant upon the accuracy of the published EA Flood Map for Planning and EA flood data. No new hydraulic modelling has been undertaken as part of this study" (para10.3.12): these flood maps do not reference recorded history of floods, and themselves state that they are only indicative: it is negligent not to reference recent and documented local history, and to undertake detailed hydraulic modelling specific to the site. Re Baseline Conditions: West Burton 4 (section 10.4). The risk of long-term flooding derives from the whole of the 5.73 sq. Km of the Toftdyke catchment area, over 40% of which comprised by the WB4 site, not just the Clayworth Road. That Notts CC fail to maintain the camber drains is an added risk. Without any evidence-base or modelling, the PEIR grades the significance of the risks of water course pollution and flood risk from increased</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>run-off as "Major Adverse". Astonishingly, by just using permeable surfaces to the access roads during construction (ignoring the effect of compaction of the clay sub-soil by construction traffic), "suitable planting" under and between the solar panels, and drainage ditches around hard-standings and buildings - these become conveniently reduced to "negligible" and "unlikely to generate surface water runoff rates beyond the baseline scenario" (Para 10.8.22,24). Unbelievable. The only evidence cited to support this argument is the paper by Cook & McCuen (2013), which models the Hydrologic Response of Solar Farms concentrating on their impact on water run-off (para 10.8.9). Delta-Simons' simple adoption of Cook & McCuen's conclusions are fallacious for 2 reasons: 1) Many of the assumptions about the design of the solar arrays, the topography of the land, and the nature of the soils and surfaces upon which they sit are contrary and inapplicable to</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>the WB4 site; 2) Cook & McCuen's conclusion of no significant effect on run-off from rows of solar panels is critically dependent upon free drainage through sandy soils planted with quality grasses, actively maintained by an intensive ground management programme (which prevents soil erosion and the development of hard or bare surfaces under and/or between the panel rows). Failure of any of these factors greatly increases run-off, but the worst scenario is the ground becoming bare, when the modelling shows that solar panels increase run-off by 73-100%. This finding is conveniently ignored in the PEIR, but is the one scenario in the model which is relevant to WB4: Clayworth particularly floods under 2 circumstances, when a heavy rainstorm follows a period of steady "normal" rain which saturates the clay soil so it cannot absorb any more, and a period of dry weather baking the clay hard followed by a flash rainstorm. High-quality maintenance of the ground and planting beneath and between</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>panels is not considered: in operation the site will be "unmanned", and the ONLY reference to this is a final sentence in a box in the summary Table 10.7: Mitigation: "any proposed drainage features such as permeable surfacing, infiltration trenches and wildflower planting should be designed to good practice standards and a robust maintenance plan should be implemented. Given that the project and its operation will be sold on - probably repeatedly - it is very relevant that a robust maintenance plan is NOT the experience of other UK solar sites where the grounds have become bare, hard and more or less derelict.</p> <p>In addition, [it was] stated at Gringley that the plan was for sheep to graze under/between the panels - tho' again, experience from other sites is that this often fails due to awkward logistics for the farmer and poor quality grass. Sheep grazing would aggravate water run-off as they would greatly reduce the volume and quality of grass and further</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>compact the soil, both of which greatly reduce the soil's absorption capacity: sheep are the greatest "compactors" of farm animals.</p> <p>The specific attributes of Cook & McCuen's model for solar run-off which make it inapplicable to WB4 are their different: array dimensions, direction and steepness of the ground slope, soil type and drainage, 100-year event in US weather patterns.</p> <p>The absence of maintaining the quality of surface soils and planting from the mitigation proposals is a critical omission (paras. 10.8.9-10.8.25). Para 10.8.22 states that "The topography within the majority of the site is relatively flat" which is patently not true: the overall slope of the site is 1:46 (2.2%), which hides the fact that it is undulating and in many areas the slope is considerably greater and variously orientated. The conclusion of this paragraph that ". . . the ground cover is unlikely to generate surface water</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>runoff rates beyond the baseline scenario" is a complacent and dangerously simplistic avoidance of the facts.</p> <p>Re maintenance: [it was] stated that the panels are cleaned once a year at most, by a tractor (a typical farm tractor) fitted with a revolving brush at the back (like an automatic car wash); other operational maintenance (rarely if ever needed - not even regular inspections) would be by quad bike. He stated that with this negligible amount of traffic there will be no compaction of ground between the panel rows. The John Dere M6 is a typical utility farm tractor: it has a width of 2.25m and weighs c.6,000Kg/6 tons. A typical quad bike (e.g. Honda ATV) is 1,2m wide and weighs c. 300Kg. I contest that even with such a low maintenance/inspection regime (which Table 10.7 states should be "a robust maintenance plan") there will be compaction and settlement sufficient to degrade the soil and planting and increase rainwater runoff.</p>		
--	---	--	--

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_273 OF_CAWB02_292</p>	<p>Ground Conditions and Contamination There is risk from ordnance in WB4. The A613 Gringley by-pass was bombed by the Germans in the WW2: unexploded bombs were found during reconfiguration of the junction with Clayworth Road. Bombs were jettisoned over Toftdyke Lane south of Highfield Farm in WW2: the crater of 1 of them is still clearly visible.</p> <p>The risk of contamination of the ground and water courses from the minor but highly toxic components of solar panels are completely ignored in the PEIR. Research shows that rain water will slowly leach the toxic chemicals from solar panels (Lead, Cadmium, Selenium, Arsenic), and that this is likely to increase as the panels age. Any damage or defect in the structural integrity of a solar panel will lead to</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>escape of toxic components and environmental contamination, and the need for a safe (and expensive) clean-up. The greatest risk for WB4 would be at the time of building and decommission.</p> <p>Wholesale destruction of utility solar installations has been caused by hurricanes, tornados and earthquakes, rare (but not unknown) occurrences in the UK. The frequency of very severe storms with gale- and storm-force winds is increasing here, and a mild earthquake was widely felt in the Clayworth-Gringley area a few years ago. Solar arrays have also been damaged by hailstorms, which is more likely here. Much more common is damage during transportation, construction and replacement when life-expired.</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>There will be a risk of land contamination for WB4, worse at the times of initial construction, interval renewals and final decommission. Contaminants will soak into the water table (which is always high here) and risk water extraction for human (Anglian Water boreholes) and animal use, and absorption by crops and to enter the food chains in this way, too. At times of heavy rain, contamination would be swept along with the water run-off and thence via Toft Dyke to the River Idle. This would risk contamination of the whole Idle valley and its habitats, wildlife and farmland, up to its entry into the River Trent above West Stockwith. We are very familiar with the insidious contamination that has ruined the sites of old gas works, mines, power stations, chemical works etc, and the difficulty</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>and sometimes impossibility of de-contaminating them (and forcing the owner to actually do it and pay for it). Should this be the case for WB4, it will be far from temporary (however that is defined): it will be permanently unusable for anything. To insult us by dismissing WB4 as temporary and thus inconsequential is an insult to our intelligence.</p> <p>Recycling of glass, silicon, aluminium, silver and copper from solar panels is possible, but the toxic elements are not recyclable and have to be disposed of as toxic waste (expensive). Recovery of materials from solar panels is not cost-effective: with current technologies, using recovered materials is up to 10x more costly than using new. Thus, at the present time there is no commercial incentive to recycle panels.</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>The Area around WB4 was a coal-mining area, and still continues extraction of oil. It has rich resources of shale gas though test drilling and fracking hereabouts are currently suspended. All of these give a risk of ground settlement with damage of solar panels and consequent ground and water contamination by their toxic components. This is ignored in the PEIR.</p>		
<p>OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_273 OF_CAWB02_292</p>	<p>Cultural Heritage</p> <p>The panels of WB4 would clothe the hill which is the WB4 site. Its pinnacle is Beacon Hill: the single most dominant feature of the landscape, the highest hill in the area and visible for 20 miles in all directions. It gives superb views down the hillside and for 20+miles across the flatlands to the south, and is directly in line with the mid-axis of WB4. Beacon Hill is a Scheduled Monument of</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>national geologic and historical significance (bronze age, Roman, Saxon, Norman, Civil War). Beacon Hill is the central feature - the key landmark - of the whole area, the centre-piece of its well-used, high amenity value. The Trent Valley Way and many local walks lead up to it and circumnavigate it. Its topography, rising out of the flatlands to the north and south, is everything, its raison d'être: its history and heritage derive from its prominence, visibility and outlook. Clothing it in solar panels would desecrate its setting, be contemptuous of its heritage, make a mockery of our protective heritage regulations; it would destroy its attraction and amenity for local residents and its many regional visitors.</p> <p>The clear 20+-mile sight lines across 3 counties to and from Beacon Hill, the</p>		<p>results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>primary local visual amenity, renders the arbitrarily-defined extensions of the study area to 2 & 5Km beyond the site boundary inappropriate.</p> <p>There is no assessment of Beacon Hill in either Vol 1 or Vol 2 of the PEIR: it is stated that this will be the subject of a separate Heritage Statement. The absence of this from either Volume is a major deficiency in the PEIR.</p> <p>Throughout the Heritage Chapters, important heritage assets and context which are not Scheduled Monuments or Graded Buildings are ignored. The landscape of the WB4 site, the villages which adjoin it (Clayworth, Gringley, Wiseton) and the surrounding area is a rich, highly-treasured, beautiful, easily accessible, popular rural amenity for walkers, riders, cyclists, boaters, fishers and nature lovers. What gives this area its value is not just the beauty and</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>variety of the countryside here, but the interweaving of ancient patterns of co-existence between natural environment, farmed land and habitation. Wherever you go - open glaciated landscape, along country lanes, rural roads, beside farmed fields, down village streets and into their Churches and buildings - you walk through two thousand years of human history - and more.</p> <p>Examples are the visible evidence of centuries' interdependence of farmland and villages, historic Churches (with the nationally recognised Traquair murals in Clayworth church - which, incidentally has Saxon origins, not as stated 2th century), attractive vernacular and manorial buildings, the early industrial archaeology of the Chesterfield canal (also an SSSI and nationally important long-distance walking route), the Roman Road through Clayworth (which kept the</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>route between Lincoln and York open in winter by avoiding the impassable salt marsh of the Humber Lake), the old Viking route between Bawtry and Gainsborough along Toftdyke Lane thence eastward through the centre of WB4 (which remained the principle coach road until the modern tarmac'd roads were built and passes by the mounds of the deserted village just south of Highfield Farm). Plant a square mile of solar panels in the middle of this, and the area ceases to draw you to it, the setting and integrity of the human and natural history of the area is lost, and with it goes its amenity value and the uplift, well-being and health it generates.</p> <p>All of this is totally ignored in the Chapter on heritage value. No planting, fencing or reduction of site</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>area can mitigate the lost connection between the countryside and our history when walking and riding through it. The statement in para 11.3.2 that ". . . with appropriate mitigation in place effects can be reduced or eliminated" is ignorant and fatuous, and displays the dangerous limitations of desk-top analyses.</p> <p>Even so, no specific proposals for mitigation are offered.</p> <p>Noise and Vibration</p> <p>This 50-page section in Vol 1 of the PEIR does nothing but record baseline levels of noise (which we know are very low for WB4) and regales the regulations and methodology for assessing its impact and that of vibration, with promises to consider this in future.</p> <p>Why could not real data from similar equipment operating in IGP's other solar plants have been offered as an</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>illustration of likely effects for WB4? This section is meaningless for us. Light Pollution - Glint & Glare This is another theoretical section with the application of arbitrary distance intervals to GCSE optical physics to diminish significance. I contest that the threshold distances are irrelevant: irrespective of distance, the area of identically-aligned panels is so great that any direct reflection of the sun's rays to a human receptor will be incapacitating (instantly blinding, after-glare, permanently damaged retina). Solar panels must not be placed anywhere (at any distance from) where they might reflect into a dwelling, or directly at a road user, train driver or aircraft pilot. Full stop.</p>		
<p>OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_273 OF_CAWB02_292</p>	<p>Air Quality The main issue discussed here is fire risk - a very real risk with lithium-ion</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>batteries as experience has shown. In summer with dry planting covering the site, a fire starting in a battery (or anywhere else on the solar site) would rapidly spread and could easily escalate into an uncontrollable wildfire similar to those seen in the UK within the last week.</p> <p>WB4 is a rural location along minor roads, its closest, local fire station (? 2 engines) being 7 miles away - 20-30 minutes minimum from alarm to deploying water hoses, longer if no-one is on site which would be locked which will be the normal case during operation.</p> <p>It is dismissively complacent to arbitrarily state that "it would be a short period before being extinguished". It is equally complacent only to consider the</p>		<p>infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	consequence of fire to be drifting smoke, and to completely ignore the direct risk of a spontaneous fire during the operational phase of the project.		
OF_CAWB02_270; OF_CAWB02_273; OF_CAWB02_292	<p>Land Use</p> <p>A major concern locally is the effect on farming and food production. This is discussed above, and the cumulative effects for this area would be devastating. The nation's food security and food prices are at stake here, and are at risk of permanent loss. This is, perhaps, the primary local concern: maintaining food productivity is at least as important as energy production, and requires the retention of farming expertise and capacity on land which is "best and most versatile". Most of the nation's food is grown on soils graded 3b, which has recently been confirmed by the Secretary of State as "best and most versatile". ALL the land of WB4 is</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>this or better, by every criterion: soil category, range of crops grown (wheat, Barley, corn, rape, potatoes, beans, linseed, and more), consistently high yields, the great majority going locally into the human food chain.</p> <p>The 2 farmers who currently tenant WB4 are both retiring; the adjacent farmers have been pressing the landlord - the Henry Smith Charity - for years, for more land, to no avail. WB4 would continue in high-yield human food production without a break.</p> <p>There are at least 8 live large solar projects on both sides of the Trent within an 8.5mile radius of Gainsborough: West Burton, Cottam, Gate Burton, Saundby, Hecklington Fen, Sturton by Stow, Wood Lane Sturton le Steeple, Tillbridge. Together, they would</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>take 4,320 Ha (10,575 acres, 16.6 sq. miles) out of food production and amenity use. This is equivalent to the loss of 35,000 tons of wheat production annually. In addition, there are at least a further 5 proposals for large development of agricultural land within the same area.</p> <p>This voracious consumption of our best farmland for this most inefficient and unreliable source of energy production has to stop. If it's cold I can put on another jumper, if it's dark I can light a candle. I can't eat what's not in the larder.</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>OF_CAWB02_270; OF_CAWB02_273; OF_CAWB02_292</p>	<p>Other (Socio-Economic, Tourism, Recreation, Electro-magnetic) It is highly contemptuous of the communities (and the nation) to lump these 4 topics into a single chapter. These are major individual areas of impact, each deserving of detailed assessment. Another attempt to diminish the negative aspects of the project.</p> <p>How many construction workers would be drawn from the local communities? In other sections the PEIR expects them to be imported with the contractors, live in hostels and be bussed in to the sites. In this section, it "is anticipated to increase (local) employment and skills opportunities" with a "moderate to major-moderate beneficial effect". You can't have it both ways.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>How on earth can human health NOT warrant its own chapter in the PEIR? See above re the mis-information and dismissal in the PEIR of the risks of flood, fire, loss of recreational amenity, contamination, road and constructional accident, glint and glare, socio-economic cost - all of which are serious adverse effects the significance of which is dismissed out-of-hand. This is greenwashing in the extreme.</p> <p>The benefits of using "green" areas - especially natural and rural countryside - are evidenced by much research. They are incorporated into UK government planning advice, and their preservation is a thread running through every section of the Bassetlaw Local Plan. Having access to a beautiful natural environment brings measurable improvements in the morbidity and</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>mortality of cardio-vascular disease, stroke, diabetes, obesity, cancer, arthritis and physical fitness, as well as the more predictable benefits for mental health of less depression, anxiety and stress. Physical exercise, especially in an outdoor natural environment, is a principle therapeutic agent in the treatment of depression, anxiety and stress, and the opportunity to do it locally benefits self-confidence, loneliness and social skills for the elderly and young alike.</p> <p>The value of attractive, easily-accessible and local rural environments has never been better illustrated than during the recent coronavirus pandemic. The destructive impact of personal illness and loss from the disease, and of the social isolation and economic compromise of the lock-downs,</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>generated unhappiness for all, worry, stress and anxiety for many, and frank mental illness and suicide in some. The critical and often only therapeutic avenue for many was exercise and re-connecting with nature, and the critical importance of this in the last 2 years particularly is well-evidenced. Again, the positive effects of the rural environment in Covid on public health will have been tangible - less demand on NHS services, and less worker absenteeism due to mental distress. With every lost walk, every countryside vista, every lost experience of wildlife, the health and economic costs rise.</p> <p>It is also evidenced that the closer and more accessible an area of natural environment is, the more it is used and the more health benefit accrues. This is reflected in the "20-minute rule" adopted in local planning guidelines:</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>that everyone should have access to an area of natural environment within a 20-minute walk or cycle ride is an accepted (and local) planning target. At a public health level, this has a real impact: on the demand, provision and costs of community services and general practice, on mental health services, and on out- and in-patient hospital services. Remove any one "green" amenity, and the health of the local population suffers and health costs rise.</p> <p>Social care provision would also be impacted: the elderly, those with disability, anyone needing assisted living. They will inevitably be less mobile, and more than anyone will be affected by the loss of a nearby varied natural environment amenity. Rose Keys is a residential home for young adults on the Gringley Road bypass which would</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>be surrounded by solar panels. Its residents suffer from learning disability, brain injury, autism and mental health conditions, and can display unpredictable, aggressive and challenging behaviour. Rose Keys would be imprisoned by the WB4 perimeter fence and behind it, hundreds of yards of imposing, apparently threatening, solar panels: what impact would this have on these residents?</p> <p>The rich co-incidence of environment and heritage centred on the WB4 site is at the hub of recreation and visitor attraction in Bassetlaw, offering a natural complement to the range of attraction.</p>		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_273 OF_CAWB02_292</p>	<p>Light Pollution - Glint & Glare This is another theoretical section with the application of arbitrary distance intervals to GCSE optical physics to diminish significance. I contest that the threshold distances are irrelevant: irrespective of distance, the area of identically-aligned panels is so great that any direct reflection of the sun's rays to a human receptor will be incapacitating (instantly blinding, after-glare, permanently damaged retina). Solar panels must not be placed anywhere (at any distance from) where they might reflect into a dwelling, or directly at a road user, train driver or aircraft pilot. Full stop.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
<p>FFCAWB0202042 FFCAWB0202041 FFCAWB0202043 OF_CAWB02_150</p>	<p>Respondents felt that the site was too close to existing dwellings.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
OM_CAWB02_017	<p>Respondents were concerned that the planned site will affect local house prices.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_023	Respondents were satisfied with the proposed site design.	N/A	Noted.
OF_CAWB02_113 OF_CAWB02_149 OF_CAWB02_181 OF_CAWB02_184 OF_CAWB02_267	Respondents expressed general sentiment that the site was inappropriate without any particular reasoning.	N/A	Noted.
OF_CAWB02_253; OF_CAWB02_289; OF_CAWB02_294	Respondents contend that WB4 does not meet the site selection criteria	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_263 OF_CAWB02_267	Respondent was concerned about the disruption caused by construction traffic to access the site.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
OF_CAWB02_267	Respondents were concerned about the impact that this would have on tourism in the area.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.
OF_CAWB02_272	No mitigation will have any effect. The PEIR is wholly inadequate, incomplete and premature. Phase 2 consultation is seriously flawed and obstructive, and should be paused until the missing surveys and reports have been completed and then extended to allow proper examination and comment.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206057	The proposals are hugely inappropriate for the rural area, creating physical barriers across currently relatively open areas between small, rural settlements.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060	Severe adverse effects are created for the WB4 site and abutting communities under every single heading in the PEIR. None are capable of mitigation, and each warrants withdrawal from the project in its own right.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.
Topic area: West Burton substation			
FFCAWB0206036 FFCAWB0202008 FFCAWB0202006	<p>Size Concerns</p> <p>Community commented that the WB substation is too big.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			results of a range of environmental assessments.
FFCAWB0206016; FFCAWB0206015; OF_CAWB02_012; OF_CAWB02_048; OF_CAWB02_146; OF_CAWB02_157; OF_CAWB02_168; OF_CAWB02_201; OF_CAWB02_239; OF_CAWB02_259	<p>Land Use</p> <p>Respondents believe that this site should be retained for agriculture. This included concerns regarding food security and suggest that brownfield sites should be used instead.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0203023 FFCAWB0203006 FFCAWB0202012 FFCAWB0201013 OF_CAWB02_017	<p>Consultation Material Concerns</p> <p>Respondents felt that maps provided were obscure. They have also requested more detail regarding the dimensions of the site, switchgear, transporters and associated substations.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments</p>
OF_CAWB02_047	<p>Respondents expressed concern that the construction and operation of the installations would have a negative impact on ecology and biodiversity.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.
OF_CAWB02_088 OF_CAWB02_089 OF_CAWB02_110	Respondents expressed concern regarding the visual impact of the substation, commenting that this would be exacerbated by the topography of the land.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments</p>
FFCAWB0206057	The proposals are hugely inappropriate for the rural area, creating physical barriers across currently relatively open areas between small, rural settlements.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments</p>
<p>Comments which were not connected to a previous multiple choice selection</p>			
<p>OF_CAWB02_008 OF_CAWB02_054 OF_CAWB02_017</p>	<p>Respondents do not agree with the amalgamation of the proposed sites, arguing that this allows for the dilution of issues. They especially highlighted that WB4 is in another county.</p> <p>Respondent expressed opposition to panels being placed on either side of the Trent Valley.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>e Applicant has followed a step-by-step site selection process which confirms the location of the Scheme is suitable for a large scale solar farm. This has included the avoidance of sensitive landscape and environmental designations in confirming site suitability and consideration of alternative sites.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Details of the process are set out in Appendix 5.1: Site Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			results of a range of environmental assessments.
OF_CAWB02_030 OF_CAWB02_111	Respondents were concerned about potential links to forced labour in the production of solar panels.	N/A	<p>The Applicant unequivocally condemns and opposes the use of forced labour in any context in the strongest possible terms.</p> <p>The Applicant fully supports the steps already being taken by the UK government and solar industry to ensure the highest possible levels of transparency and to rid human rights abuses from the global supply chain for UK solar developments. This includes developing an industry-led traceability protocol in line with internationally recognised standards. The Applicant also supports the independent auditing of all UK solar supply chains. While procurement has not been confirmed for the Scheme, the Applicant has prepared a Skills and Supply Chain Plan</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>[EN010132/APP/WB7.10], submitted as part of the DCO application.</p> <p>The Applicant is seeking opportunities to develop the local skill base through practicable means during the construction and operational phase of development. Opportunities to support skill training in locally-based companies, and construction-based apprenticeships or educational opportunities have been explored in the Skills and Supply Chain Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.10].</p>
<p>OF_CAWB02_040 OF_CAWB02_039 OF_CAWB02_110 OF_CAWB02_152 OF_CAWB02_251</p>	<p>Concern regarding the Applicant</p> <p>Respondents were generally sceptical of the Applicant's motives, suggesting that they were not driven by sustainability but rather profit.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this response.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p> <p>In addition to the information shared through consultation materials at the pre-application stage, a Statement of Need</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>[EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, setting out context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p>
<p>OF_CAWB02_085 OF_CAWB02_236 OF_CAWB02_261</p>	<p>Agricultural land should not be used for solar farms</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this feedback and appreciates the importance of agricultural land. Impacts upon agricultural land have been assessed within Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19], which includes detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites.</p> <p>The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land from the Scheme.</p> <p>Table 5.6-5.9 of Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] details</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>the design evolution that has led to the majority of BMV land being removed from the Scheme. The finalised Scheme contains only 26.24% Best and Most Versatile land and clear justification for why these small areas remain within the Scheme is set out at Tables 5.6 - 5.9 of ES Chapter 5.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that the Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality, and that some agricultural land could be retained during the operational phase, for example pasture grazed by sheep.</p>
<p>OF_CAWB02_127 OF_CAWB02_163 OF_CAWB02_251</p>	<p>Respondents were concerned about the potential of fires associated with the BESS.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 21 (Other Environmental Matters) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.21] assesses the impacts of the Scheme upon human health and also considers major accidents and disasters.</p> <p>The outline battery storage safety</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			management plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.9] sets out firefighting and safety measures in the event of a fire or explosion. This has been informed through consultation with the local Fire and Rescue authority.
OF_CAWB02_141; OF_CAWB02_213	Respondents stated that they supported proposed site designs	N/A	Noted.
OF_CAWB02_182 OF_CAWB02_185 OF_CAWB02_245	All sites should not be developed	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206059	The proposals are hugely inappropriate for the rural area, creating physical barriers across currently relatively open areas between small, rural settlements.	Yes	<p>The Applicant has followed a step-by-step site selection process which confirms the location of the Scheme is suitable for a large-scale solar farm. This has included the avoidance of sensitive landscape and environmental designations in confirming site suitability and consideration of alternative sites.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken (See Site Selection Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1] and explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the impacts and effects on the fabric of the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>landscape are taken into account as well as the views and visibility.</p> <p>The assessment includes a suite of viewpoints that cover a wide range of visual receptors, including public locations such as transport routes, public rights of way, and residential properties. These viewpoints have been discussed and agreed with the competent authority.</p> <p>Mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p>

5 **Table 5.12.4: Feedback received to Question 6: Please provide your specific comments on the refined cable routes.**

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Topic area: West Burton 1			
FFCAWB0206052 FFCAWB0203016 FFCAWB0201007 OM_CAWB02_008 OF_CAWB02_183 FFCAWB0206065	<p>Loss of Agricultural Land</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the loss of agricultural land to cable routes.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] explains at paragraph 19.8.9 that an Agricultural Land Classification assessment has not been undertaken for the Cable Corridor Route. This is because the development proposed is a buried cable, with the interruption of the existing agricultural use limited to the brief cable laying operation.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OM_CAWB02_009 OF_CAWB02_142 OF_CAWB02_215 OF_CAWB02_239 OF_CAWB02_240 OF_CAWB02_241	<p>Future Developments</p> <p>Respondent concerns that cable routes are attracting piggy back speculative development opportunities for other developments.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The limits of the DCO would not allow for any further works beyond the Scheme as described and presented in the Applicant's application.</p> <p>Any future development would be subject to its own separate planning application and consultation process.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Scheme includes a 'shared cable route corridor', in which part of the Gate Burton Energy Park cable route and West Burton Solar Project cable route will fall within the cable corridor for the Scheme. This is described in Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.4].</p> <p>The cumulative environmental effects of the simultaneous or sequential construction of these cables have been assessed in the Environmental Statement</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.2]. This is in order to seek to minimise potential environmental effects and identify the benefits of combined construction activities.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_040	<p>The cabling is over engineered for even a plan of this scale, clearly there are other plans in the future that will utilise this that have not yet been shared. If this was about true electricity generation, then local communities would get to use the electricity and these cables would not all be required on this scale.</p>	Yes	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the figure of 324,000 homes was communicated during the pre-application phase to provide context to the capacity of the grid connections agreed between the Applicant and National Grid for both the Scheme and West Burton Solar Project. The Applicant notes that the actual number of homes powered by the Scheme will be determined by final technology, design, and household consumption.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, setting out context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_048 OF_CAWB02_130	Respondent belief this is Completely the wrong site for this proposal and cables are not refined	No	<p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resources & Farming Circumstances)</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.3.19.1].</p> <p>The vast majority of the Scheme is located on lower quality agricultural land with only 26.24% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land). See Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] which sets out the design evolution of the Scheme. This includes justification for removal of certain fields from the Scheme and retention of other limited areas of BMV.</p> <p>The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality.</p> <p>The cable route corridor has been refined as explained within Tables 5.13 of ES</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Chapter 5: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] .

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>OF_CAWB02_058 OF_CAWB02_155 OF_CAWB02_160</p>	<p>Ecology and Biodiversity</p> <p>The community expressed concern regarding the impact the cable routes and their construction would have on ecology and biodiversity.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9] sets out the baseline information available at the time of writing and considers the likely effects of the Scheme on ecological features during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out a series of mitigation and landscape management improvements to improve biodiversity in its Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.3].</p> <p>Regarding potential impacts to habitats and local wildlife, these are assessed and presented in Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9]. Appendix 12 to Chapter 9 [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] shows how</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units. All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme.</p>
<p>OF_CAWB02_086 OF_CAWB02_110</p>	<p>The proposed cable routes you have indicated are totally nonsensical! Running cables from Saxilby/Ingleby/Torksey/Brampton to West Burton and other cables from Blyton/Pelham/Corringham to Cottam is almost laughable and clearly hasn't been given much thought from either an engineering or geographical perspective? It would make much more sense if the cables from Saxilby/Ingleby/Torksey/Brampton went to Cottam and those from</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>This is the opinion of the respondents. The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable land, has been undertaken and presented within the Site Selection Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1].</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	Blyton/Pelham/Corringham to West Burton.		Table 5.13: Main Stages of Refinement for the Cable Route Corridor within Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains how the cable route has been refined.
OF_CAWB02_168	No need for cables	N/A	Noted.
OF_CAWB02_182 OF_CAWB02_185	Detailed designs of the routes are not relevant, the project should not be allowed.	N/A	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_191	Severe disruption to land. Roads in area often narrow and single track. This is going to be highly disruptive.	Yes	<p>Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction.</p> <p>The Applicant notes relevant information from this chapter below.</p> <p>Section 14.7 of summarises the likely effects associated with the movement of vehicles during the construction phase. The effects of the Cable Route Corridor are considered more temporary in nature than for the panel Site areas. The Route will be constructed in sections of approximately 4km at a time. Each section will take approximately 90 working days. These accesses are presented in Figure 14.5.</p> <p>As there will only be around 18 arrivals and departures per access per day over a short, 90-day period, a detailed</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>assessment has not been undertaken. It is unlikely that the addition of these trips will trigger the need for further assessment in line with the IEMA guidelines (10% change in traffic flows on sensitive road or a 30% on non-sensitive road). If the thresholds are breached, it would mean that baseline traffic flows are very low. This, in itself, would mean that the effects of traffic flows in relation to the construction of the Grid Connection Route would not be significant. The likely effects of the Scheme during the construction phase, are summarised in Table 14.24. This presents the effects to be negligible or minor.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_192	I strongly oppose the project as a whole, as this will not generate the energy required as the system will not work at night, and will work at a reduced level during the winter when most energy is required.	No	<p>In addition to the information shared through consultation materials at the pre-application stage, a Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, explaining the reasons for the Scheme being large scale solar generation, and setting out the context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p> <p>Regarding efficiency, the Applicant notes that single-axis tracking technology may be used as part of the Scheme. The axis will be oriented North-South, with modules rotating East-West tracking with backtracking strategy for tracking arrays: when the mutual shadings begin, the tracking angle does not follow the sun anymore, but it instead goes back (decreases) so that no shading occurs. Generally, a solar panel system with a</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>single-axis solar tracker installed sees a performance gain of anywhere between 10 to 30 percent compared to a fixed mounting system.</p> <p>Early signs from other Solar Farms suggests panels are lasting longer than original expected lifespan of 25 years, therefore it is expected that the majority of panels will remain efficient for at least 40 years.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_206	Taking too much land	No	In addition to the information shared through consultation materials at the pre-application stage, a Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, explaining the reasons for the Scheme being large scale solar generation, and setting out the context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.
OF_CAWB02_210	The cable routes are still too wide/undefined for comment on them	Yes	<p>The Applicant initially presented a cable route search corridor, which has been refined through engagement and consultation with landowners.</p> <p>Table 5.13: Main Stages of Refinement for the Cable Route Corridor within Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains how the cable route has been refined. The initial cable corridor search area included</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			whole fields with multiple river crossing options. This was then narrowed to a target route, predominantly 100m in width, which was fully surveyed by geophysical surveys, ecological surveys, and landscape assessments to generate options within the target route. The final cable corridor is 50m in width over the majority of its length.
OF_CAWB02_245	See the above comment. Ridiculous idea. Driven by Henry Smith Charity, Savill's and IGP. You do not care what the people in the area think or need. Your agenda is not our agenda. Going to cost billions, a total waste of taxpayers' money. This whole project needs to be stopped NOW.	N/A	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_246	<p>Yes, we hope that the landowners feel like we do and do not consent to you churning up the countryside just so that your companies can just make a stack of cash - it's absolutely nothing to do with green energy because the solar panels only have a limited shelf life - where do you propose to then put all of the retired solar panels - more land being stolen from the countryside for landfill??????</p>	Yes	<p>An Outline Decommissioning Statement [EN010132/APP/WB7.2] is provided as part of the DCO application.</p> <p>This document sets out the proposed method for the removal of all the solar panels (PV), structures, enclosures, equipment, and all other apparatus associated with the Scheme.</p> <p>Infrastructure such as PV panels and battery storage units will be removed and recycled as far as practical and in accordance with legislation and guidance applicable at the time, or if more suitable at the time, sold for refurbishment and reuse.</p> <p>The 400kV and 132kV cables may be left in situ, depending on which method is likely to have the least environmental impact at the time but are likely to be removed. It is considered generally desirable to remove the cables where possible, for both</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>recycling purposes and to leave the land as close to its previous use state as possible. The cables would be removed by pulling the cables out from the ducts without the subsequent removal of the ducts themselves, thereby minimising surface disturbances.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_251	<p>There has been no indication given for timescale for installation, type of disruption to roads and travelling and noise pollution to be expected should planning ever be granted.</p> <p>People move to the countryside for a better way of life - no one wants to live in the middle of what would be a huge industrial development - worse than the existing power stations.</p> <p>People visit this area for the natural beauty, the nature reserves, the ancient footpaths, the chesterfield canal and the pretty villages and pubs - why do you want to spoil your own rural England?</p>	Yes	<p>Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2] also considers road users safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the development.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that mitigation measures are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.1], the Construction Traffic Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.2 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2] and the Public Rights of Way Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.3 to</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.3].</p> <p>Chapter 15 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES details the consideration of noise and vibration effects during construction. The effect of noise from construction vehicles on the surrounding road network has also been considered. Worst-case methodology has been followed ensuring robust assessments.</p>
<p>OF_CAWB02_259 OF_CAWB02_280 OF_CAWB02_300</p>	<p>The proposed routes should not be used as the whole Scheme is inappropriate for this area</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>This is the opinion of the respondents. The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable land, has been undertaken and presented within the Site Selection Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1].</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p>
OF_CAWB02_262	<p>This is far too intense for a rural area. Massive impact on crop supply, farming jobs and visual amenity. Far too much.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that the cables will be underground.</p> <p>Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] concludes that the 40-year lifetime of the project will facilitate a recovery in topsoil organic matter.</p> <p>This will enhance the functional capacity of the soil resource for future arable production.</p> <p>A full assessment of the economic impact of the Scheme is presented in Chapter 18</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			(Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.18] , with quantitative results for numbers of employment opportunities anticipated vs. agricultural sector jobs lost.
OF_CAWB02_281	Fields are needed for agriculture - while I support alternative energy sources, this project is to the detriment of the local economy and isn't a concern regarding the amount of farmland that will be lost.	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and appreciates the importance of agricultural land.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites, as presented in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19].</p> <p>The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land from the Scheme. The Scheme will be decommissioned with</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality.</p> <p>Agricultural land will be retained during the operational phase, e.g. pasture grazed by sheep.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
CAWB0207017_WB	<p>The cables from West Burton 1 goes through land which is deemed opportunity for ecological improvement as noted on the biodiversity mapping for West Burton as put out by Lincolnshire County Council. For this reason, we are opposed to this given the technical detail on underground cabling in the PEIR.</p>	Yes	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%.</p> <p>The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and the report at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The LVIA picks up the delivery of landscape mitigation to address biodiversity net gain</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>through the enhancement of existing habitats and green infrastructure proposals. The landscape measures also include the preparation of a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives. The Applicant and its LVIA consultants at Lanpro have worked closely with the ecology consultant throughout the application process to inform the LVIA and associated mitigation plans. The mitigation proposals allow for flexibility, but they can also be fixed, where appropriate and applicable.</p>
FFCAWB0206061	As per Q5.b, avoid any development in the monument areas associated with the designated DMV monument of ħNorth	Yes	Pasture fields containing earthwork remains associated with the deserted medieval villages of North and South Ingleby have been removed from the

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	Ingleby (NHLE 1003570, MLI 50391, MLI 54225).		Scheme. This includes the Scheduled Monument: deserted village of North Ingleby (NHLE 1003570).
Topic area: West Burton 2			
FFCAWB0206052 FFCAWB0203016 FFCAWB0201007 FFCAWB0202038 OM_CA WB02_008 FFCAWB0206065	Loss of Agricultural Land Respondents expressed concern regarding the loss of agricultural land to cable routes.	Yes	ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.19] explains at paragraph 19.8.9 that an Agricultural Land Classification assessment has not been undertaken for the Cable Corridor Route. This is because the development proposed is a buried cable, with the interruption of the existing agricultural use limited to the brief cable laying operation.
FFCAWB0206045 OM_CA WB02_013	Respondent emphasised that development should not be undertaken within areas which have the designated DMV monument of North Ingleby.	Yes	Pasture fields containing earthwork remains associated with the deserted medieval villages of North and South Ingleby have been removed from the Scheme. This includes the Scheduled

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Monument: deserted village of North Ingleby (NHLE 1003570).
OM_CAWB02_009 OF_CAWB02_142 OF_CAWB02_215 OF_CAWB02_239 OF_CAWB02_240 OF_CAWB02_241	Respondent concerns that cable routes are attracting piggy back speculative development opportunities for other developments.	Yes	<p>The limits of the DCO would not allow for any further works beyond the Scheme as described and presented in the Applicant's application.</p> <p>Any future development would be subject to its own separate planning application and consultation process.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Scheme includes a 'shared cable route corridor', in which part of the Gate Burton Energy Park cable route and West Burton Solar Project cable route will fall within the cable corridor for the Scheme. This is described in Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.4].</p> <p>The cumulative environmental effects of the simultaneous or sequential</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>construction of these cables have been assessed in the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2].</p> <p>This is in order to seek to minimise potential environmental effects and identify the benefits of combined construction activities.</p>
OM_CAWB02_014	<p>Ingleby is a small hamlet which will be engulfed by this development. It is also a historic area with lots of archaeology and visible earthworks. There should not be any development close to houses or in the historic fields.</p>	No	<p>The Applicant has assessed the visual impact upon neighbouring properties as part of the Environmental Statement, Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The Applicant's landscape consultants have visited the Scheme area and surrounding landscape, including a number of neighbouring properties, to satisfy themselves that the extent of embedded and secondary mitigation is appropriate to mitigate the effects of the Scheme near neighbours.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OM_CAWB02_015	For the same reasons I have already stated, there should be no development around Ingleby or the Saxilby to Sturton Road.	No	The potential impacts of the Scheme are assessed in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement: Cultural Heritage [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.13] , together with an overview of the programme of mitigation required to remove or reduce such impacts.
OM_CAWB02_016 OF_CAWB02_217 OM_CAWB02_010	Shared view that West Burton 2 is too near to Saxilby. Comment that there are 230 houses that are not shown on the map, which is considered misleading and disgraceful. Move the whole of West Burton 2.	No	<p>The Applicant has assessed the visual impact upon neighbouring properties as part of the Environmental Statement, Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The Applicant's landscape consultants have visited the Scheme area and surrounding landscape, including a number of neighbouring properties, to satisfy themselves that the extent of embedded and secondary mitigation is appropriate to mitigate the effects of the Scheme near neighbours.</p>
OF_CAWB02_001	Everything looks well thought out.	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_040	<p>The cabling is over engineered for even a plan of this scale, clearly there are other plans in the future that will utilise this that have not yet been shared. If this was about true electricity generation, then local communities would get to use the electricity and these cables would not all be required on this scale.</p>	Yes	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the figure of 324,000 homes was communicated during the pre-application phase to provide context to the capacity of the grid connections agreed between the Applicant and National Grid for both the Scheme and West Burton Solar Project. The Applicant notes that the actual number of homes powered by the Scheme will be determined by final technology, design, and household consumption.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, setting out context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_048	As above.... (these routes will significantly impact on the surrounding area. Any land-owner objections to this face the possibility of having their land compulsory purchased, so how is this a fair consultation or consideration of the project). Completely the wrong site for this proposal.	No	The Applicant notes that landowners have been provided a consultation period to provide feedback on the proposals. All feedback will be displayed during application submission to the Planning Inspectorate.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_058; OF_CAWB02_155; OF_CAWB02_160	The community expressed concern regarding the impact the cable routes and their construction would have on ecology and biodiversity.	Yes	<p>Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9] sets out the baseline information available at the time of writing and considers the likely effects of the Scheme on ecological features during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out a series of mitigation and landscape management improvements to improve biodiversity in its Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.3].</p> <p>Regarding potential impacts to habitats and local wildlife, these are assessed and presented in Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9].</p> <p>Appendix 12 to Chapter 9</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units . All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_086; OF_CAWB02_110	The proposed cable routes you have indicated are totally nonsensical! Running cables from Saxilby/Ingleby/Torksey/Brampton to West Burton and other cables from Blyton/Pelham/Corringham to Cottam is almost laughable and clearly hasn't been given much thought from either an engineering or geographical perspective? It would make much more sense if the cables from Saxilby/Ingleby/Torksey/Brampton went to Cottam and those from Blyton/Pelham/Corringham to West Burton.	No	<p>This is the opinion of the respondents.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Table 5.13: Main Stages of Refinement for the Cable Route Corridor within Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains how the cable route has been refined.</p>
OF_CAWB02_168	No need for cables	N/A	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_182; OF_CAWB02_185	Detailed designs of the routes are not relevant, the project should not be allowed.	No	Noted.
OF_CAWB02_191	Severe disruption to land. Roads in area often narrow and single track. This is going to be highly disruptive.	Yes	<p>Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The Applicant notes relevant information from this chapter below.</p> <p>Section 14.7 of summarises the likely effects associated with the movement of vehicles during the construction phase. The effects of the Cable Route Corridor are considered more temporary in nature than for the panel Site areas. The Route will be constructed in sections of approximately 4km at a time. Each section will take approximately 90 working days. These accesses are presented in Figure 14.5. As there will only be around 18 arrivals</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>and departures per access per day over a short, 90-day period, a detailed assessment has not been undertaken. It is unlikely that the addition of these trips will trigger the need for further assessment in line with the IEMA guidelines (10% change in traffic flows on sensitive road or a 30% on non-sensitive road). If the thresholds are breached, it would mean that baseline traffic flows are very low. This, in itself, would mean that the effects of traffic flows in relation to the construction of the Grid Connection Route would not be significant. The likely effects of the Scheme during the construction phase, are summarised in Table 14.24. This presents the effects to be negligible or minor.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_192	I strongly oppose the project as a whole, as this will not generate the energy required as the system will not work at night, and will work at a reduced level during the winter when most energy is required.	No	<p>In addition to the information shared through consultation materials at the pre-application stage, a Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, explaining the reasons for the Scheme being large scale solar generation, and setting out the context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p> <p>Regarding efficiency, the Applicant notes that single-axis tracking technology may be used as part of the Scheme. The axis will be oriented North-South, with modules rotating East-West tracking with backtracking strategy for tracking arrays: when the mutual shadings begin, the tracking angle does not follow the sun anymore, but it instead goes back (decreases) so that no shading occurs. Generally, a solar panel system with a</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>single-axis solar tracker installed sees a performance gain of anywhere between 10 to 30 percent compared to a fixed mounting system.</p> <p>Early signs from other Solar Farms suggests panels are lasting longer than original expected lifespan of 25 years, therefore it is expected that the majority of panels will remain efficient for at least 40 years.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_206	Taking too much land	No	<p>In addition to the information shared through consultation materials at the pre-application stage, a Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, explaining the reasons for the Scheme being large scale solar generation, and setting out the context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p> <p>Regarding efficiency, the Applicant notes that single-axis tracking technology may be used as part of the Scheme. The axis will be oriented North-South, with modules rotating East-West tracking with backtracking strategy for tracking arrays: when the mutual shadings begin, the tracking angle does not follow the sun anymore, but it instead goes back (decreases) so that no shading occurs. Generally, a solar panel system with a</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>single-axis solar tracker installed sees a performance gain of anywhere between 10 to 30 percent compared to a fixed mounting system.</p> <p>Early signs from other Solar Farms suggests panels are lasting longer than original expected lifespan of 25 years, therefore it is expected that the majority of panels will remain efficient for at least 40 years.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_210	The cable routes are still too wide/undefined for comment on them	Yes	<p>The Applicant initially presented a cable route search corridor, which has been refined through engagement and consultation with landowners.</p> <p>Table 5.13: Main Stages of Refinement for the Cable Route Corridor within Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement</p> <p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains how the cable route has been refined. The initial cable corridor search area included whole fields with multiple river crossing options. This was then narrowed to a target route, predominantly 100m in width, which was fully surveyed by geophysical surveys, ecological surveys, and landscape assessments to generate options within the target route. The final cable corridor is 50m in width over the majority of its length.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_245	See the above comment. Ridiculous idea. Driven by Henry Smith Charity, Savill's and IGP. You do not care what the people in the area think or need. Your agenda is not our agenda. Going to cost billions, a total waste of taxpayers' money. This whole project needs to be stopped NOW.	No	Noted.
OF_CAWB02_246	Yes, we hope that the landowners feel like we do and do not consent to you churning up the countryside just so that your companies can just make a stack of cash - it's absolutely nothing to do with green energy because the solar panels only have a limited shelf life - where do you propose to then put all of the retired solar panels - more land being stolen from the countryside for landfill??????	Yes	<p>An Outline Decommissioning Statement [EN010132/APP/WB 7.2] is provided as part of the DCO application. This document sets out the proposed method for the removal of all the solar panels (PV), structures, enclosures, equipment, and all other apparatus associated with the Scheme.</p> <p>Infrastructure such as PV panels and battery storage units will be removed and recycled as far as practical and in accordance with legislation and guidance applicable at the time, or if more suitable</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>at the time, sold for refurbishment and reuse.</p> <p>The 400kV and 132kV cables may be left in situ, depending on which method is likely to have the least environmental impact at the time but are likely to be removed. It is considered generally desirable to remove the cables where possible, for both recycling purposes and to leave the land as close to its previous use state as possible. The cables would be removed by pulling the cables out from the ducts without the subsequent removal of the ducts themselves, thereby minimising surface disturbances.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_251	<p>There has been no indication given for timescale for installation, type of disruption to roads and travelling and noise pollution to be expected should planning ever be granted.</p> <p>People move to the countryside for a better way of life - no one wants to live in the middle of what would be a huge industrial development - worse than the existing power stations.</p> <p>People visit this area for the natural beauty, the nature reserves, the ancient footpaths, the chesterfield canal and the pretty villages and pubs - why do you want to spoil your own rural England?</p>	Yes	<p>Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction.</p> <p>The Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010132/APP/WB6.14.2] also considers road users safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the development.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that mitigation measures are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.1], the Construction Traffic Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.2 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2]. and the Public Rights of Way Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.3 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.3].
OF_CAWB02_259; OF_CAWB02_280; OF_CAWB02_300	The proposed routes should not be used as the whole Scheme is inappropriate for this area	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_262	This is far too intense for a rural area. Massive impact on crop supply, farming jobs and visual amenity. Far too much.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that the cables will be underground.</p> <p>Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] concludes that the 40-year lifetime of the project will facilitate a recovery in topsoil organic matter. This will enhance the functional capacity of the soil resource for future arable production.</p> <p>A full assessment of the economic impact of the Scheme is presented in Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.18], with quantitative results for numbers of employment opportunities anticipated vs. agricultural sector jobs lost.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_281	Fields are needed for agriculture - while I support alternative energy sources, this project is to the detriment of the local economy and isn't a concern regarding the amount of farmland that will be lost.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and appreciates the importance of agricultural land.</p> <p>ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] explains at paragraph 19.8.9 that an Agricultural Land Classification assessment has not been undertaken for the Cable Corridor Route. This is because the development proposed is a buried cable, with the interruption of the existing agricultural use limited to the brief cable laying operation.</p>
FFCAWB0206061	As per Q5.b, avoid any development in the monument areas associated with the designated DMV monument of North Ingleby (NHLE 1003570, MLI 50391, MLI 54225).	Yes	Pasture fields containing earthwork remains associated with the deserted medieval villages of North and South Ingleby have been removed from the Scheme. This includes the Scheduled Monument: deserted village of North Ingleby (NHLE 1003570).

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Topic area: West Burton 3			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206053	<p>Respondent commented that the cable route southwest of Marton crossing the river Trent would cause problems with Traffic and construction deliveries, inevitably affecting the A15000. Respondents feel that this would impact businesses and revenue in the surrounding area.</p>	No	<p>Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The Applicant notes relevant information from this chapter below.</p> <p>Section 14.7 of summarises the likely effects associated with the movement of vehicles during the construction phase. The effects of the Cable Route Corridor are considered more temporary in nature than for the panel Site areas. The Route will be constructed in sections of approximately 4km at a time. Each section will take approximately 90 working days. These accesses are presented in Figure 14.5.</p> <p>As there will only be around 18 arrivals and departures per access per day over a short, 90-day period, a detailed</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>assessment has not been undertaken. It is unlikely that the addition of these trips will trigger the need for further assessment in line with the IEMA guidelines (10% change in traffic flows on sensitive road or a 30% on non-sensitive road). If the thresholds are breached, it would mean that baseline traffic flows are very low. This, in itself, would mean that the effects of traffic flows in relation to the construction of the Grid Connection Route would not be significant.</p> <p>The likely effects of the Scheme during the construction phase, are summarised in Table 14.24. This presents the effects to be negligible or minor.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206052 FFCAWB0203016 FFCAWB0201007 FFCAWB0201007 FFCAWB0202038 FFCAWB0206065	<p>Loss of Agricultural Land</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the loss of agricultural land to cable routes.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and appreciates the importance of agricultural land.</p> <p>Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] explains at paragraph 19.8.9 that an Agricultural Land Classification assessment has not been undertaken for the Cable Corridor Route. This is because the development proposed is a buried cable, with the interruption of the existing agricultural use limited to the brief cable laying operation.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>OF_CAWB02_058; OF_CAWB02_155; OF_CAWB02_160</p>	<p>Ecology and Biodiversity</p> <p>The community expressed concern regarding the impact the cable routes and their construction would have on ecology and biodiversity.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9] sets out the baseline information available at the time of writing and considers the likely effects of the Scheme on ecological features during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out a series of mitigation and landscape management improvements to improve biodiversity in its Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.3].</p> <p>Regarding potential impacts to habitats and local wildlife, these are assessed and presented in Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9]. Appendix 12 to Chapter 9 [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] shows how</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units . All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>OM_CAWB02_009 OF_CAWB02_142 OF_CAWB02_239 OF_CAWB02_240 OF_CAWB02_241</p>	<p>Respondent concerns that cable routes are attracting piggy back speculative development opportunities for other developments.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The limits of the DCO would not allow for any further works beyond the Scheme as described and presented in the Applicant's application.</p> <p>Any future development would be subject to its own separate planning application and consultation process.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Scheme includes a 'shared cable route corridor', in which part of the Gate Burton Energy Park cable route and West Burton Solar Project cable route will fall within the cable corridor for the Scheme.</p> <p>This is described in Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.4].</p> <p>The cumulative environmental effects of the simultaneous or sequential construction of these cables have been assessed in the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2]. This is in order to</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			seek to minimise potential environmental effects and identify the benefits of combined construction activities.
OF_CAWB02_002	This does not appear to impact on Brampton.	N/A	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_040	<p>The cabling is over engineered for even a plan of this scale, clearly there are other plans in the future that will utilise this that have not yet been shared. If this was about true electricity generation, then local communities would get to use the electricity and these cables would not all be required on this scale.</p>	Yes	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the figure of 324,000 homes was communicated during the pre-application phase to provide context to the capacity of the grid connections agreed between the Applicant and National Grid for both the Scheme and West Burton Solar Project. The Applicant notes that the actual number of homes powered by the Scheme will be determined by final technology, design, and household consumption.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, setting out context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_048	As above.... Completely the wrong site for this proposal	No	<p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1].</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>The LVIA provides comments on alternative technologies and design alternatives within Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>As the output of the Scheme is to exceed</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>50 MW, the Scheme is considered a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). As a result, the Applicant is required to submit Development Consent Order to The Planning Inspectorate (PINS). Local Planning Authorities and communities play an important role in the process. Engagement and consultation with them are described in the Consultation Report [EN010132/APP/WB5.1].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>OF_CAWB02_086 OF_CAWB02_110</p>	<p>The proposed cable routes you have indicated are totally nonsensical! Running cables from Saxilby/Ingleby/Torksey/Brampton to West Burton and other cables from Blyton/Pelham/Corringham to Cottam is almost laughable and clearly hasn't been given much thought from either an engineering or geographical perspective? It would make much more sense if the cables from Saxilby/Ingleby/Torksey/Brampton went to Cottam and those from Blyton/Pelham/Corringham to West Burton.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>This is the opinion of the respondents. The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1].</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme. Table 5.13: Main Stages of Refinement for the Cable Route Corridor within Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains how the cable route has been refined.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_088; OF_CAWB02_089 OF_CAWB02_106; OF_CAWB02_215	This cable will be used in the future to serve more solar panels- again on land that should remain in agricultural use.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and appreciates the importance of agricultural land.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites, as presented in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19].</p> <p>The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land from the Scheme. The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality. Agricultural land will be retained during the operational phase, e.g. pasture grazed by sheep.</p>
OF_CAWB02_168	No need for cables	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_182; OF_CAWB02_185	Detailed designs of the routes are not relevant, the project should not be allowed.	No	Noted.
OF_CAWB02_191	Severe disruption to land. Roads in area often narrow and single track. This is going to be highly disruptive.	Yes	<p>Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The Applicant notes relevant information from this chapter below.</p> <p>Section 14.7 of summarises the likely effects associated with the movement of vehicles during the construction phase. The effects of the Cable Route Corridor are considered more temporary in nature than for the panel Site areas. The Route will be constructed in sections of approximately 4km at a time. Each section will take approximately 90 working days. These accesses are presented in Figure 14.5. As there will only be around 18 arrivals</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>and departures per access per day over a short, 90-day period, a detailed assessment has not been undertaken.</p> <p>It is unlikely that the addition of these trips will trigger the need for further assessment in line with the IEMA guidelines (10% change in traffic flows on sensitive road or a 30% on non-sensitive road). If the thresholds are breached, it would mean that baseline traffic flows are very low. This, in itself, would mean that the effects of traffic flows in relation to the construction of the Grid Connection Route would not be significant.</p> <p>The likely effects of the Scheme during the construction phase, are summarised in Table 14.24. This presents the effects to be negligible or minor.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_192	I strongly oppose the project as a whole, as this will not generate the energy required as the system will not work at night, and will work at a reduced level during the winter when most energy is required.	Yes	<p>In addition to the information shared through consultation materials at the pre-application stage, a Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, explaining the reasons for the Scheme being large scale solar generation, and setting out the context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p> <p>Regarding efficiency, the Applicant notes that single-axis tracking technology may be used as part of the Scheme. The axis will be oriented North-South, with modules rotating East-West tracking with backtracking strategy for tracking arrays: when the mutual shadings begin, the tracking angle does not follow the sun anymore, but it instead goes back (decreases) so that no shading occurs. Generally, a solar panel system with a</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>single-axis solar tracker installed sees a performance gain of anywhere between 10 to 30 percent compared to a fixed mounting system.</p> <p>Early signs from other Solar Farms suggests panels are lasting longer than original expected lifespan of 25 years, therefore it is expected that the majority of panels will remain efficient for at least 40 years.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_206	Taking too much land	Yes	<p>Noted.</p> <p>In addition to the information shared through consultation materials at the pre-application stage, a Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, explaining the reasons for the Scheme being large scale solar generation, and setting out the context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_210	The cable routes are still too wide/undefined for comment on them	Yes	<p>The Applicant initially presented a cable route search corridor, which has been refined through engagement and consultation with landowners.</p> <p>Table 5.13: Main Stages of Refinement for the Cable Route Corridor within Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB 6.2.5] explains how the cable route has been refined. The initial cable corridor search area included whole fields with multiple river crossing options.</p> <p>This was then narrowed to a target route, predominantly 100m in width, which was fully surveyed by geophysical surveys, ecological surveys, and landscape assessments to generate options within the target route. The final cable corridor is 50m in width over the majority of its length.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_245	See the above comment. Ridiculous idea. Driven by Henry Smith Charity, Savill's and IGP. You do not care what the people in the area think or need. Your agenda is not our agenda. Going to cost billions, a total waste of taxpayers' money. This whole project needs to be stopped NOW.	No	Noted.
OF_CAWB02_246	Yes, we hope that the landowners feel like we do and do not consent to you churning up the countryside just so that your companies can just make a stack of cash - it's absolutely nothing to do with green energy because the solar panels only have a limited shelf life - where do you propose to then put all of the retired solar panels - more land being stolen from the countryside for landfill??????	Yes	<p>An Outline Decommissioning Statement [EN010132/APP/WB7.2] is provided as part of the DCO application. This document sets out the proposed method for the removal of all the solar panels (PV), structures, enclosures, equipment, and all other apparatus associated with the Scheme.</p> <p>Infrastructure such as PV panels and battery storage units will be removed and recycled as far as practical and in accordance with legislation and guidance applicable at the time, or if more suitable</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>at the time, sold for refurbishment and reuse.</p> <p>The 400kV and 132kV cables may be left in situ, depending on which method is likely to have the least environmental impact at the time but are likely to be removed. It is considered generally desirable to remove the cables where possible, for both recycling purposes and to leave the land as close to its previous use state as possible. The cables would be removed by pulling the cables out from the ducts without the subsequent removal of the ducts themselves, thereby minimising surface disturbances.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_251	<p>There has been no indication given for timescale for installation, type of disruption to roads and travelling and noise pollution to be expected should planning ever be granted.</p> <p>People move to the countryside for a better way of life - no one wants to live in the middle of what would be a huge industrial development - worse than the existing power stations.</p> <p>People visit this area for the natural beauty, the nature reserves, the ancient footpaths, the chesterfield canal and the pretty villages and pubs - why do you want to spoil your own rural England?</p>	Yes	<p>Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction.</p> <p>The Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2] also considers road users safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the development.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that mitigation measures are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.1], the Construction Traffic Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.2 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2] and the Public Rights of Way Management Plan,</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			presented as Appendix 14.3 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.3] .
OF_CAWB02_259; OF_CAWB02_280; OF_CAWB02_300	The proposed routes should not be used as the whole Scheme is inappropriate for this area	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_262	This is far too intense for a rural area. Massive impact on crop supply, farming jobs and visual amenity. Far too much.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that the cables will be underground.</p> <p>Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] explains at paragraph 19.8.9 that an Agricultural Land Classification assessment has not been undertaken for the Cable Corridor Route. This is because the development proposed is a buried cable, with the interruption of the existing agricultural use limited to the brief cable laying operation.</p> <p>A full assessment of the economic impact of the Scheme is presented in Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.18], with quantitative results for numbers of employment opportunities anticipated vs. agricultural sector jobs lost.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_281	Fields are needed for agriculture - while I support alternative energy sources, this project is to the detriment of the local economy and isn't a concern regarding the amount of farmland that will be lost.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and appreciates the importance of agricultural land.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites, as presented in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19]. The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land from the Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality. Agricultural land will be retained during the operational phase, e.g. pasture grazed by sheep.</p> <p>ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] explains at paragraph 19.8.9 that an Agricultural Land Classification assessment has not been undertaken for the Cable Corridor Route. This is because the development proposed is a buried cable, with the interruption of the existing agricultural use limited to the brief cable laying operation.</p>
OF_CAWB02_299	I have read that these are likely to be overhead cables. This is just awful. They will look awful, could be hazardous to health if near residential areas and will be hazardous to wildlife.	No	The applicant notes that all cables used will be underground.
Topic area: West Burton 4			
OF_CAWB02_267 OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_273 OF_CAWB02_293 OF_CAWB02_091 OF_CAWB02_207 OM_CAWB02_012 OM_CAWB02_011	<p>Cable Route Design</p> <p>Community concern that the cables are unrefined and lack detailed design or clarity</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.
FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206047 FFCAWB0206017 FFCAWB0205012 FFCAWB0202039 FFCAWB0201025 FFCAWB0201007 FFCAWB0202038 OM_CAWB02_012 OF_CAWB02_025 OF_CAWB02_029 OF_CAWB02_038 OF_CAWB02_041 OF_CAWB02_043 OF_CAWB02_055	<p>Cable Route Damage to Agricultural Land</p> <p>Community was concerned that the cable routes will further damage agricultural land.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_079 OF_CAWB02_092 OF_CAWB02_094 OF_CAWB02_099 OF_CAWB02_115 OF_CAWB02_117 OF_CAWB02_118 OF_CAWB02_119 OF_CAWB02_123 OF_CAWB02_128 OF_CAWB02_135 OF_CAWB02_179 OF_CAWB02_181 OF_CAWB02_188 OF_CAWB02_189 OF_CAWB02_190 OF_CAWB02_207 OF_CAWB02_279			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206054 FFCAWB0206020 FFCAWB0206019 FFCAWB0206018 FFCAWB0205022 FFCAWB0205021 FFCAWB0206038 FFCAWB0206037 FFCAWB0206035 FFCAWB0206050 FFCAWB0206047 FFCAWB0206044 FFCAWB0206017 FFCAWB0206029 FFCAWB0206024 FFCAWB0206026 FFCAWB0206007 FFCAWB0206004 FFCAWB0205020 FFCAWB0205014 FFCAWB0205013 FFCAWB0205012	<p>Cumulative Developments</p> <p>Community expressed concern that the cable route will allow for additional solar farms to be built in the future. Concerns were expressed regarding cumulative impact.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0205008 FFCAWB0204011 FFCAWB0204006 FFCAWB0203017 FFCAWB0203015 FFCAWB0203013 FFCAWB0203011 FFCAWB0202025 OM_CAWB02_009 OF_CAWB02_025 OF_CAWB02_026 OF_CAWB02_027 OF_CAWB02_028 OF_CAWB02_030 OF_CAWB02_042 OF_CAWB02_054 OF_CAWB02_079 OF_CAWB02_093 OF_CAWB02_095 OF_CAWB02_098 OF_CAWB02_117 OF_CAWB02_118			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_128 OF_CAWB02_130 OF_CAWB02_131 OF_CAWB02_139 OF_CAWB02_142 OM_CAWB02_018 OM_CAWB02_019 OM_CAWB02_020 OF_CAWB02_044 OF_CAWB02_072 OF_CAWB02_073 OF_CAWB02_075 OF_CAWB02_114 OF_CAWB02_133 OF_CAWB02_134 OF_CAWB02_144 OF_CAWB02_149 OF_CAWB02_150 OF_CAWB02_151 OF_CAWB02_152 OF_CAWB02_154 OF_CAWB02_158			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_162 OF_CAWB02_163 OF_CAWB02_169 OF_CAWB02_176 OF_CAWB02_184 OF_CAWB02_190 OF_CAWB02_194 OF_CAWB02_197 OF_CAWB02_203 OF_CAWB02_212 OF_CAWB02_215 OF_CAWB02_217 OF_CAWB02_220 OF_CAWB02_237 OF_CAWB02_253 OF_CAWB02_257 OF_CAWB02_266 OF_CAWB02_274 OF_CAWB02_275 OF_CAWB02_297 OF_CAWB02_239			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_240 OF_CAWB02_241			
FFCAWB0206052 FFCAWB0206012 FFCAWB0205006 FFCAWB0203016 FFCAWB0206057 FFCAWB0206065	<p>Loss of Agricultural Land</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the loss of agricultural land to cable routes.</p>	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
<p>FFCAWB0206003 FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0206042 OF_CAWB02_092 OF_CAWB02_094 OF_CAWB02_097 OF_CAWB02_099 OF_CAWB02_156 OF_CAWB02_170 OF_CAWB02_200</p>	<p>Trent Valley Way</p> <p>Respondents highlighted that the cable route cuts across areas of natural beauty such as the Trent Valley way - a nature walk with many beautiful views and interesting sites.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			the results of a range of environmental assessments.
FFCAWB0206003 FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0206002	<p>Historic Sites</p> <p>Respondents emphasised that the cable route runs through sites of historical interest such as along the old Roman road from Clayworth to Wheatley which represents a site of archaeological interest which will be destroyed forever.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0203007 OF_CA WB02_045	The community was concerned about construction traffic and potential for road traffic accidents during the construction of the cable route corridors.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206041 FFCAWB0206047 FFCAWB0206031 FFCAWB0206028 FFCAWB0205012 OF_CA WB02_058 OF_CA WB02_130;	<p>Ecology and Biodiversity</p> <p>The community expressed concern regarding the impact the cable routes and their construction would have on ecology and biodiversity.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_155; OF_CAWB02_156; OF_CAWB02_160; OF_CAWB02_169; OF_CAWB02_180; FFCAWB0206057			part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.
FFCAWB0206012; FFCAWB0206009; FFCAWB0202036; OF_CAWB02_120; OF_CAWB02_161; OF_CAWB02_164; OF_CAWB02_170; OF_CAWB02_294	<p>Location of Cable Route</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that the proposed cable route is not near a grid connection.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OM_CAWB02_002 OF_CAWB02_164 OF_CAWB02_198 OF_CAWB02_208 OF_CAWB02_287	Respondent expressed unhappiness towards the cable route in a general manner	Yes	Noted.
OF_CAWB02_011	As you originally proposed they are away from villages and will cause the least disruption.	Yes	Noted.
OF_CAWB02_048 OF_CAWB02_277	As above.... Completely the wrong site for this proposal	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_086 OF_CAWB02_110	<p>The proposed cable routes you have indicated are totally nonsensical! Running cables from Saxilby/Ingleby/Torksey/Brampton to West Burton and other cables from Blyton/Pelham/Corringham to Cottam is almost laughable and clearly hasn't been given much thought from either an engineering or geographical perspective? It would make much more sense if the cables from Saxilby/Ingleby/Torksey/Brampton went to Cottam and those from Blyton/Pelham/Corringham to West Burton.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_091	<p>The cable route is the same as the first consultation, you haven't told us where is going, again there are still more questions than answers. There is no information on the construction process, time it will take to construction, road closures, noise and impact on the local villages. The information you have provided is rubbish. I asked these questions to several people at the consultation. The answers I received on road closures ranged from no road closures to maybe up to a month. I was told the trench maybe two meters wide, others said it could be up to 20 meters wide. Your reps at both consultations did not have an any idea what they were talking about.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_096	Any closure of the public rights of way and access along Mill Lane is wrong. IGP stated at phase one that no public paths would be closed or diverted.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
OF_CAWB02_100 OF_CAWB02_102 OF_CAWB02_112 OF_CAWB02_113 OF_CAWB02_188 OF_CAWB02_235 OF_CAWB02_236	<p>Location of Scheme in proximity to Villages</p> <p>Disruptive to Wheatley and Clayworth.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
<p>OF_CAWB02_107; OF_CAWB02_272; OF_CAWB02_287</p>	<p>Don't do it.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_168	No need for cables	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
OF_CAWB02_182; OF_CAWB02_185	Detailed designs of the routes are not relevant, the project should not be allowed.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.
OF_CAWB02_191	Severe disruption to land. Roads in area often narrow and single track. This is going to be highly disruptive.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_192	I strongly oppose the project as a whole, as this will not generate the energy required as the system will not work at night, and will work at a reduced level during the winter when most energy is required.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
OF_CAWB02_206; OF_CAWB02_272	Taking too much land	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.
OF_CAWB02_245	See the above comment. Ridiculous idea. Driven by Henry Smith Charity, Savill's and IGP. You do not care what the people in the area think or need. Your agenda is not our agenda. Going to cost billions, a total waste of taxpayers' money. This whole project needs to be stopped NOW.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_246	<p>Yes, we hope that the landowners feel like we do and do not consent to you churning up the countryside just so that your companies can just make a stack of cash - it's absolutely nothing to do with green energy because the solar panels only have a limited shelf life - where do you propose to then put all of the retired solar panels - more land being stolen from the countryside for landfill??????</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
OF_CAWB02_251	<p>There has been no indication given for timescale for installation, type of disruption to roads and travelling and noise pollution to be expected should planning ever be granted.</p> <p>People move to the countryside for a better way of life - no one wants to live in the middle of what would be a huge</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>industrial development - worse than the existing power stations. People visit this area for the natural beauty, the nature reserves, the ancient footpaths, the chesterfield canal and the pretty villages and pubs - why do you want to spoil your own rural England?</p>		<p>part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
<p>OF_CAWB02_259; OF_CAWB02_280; OF_CAWB02_300</p>	<p>The proposed routes should not be used as the whole Scheme is inappropriate for this area</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_262	This is far too intense for a rural area. Massive impact on crop supply, farming jobs and visual amenity. Far too much.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
OF_CAWB02_271	Sensitive digging' to avoid disruption to the surface is an absolute nonsense. Directional drilling is similarly ridiculous in its suggestion that somehow this will prevent undermining the structural integrity of the landscape.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
OF_CAWB02_281	<p>Fields are needed for agriculture - while I support alternative energy sources, this project is to the detriment of the local economy and isn't a concern regarding the amount of farmland that will be lost.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_284	They are beneath grade 3a agricultural land and therefore fail the test in the NPPF.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060	<p>There has been virtually no progress towards defining cable routes in the 6 months since the first maps were produced. The route corridor from WB4 is virtually unchanged.</p> <p>At 12Km x 25m, the WB4 cable will destroy a further 30 hectares (75 acres) of productive land.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.
West Burton Substation			
OM_CAWB02_009	Your cable routes are attracting piggy back speculative development opportunities for other developments. IGP has stated that no further expansion is planned. Where are assurances that you will not sell cable capacity to other companies???	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_048	As above.... Completely the wrong site for this proposal	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments</p>
OF_CAWB02_058	The community expressed concern regarding the impact the cable routes and their construction would have on ecology and biodiversity.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments
OF_CAWB02_088 OF_CAWB02_089 OF_CAWB02_106 OF_CAWB02_239 OF_CAWB02_240 OF_CAWB02_241	<p>Cumulative Developments</p> <p>Respondent concern that the cable will be used in the future to serve more solar panels.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_192	I strongly oppose the project as a whole, as this will not generate the energy required as the system will not work at night, and will work at a reduced level during the winter when most energy is required.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
OF_CAWB02_206	Taking too much land	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
	<p>IGP have not been able to provide a reason why Wiseton residence have recently received letters from Dalcour Maclaren asking about land and property ownership near the proposed site and cabling routes, when the cabling route isn't proposed to cross the Wiseton estate (or anywhere near Wiseton). Leading to suspicions that this is just phase 1, with further expansion of the site proposed for subsequent phases.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_245	See the above comment. Ridiculous idea. Driven by Henry Smith Charity, Savill's and IGP. You do not care what the people in the area think or need. Your agenda is not our agenda. Going to cost billions, a total waste of taxpayers' money. This whole project needs to be stopped NOW.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
OF_CAWB02_246	Yes, we hope that the landowners feel like we do and do not consent to you churning up the countryside just so that your companies can just make a stack of cash - it's absolutely nothing to do with green energy because the solar panels only have a limited shelf life - where do you propose to then put all of the retired	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	solar panels - more land being stolen from the countryside for landfill??????		part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.
OF_CAWB02_251	<p>There has been no indication given for timescale for installation, type of disruption to roads and travelling and noise pollution to be expected should planning ever be granted.</p> <p>People move to the countryside for a better way of life - no one wants to live in the middle of what would be a huge industrial development - worse than the existing power stations.</p> <p>People visit this area for the natural beauty, the nature reserves, the ancient</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>footpaths, the chesterfield canal and the pretty villages and pubs - why do you want to spoil your own rural England?</p>		
<p>OF_CAWB02_259 OF_CAWB02_280 OF_CAWB02_300</p>	<p>The proposed routes should not be used as the whole Scheme is inappropriate for this area</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
OF_CAWB02_262	<p>This is far too intense for a rural area. Massive impact on crop supply, farming jobs and visual amenity. Far too much.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_281	Fields are needed for agriculture - while I support alternative energy sources, this project is to the detriment of the local economy and isn't a concern regarding the amount of farmland that will be lost.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
Comments which were not assigned to a specific site			
FFCAWB0205017	Respondent felt that all cable routes don't make sense.	N/A	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0205015; FFCAWB0206005; OF_CAWB02_166	When the site is decommissioned, land and previous cable route corridors must be restored to previous quality.	N/A	<p>An Outline Decommissioning Statement [EN010132/APP/WB7.2] is provided as part of the DCO application.</p> <p>This document sets out the proposed method for the removal of all the solar panels (PV), structures, enclosures, equipment, and all other apparatus associated with the Scheme.</p> <p>Infrastructure such as PV panels and battery storage units will be removed and recycled as far as practical and in accordance with legislation and guidance applicable at the time, or if more suitable at the time, sold for refurbishment and reuse.</p> <p>The 400kV and 132kV cables may be left in situ, depending on which method is likely to have the least environmental impact at the time but are likely to be removed. It is</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			considered generally desirable to remove the cables where possible, for both recycling purposes and to leave the land as close to its previous use state as possible. The cables would be removed by pulling the cables out from the ducts without the subsequent removal of the ducts themselves, thereby minimising surface disturbances.
FFCAWB0203002	Respondent expressed concern regarding the increase of crime in the area which could be caused by the installation of copper wires.	No	Noted.
FFCAWB0202005; FFCAWB0201029; FFCAWB0201006	Respondents felt that maps were not sufficiently detailed.	N/A	Noted.
OM_CAWB02_011	not really refined - still very wide	Yes	The Applicant initially presented a cable route search corridor, which has been refined through engagement and consultation with landowners. Table 5.13: Main Stages of Refinement for

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>the Cable Route Corridor within Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement</p> <p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains how the cable route has been refined. The initial cable corridor search area included whole fields with multiple river crossing options. This was then narrowed to a target route, predominantly 100m in width, which was fully surveyed by geophysical surveys, ecological surveys, and landscape assessments to generate options within the target route. The final cable corridor is 50m in width over the majority of its length.</p>
OF_CAWB02_051	As far as I can see the cabling will be buried on all routes, so will have no lasting visual impact, so acceptable in my view.	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_085	See above - agricultural land should not be used for these proposals	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes these comments and that further relevant information has been provided through the DCO application.</p> <p>For example, the Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] explains the reasons for the Scheme being large scale solar generation. It is not considered that small scale generation is an alternative to this, rather it complements it.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resources & Farming Circumstances) [EN010132/APP/W6.3.19.1].</p> <p>The vast majority of the Scheme is located on lower quality agricultural land with only 26.24% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land).</p> <p>See Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] which sets out</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>the design evolution of the Scheme. This includes justification for removal of certain fields from the Scheme and retention of other limited areas of BMV.</p> <p>The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality.</p> <p>In addition, some agricultural land may be retained during the operational phase, such as with pasture grazed by sheep, for example.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">ES Chapter 19:</p> <p>Soils and Agriculture [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] explains at paragraph 19.8.9 that an Agricultural Land Classification assessment has not been undertaken for the Cable Corridor Route. This is because the development proposed is a buried cable, with the interruption of the existing agricultural use limited to the brief cable laying operation.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_146	You are using small roads and footpaths.	N/A	Noted.
OF_CAWB02_148	Should not be approved	No	Noted.
OF_CAWB02_153	We strongly disapprove the proposals	No	Noted.
OF_CAWB02_163	I am opposed to the destruction of these wide swathes of farmland and natural countryside, habitats and wildlife that will probably never recover.	Yes	<p>Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9] considers the potential impacts and mitigations regarding the Scheme and birds and wildlife.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%.</p> <p>The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The landscape measures also include the preparation of a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives.</p>
OF_CAWB02_201	outrageous to violate countryside like this	N/A	Noted.
OF_CAWB02_213	Fully support renewable energy cable routes	N/A	Noted.
OF_CAWB02_227	WB4- could mean move development	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.
OF_CAWB02_295	Your questioning is based on the principle that the building of the solar farms is a fait accompli. No farms, no routes needed.	No	Noted.
OF_CAWB02_296	A CABLE ROUTE IS UN NECESSARY IF THE SOLAR PROPOSAL DOES NOT TAKE PLACE.	No	Noted.

6 Table 5.12.5: Feedback received to Question 7: We have presented proposals in the PEIR for mitigating impacts on the local ecology and delivering biodiversity net gain. Do you have any comments on these proposals or do you have anything else you would like us to consider?

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0202038 FFCAWB0206018 FFCAWB0206003 FFCAWB0205022 FFCAWB0205021 FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206041 FFCAWB0206040 FFCAWB0206038 FFCAWB0206037 FFCAWB0206036 FFCAWB0206050 FFCAWB0206047 FFCAWB0206032 FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0206045 FFCAWB0206044 FFCAWB0206031	<p>General concern and opposition regarding ecology</p> <p>Respondents expressed general concern regarding the impact that the development and proposed sites would have on local ecology and biodiversity. Endangered species should be particularly protected.</p> <p>Respondents expressed opinion that artificial enhancements and mitigation measures will not compensate the degradation of the rural ecology and landscape, caused by perceived industrialisation from the Scheme.</p> <p>Respondents stated that the proposed mitigation didn't, or in some cases couldn't, go far enough to offset harm.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9] considers the potential impacts and mitigations regarding the Scheme and birds and wildlife.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%.</p> <p>The mitigation associated with the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206042 FFCAWB0206029 FFCAWB0206026 FFCAWB0206007 FFCAWB0206004 FFCAWB0205019 FFCAWB0205014 FFCAWB0205008 FFCAWB0204012 FFCAWB0204011 FFCAWB0204006 FFCAWB0204003 FFCAWB0203019 FFCAWB0203017 FFCAWB0203015 FFCAWB0203013 FFCAWB0202041 FFCAWB0203010 FFCAWB0203005 FFCAWB0202028 FFCAWB0202025 FFCAWB0202022 FFCAWB0201027			<p>Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and the report at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8]. The LVIA picks up the delivery of landscape mitigation to address biodiversity net gain through the enhancement of existing habitats and green infrastructure proposals.</p> <p>The landscape measures also include the preparation of a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0201023 OM_CAWB02_002 OM_CAWB02_004 OF_CAWB02_030 OF_CAWB02_040 OF_CAWB02_042 OF_CAWB02_043 OF_CAWB02_045 OF_CAWB02_046 OF_CAWB02_047 OF_CAWB02_054 OF_CAWB02_055 OF_CAWB02_061 OF_CAWB02_070 OF_CAWB02_071 OF_CAWB02_087 OF_CAWB02_088 OF_CAWB02_089 OF_CAWB02_094 OF_CAWB02_117 OF_CAWB02_118 OF_CAWB02_119 OF_CAWB02_121			<p>ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives. The Applicant and its LVIA consultants at Lanpro have worked closely with the ecology consultant throughout the application process to inform the LVIA and associated mitigation plans. The mitigation proposals allow for flexibility, but they can also be fixed, where appropriate and applicable.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_123 OF_CAWB02_128 OF_CAWB02_132 OF_CAWB02_134 OF_CAWB02_152 OF_CAWB02_162 OF_CAWB02_179 OF_CAWB02_185 OF_CAWB02_190 OF_CAWB02_191 OF_CAWB02_207 OF_CAWB02_226 OF_CAWB02_235 OF_CAWB02_236 OF_CAWB02_246 OF_CAWB02_259 OF_CAWB02_262 OF_CAWB02_267 FFCAWB0206015 FFCAWB0206012 FFCAWB0206009 FFCAWB0206024 FFCAWB0205012			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0204009 FFCAWB0203022 FFCAWB0202038 FFCAWB0202020 FFCAWB0202003 FFCAWB0201033 FFCAWB0201007 OM_CAWB02_014 OM_CAWB02_016 OF_CAWB02_097 OF_CAWB02_099 OF_CAWB02_140 OF_CAWB02_105 OF_CAWB02_149 OF_CAWB02_153 OF_CAWB02_155 OF_CAWB02_160 OF_CAWB02_169 OF_CAWB02_183 OF_CAWB02_188 OF_CAWB02_253 OF_CAWB02_257 OF_CAWB02_265			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_271 OF_CAWB02_273 OF_CAWB02_200 OF_CAWB02_287 OF_CAWB02_293 OF_CAWB02_079 OF_CAWB02_163 OF_CAWB02_204 OF_CAWB02_298 OF_CAWB02_299 OF_CAWB02_026 OF_CAWB02_029 OF_CAWB02_034 OF_CAWB02_093 OF_CAWB02_095 OF_CAWB02_098 OF_CAWB02_200 FFCAWB0206017 FFCAWB0201025 OF_CAWB02_134 OF_CAWB02_181 OF_CAWB02_267			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_141 OF_CAWB02_233 OF_CAWB02_175 OM_CAWB02_011 OF_CAWB02_110 OF_CAWB02_240 OF_CAWB02_239 OF_CAWB02_063 OF_CAWB02_121 OF_CAWB02_132 OF_CAWB02_140 OF_CAWB02_182 OF_CAWB02_183 OF_CAWB02_223 OF_CAWB02_005 OF_CAWB02_061 OF_CAWB02_188 OF_CAWB02_206 OF_CAWB02_214 OF_CAWB02_208 FFCAWB0206061 FFCAWB0206054 FFCAWB0206030			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0205020 FFCAWB0205001			
FFCAWB0206013 FFCAWB0202016 FFCAWB0202013 FFCAWB0201024 FFCAWB0201011 OF_CAWB02_140 OF_CAWB02_141 OF_CAWB02_011	<p>General support for ecology proposals</p> <p>Respondents were satisfied with proposals regarding ecology and biodiversity and support proposals for land being set aside for conservation and amenity purposes.</p>	N/A	Noted.
FFCAWB0202038 FFCAWB0206002	<p>Visual confusion</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that solar sites can be confusing for wildlife, commenting that birds or insects may mistake solar panels for water.</p>	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes that current Natural England advice with respect to invertebrates and solar panels is to avoid siting panels in close proximity to major bodies of standing water or wetland areas. The location proposed contains a dearth of standing water and is located in a predominantly arable environment. Mounting evidence (including RSPB and Natural England Statements on the matter) also indicates that solar panels are</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			unlikely to be a collision risk to birds and that birds are unlikely to confuse them with water.
FFCAWB0202038	<p>SSSI</p> <p>The Idle Valley Nature reserve is an SSSI which should not be disturbed by these installations.</p> <p>Chesterfield Canal is an SSSI which should be undisturbed by these installations</p>	Yes	The Applicant has distinguished SSSI locations in close proximity to the Scheme and assessed potential effects and evaluated ecological enhancements that may be required. These can be found within Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9] .
FFCAWB0202038 OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_273 OF_CAWB02_293	<p>CEMP</p> <p>A CEMP (Construction Environmental Mitigation Plan) should be implemented and supervised, policed and enforced.</p>	Yes	The Applicant has ensured that prior to the commencement of any phase of development a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, and this will be secured by the Requirements in the DCO. The CEMP for each phase will be in

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			accordance with the Outline CEMP which will be submitted as part of the DCO application.
FFCAWB0202038 FFCAWB0205005 FFCAWB0206053 OF_CAWB02_063 OF_CAWB02_068 OF_CAWB02_127 OM_CAWB02_007 OF_CAWB02_204 OF_CAWB02_251 OF_CAWB02_223 OF_CAWB02_110 FFCAWB0206061	<p>Birds</p> <p>Respondents expressed opinion that specific regard should be paid to the impact on birds.</p> <p>Comments requested for birds such as skylarks and barn owls to be protected.</p> <p>Some respondents noted recently observing Red Kite for the first time in 29 years.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant has assessed impacts on all recorded bird species. These assessments are presented and discussed in Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement</p> <p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9], with barn owls being considered highly likely to experience a beneficial effect from the improved access to higher quality hunting habitat under panels when compared to the baseline of intensive arable.</p> <p>Mitigation within the Scheme has been put forward to accommodate a proportion of potentially displaced skylark territories, while access to improved foraging habitat under the panels (compared to the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>arable baseline) can be expected to improve the nesting success of adjacent territories.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that consultation with Natural England and a full suite of bird surveys have been undertaken and inform their assessment, as presented in Sections 9.7.160 - 9.7.199 of Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206052 FFCAWB0206020 FFCAWB0206019 FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0206016 FFCAWB0202014 FFCAWB0202010 FFCAWB0202001 OF_CAWB02_030 OF_CAWB02_046 OF_CAWB02_115 OF_CAWB02_120 OF_CAWB02_134 OF_CAWB02_148 OF_CAWB02_161 OF_CAWB02_178 OF_CAWB02_180 OF_CAWB02_196 OF_CAWB02_204 OF_CAWB02_223 OF_CAWB02_272 OF_CAWB02_038 OF_CAWB02_056	<p>Evidence and detail</p> <p>Respondents consider that there has not been sufficient evidence or detail within the proposal provided on how a biodiversity net gain will be achieved. Respondents expressed scepticism that proposed mitigation and enhancement would be delivered in reality.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme.</p> <p>The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units .</p> <p>All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme.</p> <p>The BNG assessment report also sets out how these calculations are</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OM_CAWB02_009 OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_273 OF_CAWB02_293 OF_CAWB02_259 OF_CAWB02_110 OF_CAWB02_219 OF_CAWB02_217 OM_CAWB02_012 OF_CAWB02_215 OF_CAWB02_180 OF_CAWB02_111 OF_CAWB02_184 OM_CAWB02_012 OF_CAWB02_172 OF_CAWB02_272 OF_CAWB02_228 OF_CAWB02_229 OF_CAWB02_224 OF_CAWB02_245 FFCAWB0206008 FFCAWB0205009			based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010132/APP/WB7.3] which will be secured under a requirement of the DCO.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0205018	<p>Lighting</p> <p>Light pollution may have an underestimated impact on ecology and biodiversity</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant has assessed lighting impacts upon bats, invertebrates and fish. This assessment is presented in Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9], with limitations on installation and usage put forward as mitigation.</p>
OF_CAWB02_159	<p>Buffer zones</p> <p>Respondent commented on their property being a self-funded, 11-acre nature reserve and re wilding project, with requests for an increased buffer to embedded into the Scheme.</p>	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and is grateful for the respondent's engagement and feedback.</p> <p>The Applicant has detailed potential effects as well as mitigation measures in place for local animals and species regarding buffer zones within Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0205001 FFCAWB0203024	<p>Wildflowers</p> <p>Respondents commented that there should be more wildflowers and pollinator grasslands which are species rich as opposed to a grass mono-culture.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010132/APP/WB7.3] contains extensive provision of new, diverse grassland habitat of various types where arable existed (including meadow, semi-improved, tussocky and herb-rich pollinator grassland), and diversification of retained arable margins. New grassland creation measures approximately 800ha.</p> <p>As many SSSIs and LWSs noted in the Desk Study are designated for their grassland or meadow habitats, this is considered to be a significant and sympathetic contribution to the grassland habitat network in the local area. Additionally, the majority of the higher-diversity meadows are focussed within land identified as</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>"opportunity for creation" within the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership Biodiversity Opportunities Mapping Scheme. Other significant green infrastructure creation present within the Scheme includes approximately 20km of new hedgerow planting and 16ha of new scrub planting as well as a small number of new ponds and an area of wetland habitat containing wader scrapes.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OM_CAWB02_015 OF_CAWB02_251 OF_CAWB02_051 OF_CAWB02_068 OF_CAWB02_127 OM_CAWB02_007 FFCAWB0205015 FFCAWB0206005 FFCAWB0202036 FFCAWB0202006 OF_CAWB02_144 OF_CAWB02_105 OF_CAWB02_077 OF_CAWB02_287 OF_CAWB02_091 OF_CAWB02_204 FFCAWB0206065	<p>Fencing and routes</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the potential impact of fencing around the Scheme on the health and wellbeing on wildlife, particularly mammals, where routes and habitats may be disturbed.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant has detailed potential effects as well as mitigation measures and ecological enhancements in place for local animals and species within Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement: [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9].</p> <p>The Applicant notes that deer and other mammal species have been seen to surmount or undermine solar installation fencing at other locations. Due to their wide-ranging habits and movements, deer will most likely continue to move through the landscape around the proposed fencing. However, it is not considered that this would lead to any negative effects on the conservation status of these species.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_013 OF_CAWB02_182 OF_CAWB02_058 OF_CAWB02_154 OF_CAWB02_295 OF_CAWB02_189 OF_CAWB02_112	<p>Land use and condition</p> <p>Respondents expressed a preference for agricultural land to be avoided and for the Sites to be left in current condition. It was commented this would be better wildlife and food security.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and appreciates the importance of agricultural land.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented within the Site Selection Assessment.</p> <p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement</p> <p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>and are reported in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resources & Farming Circumstances) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.19.1].</p> <p>The vast majority of the Scheme is located on lower quality agricultural land with only 26.24% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land).</p> <p>The Applicant notes that The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality. Agricultural land may also be retained during the operational</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			phase, such as pasture grazed by sheep, for example.
OF_CAWB02_077 OF_CAWB02_287	<p>Brown hare and deer</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern regarding potential impacts to brown hares and deer.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that Brown hare thrive within solar farms from extensive monitoring experience.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that deer and other mammal species have been seen to surmount or undermine solar installation fencing at other locations. Due to their wide-ranging habits and movements, deer will most likely continue to move through the landscape around the proposed fencing. However, it is not considered that this would lead to any negative effects on the conservation status of these species.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_141; OF_CAWB02_094; OF_CAWB02_222	<p>Flora and fauna</p> <p>Respondents commented on the importance of flora and fauna and expressed opinion that the Scheme should improve this.</p> <p>It was also suggested that the Scheme considers promoting the benefits of the life-supporting microbial communities within the earth beneath the solar panels as a vital link to regenerating healthy biodiversity during the lifetime of the project.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant has set out mitigation measures and ecological enhancements regarding increased flora and fauna in Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9].</p>
OF_CAWB02_150	<p>Shadowing</p> <p>Panels lead to shadowing - damaging biodiversity</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant has set out the preferred topography of the Scheme Sites and the mitigation of shadowing in Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Site Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_284; OF_CAWB02_192	<p>Glint and glare</p> <p>We do not know the effect of 'glare' from solar panels on migrating birds, this is of grave concern and has not been considered.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant has assessed the potential impact of glint and glare through Chapter 16 (Glint and Glare) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.16].</p>
OF_CAWB02_265	<p>Cumulative assessment</p> <p>Have other plans including Gate Burton and the Tillbridge solar proposals been considered in the round? There seems to be a 'gold rush' for land in the area for this type of Scheme. Can the local environment and community cope with the number of proposals if all are fulfilled?</p>	Yes	<p>Section 9.9 of Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9] considers potential cumulative impacts arising from the combined impacts of similar or large-scale development in proximity to the Scheme.</p>
OF_CAWB02_265	<p>Otter</p> <p>Brown Hare are already prevalent in this area. However, other species such as otters, what measures are being put in place to protect these species?</p>	Yes	<p>Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9] considers potential effects to species such as otters.</p> <p>Section 9.5.89 states:</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Considering the presence of otter principally within the larger watercourses at the Sites and relatively limited network of good or optimal riparian corridors within the Survey Area, the Scheme and CRSA are considered to be of Local importance for otters, as it does not appear to be of elevated value for this species above similar land in the surrounding area. Nevertheless, the presence of otter within the more major watercourses and at least sporadically within the minor ditch network would be a consideration within the assessment and, if relevant, the development of mitigation.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206034 FFCAWB0206028 FFCAWB0204011 FFCAWB0203024 FFCAWB0203016 FFCAWB0202036 FFCAWB0202025 FFCAWB0202002 FFCAWB0202002 OF_CAWB02_134 OF_CAWB02_148 OF_CAWB02_162 OF_CAWB02_170 OF_CAWB02_184 OF_CAWB02_192 OF_CAWB02_201 OF_CAWB02_203 OF_CAWB02_226 OF_CAWB02_257 OF_CAWB02_277 OF_CAWB02_279 OF_CAWB02_280 OF_CAWB02_281	<p>Land use and quality of agricultural land</p> <p>Respondents contend that agricultural land or BMV land should not be used.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this feedback and appreciates the importance of agricultural land.</p> <p>Impacts upon agricultural land have been assessed within Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19], which includes detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites.</p> <p>The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land from the Scheme.</p> <p>Table 5.6-5.9 of Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] details the design evolution that has led to the majority of BMV land being removed from the Scheme. The</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_285 OM_CAWB02_008 OF_CAWB02_026 OF_CAWB02_040 OF_CAWB02_045 OF_CAWB02_093 OF_CAWB02_095 OF_CAWB02_098 OF_CAWB02_141			<p>finalised Scheme contains only 26.24% Best and Most Versatile land and clear justification for why these small areas remain within the Scheme is set out at Tables 5.6 - 5.9 of ES Chapter 5.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that the Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality, and that some agricultural land could be retained during the operational phase, for example pasture grazed by sheep.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OM_CAWB02_018 OM_CAWB02_019 OM_CAWB02_020 OM_CAWB02_025 OF_CAWB02_028 OF_CAWB02_044 OF_CAWB02_072 OF_CAWB02_073 OF_CAWB02_075 OF_CAWB02_105 OF_CAWB02_114 OF_CAWB02_131 OF_CAWB02_133 OF_CAWB02_135 OF_CAWB02_139 OF_CAWB02_145 OF_CAWB02_151 OF_CAWB02_176 OF_CAWB02_190 OF_CAWB02_212 OF_CAWB02_220 OF_CAWB02_226 OF_CAWB02_237	<p>Land Use regarding West Burton 4</p> <p>This land is a huge ecological asset, connecting two villages and linked to a major nature reserve through a very large and ancient off-road footpath and bridleway network, with vast numbers of varied users who all enjoy close contact with nature and wildlife in this at-risk landscape.</p> <p>The landscape at West Burton 4 is not ecologically degraded, despite claims by Island Green Power and their consultants. Artificial enhancements of the landscape cannot compensate for the degradation industrialisation of the site will cause.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_266 OF_CAWB02_274 OF_CAWB02_275 OF_CAWB02_297 OF_CAWB02_197			
OF_CAWB02_115 OF_CAWB02_130	<p>For WB4, I do not agree that minimal tweaks around hundreds of acres of solar panels achieves the same bio-diversity as exists currently.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.
OF_CAWB02_013 OM_CAWB02_008 OF_CAWB02_264 OF_CAWB02_198	<p>Alternative sites</p> <p>Respondents state that solar panels should be located on brownfield sites and on new builds.</p>	Yes	<p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application. In reviewing the policies and information available regarding solar generation and the need to decarbonise, it is the Applicant's view that large-scale solar must be considered as additional to, as opposed to instead of, smaller scale solar, and this includes the development of rooftop solar.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land and consideration of rooftop solar opportunities, has been undertaken and presented within the Site</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Selection Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p>
<p>OF_CAWB02_230 OF_CAWB02_139 OF_CAWB02_105 OF_CAWB02_141 OF_CAWB02_194 OF_CAWB02_134 OF_CAWB02_182 OF_CAWB02_296 OF_CAWB02_281 OF_CAWB02_300 OF_CAWB02_245</p>	<p>Ecology and visual mitigation</p> <p>Respondents commented on the relationship between ecological and visual mitigation, with concern that neither topic could be addressed.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The Applicant and its LVIA consultants at Lanpro have worked</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>closely with the ecology consultant throughout the application process to inform the LVIA and associated mitigation plans. The mitigation proposals allow for flexibility, but they can also be fixed, where appropriate and applicable.</p>
OF_CAWB02_223	<p>Flood risk</p> <p>Channelling water into narrower areas as it pours off the panels onto smaller ground area will increase flood risk - faster flowing water will then travel unchecked onto land that is already at risk of flood and was flooded to such an extent last year that sheep drowned in their field and the village of Stow was literally marooned.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes a full assessment of the Site including the cable routes from existing flood risk and its potential impact on local flood risk is assessed throughout the Flood Risk Assessment and Chapter 10 (Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.10].</p> <p>The proposed development will not</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>have a detrimental impact on surface water runoff. Where hardstanding is proposed this will be managed through local SuDS proposals considered in Section 5.0 (Drainage Strategy) of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy and throughout the supporting Annexes.</p>
<p>FFCAWB0206026; FFCAWB0204005; FFCAWB0202036; FFCAWB0202006; OF_CAWB02_122; OF_CAWB02_131</p>	<p>Flooding in Clayworth Village</p> <p>Development of this site will exacerbate flooding problems in Clayworth. Respondents were concerned that drainage dykes should not be disturbed since the area is a flood risk.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.
FFCAWB0202017	<p>Wind</p> <p>Respondent was concerned about the potential for high winds to be generated as a result of the solar panels.</p>	Yes	The Applicant has undertaken a thorough Environmental Impact Assessment for the Scheme.
OF_CAWB02_141	<p>Employment opportunities</p> <p>The respondent would like to see opportunities for local employment to both enable the normal maintenance of the sites and to facilitate the improvement of biodiversity.</p>	Yes	<p>Direct and indirect impacts on employment have been assessed by the Applicant in Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement</p> <p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.2.18] based on estimated construction numbers, and standard methodology for indirect and induced employment. Employment impacts on existing industries (i.e.,</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			agriculture) are included in the baseline conditions.
OF_CAWB02_143	<p>PEIR Accessibility</p> <p>The respondent cited their challenges accessing information through the PEIR, and commented that members of the community may have struggled to understand the Scheme.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment, and appreciates that a significant volume of technical information was published for consultation.</p> <p>A non-technical summary of the PEIR was made available online at the Scheme website, at CAP sites, at public information events and upon request. The Applicant recognises that the summary was introduced to broaden the reception of the PEIR to more members of the local community. The Scheme free-to-use communications channels were open throughout the consultation</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			period to provide assistance to consultees.
OF_CAWB02_149; OF_CAWB02_203; OF_CAWB02_210	<p>Footpaths and wellbeing</p> <p>Respondents commented on the importance of footpaths and bridleways for the mental and physical wellbeing of local residents.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that information on the public rights of way within and around the Site and an assessment of them is presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.18] considers public right of way and the user experience.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206028 OF_CAWB02_094	The site cannot be screened as it is on a slope	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
CAWB0206006	Scepticism regarding the information presented in the PEIR, leading to belief the project is a tick box exercise	N/A	The Applicant is committed to reading and reviewing all comments and feedback submitted regarding the West Burton Solar project as part of the DCO process. The applicant is also committed to

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			publicising all feedback within Applicant response tables.
FFCAWB0205006	Leave as they are	N/A	The Applicant notes this response.
FFCAWB0202005 FFCAWB0201031	No	No	Noted.
CAWB0207017_W B	<p>The River Till is very important for wildlife, as are the surrounding fields. Swans raise their signets here. What about deer and hedgehogs that travel distances through fields (their stepping stones) which would be cut off with 70 miles of fencing round the whole site? Hares live on these fields too. Can you supply a long-term study on the effect that solar panels would have on birds, birds of prey, bats etc.</p> <p>We see no figures in this document to demonstrate maximum economic benefit to justify the net gain in your mitigation in delivering biodiversity net gain! By altering long established natural environments for the purposes of solar farm gain requires large acres of land to produce in essence less</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units . All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	energy that would come from a single offshore wind turbine.		<p>significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme.</p> <p>The BNG assessment report also sets out how these calculations are based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010132/APP/WB7.3] which will be secured under a requirement of the DCO.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0206060</p>	<p>What scientific evidence there is for the ecological effects (good or bad) of a huge solar PV site relates to small PV sites where evidence-gathering has been fragmentary, selective and thin (and not in the UK), or to huge sites in the deserts of south-western USA (which include solar-concentrating as well as PV sites which have very different ecological impacts), neither of which can be extrapolated to WB4.</p> <p>The fragmentary evidence from small PV sites does suggest that a variety of species read a PV solar array for water. Birds and bats try to drink from the panels, and bats are also confused by the more vertical surfaces in open flight. Some insects which have to lay their eggs in still water (and are an important food source for some bird species) try to lay their eggs on solar panels.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0206060</p>	<p>The Chesterfield Canal is a SSSI for its length from Retford to Misterton. It passes just 250m (275yards) south of WB4 and supports a number of nationally scarce plant species in its brackish water, and is home to breeding families of swans, ducks, moorhens, coots and kingfishers. Dragon- and damsel-flies are common sights further from the canal, throughout Clayworth and surrounding lanes and fields. The canal's rich ecology is easily seen from the towpath - the Cuckoo Way.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0206060</p>	<p>The Idle Valley Nature Reserve is a second adjacent Site of Special Scientific Interest, larger than the WB4 site and just 1¼ miles south of it. It is one of the largest in Nottinghamshire and nationally important, a patchwork of woodlands, wild-flower areas, wetlands, lakes and river which is a haven for water fowl and a massive diversity of plants and animals. It supports an exceptional diversity of breeding, wintering and passage birds and is one of the most important localities for passage and over-wintering wildfowl in the East Midlands: terns, gulls, waders, raptors, and passerines; the lagoons are particularly significant as wildfowl refuges each winter: over seventeen species of wildfowl can be recorded each year. The distant sound of the geese and ducks in the Reserve is a constant backdrop to our gardens in Clayworth, and to our walks in the countryside around there.</p> <p>We regularly see large flocks of migrating ducks and geese flying right down the centre</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>of the WB4 site and over our home. There is a frequently-reported view that migrating birds mistake large areas of glass such as a field of solar panels for water. There is no hard scientific evidence for this (which is NOT confirmation that this is not a risk), but by analogy with the behaviour of swallows and bats it would be a logical deduction. The Nature Reserve is directly under the migration routes. What would they make of a whole square mile of dark reflective glass beneath them?</p>		
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0206060</p>	<p>Deer are frequently seen across WB4 and along its paths: the whole area of the site would be closed to them: they would lose a large block of their habitat and foraging corridors. Deer have been completely ignored in the Landscape and Ecology assessments. Badgers forage further than the 10-30m buffer zone proposed be allotted to them. There is no Construction Environmental Mitigation Plan (CEMP). How will it be supervised, policed, and breaches</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>sanctioned? 7.3.2 ". . . the favourable management of the grasslands under and surrounding the arrays . . ." Apart from being artificial and atypical for the natural environment of the area and its wildlife, maintaining healthy planting under and between panel rows is absolutely critical for the management of run-off water and the prevention of flooding of Clayworth. Despite obligations to operate ecological management plans and the appointment of specific officers to do this, experience with other solar sites is that this simply does not happen, and the ground beneath and around the panels is left to become compacted, bare and derelict. Low light and reduced rain under the panels lead to an altered microclimate there with poor growth of alien species, and consequential distortion of ecological balance.</p>		<p>the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206056</p>	<p>The plan to control planting here by grazing sheep is flawed: few farms have sheep in this area, the grazing would be poor, and the logistics of constantly shepherding and corralling them around the panels and relocation to fresh areas makes this uneconomic: such plans have largely failed elsewhere.</p> <p>Corralling wild species into artificially defined marginal, narrow linear and sequestered areas is unnatural and will have a negative impact; removal of cropping from the fields removes the hunting grounds of apex bird and animal predators.</p> <p>Rare open-farmland-nesting-birds (such as skylark, yellow wagtail) - precious sightings on walks here - will have no place on any of these sites.</p> <p>No evidence is presented to support the claims of enhanced biodiversity, nor of the maintenance of healthy populations: they are false. The loss of natural habitat and corridors, and unnatural planting with</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>consequent disturbance of ecological balance, are real threats to animal and plant species. There is no trust that ecological mitigation measures will be effective: they are an added expense for contractor and operator, and without active and effective policing, calling to account and meaningful sanctions - will not be followed. We need to see both the CEMP and operational Landscape Environmental Management Plan.</p>		

7 Table 5.12.6: Feedback received to Question 8: In the PEIR we have shown photographs looking towards the sites taken from publicly accessible viewpoints. Please share with us suggestions you have on your preferred landscaping measures, including for example the positioning of the infrastructure and location of tree planting. Please indicate which site your comments refer to.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0203008 OF_CAWB02_280 OF_CAWB02_207 OF_CAWB02_282 OF_CAWB02_258 FFCAWB0206054 FFCAWB0206018 FFCAWB0205022 FFCAWB0205021 FFCAWB0206037 FFCAWB0206024 FFCAWB0206026 FFCAWB0206007 FFCAWB0206006 FFCAWB0206004 FFCAWB0205008	<p>Opposition to the Scheme</p> <p>Respondents expressed opposition to the Scheme. It was commented that visual mitigation would not be required if infrastructure were not developed.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this response.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0204006 FFCAWB0203017 FFCAWB0203015 FFCAWB0203013 OF_CAWB02_044 OF_CAWB02_072 OF_CAWB02_075 OF_CAWB02_093 OF_CAWB02_095 OF_CAWB02_098 OF_CAWB02_114 OF_CAWB02_115 OF_CAWB02_135 OF_CAWB02_145 OF_CAWB02_151 OF_CAWB02_176 OF_CAWB02_190 OF_CAWB02_197 OF_CAWB02_204 OF_CAWB02_212 OF_CAWB02_220			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_266 OF_CAWB02_274 OF_CAWB02_275 OF_CAWB02_297 FFCAWB0206020 FFCAWB0206019 FFCAWB0206040 FFCAWB0205012 OF_CAWB02_091 OF_CAWB02_092 OF_CAWB02_139 OF_CAWB02_152 OF_CAWB02_267 OF_CAWB02_277 OF_CAWB02_294 FFCAWB0205011 FFCAWB0202025 OF_CAWB02_058 OF_CAWB02_092 OF_CAWB02_300 OF_CAWB02_150			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_198 OF_CAWB02_280 OF_CAWB02_282 FFCAWB0206048 FFCAWB0206017 FFCAWB0201025 OF_CAWB02_245 FFCAWB0205006 OF_CAWB02_208 OF_CAWB02_279 OF_CAWB02_287 FFCAWB0202037 FFCAWB0206032 FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0206023 FFCAWB0204003 FFCAWB0203023 OF_CAWB02_013 FFCAWB0201017 OF_CAWB02_148 OF_CAWB02_192			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_206 OF_CAWB02_259 OF_CAWB02_140 OF_CAWB02_251 OF_CAWB02_132 OF_CAWB02_183 OF_CAWB02_241 OF_CAWB02_239 FFCAWB0206057 OF_CAWB02_245 OF_CAWB02_259 OF_CAWB02_287 FFCAWB0204001 FFCAWB0206033 FFCAWB0204004 FFCAWB0202014 OF_CAWB02_105 OF_CAWB02_153	<p>Effectiveness of screening</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that the Sites could not be effectively screened.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and the report at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The LVIA picks up the delivery of landscape mitigation to address biodiversity net gain through the enhancement of existing habitats and green infrastructure proposals. The landscape measures also include the preparation of a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>the objectives. The Applicant and its LVIA consultants at Lanpro have worked closely with the ecology consultant throughout the application process to inform the LVIA and associated mitigation plans. The mitigation proposals allow for flexibility, but they can also be fixed, where appropriate and applicable.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, such as presented in Section 8.6 and Table 8.22 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], takes embedded mitigation into account to include the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Panels to be set a minimum of 3m from Site boundaries. - Panels to be set minimum of 20m from major watercourses and minimum of 8m

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>from minor watercourses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Panels to be set 50m (min) from boundary curtilage to outer edge of solar panel. - Site boundary fencing to be set back 5m from adjacent existing hedgerows to allow for proposed thickening and growth. - Let existing hedges grow out and managed at 5m. Encourage hedgerow trees to grow out within existing hedges to add further thickening and growth within the field boundaries. <p>Additional secondary mitigation has also been designed into the Scheme, consisting of new planting proposals, details of which can be found on Figures 8.18.1-8.18.3 [EN010132/APP/WB6.4.8.18.1 – WB6.4.8.18.3] and is further described within the Outline Landscape and</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010132/APP/WB7.3]
FFCAWB0206013	I'm struggling to see how tree planting would work on a solar farm but low-level trees/ shrubs might be feasible and help to hide the cells from view and possibly reduce invasive reflection.	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8] presents an assessment the potential landscape and visual effects of the Scheme.</p> <p>This chapter describes how views will be screened in close-mid range proximity due to the new hedgerows and shelterbelt planting and the enhancement of existing hedgerows which will be managed to a height of 5m. These new and augmented hedgerows will provide a series of good quality field boundaries both formally strengthening the existing and historical field pattern and creating a multi-layered landscape. Scattered tree belts will also follow the routes of existing watercourses,</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>strengthening their visibility in the wider landscape.</p> <p>Views of the longer distance, where hedgerows do not block these, will be of a layered, well treed landscape with a backdrop of some wooded vegetation in places on the horizon. Both new and existing vegetation will have established and begun to mature, creating a much stronger structure to the landscape, and retaining and enhancing the overall character of the area. Planting takes into account the nature of the landscape and where applicable tree planting would be scoped out to preserve the open character of the landscape.</p>
FFCAWB0204012 FFCAWB0206053 OF_CAWB02_019 FFCAWB0204012	Consultation materials	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this response.</p> <p>Updated viewpoint photography has been provided as part of the DCO application</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_168 OF_CAWB02_241 OF_CAWB02_239 OF_CAWB02_219 OF_CAWB02_230 OF_CAWB02_079 FFCAWB0205011 OF_CAWB02_243 FFCAWB0206001 FFCAWB0201018 OF_CAWB02_037	Respondents commented that they had not located photographs through the consultation materials.		and is presented through Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8] .
FFCAWB0203016 FFCAWB0203008	Proposed landscape tweaks are only trying to dress up and disguise what is a good project idea but targeted at the wrong areas of land at an unnecessarily high cost to the country.	Yes	The Applicant notes this opposition. A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application. In reviewing the policies and information available regarding solar generation and the need to decarbonise, it is the Applicant's view that large-scale solar must be considered as additional to, as opposed

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>to instead of, the need for continued development in distribution connected, smaller scale solar, and this includes the development of rooftop solar.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p>
FFCAWB0203006	The PEIR does not include firm proposals, only potential options.	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes this response. Updated viewpoint photography has been provided as part of the DCO application and is presented through Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Environmental Statement [Document reference: WB6.2.8].
FFCAWB0206021	Tree planting should be 100 yards into the fields away from the village boundary. Hedge planting should be double planted along routes through.	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8] presents an assessment the potential landscape and visual effects of the Scheme.</p> <p>This chapter describes how views will be screened in close-mid range proximity due to the new hedgerows and shelterbelt planting and the enhancement of existing hedgerows which will be managed to a height of 5m. These new and augmented hedgerows will provide a series of good quality field boundaries both formally strengthening the existing and historical field pattern and creating a multi-layered landscape. Scattered tree belts will also</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>follow the routes of existing watercourses, strengthening their visibility in the wider landscape.</p> <p>Views of the longer distance, where hedgerows do not block these, will be of a layered, well treed landscape with a backdrop of some wooded vegetation in places on the horizon. Both new and existing vegetation will have established and begun to mature, creating a much stronger structure to the landscape, and retaining and enhancing the overall character of the area. Planting takes into account the nature of the landscape and where applicable tree planting would be scoped out to preserve the open character of the landscape.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206014	The positioning of the panels is too close to my boundary. You said you would take account of this when you inspected but your latest plans have not. Please confirm you would set the panels back significantly further away from the village.	Yes,	The Applicant notes that panels are to be set back from boundaries to allow buffer zones.
FFCAWB0206016	The sites need to be screened by mature hedging and trees - concern for motorists being affected by sunlight bouncing off the panels.	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB 6.2.8] presents an assessment the potential landscape and visual effects of the Scheme.</p> <p>This chapter describes how views will be screened in close-mid range proximity due to the new hedgerows and shelterbelt planting and the enhancement of existing hedgerows which will be managed to a height of 5m. These new and augmented hedgerows will provide a series of good quality field boundaries both formally</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>strengthening the existing and historical field pattern and creating a multi-layered landscape. Scattered tree belts will also follow the routes of existing watercourses, strengthening their visibility in the wider landscape.</p> <p>Views of the longer distance, where hedgerows do not block these, will be of a layered, well treed landscape with a backdrop of some wooded vegetation in places on the horizon. Both new and existing vegetation will have established and begun to mature, creating a much stronger structure to the landscape, and retaining and enhancing the overall character of the area. Planting takes into account the nature of the landscape and where applicable tree planting would be scoped out to preserve the open character of the landscape.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206015	More hedging needs planting as, depending on the rate of growth of trees planted the site will be visible for years. Whatever is planted should not only be native and in keeping with the area but also fast growing.	Yes,	<p>Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8] presents an assessment the potential landscape and visual effects of the Scheme.</p> <p>This chapter describes how views will be screened in close-mid range proximity due to the new hedgerows and shelterbelt planting and the enhancement of existing hedgerows which will be managed to a height of 5m. These new and augmented hedgerows will provide a series of good quality field boundaries both formally strengthening the existing and historical field pattern and creating a multi-layered landscape. Scattered tree belts will also follow the routes of existing watercourses, strengthening their visibility in the wider landscape.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Views of the longer distance, where hedgerows do not block these, will be of a layered, well treed landscape with a backdrop of some wooded vegetation in places on the horizon. Both new and existing vegetation will have established and begun to mature, creating a much stronger structure to the landscape, and retaining and enhancing the overall character of the area. Planting takes into account the nature of the landscape and where applicable tree planting would be scoped out to preserve the open character of the landscape.
FFCAWB0206036	Take from cliff rd.- (from Burton to Hemswell)- shows views across to the Trent.	No	Noted.
OF_CAWB02_300	No panels, no landscaping required.	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_175	If you need to hide it with landscaping, then you admit that what you are doing is bad.	No	Noted. This is the view of the respondent.
OF_CAWB02_058 OF_CAWB02_299	The impact is not reversible on many levels. The loss of wildlife and pollution would be devastating.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%.</p> <p>The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and the report at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8]. The LVIA picks up the delivery of landscape mitigation to address biodiversity net gain</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>through the enhancement of existing habitats and green infrastructure proposals. The landscape measures also include the preparation of a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives. The Applicant and its LVIA consultants at Lanpro have worked closely with the ecology consultant throughout the application process to inform the LVIA and associated mitigation plans. The mitigation proposals allow for flexibility, but they can also be fixed, where appropriate and applicable. Chapter 17 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.17] assesses the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>effects of the Scheme on air quality at nearby sensitive receptors during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases. The aim of this assessment is to predict the levels of air quality pollutants and assess them to determine whether there are any likely significant effects, taking account of relevant policy, guidelines and best practice.</p>
OF_CAWB02_182	<p>The project is a disgrace and should not be allowed, Solar panels have a place on the roofs of buildings and should be mandatory on new builds including industrial where they cannot be seen or at least are disguised.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this opposition.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application. In reviewing the policies and information available regarding solar generation and the need to decarbonise, it is the Applicant's view that large-scale solar must be considered as additional to, as opposed to instead of, smaller scale solar, and this</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>includes the development of rooftop solar. The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land and consideration of roof top solar opportunities is set out within the Site Selection Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p>
OF_CAWB02_185	<p>The project should not be allowed, it will cover 1000's of hectares with black glass and steel. it will be a national disaster with no carbon saving over its lifetime when production, installation and disposal carbon figures are taken into account.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this opposition.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application. Section 12 summarises the urgent need for large scale solar developments to</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>support the decarbonisation of the GB electricity sector.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, includes a search for suitable brownfield land and consideration of rooftop solar opportunities and is set out within the Site Selection Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_110	<p>Photographs don't always show reality. I'd prefer not to see any solar farms close to where I live as I am dreading the disruption to my quiet, retired life if these projects go ahead. The thought of the construction phase fills me with dread. I wonder how the owners and management of IGP and Low Carbon would feel if massive solar farms were constructed within 300 meters of where they live?</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this response. Updated viewpoint photography has been provided as part of the DCO application and is presented through Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p>
OF_CAWB02_251	<p>In particular on the Trent Valley way route there is probably one of the best views in this area which the proposed trees would obliterate - so again we have to object strongly to the proposed site.</p> <p>In some other areas near to Fillingham you have residents who you propose to literally surround with panel on all four sides taking away every view that they have in every</p>	Yes	<p>The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and the report at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	direction - that is cruel and potentially damaging to mental health.		
OF_CAWB02_143	<p>The WB1 VP 15 site does not show the full impact from the cliff edge. You should have taken a photomontage to the South on Middle Street. Why did you not???</p> <p>Landscaping measures which would obscure the panels below the North South cliff edge would remove the open views of the landscape. You cannot hide the developments from the cliff edge westerly view. The best solution would be to prevent WB1 development completely</p>	Yes,	<p>The Applicant notes this response.</p> <p>Updated viewpoint photography has been provided as part of the DCO application and is presented through Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_155 OF_CAWB02_160	Much more mature hedging and trees need planting and these should be native species which are fast growing. To simply plant trees which will take the lifetime of the project to mature is insufficient.	Yes	<p>The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and the report at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The LVIA picks up the delivery of landscape mitigation to address biodiversity net gain through the enhancement of existing habitats and green infrastructure proposals. The landscape measures also include the preparation of a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>the objectives. The Applicant and its LVIA consultants at Lanpro have worked closely with the ecology consultant throughout the application process to inform the LVIA and associated mitigation plans. The mitigation proposals allow for flexibility, but they can also be fixed, where appropriate and applicable.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that the West Burton substation and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			the results of a range of environmental assessments.
OF_CAWB02_281	Fields are needed for agriculture - while I support alternative energy sources, this project is to the detriment of the local economy and isn't a concern regarding the amount of farmland that will be lost.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this feedback and appreciates the importance of agricultural land. Impacts upon agricultural land have been assessed within Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19], which includes detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites.</p> <p>The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land from the Scheme.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Tables 5.6-5.9 of Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] details the design evolution that has led to the majority of BMV land being removed from the Scheme. The finalised Scheme contains only 26.24% Best and Most Versatile land and clear justification for why these small areas remain within the Scheme is set out at Tables 5.6 - 5.9 of Chapter 5.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that the Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality, and that some agricultural land could be retained during the operational phase, for example pasture grazed by sheep.</p>
OF_CAWB02_191 OF_CAWB02_299	Respondents expressed concern about the visual effect on the landscape, commenting	Yes	The landscape measures include the preparation of a Landscape and

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>that this will be altered significantly and that the fields look nice as they are and provide an important natural habitat.</p>		<p>Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010132/APP/WB7.3] which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives. The Applicant and its LVIA consultants at Lanpro have worked closely with the ecology consultant throughout the application process to inform the LVIA and associated mitigation plans. The mitigation proposals allow for flexibility, but they can also be fixed, where appropriate and applicable.</p> <p>New tree planting would likely be confined to hedgerows and existing planting areas, not across agricultural land.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
CAWB0207017_W B	<p>A landscape quality review by Defra suggested that it is people's perceptions that turn land into the concept of landscape. Not your view - our view. We look from the flatter fields towards the cliff and the Cathedral, and love it. Currently no hedge rows block that view and we certainly don't want solar panels obstructing our view either.</p> <p>The views shown in the PEIR were disappointing and did not capture this in our view.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this response.</p> <p>Updated viewpoint photography has been provided as part of the DCO application and is presented through Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p>
FFCAWB0206061 FFCAWB0206045	<p>Panels in area N21 are too close to the road without adequate screening from day 1. They are both dangerous due to glint and glare on a dangerous section of road and are deleterious to the open nature of the countryside and associated views.</p>	Yes	<p>The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and the report at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The LVIA picks up the delivery of landscape</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>mitigation to address biodiversity net gain through the enhancement of existing habitats and green infrastructure proposals. The landscape measures also include the preparation of a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives. The Applicant and its LVIA consultants at Lanpro have worked closely with the ecology consultant throughout the application process to inform the LVIA and associated mitigation plans. The mitigation proposals allow for flexibility, but they can also be fixed, where appropriate and applicable.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>and Visual Impact Assessment, such as presented in Section 8.6 and Table 8.22 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], takes embedded mitigation into account to include the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Panels to be set a minimum of 3m from Site boundaries. - Panels to be set minimum of 20m from major watercourses and minimum of 8m from minor watercourses. - Panels to be set 50m (min) from boundary curtilage to outer edge of solar panel. - Site boundary fencing to be set back 5m from adjacent existing hedgerows to allow for proposed thickening and growth. - Let existing hedges grow out and managed at 5m. Encourage hedgerow trees to grow out within existing hedges to

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>add further thickening and growth within the field boundaries.</p> <p>Additional secondary mitigation has also been designed into the Scheme, consisting of new planting proposals, details of which can be found on Figures 8.18.1-8.18.3 [EN010132/APP/WB6.4.8.18.1 – WB6.4.8.18.3] and is further described within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010132/APP/WB7.3].</p>
<p>OF_CAWB02_262 OF_CAWB02_123 OF_CAWB02_198</p>	<p>This is far too intense for a rural area. Massive impact on crop supply, farming jobs and visual amenity. Far too much.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1].</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resources & Farming Circumstances)</p> <p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.3.19.1].</p> <p>The vast majority of the Scheme is located on lower quality agricultural land with only 26.24% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land).</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>See Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] which sets out the design evolution of the Scheme. This includes justification for removal of certain fields from the Scheme and retention of other limited areas of BMV.</p> <p>The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality.</p> <p>In addition, some agricultural land may be retained during the operational phase, such as with pasture grazed by sheep, for example.</p>
OF_CAUB02_168	No PEIR attached to this consultation, therefore unable to comment.	N/A	The Applicant notes that the PEIR was available to view at advertised Community Access Points, public information events, online at the Scheme website, and provided upon request.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_251 OF_CAWB02_241 OF_CAWB02_239 FFCAWB0204009 FFCAWB0206056 OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_293 OF_CAWB02_241 OF_CAWB02_184 OF_CAWB02_122 FFCAWB0206029 FFCAWB0203022 FFCAWB0202039 OF_CAWB02_233	<p>Time for mitigation to develop</p> <p>Respondents commented that visual mitigation will take time to mature and therefore may not fully screen site areas from the start of the operational phase of the Scheme.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and the report at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The LVIA picks up the delivery of landscape mitigation to address biodiversity net gain through the enhancement of existing habitats and green infrastructure proposals. The landscape measures also include the preparation of a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives.</p> <p>The Applicant and its LVIA consultants at Lanpro have worked closely with the ecology consultant throughout the application process to inform the LVIA and associated mitigation plans. The mitigation proposals allow for flexibility, but they can also be fixed, where appropriate and applicable.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, such as presented in Section 8.6 and Table 8.22 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], takes embedded mitigation into account to include the following measures:</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Panels to be set a minimum of 3m from Site boundaries. - Panels to be set minimum of 20m from major watercourses and minimum of 8m from minor watercourses. - Panels to be set 50m (min) from boundary curtilage to outer edge of solar panel. - Site boundary fencing to be set back 5m from adjacent existing hedgerows to allow for proposed thickening and growth. - Let existing hedges grow out and managed at 5m. Encourage hedgerow trees to grow out within existing hedges to add further thickening and growth within the field boundaries.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Additional secondary mitigation has also been designed into the Scheme, consisting of new planting proposals, details of which can be found on Figures 8.18.1-8.18.3 [EN010132/APP/WB6.4.8.18.1 – WB6.4.8.18.3] and is further described within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010132/APP/WB7.3]</p>
OF_CAWB02_001	Site photos look as expected.		Noted.
OF_CAWB02_106 OF_CAWB02_088 FFCAWB0206028 OF_CAWB02_207	Visual impact assessment and proposed mitigation is inadequate given the complexity and visibility of the Scheme.	Yes	<p>The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and the report at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The LVIA picks up the delivery of landscape mitigation to address biodiversity net gain</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>through the enhancement of existing habitats and green infrastructure proposals. The landscape measures also include the preparation of a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives. The Applicant and its LVIA consultants at Lanpro have worked closely with the ecology consultant throughout the application process to inform the LVIA and associated mitigation plans. The mitigation proposals allow for flexibility, but they can also be fixed, where appropriate and applicable.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, such as</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>presented in Section 8.6 and Table 8.22 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], takes embedded mitigation into account to include the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Panels to be set a minimum of 3m from Site boundaries. - Panels to be set minimum of 20m from major watercourses and minimum of 8m from minor watercourses. - Panels to be set 50m (min) from boundary curtilage to outer edge of solar panel. - Site boundary fencing to be set back 5m from adjacent existing hedgerows to allow for proposed thickening and growth. - Let existing hedges grow out and managed at 5m.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encourage hedgerow trees to grow out within existing hedges to add further thickening and growth within the field boundaries. <p>Additional secondary mitigation has also been designed into the Scheme, consisting of new planting proposals, details of which can be found on Figures 8.18.1-8.18.3 [EN010132/APP/WB6.4.8.18.1 – WB6.4.8.18.3] and is further described within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010132/APP/WB7.3]</p>
FFCAWB0206065	Landscaping along Tillbridge Lane from Marton to Sturton by Stow	No.	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_149 OF_CAWB02_227 FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0206047 OF_CAWB02_237 FFCAWB0206012 FFCAWB0205014 OF_CAWB02_296	<p>Topography of West Burton 4</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that the topography of the West Burton 4 site area makes it a more difficult site to effectively screen.</p> <p>Respondents commented that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the West Burton 4 site provides an inadequate number of visual survey points relative to the challenging topography of the site.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
FFCAWB0201014	<p>Request for transparency regarding the location and most importantly the dimensions of the site. Investors, switchgear, transporters and associated substations.</p>	Yes	<p>The Environmental Statement employs a maximum design scenario approach reflecting the principle of the 'Rochdale Envelope'. This approach allows for a project to be assessed on the basis of maximum project design parameters for example, the worst-case scenario in order</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>to provide flexibility and take advantage of technological improvements, assessing all potentially significant effects (positive or adverse) within the EIA process and reported in the Environmental Statement. Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], clearly sets out the details of the design elements including extents and parameters, such as heights and locations that have been used in the assessment. The full details/parameters of the elements that have been modelled (Solar Arrays, substation etc.) are set out in the Concept Design Parameters and Principles document [EN010132/APP/WB.15] and Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.4], which accompany the DCO application.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0201007 OF_CAWB02_207 OF_CAWB02_271 OF_CAWB02_28 FFCAWB0206029 FFCAWB0206012 FFCAWB0206009 FFCAWB0204011 OF_CAWB02_208 FFCAWB0202006 FFCAWB0201029 OF_CAWB02_148 OF_CAWB02_163 OF_CAWB02_295 OF_CAWB02_163	<p>Impact to landscape</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern and opposition regarding any change to the existing landscape, considered to be natural and agricultural.</p> <p>Respondents commented that views from residential properties, not just publicly accessible areas, should be considered.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and is presented within the Site Selection Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resources & Farming Circumstances) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.19.1].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The vast majority of the Scheme is located on lower quality agricultural land with only 26.24% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land). See Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] which sets out the design evolution of the Scheme. This includes justification for removal of certain fields from the Scheme and retention of other limited areas of BMV.</p> <p>The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality.</p> <p>In addition, some agricultural land may be retained during the operational phase, such as with pasture grazed by sheep, for example.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that West</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
<p>FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0206041 FFCAWB0206047 OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_293 FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0206018 OF_CAWB02_038 OF_CAWB02_257 OF_CAWB02_267</p>	<p>Insufficient mitigation for West Burton 4</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that no planting will mitigate the impact of solar panels on the visual amenity from any point of public access adjacent to or through the West Burton 4 site area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206003 FFCAWB0206002 OF_CAWB02_054 OF_CAWB02_055 OF_CAWB02_130 OF_CAWB02_131 OF_CAWB02_133 FFCAWB0206040 OF_CAWB02_096 OF_CAWB02_097 OF_CAWB02_099 OF_CAWB02_100 OF_CAWB02_102 OF_CAWB02_112 OF_CAWB02_113 OF_CAWB02_118 OF_CAWB02_120 FFCAWB0205013 OF_CAWB02_128 OF_CAWB02_161 OF_CAWB02_188			these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_203 OF_CAWB02_235 OF_CAWB02_236 OF_CAWB02_257 FFCAWB0206057 FFCAWB0206047 OF_CAWB02_131 OF_CAWB02_133 OF_CAWB02_169 OF_CAWB02_094 FFCAWB0206050 FFCAWB0206031 FFCAWB0206009 FFCAWB0205012 FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060 OF_CAWB02_246 OF_CAWB02_253			
OF_CAWB02_196 OF_CAWB02_263	Support for tree and hedgerow planting	N/A	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0202036 OF_CAWB02_051	Respondents expressed support for tree planting and increased hedgerows.		
OF_CAWB02_162	[Commenting on West Burton 4:] You have moved the proposed solar panel locations back from the most visually objectionable points, but there would be nothing to stop the operators subsequently applying to add these panels back in once the site is up and running! The site's topography will make it impossible to shield the panels from view for the many years it would take for suitable trees to become established.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206041 FFCAWB0206030 OF_CAWB02_025 OF_CAWB02_026 OF_CAWB02_027 OF_CAWB02_028 OF_CAWB02_029 OF_CAWB02_030 OF_CAWB02_041 OF_CAWB02_042 OF_CAWB02_043 OF_CAWB02_045 OF_CAWB02_054 OF_CAWB02_055 OF_CAWB02_107 OF_CAWB02_117 OF_CAWB02_119 FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0205020 FFCAWB0205014	<p>Photograph accuracy</p> <p>Respondents expressed scepticism that photographs of the West Burton 4 site area were representative.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206038 OF_CAWB02_270	In the winter the sight will be a lot more visible.	Yes	Noted.
FFCAWB0206035	You should produce a residential visual impact assessment due to the proximity to Clayworth.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.
OF_CAWB02_170	Not enough of them. Death lane is not even mentioned and Toft Dyke Lane has already been altered as the tenant farmers has deliberately not cut the hedges in Toft Dyke	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	and mill lane since winter 2020 do already not as it has been for decades.		was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.
FFCAWB0206044 FFCAWB0206012 FFCAWB0206009 FFCAWB0206042 FFCAWB0206008 FFCAWB0202041 FFCAWB0205013 FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060	Respondents expressed that there was a limited quantity of photographs.	Yes	The Applicant notes this response. Updated viewpoint photography has been provided as part of the DCO application and is presented through Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8] .

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_011	<p>The West Burton 4 site is on sloping land but in reality, the view of the site is restricted from all major roads surrounding it by the carefully managed hedgerows.</p> <p>From the footpath which goes through the middle of the site there are limited views of part but not all of the proposed site. The view from the Trent Valley Way at certain points cannot be avoided but the footfall on these paths is not vast as they very soon get overgrown until cut by the Council.</p>	Yes	Noted, however the Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_023	[Commenting on West Burton 4:] You have moved panels away from properties so areas could be planted with ecologically acceptable meadows and wooded areas.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
FFCAWB0203026	It doesn't matter what I write on this because you'll be going ahead with it regardless. It just a box ticking exercise to say that you have provided us with a say. Once the solar panels are down, you'll carry on extending them regardless to what you say now. You can sing the positives of solar panels all you like but at	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this opposition.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application. In reviewing the policies and information available regarding solar generation and</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>the end of the day they are s***t. If they were that good you wouldn't have to take up the amount of land you are.</p> <p>Nuclear energy is far better. Solar panels are best served on the roofs of new build houses to provide electricity and hot water. So why don't you invest money more into that to perfect them and leave the fields alone. especially since the UK weather isn't that optimal for producing that much energy. Nuclear can operate at full power for 341 out of 365 days. Concentrate on improving and compacting the solar units and storage batteries for houses and leave the land alone.</p>		<p>the need to decarbonise, it is the Applicant's view that large-scale solar must be considered as additional to, as opposed to instead of, smaller scale solar, and this includes the development of rooftop solar. The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land and consideration of rooftop solar opportunities, is presented within the Site Selection Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1].</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0203009	Where is the industrial fencing.	Yes	The Applicant notes that Site boundary fencing to be set back 5m from adjacent existing hedgerows to allow for proposed thickening and growth.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0202023	The view from the B1398 will be totally blighted by these solar panels, looking west out the Trent Valley.	No	<p>Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8] set outs the ways in which the Applicant has considered the potential visual and landscape impacts to local residents and visitors, potential effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the impacts and effects on the fabric of the landscape are taken into account as well as the views and visibility.</p> <p>The assessment includes a suite of viewpoints that cover a wide range of visual receptors, including public locations such as transport routes, public rights of</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>way, and residential properties. These viewpoints have been discussed and agreed with the competent authority.</p> <p>Mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>This mitigation has been informed by feedback received and visits undertaken by the Applicant's landscape consultants throughout the surrounding landscape to satisfy themselves that the extent of embedded and secondary mitigation is appropriate to mitigate the effects of the Scheme on the nearby properties.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_166	Those should not impact on public footpaths, PROW or access for local cyclists, walkers or runners.	Yes	The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the public right of way (PRoW) network as a community benefit, which is aimed to benefit the community as a whole.

8 Table 5.12.7: Feedback received to Question 9: Do you have any comments on our traffic access routes and the proposed mitigation measures in the PEIR being considered when preparing for the construction phase of the projects?

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0204001 FFCAWB0206031 FFCAWB0206030 FFCAWB0206029 FFCAWB0206013 FFCAWB0206012 FFCAWB0206010 FFCAWB0206009 FFCAWB0205018 FFCAWB0205014 FFCAWB0205013 FFCAWB0205008 FFCAWB0203018 FFCAWB0203016 FFCAWB0203010 FFCAWB0202036 FFCAWB0203005 FFCAWB0202033	<p>Increased traffic and safety concerns</p> <p>Respondents expressed general concern regarding an increase in construction traffic and associated disruption including concerns regarding pedestrian and cyclist safety.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction.</p> <p>The Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2] also considers road users safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the development.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that mitigation measures are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.1], the Construction Traffic Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.2 to Chapter</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0202026 FFCAWB0201012 FFCAWB0201007 OM_CAWB02_008 OM_CAWB02_010 OM_CAWB02_015 OF_CAWB02_022 OF_CAWB02_027 OF_CAWB02_028 OF_CAWB02_031 OF_CAWB02_033 OF_CAWB02_035 OF_CAWB02_039 OF_CAWB02_060 OF_CAWB02_079 OF_CAWB02_088 OF_CAWB02_091 OF_CAWB02_095 OF_CAWB02_098 OF_CAWB02_111 OF_CAWB02_127 OF_CAWB02_131			14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2] . and the Public Rights of Way Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.3 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_133 OF_CAWB02_138 OF_CAWB02_154 OF_CAWB02_170 OF_CAWB02_172 OF_CAWB02_179 OF_CAWB02_182 OF_CAWB02_189 OF_CAWB02_191 OF_CAWB02_194 OF_CAWB02_198 OF_CAWB02_217 OF_CAWB02_219 OF_CAWB02_228 OF_CAWB02_229 OF_CAWB02_230 OF_CAWB02_233 OF_CAWB02_246 OF_CAWB02_267 OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_271 OF_CAWB02_284			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_299 OF_CAWB02_300 FFCAWB0206057 FFCAWB0205006 FFCAWB0206059 FFCAWB0206064			
FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0203003 FFCAWB0206050 FFCAWB0206030 FFCAWB0206009 FFCAWB0206006 OM_CAWB02_012 OF_CAWB02_134 OF_CAWB02_217 OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_271 OF_CAWB02_273 OF_CAWB02_293 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206058	<p>Volume of Traffic Inaccuracies</p> <p>Respondents felt that estimates for the volume of construction traffic have been underestimated according to the calculations being conducted during Covid lockdown when traffic representations will not be accurate. More surveys are required of road usage.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Section 14.5 of Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] states:</p> <p>Automatic Traffic Count Surveys have been undertaken for all roads within the Study Area. These were undertaken between 2nd November 2021 and 8th November 2021. At the time, there were no Covid-19 restrictions in place. In addition, DfT data has been reviewed for the strategic road network, including the A15 and A631. The average weekday two-way traffic count for the main roads</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>within the vicinity of the Site is set out in Table 14.8. A plan showing the location of the counting points is shown in Figure 14.3.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that Construction Traffic Management Plans will be informed by baseline traffic information, professional experience, and data from other projects.</p>
<p>FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0204011 FFCAWB0204005 OF_CAWB02_063 FFCAWB0205020</p>	<p>Waste from construction traffic and workers</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern regarding dust, mud, debris and litter on the road as a result of construction traffic.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been prepared and will be secured through a DCO Requirement to manage the effects of construction traffic on the local highway network. The outline CTMP is located in Appendix 14.2 of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2].</p> <p>Section 14.6 of Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] explains that a number of embedded mitigation / management measures are set out within the outline CTMP for the control of vehicles associated with the construction phase. These will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A wheel wash facility will be provided ahead of exiting the Site allowing vehicles to be hosed down so that no construction vehicles will take mud or debris onto the local highway network; - A road sweeper will be provided for surrounding local roads along the designated route to alleviate any residual debris generated during the construction phase, as required; and - Spraying of areas with water supplied as and when conditions

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			dictate to prevent the spread of dust.
FFCAWB0206056 OF_CAWB02_270 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206058	Respondents requested more information regarding the transport plan for decommissioning the sites.	Yes	<p>A requirement for a Decommissioning Traffic Management Plan (DTMP) to be agreed with the local highway authority prior to Decommissioning will be secured through the DCO as part of the Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.2].</p> <p>This will follow the principles of the outline CTMP. It is not anticipated that the effects associated with decommissioning will be worse than during the construction phase.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206055 FFCAWB0206052 FFCAWB0206020 FFCAWB0206019 FFCAWB0206003 FFCAWB0203003 FFCAWB0206041 FFCAWB0206040 FFCAWB0206037 FFCAWB0206044 FFCAWB0206014 FFCAWB0206010 FFCAWB0206028 FFCAWB0205012 FFCAWB0205001 FFCAWB0204009 FFCAWB0204008 FFCAWB0204006 FFCAWB0203024 FFCAWB0203011 FFCAWB0203009 FFCAWB0203006	<p>Existing Road Use</p> <p>Respondents commented that existing road infrastructure is unsuitable and dangerous and vulnerable to damage from excessive HGVs. Roads including Clayworth Road and the A631 were cited as being already busy.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction.</p> <p>The Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2] also considers road users safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the development.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that mitigation measures are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.1], the Construction Traffic Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.2 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2]. and the Public Rights of Way Management Plan,</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0202006 FFCAWB0201002 OM_CAWB02_002 OM_CAWB02_004 OM_CAWB02_007 OM_CAWB02_008 OM_CAWB02_009 OM_CAWB02_012 OF_CAWB02_019 OF_CAWB02_022 OF_CAWB02_025 OF_CAWB02_026 OF_CAWB02_027 OF_CAWB02_028 OF_CAWB02_029 OF_CAWB02_039 OF_CAWB02_041 OF_CAWB02_042 OF_CAWB02_045 OF_CAWB02_054 OF_CAWB02_055 OF_CAWB02_063			presented as Appendix 14.3 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.3].

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_068 OF_CAWB02_093 OF_CAWB02_105 OF_CAWB02_106 OF_CAWB02_117 OF_CAWB02_118 OF_CAWB02_119 OF_CAWB02_127 OF_CAWB02_128 OF_CAWB02_130 OF_CAWB02_131 OF_CAWB02_139 OF_CAWB02_143 OF_CAWB02_149 OF_CAWB02_153 OF_CAWB02_155 OF_CAWB02_156 OF_CAWB02_158 OF_CAWB02_159 OF_CAWB02_160 OF_CAWB02_164 OF_CAWB02_170			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_180 OF_CAWB02_181 OF_CAWB02_183 OF_CAWB02_191 OF_CAWB02_206 OF_CAWB02_207 OF_CAWB02_215 OF_CAWB02_219 OF_CAWB02_223 OF_CAWB02_230 OF_CAWB02_235 OF_CAWB02_236 OF_CAWB02_253 OF_CAWB02_264 OF_CAWB02_267 OF_CAWB02_268 OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_273 OF_CAWB02_277 OF_CAWB02_282 OF_CAWB02_284 OF_CAWB02_293			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_039 OF_CAWB02_040 OF_CAWB02_111 OF_CAWB02_127 OF_CAWB02_173 OF_CAWB02_207 OF_CAWB02_272 FFCAWB0206031			
OM_CAWB02_016	<p>The road between Saxilby and Sturton is dangerous enough without further HGV's. Speed cameras should be installed if there are any access points on this road.</p>	Yes	<p>Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] describes the Applicants assessment and consideration of vehicle routes and movements.</p> <p>Construction traffic will be controlled through a Construction Traffic Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.2 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			A HGV delivery booking system will be in place, with the aim of managing arrivals and departures to ensure that they do not cross each other on the local highway network.
OM_CAWB02_009 OF_CAWB02_068 OF_CAWB02_143 OF_CAWB02_215	Respondent expressed concern regarding the lack of passing places	Yes	<p>Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [[EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] describes the Applicants assessment and consideration of vehicle routes and movements.</p> <p>Construction traffic will be controlled through a Construction Traffic Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.2 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14].</p> <p>A HGV delivery booking system will be in place, with the aim of managing arrivals</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>and departures to ensure that they do not cross each other on the local highway network.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that where necessary, temporary passing places will be provided.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206047 FFCAWB0206032 FFCAWB0205017 FFCAWB0206029 FFCAWB0205020 FFCAWB0204011 FFCAWB0203005 OM_CAWB02_007 OF_CAWB02_034 OF_CAWB02_035 OF_CAWB02_046 OF_CAWB02_047 OF_CAWB02_058 OF_CAWB02_063 OF_CAWB02_110 OF_CAWB02_154 OF_CAWB02_163 OF_CAWB02_180 OF_CAWB02_226 OF_CAWB02_245	<p>Noise and Vibration</p> <p>The community expressed concern regarding the noise and vibration which would be caused by construction traffic and the impact that this would have on the infrastructure of homes (vibrations affecting the integrity of old houses- potential subsidence, cracking to walls), particularly those homes which are situated on access routes/ where vehicles will pass, and on people's quality of life.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that Noise and Vibration assessments are presented in Chapter 15 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.15].</p> <p>Vibration thresholds have been based on the likelihood of causing annoyance for residents at the closest nearby properties, which are well below the thresholds for the onset of damage to property.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206011 FFCAWB0204012 FFCAWB0201034	Respondents were concerned about whether access to their homes would be affected by construction traffic or road damage.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that construction traffic will be managed through a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2]</p> <p>The aim of the CTMP is to minimise the effects of construction traffic on the local highway network.</p> <p>A road condition survey will be undertaken with a commitment to rectify any damage caused by construction vehicles.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206045 OF_CAWB02_032 FFCAWB0206061	Respondents commented that despite a maintenance/construction track being shown crossing areas N14, N15 and N20, there are no access designs, or even mention of this access, in any part of the PEIR. The current access to these areas is not owned by the solar development site landowner. Although there is a right of access for farm machinery there is no right to change or develop the access to make it suitable for this development.	Yes	Noted.
FFCAWB0204005 OF_CAWB02_110	Respondents requested that restricted working hours be established. With this level of traffic, it should not commence before children are safely at school and certainly not at any time over weekends.	Yes	Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] notes that Construction vehicle trips will be coordinated to avoid movement during peak hours. This will be secured through the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan, set out at Appendix 14.2 to the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] .

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Construction traffic will be spread out throughout the day, and will be coordinated, where possible, to avoid the network peak hours. Therefore, the effect of construction traffic on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) within the local proximity of the Site will be limited.</p> <p>Construction vehicles will avoid travel during the network peak hours where possible. Therefore, deliveries will be scheduled for between 09:30 and 16:30 where possible.</p> <p>Construction worker shifts will be scheduled so that workers are not traveling during the network peak hours of 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0202041 FFCAWB0203002 OM_CAWB02_012 OF_CAWB02_110 OF_CAWB02_149 OF_CAWB02_293 OF_CAWB02_061	<p>Sanctions</p> <p>Respondents commented that sanctions must be imposed on construction traffic which fails to abide by road limits. HGV drivers may fail to follow prescribed routes.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that construction traffic will be managed through a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2]</p> <p>The aim of the CTMP is to minimise the effects of construction traffic on the local highway network.</p>
FFCAWB0202038	<p>Respondent requested that roads must be re-surfaced if damage is caused.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that a road condition survey will be undertaken with a commitment to rectify any damage caused by construction vehicles.</p>
FFCAWB0202026	<p>The new housing development in Saxilby means that residents will experience even further disruption.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that CTMPs will be informed by baseline traffic information, professional experience, and data from other projects. They will also provide an anticipated number of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) movements associated with the construction works for the projects.</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			transportation impact of the Development through Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] .
FFCAWB0202013	Respondent requested that car parking is provided for employees of the site because the increase in volume makes it difficult for locals to park.	Yes	The Applicant notes that there will be temporary construction compounds required for the Sites and the grid connection works, which includes a parking area for construction and workers vehicles.
OM_CAWB02_010	Respondent expressed concern about the impact that construction might have on access for emergency services.	Yes	The Applicant notes that emergency access will be retained throughout the construction period.
OM_CAWB02_014	Respondents were concerned about the impact of glint and glare from panels on traffic.	Yes	The effects of glint and glare upon road safety have been considered and assessed within Chapter 16 (Glint and Glare) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.16] .

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			The developer has proposed screening where significant impact has been identified.
OF_CAWB02_032 OF_CAWB02_039 OF_CAWB02_127 OF_CAWB02_173	PRoW should not be closed at any time	Yes	The Applicant notes that their aim is to manage public rights of way rather than close them.
OF_CAWB02_032 OF_CAWB02_033 OF_CAWB02_034 OF_CAWB02_161	The traffic access routes and timings are inconsistent in the full PEIR.	Yes	The Applicant notes that updates to this have been made in the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2] .

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_034 OF_CAWB02_058 OF_CAWB02_152 OF_CAWB02_154 OF_CAWB02_180 OF_CAWB02_185 OF_CAWB02_201 OF_CAWB02_245	<p>Air Pollution</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern about pollution generated, carbon cost and air quality throughout the construction phase. Some suggest mitigation measures such as electric vehicles.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 7 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.7] presents the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment concerning the potential impacts of the Scheme on the Climate during the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning stages.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation will be implemented to reduce the greenhouse gas impact of the Scheme. Specific embedded mitigation measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encouraging the use of lower carbon modes of transport by identifying and communicating local bus connections and pedestrian and cycle access routes to/ from the Scheme to all construction staff, and providing

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>appropriate facilities for the safe storage of cycles;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Liaising with construction personnel for the potential to implement staff minibuses and car sharing options; - Implementing a Travel Plan to reduce the volume of construction staff and employee trips to the Scheme; and - Switching vehicles and plant off when not in use.
<p>OF_CAWB02_058 OF_CAWB02_060 OF_CAWB02_150 OF_CAWB02_280 OF_CAWB02_298 FFCAWB0205020</p>	<p>Habitat and environmental disruption</p> <p>Wildlife will be disrupted in hedgerows and grassy wildflower verges as well as the local environment.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.9] considers potential effects to wildlife from construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2] has been</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			produced to detail how vehicles, plant and materials will be transported to the construction zone and the measures required to avoid over-run and damage of the verges of Local Wildlife Sites.
OF_CAWB02_091 OF_CAWB02_127 OF_CAWB02_226 OF_CAWB02_234 OF_CAWB02_239 OF_CAWB02_240 OF_CAWB02_241 OF_CAWB02_246	<p>Insufficient Mitigation</p> <p>Respondents commented that it is impossible to mitigate additional traffic and proposed mitigation measures presented in the PEIR are insufficient.</p> <p>Respondents cited references to improvements to local roads where necessary, but and queried what this actually means or what 'improvements' will be made to minimise any traffic disruption for local communities.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that construction traffic will be managed through a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2]</p> <p>The aim of the CTMP is to minimise the effects of construction traffic on the local highway network.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_144	A local solicitor is going through the huge amount of paperwork you have produced and finding it hard work with a lot of the data being submitted by outside agencies who have no understanding of local conditions and needs. Data is being presented in ways open to interpretation and certainly beyond the understanding of most people around here.	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes this comment, and appreciates that a significant volume of technical information was published for consultation.</p> <p>A non-technical summary of the PEIR was made available online at the Scheme website, at CAP sites, at public information events and upon request. The Applicant recognises that the summary was introduced to broaden the reception of the PEIR to more members of the local community. The Scheme free-to-use communications channels were open throughout the consultation period to provide assistance to consultees.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
CAWB0207017_WB	Saturday working is TOTALLY unacceptable. Then on top of all this you want to do cable laying at night, so in essence it will be 24 hours a day, six days a week. No! Our choice is to live in a quiet country setting, without this industrialisation on our doorstep.	No	<p>The construction period will take approximately 24 months.</p> <p>Construction activities will be carried out Monday to Friday 07:00-18:00 and between 08:00 and 13:30 on Saturdays.</p> <p>The construction phase for the Scheme includes the preparation of the Sites, installing the access tracks, erection of security fencing, assembly and erection of the Solar PV arrays, installation of the inverters/transformers and grid connection.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that vehicle trips will be distributed throughout the daily period and will be coordinated to avoid the network peak hours. Therefore, the effect on the SRN will be negligible.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206053 FFCAWB0206042 FFCAWB0206012 FFCAWB0205020</p>	<p>Impact on cycles in nature</p> <p>Respondents were concerned that construction and industrialisation of natural land would create damaging implications for rainfall and drainage as well as wildlife and vegetation.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 10 (Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.10] sets out the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme on the local hydrology during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.10.1] has been produced for each of the solar Sites which demonstrate that flood risk will not be exacerbated as a result of their installation and is likely to provide betterment over the existing surface water regime due to the reintroduction of natural land cover beneath the panels. Where additional infrastructure is proposed (e.g. battery sites), additional Drainage Strategies have</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			been produced which indicate how sustainable drainage systems will be provided on-Site to attenuate any increased runoff to greenfield rates.
FFCAWB0202031 FFCAWB0202020 FFCAWB0202008 OF_CAWB02_001 OF_CAWB02_011 OF_CAWB02_023	<p>Satisfaction with mitigation measures</p> <p>Respondents were satisfied with the measures proposed to mitigate disruption, including expressed satisfaction with access points.</p>	N/A	Noted.
FFCAWB0206056; FFCAWB0204012	Respondents were sceptical whether mitigation measures and proposals would be sustained in reality.	Yes	<p>Embedded mitigation measures will be implemented during the construction period.</p> <p>An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been prepared and will be secured through a DCO Requirement. The outline CTMP is located in Appendix 14.2 of the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2].
FFCAWB0205015 FFCAWB0206005 FFCAWB0206065	Respondents were concerned about the impact of cable laying in Marton and Gate Burton Parishes.	N/A	<p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1].</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme. Table 5.13: Main Stages of Refinement for the Cable Route Corridor within Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5]</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>explains how the cable route has been refined.</p> <p>The initial cable corridor search area included whole fields with multiple river crossing options. This was then narrowed to a target route, predominantly 100m in width, which was fully surveyed by geophysical surveys, ecological surveys, and landscape assessments to generate options within the target route. The final cable corridor is 50m in width over the majority of its length.</p> <p>The Applicant initially presented a cable route search corridor, which has been refined through engagement and consultation with landowners.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>OF_CAWB02_208 OF_CAWB02_245 OF_CAWB02_280 OF_CAWB02_281</p>	<p>Respondents object to the use of agricultural land.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this feedback and appreciates the importance of agricultural land. Impacts upon agricultural land have been assessed within Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19], which includes detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites.</p> <p>The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land from the Scheme.</p> <p>Table 5.6-5.9 of Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] details the design evolution that has led to the majority of BMV land being removed from the Scheme. The finalised Scheme</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>contains only 26.24% Best and Most Versatile land and clear justification for why these small areas remain within the Scheme is set out at Tables 5.6 - 5.9 of ES Chapter 5.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that the Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality, and that some agricultural land could be retained during the operational phase, for example pasture grazed by sheep.</p>
OF_CAWB02_251	Respondent queried whether the cables could be run alongside existing roads.	Yes	<p>Table 5.13: Main Stages of Refinement for the Cable Route Corridor within Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains how the cable route has been refined. The initial cable corridor search area included whole fields with multiple river crossing options. This was then</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>narrowed to a target route, predominantly 100m in width, which was fully surveyed by geophysical surveys, ecological surveys, and landscape assessments to generate options within the target route. The final cable corridor is 50m in width over the majority of its length.</p> <p>The Applicant initially presented a cable route search corridor, which has been refined through engagement and consultation with landowners.</p>
OF_CAWB02_272	Why are site compounds not shown on the map?	N/A	The Applicant notes that the size of the site compounds of each site for the Scheme are provided within Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement: Development Description [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.4] .
OF_CAWB02_279 FFCAWB0207048	Respondents expressed objection to the Scheme.	N/A	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0201025	What are your mitigation measures for Lancaster Road Gringley? No individual mention of this is made of this road.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
FFCAWB0201031	We have good roads for police stations anyway.	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206056 OF_CAWB02_270	The PEIR omits 2 public rights of way across the WB4 site: one between Gringley Road and Toftdyke Lane, the other between Clayworth Road and A631.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
FFCAWB0206054 FFCAWB0206020 FFCAWB0206019 FFCAWB0206018 FFCAWB0205022 FFCAWB0205021 FFCAWB0206037 FFCAWB0206035	<p>A631 Junction Concerns</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the junction turning across the A631 onto Clayworth road, contending that the junction must be upgraded as it is currently dangerous and unsuitable.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0206050 FFCAWB0206047 FFCAWB0206017 FFCAWB0206042 FFCAWB0206010 FFCAWB0206024 FFCAWB0206026 FFCAWB0206007 FFCAWB0206004 FFCAWB0205014 FFCAWB0205013 FFCAWB0205011 FFCAWB0205008 FFCAWB0205009 FFCAWB0205004 FFCAWB0204006 FFCAWB0203017 FFCAWB0203015 FFCAWB0203013 OM_CAWB02_018 OM_CAWB02_019 OM_CAWB02_020</p>	<p>Respondents commented that proposals to access the West Burton 4 site via the A631, with traffic coming from the west via Bawtry and the A1, would result in a significant number of HGVs turning across the A631 dual carriageway at Gringley on the Hill, onto a narrow access point onto the B1403 (Clayworth Road). The junction of the B1403 and A631 was considered inadequate in size to accommodate both this traffic, and the additional worker traffic during the construction period. This was cited as a highways safety risk and with upgrades to the junction considered necessary.</p> <p>Respondents noted that during foggy spells in the winter months, it is often difficult to see traffic approaching along the dual carriageway, from either direction, which makes the junction extremely dangerous for traffic turning into the B1403 and even more so for traffic exiting the junction.</p>		<p>factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_025 OF_CAWB02_028 OF_CAWB02_029 OF_CAWB02_030 OF_CAWB02_043 OF_CAWB02_044 OF_CAWB02_045 OF_CAWB02_072 OF_CAWB02_073 OF_CAW B02_075 OF_CAWB02_102 OF_CAWB02_089 OF_CAWB02_092 OF_CAWB02_093 OF_CAWB02_094 OF_CAWB02_095 OF_CAWB02_098 OF_CAWB02_099 OF_CAWB02_112 OF_CAWB02_114 OF_CAWB02_115 OF_CAWB02_128			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_130 OF_CAWB02_131 OF_CAWB02_134 OF_CAWB02_135 OF_CAWB02_145 OF_CAWB02_151 OF_CAWB02_162 OF_CAWB02_164 OF_CAWB02_176 OF_CAWB02_189 OF_CAWB02_197 OF_CAWB02_204 OF_CAWB02_212 OF_CAWB02_220 OF_CAWB02_227 OF_CAWB02_237 OF_CAWB02_243 OF_CAWB02_257 OF_CAWB02_266 OF_CAWB02_274 OF_CAWB02_275 OF_CAWB02_282			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_285 OF_CAWB02_296 OF_CAWB02_297			
OF_CAWB02_094 OF_CAWB02_096 OF_CAWB02_097 OF_CAWB02_100 OF_CAWB02_113 OF_CAWB02_267	<p>Flood risk at the A631</p> <p>The A631 Junction at Gringley is dangerous and frequently flooded</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206050 FFCAWB0206017 FFCAWB0206027 OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_273 OF_CAWB02_293 FFCAWB0206017	<p>B1403 safety concerns</p> <p>The B1403 Clayworth-Gringley Road is a poorly-maintained and dangerous road. Vehicles are subject to unexpected roll, especially round corners where visibility is limited. It is a bus route, used by riders and frequently by recreational cyclists, heavily used by large farm machinery, and offers a north-south rat run for HGV and delivery vehicles from the M180 to the A1 at Markham Moor. The road is therefore inappropriate for sole site access.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_273 OF_CAWB02_293 FFCAWB0206003 FFCAWB0206020 FFCAWB0206019 FFCAWB0206056 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206058	<p>Opposition to access routes for West Burton 4</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern over the perceived unsuitability of all available access routes to the West Burton 4 site area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

9 Table 5.12.8: Feedback received to Question 10.c: Do you have any other comments on our proposed community benefit opportunities or any suggestions you would like us to consider further?

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_001 OF_CAWB02_051	The proposed permissive footpaths appear sufficient, any increased opportunity for providing footpaths on any of the proposed sites would be commended.	N/A	The Applicant notes this response.
OF_CAWB02_037	We believe the proposed Permissive Path is excellent, especially if it is to be screened from the solar panels by appropriate hedging. A Woodmeadow education site in this field, would be perfectly placed to play a part in creating an infrastructure of multifunctional green spaces which are connected to one another in a rural location close to a large village community. This would be capable of delivering a range of environmental, health and quality of life benefits for the local communities - as per Policy LP20.	N/A	The Applicant notes this response.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206065	<p>I would like to see a permissive path created around the West Burton 3 site. There is no access for walking or recreational use at all in this area.</p> <p>Does the Community Infrastructure Levy apply to this type of development.</p> <p>There is a proposal to donate an as yet unknown donation of money on an annual basis. This fund is to be distributed by the Lincolnshire Community Organisation. How do the communities most affected by the projects know that they will get their fair share? When these donations are distributed by a third party those who shout the loudest often get the most. There should be a known percentage of this proposed finance distributed to each parish affected.</p> <p>A proportion of the power generated by these solar farms could be distributed by</p>	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>In addition to on-site connectivity and biodiversity benefits, the Applicant continues to engage with Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire Community Foundations to explore how best to provide funding for meaningful opportunities to local communities.</p> <p>The Planning Statement [EN010132/APP/WB7.5] states at paragraph 4.8.1:</p> <p><i>"The Applicant has also committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and negatives of the Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in consideration of the planning</i></p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	designated vehicle charging points regulated by the local parish councils.		<i>balance within this Planning Statement. It will, however be available to fund local community projects."</i>
FFCAWB0206019 OF_CAWB02_230	<p>Removal of West Burton 4</p> <p>Respondents requested for the West Burton 4 site area to be removed from the Scheme, citing justifications including tourism, ecology, agriculture, amenity and recreation, ecology.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
FFCAWB0206003 FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0204011 FFCAWB0206017	<p>No community benefit</p> <p>Community members expressed that there is no community benefit the Applicant can</p>	Yes	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OM_CAWB02_002 FFCAWB0206041 FFCAWB0206040 OM_CAWB02_010 OM_CAWB02_018 OM_CAWB02_019 OM_CAWB02_020 OM_CAWB02_015 OM_CAWB02_016 OF_CAWB02_005 OF_CAWB02_025 OF_CAWB02_029 OF_CAWB02_030 OF_CAWB02_033 OF_CAWB02_041 OF_CAWB02_045 OF_CAWB02_070 OF_CAWB02_071 OF_CAWB02_091 OF_CAWB02_092 OF_CAWB02_093 OF_CAWB02_134	provide that will compensate for perceived impacts of the Scheme.		

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_208 OF_CAWB02_230 OF_CAWB02_245 OF_CAWB02_271 OF_CAWB02_272 OF_CAWB02_284 OF_CAWB02_294 OF_CAWB02_033 FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0204012 FFCAWB0204003 OF_CAWB02_061 OF_CAWB02_203 OF_CAWB02_251 OF_CAWB02_298 OF_CAWB02_299 FFCAWB0206028 FFCAWB0201010 OF_CAWB02_085 OF_CAWB02_131 OF_CAWB02_139 OF_CAWB02_144			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_163 OF_CAWB02_179 OF_CAWB02_180 OF_CAWB02_181 OF_CAWB02_182 OF_CAWB02_185 OF_CAWB02_194 OF_CAWB02_198 OF_CAWB02_201 OF_CAWB02_259 OF_CAWB02_271 OF_CAWB02_063 FFCAWB0205012 FFCAWB0206023 FFCAWB0205018 FFCAWB0206014 FFCAWB0202001 OF_CAWB02_061 OF_CAWB02_070 OF_CAWB02_071 FFCAWB0205008 FFCAWB0203026			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0202022 FFCAWB0201018 OF_CAWB02_122 OF_CAWB02_172 OF_CAWB02_226 FFCAWB0204009 FFCAWB0204001 OM_CAWB02_009 OF_CAWB02_005 OF_CAWB02_141 OF_CAWB02_143 OF_CAWB02_215 FFCAWB0202041 OF_CAWB02_034 OF_CAWB02_159 OF_CAWB02_173			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_208	Concerns regarding food security	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and appreciates the importance of agricultural land.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites, as presented in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB 6.2.19].</p> <p>The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land from the Scheme from the Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality.</p> <p>Agricultural land will be retained during the operational phase, e.g. pasture grazed by sheep.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_091	When you see the view from the land and deer with their families running over the land and an abundance of other wildlife nothing can be proposed that will be of additional benefit.	Yes	The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB 6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units. All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme. The BNG assessment report also sets out how these calculations are based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010132/APP/WB7.3] which will be secured under a requirement of the DCO.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206003 OF_CAWB02_042 OF_CAWB02_045 OF_CAWB02_085 OF_CAWB02_235 FFCAWB0206011 OF_CAWB02_079 FFCAWB0205006 FFCAWB0206047 OF_CAWB02_131 OF_CAWB02_175 OF_CAWB02_194 OF_CAWB02_271 OF_CAWB02_281 OF_CAWB02_299 OF_CAWB02_111 OF_CAWB02_152 OF_CAWB02_203 FFCAWB0202037 OF_CAWB02_026 FFCAWB0206044	<p>Opposition to Scheme</p> <p>Respondents expressed opposition to the Scheme, citing reasons including changes to landscape character and potential impacts to health and wellbeing.</p>	N/A	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OM_CAWB02_008 FFCAWB0206033 FFCAWB0206006 OF_CAWB02_117 OF_CAWB02_118 OF_CAWB02_119 OF_CAWB02_122 OF_CAWB02_155 OF_CAWB02_160			
OF_CAWB02_018 OM_CAWB02_019 OM_CAWB02_020 OM_CAWB02_015 OF_CAWB02_025 OF_CAWB02_026 OF_CAWB02_027 OF_CAWB02_028 OF_CAWB02_041 OF_CAWB02_045 OF_CAWB02_072 OF_CAWB02_073	<p>PRoW</p> <p>There is no requirement for any 'permissive paths' across the site, as it is already well served by public rights of way and the Trent Valley Way.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that the LVIA has carried forward from the PEIR, to Section 8.8 of the LVIA, the intention to enhance the footpath network associated with the Sites, where appropriate, noted as secondary mitigation for Public Rights of Way. These measures potentially recommend increasing accessibility and connectivity of PRoW, but also measures to increase understanding of the local landscapes and the solar project. The LVIA promotes for example information boards</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_075 OF_CAWB02_092 FFCAWB0205020 FFCAWB0204011 OM_CAWB02_014 OF_CAWB02_092			<p>at vantage points, where appropriate. The LVIA also draws out ecological enhancement measures to provide a wider public understanding of the project and encourage public access to nature.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0204011 FFCAWB0203022 OF_CAWB02_295	Respondents submitted feedback on landowners of West Burton 4 site area.	N/A	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
FFCAWB0202036	Proper path not through industrial estate.	No	Noted
FFCAWB0202036 FFCAWB0202039 FFCAWB0203002 OF_CAWB02_110 OF_CAWB02_164 FFCAWB0201025	<p>Community benefit suggestions</p> <p>Respondents provided alternative suggestions for how the Scheme could contribute potential benefits for local communities.</p>	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>In addition to on-site connectivity and biodiversity benefits, the Applicant continues to engage with Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire Community Foundations to explore how best to provide funding for</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_123 FFCAWB0206048 FFCAWB0205019 OF_CAWB02_005 OF_CAWB02_012 OF_CAWB02_129 OF_CAWB02_137 OF_CAWB02_221 OF_CAWB02_162 OF_CAWB02_283 OF_CAWB02_222 OF_CAWB02_280 OF_CAWB02_300	These suggestions included providing solar panels or funding for the community, flood alleviation, electric vehicle charging points, contributions to parish councils, high speed internet infrastructure, health education, and sponsoring local sports teams or events.		<p>meaningful opportunities to local communities.</p> <p>The Planning Statement [EN010132/APP/WB7.5] states at paragraph 4.8.1:</p> <p><i>"The Applicant has also committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and negatives of the Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in consideration of the planning balance within this Planning Statement. It will, however be available to fund local community projects."</i></p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0203013 FFCAWB0203017 FFCAWB0204006 FFCAWB0206004 CAWB0207017_W B FFCAWB0203011 FFCAWB0203015 FFCAWB0203023 FFCAWB0205013 FFCAWB0205014 FFCAWB0205021 FFCAWB0205022 FFCAWB0206007 FFCAWB0206012 FFCAWB0206018	<p>Lack of community benefit at West Burton 4</p> <p>Respondents comments that the Scheme did not seem to offer any community associated with the West Burton 4 site area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206022			
FFCAWB0206024			
FFCAWB0206026			
FFCAWB0206029			
FFCAWB0206030			
FFCAWB0206035			
FFCAWB0206037			
FFCAWB0206038			
FFCAWB0206040			
FFCAWB0206041			
FFCAWB0206047			
FFCAWB0206054			
FFCAWB0206056			
FFCAWB0206058			
FFCAWB0206060			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_026			
OF_CAWB02_043			
OF_CAWB02_044			
OF_CAWB02_054			
OF_CAWB02_055			
OF_CAWB02_072			
OF_CAWB02_073			
OF_CAWB02_075			
OF_CAWB02_088			
OF_CAWB02_092			
OF_CAWB02_093			
OF_CAWB02_094			
OF_CAWB02_095			
OF_CAWB02_096			
OF_CAWB02_098			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_106			
OF_CAWB02_112			
OF_CAWB02_113			
OF_CAWB02_114			
OF_CAWB02_115			
OF_CAWB02_118			
OF_CAWB02_119			
OF_CAWB02_120			
OF_CAWB02_128			
OF_CAWB02_130			
OF_CAWB02_133			
OF_CAWB02_134			
OF_CAWB02_145			
OF_CAWB02_148			
OF_CAWB02_149			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_150			
OF_CAWB02_154			
OF_CAWB02_161			
OF_CAWB02_162			
OF_CAWB02_176			
OF_CAWB02_190			
OF_CAWB02_197			
OF_CAWB02_204			
OF_CAWB02_212			
OF_CAWB02_220			
OF_CAWB02_223			
OF_CAWB02_257			
OF_CAWB02_266			
OF_CAWB02_270			
OF_CAWB02_274			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_275 OF_CAWB02_277 OF_CAWB02_282 OF_CAWB02_293 OF_CAWB02_294 OF_CAWB02_297 FFCAWB0206050 OF_CAWB02_097 OF_CAWB02_099 FFCAWB0206042 FFCAWB0206009 OF_CAWB02_096 OF_CAWB02_097 OF_CAWB02_099 OF_CAWB02_100 OF_CAWB02_102 OF_CAWB02_169 OF_CAWB02_170			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_188 OF_CAWB02_243			
FFCAWB0206013 OF_CAWB02_098 OF_CAWB02_114 FFCAWB0204004 FFCAWB0202002 FFCAWB0201023	Respondents commented that permissive paths may not be well used if in close proximity to solar infrastructure.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8] set outs the ways in which the Applicant has considered the potential visual and landscape impacts to local residents and visitors, potential effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the impacts and effects on the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>fabric of the landscape are taken into account as well as the views and visibility.</p> <p>The assessment includes a suite of viewpoints that cover a wide range of visual receptors, including public locations such as public rights of way. These viewpoints have been discussed and agreed with the competent authority.</p>
FFCAWB0206013	There's also the maintenance to consider as these will become overgrown if only lightly used.	Yes	Noted. The Applicant notes that an Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan will be submitted as part of the DCO Application which includes detail on site maintenance.
FFCAWB0201014 OF_CAWB02_105 OF_CAWB02_227 OF_CAWB02_226	Respondents noted that have not seen any benefits so far, they need to be clearer.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>In addition to on-site connectivity and biodiversity benefits, the Applicant continues to engage with Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire Community Foundations to explore how best to provide funding for</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			meaningful opportunities to local communities.
OF_CAWB02_056	The extent of the permissive footpaths could be extended, and indeed made suitable for cycles	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>In addition to on-site connectivity and biodiversity benefits, the Applicant continues to engage with Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire Community Foundations to explore how best to provide funding for meaningful opportunities to local communities.</p>
OF_CAWB02_110 FFCAWB0205017	IGP staff and contractors MUST use electric vehicles for the duration of the construction and operation phases of the solar projects, should they go ahead.	N/A	<p>Chapter 7 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.7] presents the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment concerning the potential impacts of the Scheme on the Climate during the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning stages.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Embedded mitigation will be implemented to reduce the greenhouse gas impact of the Scheme. Specific embedded mitigation measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encouraging the use of lower carbon modes of transport by identifying and communicating local bus connections and pedestrian and cycle access routes to/ from the Scheme to all construction staff, and providing appropriate facilities for the safe storage of cycles; - Liaising with construction personnel for the potential to implement staff minibuses and car sharing options; - Implementing a Travel Plan to reduce the volume of construction staff and employee trips to the Scheme; and - Switching vehicles and plant off when not in use.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_246	The site chosen for West Burton 4 - which surrounds Clayworth and Gringley would be visible from the SSSI nature reserve five kilometres away, from the Chesterfield Canal which is a huge tourist attraction as well as a SSSI site, not to mention from residents' homes in both conservation villages.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206056 OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_273 OF_CAWB02_293 FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206060	<p>Toftdyke Re-route</p> <p>Respondents think IGP should re-route Toftdyke below Highfield Farm, creating new culverts for it under Town Street and the Chesterfield Canal and enlarging its course along Meadow Drain and New EA Drain into the River Idle, and increasing the capacity of the sewage pumps at the bottom and top of Town Street and the capacity of the pipe between them and onward up the hill to its termination in Gringley.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
OF_CAWB02_183	<p>There is no community benefit associated with WB1</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>In addition to on-site connectivity and biodiversity benefits, the Applicant continues to engage with Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire Community Foundations to explore how best to provide funding for</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			meaningful opportunities to local communities.
FFCAWB0206054 FFCAWB0205022 FFCAWB0205021 OF_CAWB02_176 OF_CAWB02_212 OF_CAWB02_237 OF_CAWB02_274 OF_CAWB02_275 OF_CAWB02_297 OF_CAWB02_191 OF_CAWB02_200	<p>Communication of Applicant</p> <p>The community have expressed that the Applicant should be clear and upfront as to what community benefits, they are proposing before any submission of the development consent order application.</p> <p>Respondents also commented that benefits don't go far enough and that "community benefit opportunities" sounds like a bribe to justify the loss of local amenities.</p>	Yes	<p>he Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>In addition to on-site connectivity and biodiversity benefits, the Applicant continues to engage with Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire Community Foundations to explore how best to provide funding for meaningful opportunities to local communities.</p> <p>The Planning Statement [EN010132/APP/WB7.5] states at paragraph 4.8.1:</p> <p><i>"The Applicant has also committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required</i></p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p><i>to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and negatives of the Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in consideration of the planning balance within this Planning Statement. It will, however be available to fund local community projects."</i></p>
FFCAWB0206053	<p>The report states in its assessments of effects 6,8,20. There would be NO EFFECT on the hotel, bed and breakfast, and inns accommodation sector arising from the Scheme- how can this possibly be measured accurately? Even repairs to the two-railway crossing adversely affect trade at our business in Sturton by Stow- the café loses trade when the flow of traffic at the A1500 is affected, never mind when it is full of construction traffic for a solar site large than any in Europe.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>Impacts on tourism and recreation at a local and regional level have been assessed in Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.18]. This takes into account the level of significance of attractions in Section 18.7, and accounting for the cumulative impacts from solar NSIP development in the area in Section 18.10.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>A full policy review has been undertaken in the Planning Statement [EN010132/APP/WB7.5] which sets out the full planning case of the Scheme and identifies how the Scheme responds to local, county, and national policy regarding tourism and recreation strategies.</p>
FFCAWB0206053	<p>In your point 6.10 Human health and wellbeing 1'10'6 it can be seen that West Lindsey and Bassetlaw suffer from deprivation- it seems to me that this is cynically exploited in this proposed where green spaces that surround are threatened by what is in effect a giant business proposal where people have little skill to defend their surroundings.</p>	N/A	<p>This is the opinion of the respondent.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206021	You are proposing to take away a lot more than you put back.	No	<p>The operational life of the Scheme is anticipated to be 40 years. Once the Scheme ceases to operate, the development will be decommissioned. A 40-year period for the operational phase of the development has been assessed in the EIA and reported in the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2] which accompanies the DCO application. However, as is typical for energy generation NSIPs, the DCO Application does not seek a temporary or time limited consent.</p> <p>An Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.2] is provided as part of the DCO application.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0205022 FFCAWB0205021 OF_CAWB02_133	How does WB4 meet the site criteria for selection -minimise impact -not on slope re high visual impact -Brownfield sites -land quality no soil analysis report available at phase II. No archaeology report available at phase II despite being advise that it had been completed How do you propose to return the land to original quality in 40 years?	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
FFCAWB0206036	You will have a viability assessment that allows for CBs, what is that sum for WB1? As the Scheme size has only been made based on what capacity exists you have not shared at what scale the individual projects become unviable. The various solar proposals made are among the largest in Europe, its clearly opportunistic rather than an appropriate	N/A	<p>In addition to the information shared through consultation materials at the pre-application stage, a Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, explaining the reasons for the Scheme being large scale solar generation, and setting out the context,</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	size, that fits well into an area- with tangible benefits for the locals.		requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.
FFCAWB0206032 OF_CAWB02_153 OF_CAWB02_239 OF_CAWB02_240 OF_CAWB02_241	<p>Visual impact of the Scheme</p> <p>Respondents commented that there would be no attraction not see any attraction walking in close proximity to the Scheme.</p>	Yes	<p>Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>The LVIA provides comments on alternative technologies and design alternatives within Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206032	Once the landscape and habitats are lost, they cannot be replaced by putting up a few boxes or planting new trees.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%. The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and the report at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The LVIA picks up the delivery of landscape mitigation to address biodiversity net gain through the enhancement of existing habitats and green infrastructure proposals. The landscape measures also</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			include the preparation of a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives. The Applicant and its LVIA consultants at Lanpro have worked closely with the ecology consultant throughout the application process to inform the LVIA and associated mitigation plans. The mitigation proposals allow for flexibility, but they can also be fixed, where appropriate and applicable.
FFCAWB0206014	What is your community benefit budget for the various proposals?	N/A	The amount of funding is yet to be finalised, however, talks are ongoing within the solar industry to standardise these amounts. The Applicant continues to engage with Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire Community Foundations

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			to explore how best to provide funding for meaningful opportunities to local communities.
FFCAWB0204012	All residents are going to get is interference from poor invertors and noisy on the rf spectrum.	Yes	Operational noise assessments are included in Chapter 15 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.15] .
FFCAWB0204012	You are purely disrupting the countryside for the next 20+ years with panels that are made from deadly poisonous compounds barely recyclable, not long-term view only MONEY. Money for investors and profits.	Yes	<p>The Applicant is committed to a robust supply chain plan that will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate and independently assessed and examined as part of the planning application. The Applicant is also committed to The Waste Framework Directive, enshrined into English and Welsh domestic law, whereby Applicants should seek to minimise the volume of waste produced and the volume of waste sent to disposal.</p> <p>Construction best practices should be utilised in relation to storing of materials in</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>an adequate and protected place on site to prevent waste. The Applicant notes that further details on this can be found within Chapter 20 of the environmental statement: Waste [document reference number WB6.2.20].</p>
FFCAWB0204012	<p>No thoughts for the residents' farm who will be out of work. Farming dead for 20+ years.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and appreciates the importance of agricultural land.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites, as presented in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [Document reference: WB6.2.19].</p> <p>The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land from the Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme will be decommissioned with</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality.</p> <p>Agricultural land will be retained during the operational phase, e.g. pasture grazed by sheep.</p>
FFCAWB0204003	Permissive footpath can be withdrawn at any time. They are not permanent.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, as described in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], will look to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the public footpath, permissive footpath and green lane network, which is aimed to benefit the community as a whole as well as tourists, visiting walkers, local residents, ornithologists and cyclists.</p> <p>The landscape mitigation measures will seek to provide new planting which will include new native hedgerows and tree</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			cover, and this will also include their management and maintenance.
FFCAWB0203016	Negative financial impact being imposed on the areas concerned and the general economies.	Yes	The Applicant notes that tourism and recreation economy is likely to be impacted only where specific locations and views across the land are important to its economic value. The Applicant notes that the impacts are anticipated to be negligible on established tourist attractions.
FFCAWB0203008 FFCAWB0203006	Project will have a negative visual impact on the local environment and no amount of mitigating measures will reduce this impact.	Yes	The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and the report at Section 8.8. The Applicant and its LVIA consultants at Lanpro have worked closely with the ecology consultant throughout the application process to inform the LVIA and associated mitigation plans. The

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			mitigation proposals allow for flexibility, but they can also be fixed, where appropriate and applicable.
FFCAWB0201029	Put it in your back yard not ours.	N/A	<p>The Applicant has undertaken an extensive process of site selection to identify suitable areas of land for the proposals.</p> <p>The LVIA provides comments on alternative technologies and design alternatives within Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p>
FFCAWB0201027	NET ZERO SCAM.	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0201017	You are restricting local residents and visitors on where we can and can't walk and severely restricting natural beauty with solar panels which in turn will restrict or permanently remove wildlife.	Yes	<p>The LVIA provides comments on alternative technologies and design alternatives within Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and the report at Section 8.8. The Applicant and its LVIA consultants at Lanpro have worked closely with the ecology consultant throughout the application process to inform the LVIA and associated mitigation plans. The mitigation proposals allow for flexibility, but they can also be fixed, where appropriate and applicable.</p>
FFCAWB0201010	Invest in fracking, North Sea Oil and gas.	N/A	The Applicant is committed to the opportunity to repower the region with

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>clean, green and affordable energy and replace the energy produced by the West Burton power Station.</p> <p>In addition to the information shared through consultation materials at the pre-application stage, a Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, explaining the reasons for the Scheme being large scale solar generation, and setting out the context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p>
FFCAWB0201006	Respondents were concerned about the visual impact of the panels.	Yes	<p>The LVIA provides comments on alternative technologies and design alternatives within Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_058; OF_CAWB02_207; OF_CAWB02_236	Consider sites elsewhere on land that is not suitable for farming and so much destruction.	Yes	<p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1].</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resources & Farming</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Circumstances) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.19.1].</p> <p>The vast majority of the Scheme is located on lower quality agricultural land with only 26.24% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land). See Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] which sets out the design evolution of the Scheme. This includes justification for removal of certain fields from the Scheme and retention of other limited areas of BMV.</p> <p>The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality.</p> <p>In addition, some agricultural land may be retained during the operational phase,</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			such as with pasture grazed by sheep, for example.
OF_CAWB02_271	Lighting fields which lie in darkness is damaging.	N/A	The Applicant has assessed the potential impact of glint and glare through Chapter 16 (Glint and Glare) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.16] .
CAWB0207017_W B	These documents have not taken into account the full effect these solar farms will have on human health. There is no mention of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) put out by the Health and Well Being Board (LCC/NHS), which takes into account the health needs of the County, especially Gainsborough and its surrounding areas. These solar farms will have an effect on the wider determinants of health and there needs to be more substance around this other than those mentioned under potential issues. GP practices in the Gainsborough area (Trent Primary Care Network area), will not cope with the influx	No	Chapter 21 (Other Environmental Matters) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.21] assesses the impacts of the Scheme upon human health and also considers major accidents and disasters.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	of workers planned even on a temporary basis and needs further evaluation. Have they been consulted?		
CAWB0207017_W B	Also, it is a known fact that in deprived areas there is 15% more likelihood that these Schemes are passed. Having looked at the population data within the PEIR, some statistics a little outdated (2011 data), perhaps not reflecting the true picture. The PEIR talks about apprenticeships attracted from the unemployed (described as an uplift in the working age). How can this be understood in the context of the long-term unemployed when no data sits behind this to understand the problem? Just using ONS data does not reflect the true problem. Therefore, the local issues need to be really understood, especially if the agricultural workforce jobs are to be lost, some of these skills are generational passed down through families. Think of the loss to those who	Yes	The Applicant notes that a focus on delivering opportunities for Schemes such as apprenticeships or training. Practicable opportunities to promote these Schemes will be explored through the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan to be submitted with the DCO. This will seek to have a positive impact on education and skills attainment in fields such as construction, engineering, and energy technology throughout the operational lifetime of the Scheme.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>contract their services to the agricultural holdings, such as in West Burton 1. How will this Scheme improve social and community networks? It will fracture some of this. How will individual lifestyle factors be improved? Certainly not by adding in cycle paths and community sweeteners as proposed when in essence the environment is the main factor most of us choose to live in rural settings.</p>		
FFCAWB0206020	<p>There are five well used public footpaths and bridleways across and around the wb4 site, used by visiting walkers, tourists and local residents. This will be a lost amount of amenities as no one will want to walk through or alongside rows and rows of unsightly black and metal panels.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			the results of a range of environmental assessments.
FFCAWB0206018 FFCAWB0206037 FFCAWB0206029 FFCAWB0206024 OF_CAWB02_266 FFCAWB0206026 FFCAWB0206007 FFCAWB0206004 FFCAWB0204006 FFCAWB0203017 FFCAWB0203015 FFCAWB0203013 FFCAWB0206050 FFCAWB0206044	<p>PRoW at West Burton 4</p> <p>The community commented that that there is no requirement for any permissive paths across the West Burton 4 site as it is already well served by public rights of way and the Trent Valley way.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that existing Public Rights of Way are intended to be kept open throughout the operational lifetime of the development.</p> <p>The operation of the Scheme is not anticipated to impact on the use or accessibility of Public Rights of Way, however there may be a minor negative impact on their attractiveness as recreational amenities.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206018 FFCAWB0206037 FFCAWB0206029 FFCAWB0206024 FFCAWB0206026 FFCAWB0206007 FFCAWB0206004 FFCAWB0204006 FFCAWB0203017 FFCAWB0203015 FFCAWB0203013 FFCAWB0206038 FFCAWB0206030 FFCAWB0206012 FFCAWB0203011 OF_CAWB02_044 OF_CAWB02_114 OF_CAWB02_135	<p>Inadequate information regarding West Burton 4</p> <p>Respondents commented that the Applicant should be clearer and more upfront with the community affected by West Burton 4 in regards to the proposed benefit in advance of the submission of the development consent order application.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OM_CAWB02_012	Why is there not a protected bond to pay for decommissioning	Yes	The Applicant has noted that the development will be operational for up to 40 years before it is decommissioned. The Applicant notes that after decommissioning, the land will be returned to its former state. The requirements of and funding for the decommissioning process will be agreed as part of the final Development Consent Order for the project, if approved.
OF_CAWB02_010 OF_CAWB02_012	More permissive routes needed and these need to be bridleways or restricted byways to include more users. These should also be wheelchair accessible.	Yes	The Applicant notes that the LVIA has carried forward from the PEIR, to Section 8.8 of the LVIA, the intention to enhance the footpath network associated with the Sites, where appropriate, noted as secondary mitigation for Public Rights of Way. These measures potentially recommend increasing accessibility and connectivity of PRow, but also measures to increase understanding of the local landscapes and the solar project. The LVIA

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>promotes for example information boards at vantage points, where appropriate. The LVIA also draws out ecological enhancement measures to provide a wider public understanding of the project and encourage public access to nature.</p>
<p>OF_CAWB02_096 OF_CAWB02_097</p>	<p>Another example of an incomplete and rushed consultation by a company understaffed and inexperienced at a DCO.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant is committed to an extensive consultation and report process. The Applicant has set out the methodology, compliance, effects and mitigation measures of the development as part of the environmental statement across all topic themes. The Applicant will submit the environmental statement alongside a consultation report as part of the DCO process requirements.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_191	The fields around Saxilby are used for controlled flooding. I am worried about drainage issues if building on those fields goes ahead and what impact this may have on the village.	Yes	The Applicant notes that a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy has been produced for each of the solar Sites which demonstrate that flood risk will not be exacerbated as a result of their installation and is likely to provide betterment over the existing surface water regime due to the reintroduction of natural land cover beneath the panels. Where additional infrastructure is proposed e.g. battery sites, additional Drainage Strategies have been produced which indicate how SuDS will be provided on-Site to attenuate any increased runoff to greenfield rates.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_262	Respondent expressed concern that the development would detrimentally affect house prices	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this comment. At the time of writing, the Applicant is not aware of any empirical research or evidence that suggests solar farms affect property values. As such, we do not expect this to happen. However, our first principle is to ensure that we design a project which minimises effects on residential properties to an acceptable level, thereby mitigating any potential effect on property value.</p> <p>The Applicant has also assessed the visual impact upon neighbouring properties as part of the Environmental Statement, Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_269	We would be in support of any additional permissive paths which would give residents in Saxilby and surrounding villages easier and safer access into Bransby Village whilst avoiding the busy Sturton Road.	Yes	<p>The Scheme complies with the landscape-related criteria of paragraph 98 of the NPPF in that consideration is given to the enhancement of the network of open spaces, footpaths, and bridleways.</p> <p>In addition to the new permissive path included within the Scheme, the Applicant has explored alternative permissive path routes but these proved to be incompatible with existing farming activities, or required land beyond the Applicant's control. The permissive path from the track off Sykes Lane will contribute to the wider network of footpaths in the area and facilitate greater public access to the countryside.</p> <p>In addition to on-site connectivity and biodiversity benefits, the Applicant continues to engage with Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire Community Foundations</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			to explore how best to provide funding for meaningful opportunities to local communities, and has engaged with Saxilby Nature Project regarding opportunities at West Burton 2.
OF_CAWB02_278; OF_CAWB02_280	Although not yet decided – it is admitted that the panels are likely to come from China. Is there no other source that is less likely to be reliant on ‘cheap labour’ (I saw you’ve signed up the Solar Energy UK ‘statement of condemnation and support’ but that is pretty toothless), and involving less of a carbon footprint in transporting it across China, across the sea and then from the port to the sites?	Yes	<p>The Applicant is committed to creating a robust supply chain plan that will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate and independently assessed and examined as part of our planning application. The Applicant has signed up to Solar Energy UK’s commitments to ‘condemn and oppose any abuse of human rights including forced labour anywhere in the global solar supply chain.</p> <p>Chapter 7 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.7] presents the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment concerning the potential impacts of the Scheme on the Climate during the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning stages. The resilience of the Scheme to physical impacts caused by climate change has also been considered. Section 7.10 (Residual Effects) explains that while there will be inevitable greenhouse gas emissions during the transport, energy and fuel associated with the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme, overall, the Scheme itself will provide major beneficial impacts and a net reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Section 7.5 (Assessment Assumptions and Limitations) sets out the assumptions applied to the assessment. It is noted it has assumed the PV panels being sourced from China or a country of similar distance from the UK, and there will therefore be an increase in embodied carbon and transport emissions, which would otherwise be lower if sourced from Europe.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_280; OF_CAWB02_300	<p>5.2.5 – not sure what the second sentence adds to 5.2.4 – should it read West Burton??</p> <p>Table 5.5 – Avoidance of areas of surface water flooding greater than 1m depth.</p> <p>I witnessed a number of residents of Ingham Road giving evidence to your representatives at the Marton event and again to different representatives at a meeting in a private house, of flooding well in excess of 1m in areas to the north of Ingham Road that are currently included in your solar panel site area. There are photographs on social media from inside 4WD vehicles trying to drive on roads and looking towards the relevant fields. Your representatives were offered photos showing drowned sheep and the level of surface water. If this local evidence is considered, often viewable on local community Facebook pages as part of road closure warnings etc or sadness at the loss of livestock, rather than the desk-top evidence that seems to have been relied on,</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy has been produced for each of the solar Sites which demonstrate that flood risk will not be exacerbated as a result of their installation and is likely to provide betterment over the existing surface water regime due to the reintroduction of natural land cover beneath the panels. Where additional infrastructure is proposed e.g. battery sites, additional Drainage Strategies have been produced which indicate how SuDS will be provided on-Site to attenuate any increased runoff to greenfield rates.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	you will see that the reality is different to what you are reporting, and basing your conclusions on.		
OF_CAWB02_280; OF_CAWB02_300	The Planning Inspectorate Scoping report highlights related lighting issues at 3.3.6, including the effects on hedgehog and bat corridors. Where in the PEIR is this addressed?	Yes	The Applicant notes that the effects of the development on hedgehogs and bat and refers to a Bat Survey Report [document reference number WB6.3.9.5] as well as a Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] for more information.
OF_CAWB02_280; OF_CAWB02_300	So – are you saying that it is not POSSIBLE to use brown field or non-BMV land? Are these solar panel sites really avoiding greenfield sites apart from where NECESSARY? Do you have any plans for co-locating agriculture e.g. sheep -grazing between panels on these sites?	Yes	The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1] . Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resources & Farming Circumstances) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.19.1].</p> <p>The vast majority of the Scheme is located on lower quality agricultural land with only 26.24% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land). See Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] which sets out</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>the design evolution of the Scheme. This includes justification for removal of certain fields from the Scheme and retention of other limited areas of BMV.</p> <p>The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality.</p> <p>In addition, some agricultural land may be retained during the operational phase, such as with pasture grazed by sheep, for example.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_280 OF_CAWB02_300	Development site will affect a number of PRowS but no surveys are proposed to understand the baseline use of these PRowS. Surveys should be undertaken to provide baseline data in relation to the use of the PRowS affected by the site, where appropriate, to define the change in characteristics of tourism and recreational use of PRow as is required to define receptor sensitivity in Table 21.3 and the magnitude of change in Table 21.4.' Where are the results of these surveys? Have they been carried out? Will they look at pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle usage?	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes the response. The LVIA has carried forward from the PEIR, to Section 8.8 of the LVIA, the intention to enhance the footpath network associated with the Sites, where appropriate, noted as secondary mitigation for Public Rights of Way.</p> <p>These measures potentially recommend increasing accessibility and connectivity of PRow, but also measures to increase understanding of the local landscapes and the solar project. The LVIA promotes for example information boards at vantage points, where appropriate. The LVIA also draws out ecological enhancement measures to provide a wider public understanding of the project and encourage public access to nature.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_280 OF_CAWB02_300	9.4.11 In discussing the Willingham to Fillingham road verges you acknowledge that 'It is noted that the verge suffers substantially from over-run due to the narrowness of the road carriageway which leads to damage from overtaking and the passage of agricultural machinery'..... This road is typical of the back roads in the area (compare to lengths of Stow Lane/ Ingham Road and Thorpe Lane). Having seen the damage caused in places on the narrow sections, how do you conclude that these roads are suitable for construction traffic, and indeed the increased use due to workforce traffic?	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that construction traffic will be managed through a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2].</p> <p>The aim of the CTMP is to minimise the effects of construction traffic on the local highway network.</p> <p>A road condition survey will be undertaken with a commitment to rectify any damage caused by construction vehicles.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_280 OF_CAWB02_300	9.4.15 – A habitats survey at just one time of year, just one nocturnal/crepuscular bird survey visit of all the land within the site boundaries late June/ early July, an eDNA test for GCNs of the 28 located ponds in June 2021 (when many other sites would be dry) – is this really a reliable way to carry out all of the wildlife data collection? Have local residents been asked for input? Have you approached any of the local farm workers, birdwatchers and dog walkers etc who live, work and exercise in these areas and asked what they see?	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units. All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme.</p> <p>The BNG assessment report also sets out how these calculations are based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010132/APP/WB 7.3] which will be secured under a requirement of the DCO.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_280 OF_CAWB02_300	<p>9.4.16 – Have the promised further surveys been carried out? Including those of ponds found to be dry in May-June 2022, ‘a thorough walkover survey of all accessible land within the Survey Area, and ... 30m beyond this, to collect baseline habitat inventory and condition information’ etc?</p> <p>9.4.17. what exactly does ‘the survey effort and scope.... reflects what is believed at the time of writing to be sufficient and proportionate to inform the evaluation of baseline conditions for this project based on our professional judgment ‘mean in reality??</p> <p>Why not ask locals for the videos and photos they have of bats at night, snakes during the day, owls at dusk, badgers found dead, frogs toads and newts seen near or in the Till, families of deer observed etc. Occasional visits by ‘professionals’ who don’t know the land will invariably miss things that locals are aware of. Desk-based surveys of reported sightings will never reflect the true situation</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units. All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme.</p> <p>The BNG assessment report also sets out how these calculations are based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010132/APP/WB 7.3] which will be secured under a requirement of the DCO.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>on the ground as very few are reported. People don't report a sighting of an adder or grass snake or woodcock to Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust – they take a photo and share it on their social media pages!!</p>		
<p>OF_CAWB02_280 OF_CAWB02_300</p>	<p>9.4.85 – appendix 9.1 report at para 3.2.33 states 'Wetted ditches and watercourses are likely also to be key habitats for otter and water vole, both being legally protected species recorded near to or within all Sites. This will need to be considered when carrying out any engineering works close to or within ditches or river corridor' Where is this finding highlighted in the PEIR? 9.6.92 admits that they may be impacted through direct harm or disturbance during construction activity affecting ditches, watercourses and associated... habitat. 9.6.96 mentions limiting movements of construction vehicles within buffer zones – but not prohibiting them</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units. All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme. The BNG assessment report also sets out how these calculations are based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	9.4.87 again desk studies won't show all sightings ... I saw a polecat when out on my bike down Ingham Road about 4 years ago. I told friends but it won't show up on your desk study		[EN010132/APP/WB7.3] which will be secured under a requirement of the DCO.
OF_CAWB02_280; OF_CAWB02_300	Woodland in close proximity to the array sites, haul routes and cable installation works would remain sensitive to degradation through accidental pollution events, dust deposition and vehicle over-run.... The PEIR acknowledges that there aren't large stands of trees in the area – yet admits that the trees we have are likely to suffer adverse effects	Yes	The Applicant notes that measures within the Outline EPMS [EN010132/APP/WB7.17] will be followed to further minimise the possibility of indirect impacts on the Local Wildlife Sites from pollution, sediment/dust deposition or vehicle over-run. These measures include the attendance by an Ecological Clerk of Works and the avoidance of work during adverse weather conditions.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>OF_CAWB02_280 OF_CAWB02_300</p>	<p>9.6.126 and 9.6.134 detail the likely adverse effects on skylark, yellow wagtail and lapwing populations, and admit it is not possible to predict the residual effects... approx. 40 years ago there was an abundance of lapwing in the area, with a number of local fields regularly hosting large populations. These declined with the changes in farming practices and for a number of years they were rarely seen. The populations have slowly improved in recent years – just in time to be adversely affected again by your proposed projects.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this response.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units . All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme.</p> <p>The BNG assessment report also sets out how these calculations are based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010132/APP/WB 7.3] which will be secured under a requirement of the DCO.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_280 OF_CAWB02_300	Anomalies have been detected in areas in Parcel D that are possibly indicative of unrecorded Late Prehistoric or Romano-British activity, and in Parcels F and G that possibly represent unrecorded enclosure systems of unknown date but those in F may be further Medieval activity. The detailed information included at e.g. para 7.5 of Appendix 13.1 is very difficult to find: - that appendix would not download from the website – it just buffered repeatedly, and with no pagination of the appendices eventually supplied on a USB stick (not for even the appendices by chapters let alone individual appendices and sub-appendices) it has meant that it has taken hours to sift through all the extraneous material to find the relevant nuggets. The geophysical survey at Appendix 13.2 concludes that 'the archaeological potential of the study site is high where there are the ten areas of activity' Where are you publishing the results	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a full suite of archaeological assessment, survey and evaluation trenching has been undertaken. This includes desk-based assessment, drawing on HER, NHLE, NHRE, HLC and PAS information, together with separately commissioned LiDAR and aerial photographic assessments and geophysical survey. 450 archaeological evaluation trenches, measuring 2m by 30m, were excavated across the Scheme, targeting potential archaeological features identified through geophysical survey, desk-based assessment, and LiDAR and aerial photographic interpretation.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that these were undertaken to "ground truth" the results of the non-intrusive surveys, and included "blank" areas in which non-intrusive surveys had not identified any evidence for archaeological remains. All evaluation</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>of the trial trenching that you are carrying out? Is it publicly available? Has a WSI yet been agreed with LCC? G1 is the proposed location for the very heavy transformer and storage batteries for Cottam 1 so the land preparation, abnormal load transportation and delivery, operation and decommissioning will all potentially destroy any archaeological remains that are not found prior to the commencement of the project. What are the criteria for this location being chosen – apart from distance from residences?</p>		<p>trenching was agreed in advance in an evaluation WSI with the Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team, regular site meetings were held with the Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team, and they were kept continually informed on progress of all work. Where changes to the scope were required by the Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team - such as additional trenches or widening of excavation in order to more fully understand that character of archaeological remains - this was agreed and undertaken.</p>

10 Table 5.12.9: Feedback received to Question 13: Do you have any further comments on our phase two consultation for the Cottam and West Burton Solar Projects?

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206055 FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206034 FFCAWB0206013 FFCAWB0206024 FFCAWB0206006 FFCAWB0206006 FFCAWB0205012 FFCAWB0204012 FFCAWB0204003 FFCAWB0203024 FFCAWB0203018 FFCAWB0203021 FFCAWB0202042 FFCAWB0202022 FFCAWB0202011 FFCAWB0202006 FFCAWB0202001	<p>Land use and quality</p> <p>Respondents commented that agricultural land or BMV land should not be used. This land is not degraded and can be used for crop production. Brownfield sites or roofing should be used instead.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and appreciates the importance of agricultural land.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land and consideration of rooftop solar opportunities, is presented within the Site Selection Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1].</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0202002 FFCAWB0201029 FFCAWB0201026 FFCAWB0206052 OF_CAWB02_019 OF_CAWB02_025 OF_CAWB02_026 OF_CAWB02_027 OF_CAWB02_028 OF_CAWB02_040 OF_CAWB02_041 OF_CAWB02_042 OF_CAWB02_043 OF_CAWB02_045 OF_CAWB02_054 OF_CAWB02_055 OF_CAWB02_062 OF_CAWB02_068 OF_CAWB02_072 OF_CAWB02_073 OF_CAWB02_075			<p>identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resources & Farming Circumstances) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.19.1].</p> <p>The vast majority of the Scheme is located on lower quality agricultural land with only 26.24% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land). See Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] which sets out the design evolution of the Scheme. This includes justification for removal of certain fields from the Scheme and retention of other limited areas of BMV.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_078 OF_CAWB02_079 OF_CAWB02_091 OF_CAWB02_094 OF_CAWB02_097 OF_CAWB02_110 OF_CAWB02_118 OF_CAWB02_120 OF_CAWB02_122 OF_CAWB02_123 OF_CAWB02_143 OF_CAWB02_148 OF_CAWB02_156 OF_CAWB02_161 OF_CAWB02_175 OF_CAWB02_178 OF_CAWB02_179 OF_CAWB02_181 OF_CAWB02_182 OF_CAWB02_183 OF_CAWB02_185			<p>The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality.</p> <p>In addition, some agricultural land may be retained during the operational phase, such as with pasture grazed by sheep, for example.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application. In reviewing the policies and information available regarding solar generation and the need to decarbonise, it is the Applicant's view that large-scale solar must be considered as additional to, as opposed to instead of, smaller scale solar, and this includes the development of rooftop solar.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_198 OF_CAWB02_204 OF_CAWB02_207 OF_CAWB02_208 OF_CAWB02_212 OF_CAWB02_215 OF_CAWB02_220 OF_CAWB02_223 OF_CAWB02_224 OF_CAWB02_226 OF_CAWB02_244 OF_CAWB02_245 OF_CAWB02_246 OF_CAWB02_259 OF_CAWB02_262 OF_CAWB02_267 OF_CAWB02_274 OF_CAWB02_277 OF_CAWB02_278 OF_CAWB02_279 OF_CAWB02_281			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_284 OF_CAWB02_288 OF_CAWB02_294 OF_CAWB02_299 OF_CAWB02_300 OM_CAWB02_004 OM_CAWB02_008 OM_CAWB02_014 CAWB0207017_W B OF_CAWB02_204 FFCAWB0206064			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_185 OF_CAWB02_202 OF_CAWB02_239 OF_CAWB02_240 OF_CAWB02_241 OF_CAWB02_262 CAWB0207017_W B OF_CAWB02_265	<p>Employment</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that jobs will be lost in agriculture, agricultural support workers, tourism and more. This will result in a reduction in prosperity for the area and be damaging to the economy.</p> <p>Will employment opportunities be made available to local people?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered the likely significant effects of the development on the local economy in Chapter 18 of the Environmental Statement: Socio-Economics, Agriculture, and Tourism and Recreation [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.18]</p>
OF_CAWB02_025 OF_CAWB02_029 OF_CAWB02_122 OF_CAWB02_185 OF_CAWB02_226	<p>Food security</p> <p>The Ukrainian situation as well as food precarity has shown we need food and</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and appreciates the importance of agricultural land.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>OF_CAWB02_232 OF_CAWB02_244 CAWB0207017_W B</p>	<p>energy. Solar panels can be sited elsewhere - we need productive farmland.</p>		<p>The Applicant has undertaken detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites, as presented in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19].</p> <p>The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land from the Scheme. The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality.</p> <p>Agricultural land will be retained during the operational phase, e.g. pasture grazed by sheep. Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] states at paragraphs 19.5.2- 3 (in respect of food security):</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p><i>"It should be noted that the above Lincolnshire County Council consultation response is incorrect when it states that "... all arable land of whatever agricultural classification produces food, whether for animal feed or human consumption..." Arable land can be and is used for growing energy crops. Examples include fuel crops such as biodiesel and miscanthus grass, and energy substrate crops such as maize for anaerobic digestion, or grain for ethanol manufacture. There are no food security or planning policy constraints on growing these energy crops on arable land, just as there are no food security policy constraints on the use of agricultural land for solar PV. Studies have shown solar PV also produces more kWh per hectare than other renewable energy crops. This is also achieved with land remaining in agricultural production, fattening lambs, and without the</i></p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p><i>environmental and land degradation hazards of the most popular energy crop, maize.</i></p> <p><i>Arable land is also used to produce non-food crops for markets including industrial oils, cosmetics, pharmaceuticals and Christmas trees. Food security is not a material planning consideration. The relevant assessment for policy purposes is the ALC grade of the agricultural land, not its current use or the intensity of that use."</i></p> <p>Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] concludes that the 40-year lifetime of the project will facilitate a recovery in topsoil organic matter. This will enhance the functional capacity of the soil resource for future arable production.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206041 FFCAWB0204001 FFCAWB0206048 FFCAWB0206050 FFCAWB0206030 FFCAWB0206013 FFCAWB0206023 FFCAWB0205006 FFCAWB0204009 FFCAWB0203010 FFCAWB0203008 FFCAWB0203001 FFCAWB0202002 FFCAWB0201029 FFCAWB0201010 FFCAWB0201007 OF_CAWB02_016 OF_CAWB02_022 OF_CAWB02_026 OF_CAWB02_028 OF_CAWB02_032	<p>Site selection</p> <p>Respondents commented that the project should not go ahead, often citing that the site areas do not fulfil important site selection criteria due to land quality and use, topography, and proximity o grid connection.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant's site selection process, includes a search for suitable brownfield land and consideration of rooftop solar opportunities, and is presented in the Site Selection Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1].</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites, as presented in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19].</p> <p>The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_035 OF_CAWB02_039 OF_CAWB02_040 OF_CAWB02_042 OF_CAWB02_046 OF_CAWB02_047 OF_CAWB02_091 OF_CAWB02_092 OF_CAWB02_094 OF_CAWB02_096 OF_CAWB02_099 OF_CAWB02_100 OF_CAWB02_102 OF_CAWB02_107 OF_CAWB02_113 OF_CAWB02_118 OF_CAWB02_119 OF_CAWB02_121 OF_CAWB02_128 OF_CAWB02_132 OF_CAWB02_134			<p>versatile land from the Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality.</p> <p>Agricultural land will be retained during the operational phase, e.g. pasture grazed by sheep.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_155 OF_CAWB02_156 OF_CAWB02_160 OF_CAWB02_161 OF_CAWB02_169 OF_CAWB02_180 OF_CAWB02_184 OF_CAWB02_188 OF_CAWB02_190 OF_CAWB02_198 OF_CAWB02_204 OF_CAWB02_207 OF_CAWB02_219 OF_CAWB02_230 OF_CAWB02_235 OF_CAWB02_236 OF_CAWB02_246 OF_CAWB02_253 OF_CAWB02_267 OF_CAWB02_271 OF_CAWB02_287			results of a range of environmental assessments.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_295 OM_CAWB02_002 OM_CAWB02_011 OF_CAWB02_300 CAWB0207017_W B FFCAWB0206064			
OF_CAWB02_005	<p>Scale</p> <p>Respondents commented that the project is too large.</p>		<p>The Applicant notes these comments and that further relevant information has been provided through the DCO application. For example, the Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] explains the reasons for the Scheme being large scale solar generation and sets out the context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply. It is not considered that small scale generation is an alternative to this, rather it complements it.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>OF_CAWB02_194 FFCAWB0206003 FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206050 OF_CAWB02_267</p>	<p>Cultural heritage The site has not changed since medieval times.</p> <p>Respondents were concerned that survey of the area showed evidence of iron age settlements on the land and that construction will damage this and other historical artefacts.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Archaeological assessment and evaluation work has identified several concentrations of Iron Age / Roman activity. A detailed mitigation strategy (WSI) is included as Appendix 13.7 to the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.13.7] that outlines the various mitigation strategies required to safeguard archaeological assets within the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			results of a range of environmental assessments.
OM_CAWB02_010 FFCAWB0201023 OF_CAWB02_218 OF_CAWB02_232 OM_CAWB02_008	<p>Cumulative impacts</p> <p>Respondents commented that they were displeased with the number of industrial developments in the area, including reference to a chicken farm nearby.</p> <p>Respondents were concerned about the density of solar panel farms in the area from a number of proposed projects. Respondents commented that these would change a currently rural area into a large industrial complex than.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant is aware of other projects being proposed in the area and has undertaken assessments to consider any cumulative effects of this. The Applicant has held regular discussions with Low Carbon and Tillbridge Solar to ensure any cumulative impacts are minimised.</p> <p>Details of these assessments and the ways in which any cumulative are intended to be minimised can be found within multiple chapters of the Environmental Statement included within the application.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts of the Scheme have been addressed as a whole within the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.1 - WB6.2.21]. Each topic chapter considers the impacts of</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Scheme; and the impact of the Scheme in conjunction with other large scale solar proposals and other committed developments within the region.</p> <p>For example, impacts on tourism and recreation at a local and regional level have been assessed in Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.18]. This takes into account the level of significance of attractions in Section 18.7, and accounting for the cumulative impacts from solar NSIP development in the area in Section 18.10.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>OM_CAWB02_012 CAWB0207017_W B</p>	<p>Decommissioning</p> <p>Respondents were sceptical that the site would actually be returned to agricultural land in 40 years</p> <p>Further down the line when the site is decommissioned, who will take responsibility of disposing of all the panels and batteries, because we think it will be the farmers who end up doing it. Where will all these items end up? Land fill? Shipped to other countries to pollute them with our waste? Will any of the items be recycled?</p> <p>The soil will have deteriorated over 40 years and will then be deemed grade 4, which is contrary to what you have stated. Would this then be land used for house building? Will the land ever revert back to agricultural land?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The operational life of the Scheme is anticipated to be 40 years. Once the Scheme ceases to operate, the development will be decommissioned. A 40-year period for the operational phase of the development has been assessed in the EIA and reported in the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2] which accompanies the DCO application. However, as is typical for energy generation NSIPs, the DCO Application does not seek a temporary or time limited consent.</p> <p>An Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.2] is provided as part of the DCO application.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that after decommissioning, the land will be returned to its former state. The requirements of and funding for the decommissioning</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>process will be agreed as part of the final Development Consent Order for the project, if approved.</p> <p>The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality.</p> <p>Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] concludes that the 40-year lifetime of the project will facilitate a recovery in topsoil organic matter. This will enhance the functional capacity of the soil resource for future arable production.</p>
CAWB0207017_W B	<p>Landowner agreements</p> <p>Who will eventually own this land? Is there a deal between yourselves and the farmers?</p>	N/A	The Applicant has lease agreements with relevant landowners for the duration of the development. Following decommission and the ending of the leases the land will

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			remain under ownership of the relevant landowners.
CAWB0207017_W B	<p>Maintenance plan</p> <p>Which chemicals will be used for cleaning the panels and what effect does it have on the soil and biodiversity? Which will you use for controlling weeds? Will this be detrimental to bees and wildlife? Some solar sites install bird deterrents to stop having faeces on the panels. Is this something you plan to do?</p>	N/A	Panels are to be cleaned with water only. Groundcover planting will consist of meadow and grazing mixes including flowering plants, which will be maintained primarily by mowing. Unless identified as an invasive species, other self-germinating species are not likely to be controlled separately, and as such will not impact on pollinators or foraging wildlife. Bird deterrents have not been proposed at this stage of the development, but may be considered as part of the detailed design. This feature will be confirmed as required in the final Operational Environmental Management Plan, to be secured by requirement in the DCO.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206065	<p>Wildlife corridors and air ambulance access</p> <p>Wildlife corridors are essential on all these proposals and there must be inter connections between the sites of all organisations involved.</p> <p>In rural areas like these the Ambucoptor is often employed where vehicle access is difficult or impossible. With a high concentration of solar panels this is severely restricted. Designated landing areas should be included.</p>	Yes	<p>The LVIA includes the dedicated sections 8.6 and 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8] to show how the landscape and planting Scheme is co-ordinated with other relevant disciplines. The LVIA also includes supporting detailed plans showing landscape mitigation at Figures 8.18.1 to Figure 8.18.3 reflecting, where appropriate, local and regional aims within the published landscape character assessments and green infrastructure guidance. The LVIA also sets out the policy context for green infrastructure at Section 8.3 of Chapter 8 and the relevant corridors are shown on Figure 8.7.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			The Applicant also notes they have undertaken consultation with relevant fire and rescue services.
OF_CAWB02_222	<p>Dual use</p> <p>The grazing allowed under the Scheme could, if managed holistically, significantly improve the life-supporting structure of the earth beneath the panels in a far more positive way than leaving it fallow. According to the Royal Society "Soil carries out a range of functions and services without which human life would not be possible. It provides an environment for plants (including food crops and timber wood) to grow in, by anchoring roots and storing nutrients. It filters and cleans our water and helps prevent natural hazards such as flooding. It contains immense levels of biodiversity. Finally, it is the largest terrestrial</p>	N/A	<p>The Applicant noted that there will be opportunities for agricultural land to be retained during the operational phase, e.g. pasture grazed by sheep.</p> <p>Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] concludes that the 40-year lifetime of the project will facilitate a recovery in topsoil organic matter. This will enhance the functional capacity of the soil resource for future arable production.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	store of carbon, and therefore helps to regulate the climate.		
OF_CAWB02_010	<p>Connectivity and recreation</p> <p>Please ensure this project also enables people to enjoy the biodiversity you are promoting. Space to enjoy with friends and children would be ideal. Permissive routes (bridleways or restricted byways to enable access for as many minority groups as possible) in loops around the sites would be great.</p>	No	<p>The Scheme complies with the landscape-related criteria of paragraph 98 of the NPPF in that consideration is given to the enhancement of the network of open spaces, footpaths, and bridleways.</p> <p>In addition to the new permissive path included within the Scheme, the Applicant has explored alternative permissive path routes but these proved to be incompatible with existing farming activities, or required land beyond the Applicant's control.</p> <p>In addition to on-site connectivity and biodiversity benefits, the Applicant continues to engage with Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire Community Foundations to explore how best to provide funding for</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>meaningful opportunities to local communities.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that some permissive paths are proposed, although it would be unsuitable to permit access to specific ecological mitigation land due to potential for disturbance of species such as nesting birds. The Applicant has been liaising with Saxilby Nature Project regarding the creation of a habitat management area in the south western corner of West Burton 2 for future community activities and biodiversity mitigation.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_025 OF_CAWB02_032 OF_CAWB02_033 OF_CAWB02_034 OF_CAWB02_058 OF_CAWB02_072 OF_CAWB02_073 OF_CAWB02_075 OF_CAWB02_079 OF_CAWB02_091 OF_CAWB02_105 OF_CAWB02_110 OF_CAWB02_137 OF_CAWB02_156 OF_CAWB02_173 OF_CAWB02_181 OF_CAWB02_189 OF_CAWB02_191 OF_CAWB02_192 OF_CAWB02_208 OF_CAWB02_210	<p>Ecology</p> <p>Respondents were concerned about the impact that the site would have on wildlife, ecology and biodiversity, natural flora and fauna and natural habitats. Wooded areas and hedges should be protected.</p> <p>Respondents commented that wildlife corridors should be introduced and that a more concerted effort should be made surrounding biodiversity net gain.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units . All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme.</p> <p>The BNG assessment report also sets out how these calculations are based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010132/APP/WB 7.3] which will be secured under a requirement of the DCO.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_212 OF_CAWB02_220 OF_CAWB02_232 OF_CAWB02_266 OF_CAWB02_274 OF_CAWB02_297 OF_CAWB02_298 CAWB0207017_W B FFCAWB0205015 FFCAWB0206005 FFCAWB0202041 FFCAWB0202028 OF_CAWB02_058 FFCAWB0206064			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0205017 OF_CAWB02_061 OF_CAWB02_219 OM_CAWB02_010 CAWB0207017_W B FFCAWB0206064	<p>BESS Safety management</p> <p>Respondents raised concern regarding the safety of the panels and BESS, referencing the potential for fires and toxic fumes, water and soil pollution through battery acid leeching. The recent fire in Devon has shown that there is a risk not only of toxic fumes, but of explosions too. How will you mitigate this?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>A risk assessment has been undertaken in the Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.9]. Further information on mitigation measures for human health impacts from fires and explosions are contained in Section 21.6 – Major Accidents and Disasters of Chapter 21 (Other Environmental Matters) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.21], and in Chapter 17 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.17].</p> <p>Design requirements as set out by Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue with regard to BESS design, and firewater provision have been included in the Scheme design.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>OF_CAWB02_061; OF_CAWB02_033; OF_CAWB02_040; OF_CAWB02_111; OF_CAWB02_152</p>	<p>Carbon</p> <p>Respondents were concerned about the carbon cost of installing the site, arguing that the solar panels are not sufficiently efficient to make up for this.</p> <p>Respondents expressed scepticism that the Scheme will result in a carbon negative position within the project lifetime.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 7 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.7] presents the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment concerning the potential impacts of the Scheme on the Climate during the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning stages.</p> <p>The resilience of the Scheme to physical impacts caused by climate change has also been considered. Section 7.10 (Residual Effects) explains that while there will be inevitable greenhouse gas emissions during the transport, energy and fuel associated with the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme, overall, the Scheme itself will provide major beneficial impacts and a net reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Section 7.5 (Assessment Assumptions and Limitations) sets out the assumptions applied to the assessment. It is noted it has assumed the PV panels being sourced from China or a country of similar distance from the UK, and there will therefore be an increase in embodied carbon and transport emissions, which would otherwise be lower if sourced from Europe.</p> <p>The Applicant notes sources of emissions during construction considered within the ES include emissions from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Products (PV arrays including mounting) - Products (Transformers) - Products (High voltage cables) - Products (Low voltage cables) - Products (Batteries) - Transportation of Materials - Worker Transportation

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Waste - Water Usage - Energy Usage for Construction Period - Packaging
FFCAWB0206003 FFCAWB0206002 OF_CAWB02_068 OF_CAWB02_079 OF_CAWB02_127 OF_CAWB02_173 OF_CAWB02_189 OF_CAWB02_266 OM_CAWB02_007 CAWB0207017_W B	<p>Health and wellbeing</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the impact that the solar farm and its construction could have on community health and wellbeing. Some respondents commented that the stress and strain would result in some residents dying or suffering significant physical health implications.</p>	Yes	Chapter 21 (Other Environmental Matters) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.21] assesses the impacts of the Scheme upon human health and also considers major accidents and disasters.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0205015 FFCAWB0206005	<p>Emergency response</p> <p>Respondents were concerned that emergency vehicles and helicopters should still be able to access the surrounding areas.</p>	N/A	<p>The Scheme will not have any effect on the accessibility of the surrounding areas for emergency vehicles and helicopters.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes they have undertaken consultation with relevant fire and rescue services.</p>
FFCAWB0205011 FFCAWB0205009 OF_CAWB02_030 OF_CAWB02_131 OF_CAWB02_133	<p>Ethical supply chain</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern about the use of Uyghur slave labour in the solar panel supply chain.</p>	N/A	<p>The Applicant unequivocally condemns and opposes the use of forced labour in any context in the strongest possible terms.</p> <p>The Applicant fully supports the steps already being taken by the UK government and solar industry to ensure the highest possible levels of transparency and to rid human rights abuses from the global supply chain for UK solar developments. This includes developing an industry-led traceability protocol in line with internationally recognised standards.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The Applicant also supports the independent auditing of all UK solar supply chains. While procurement has not been confirmed for the Scheme, the Applicant has prepared a Skills and Supply Chain Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.10], submitted as part of the DCO application.</p> <p>The Applicant is seeking opportunities to develop the local skill base through practicable means during the construction and operational phase of development. Opportunities to support skill training in locally-based companies, and construction-based apprenticeships or educational opportunities have been explored in the Skills and Supply Chain Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.10].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0205001 FFCAWB0201011 OF_CAWB02_106 OF_CAWB02_239 OF_CAWB02_240 OF_CAWB02_241	<p>Community benefit</p> <p>The community commented that they would like a fund to be made accessible for the improvement of play parks, including accessible equipment for disabled children. Financial sponsorship would show commitment to the local community.</p> <p>Subsidised solar panels should be provided for the local community.</p>	N/A	<p>In addition to on-site connectivity and biodiversity benefits, the Applicant continues to engage with Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire Community Foundations to explore how best to provide funding for meaningful opportunities to local communities.</p> <p>The Planning Statement [EN010132/APP/WB7.5] states at paragraph 4.8.1:</p> <p><i>"The Applicant has also committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF). The CBF does not form part of the DCO Application and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, the SoS cannot, and must not, apply any positive weight to the CBF when balancing the positives and negatives of the Scheme. The CBF is therefore not taken into account in consideration of the planning</i></p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<i>balance within this Planning Statement. It will, however be available to fund local community projects."</i>
OF_CAWB02_068 OF_CAWB02_110 OF_CAWB02_127 OM_CAWB02_007	<p>Proximity to houses</p> <p>Respondents are opposed to sites being constructed in such close proximity to resident houses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant has also assessed the visual impact upon neighbouring properties as part of the Environmental Statement, Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, includes a search for suitable brownfield land and consideration of rooftop solar opportunities, and is presented in the Site Selection Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.
OF_CAWB02_068 OF_CAWB02_127 OM_CAWB02_007	<p>Glint and Glare</p> <p>Respondents expressed general concerns regarding glint and glare.</p>	Yes	The Applicant has assessed the potential impact of glint and glare through Chapter 16 (Glint and Glare) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.16] .
OF_CAWB02_068 OF_CAWB02_077 OF_CAWB02_094 OF_CAWB02_105 OF_CAWB02_127	<p>Noise and vibration</p> <p>Noise and vibration from both construction vehicles and the tracking panels themselves.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that Noise and Vibration assessments are presented in Chapter 15 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.15].</p> <p>Vibration thresholds have been based on the likelihood of causing annoyance for residents at the closest nearby properties, which are well below the thresholds for the onset of damage to property.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_077 OF_CAWB02_105 OF_CAWB02_127 OF_CAWB02_156 OF_CAWB02_173 OF_CAWB02_210 OM_CAWB02_007	<p>Traffic and Access</p> <p>Respondents were concerned about the disruption which would be caused by HGVs and increased traffic volume.</p>	Yes	<p>Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of</p>
OF_CAWB02_094	<p>It is close to a residential home for young adults with acquired brain injury and autism. It will have a severe impact on them both during construction and afterwards. It will be both an attraction and distraction to them and liberties will be removed.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant understands this comment to refer to Rosekeys on Gainsborough Road, Gringley on the Hill, which is adjacent to West Burton 4.</p> <p>The Site at West Burton 4 has been removed from the Scheme and as such, there will be no impact on this residential care facility.</p>
OF_CAWB02_170	<p>Heat</p>	No	The Applicant notes this response.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	This development will affect temperature locally.		
OF_CAWB02_172	<p>Radio frequency</p> <p>The RF spectrum will be polluted with electromagnetic interference.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this response.</p> <p>Electromagnetic fields attributed to power have a frequency of ~50Hz. Any resultant RF spectrum interference is therefore limited to this frequency and its harmonics, all which fall into the category of extremely-low or super-low frequency radio waves (<300Hz). Radio transmissions, telephone transmissions, and Wi-Fi signals are generally between 20kHz and 300GHz and so will not be adversely affected by interference from electromagnetic fields from the Scheme. Further, the propagation of electromagnetic fields attributed to power is likely to be limited the Scheme</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			extends and a narrow corridor around the cable route.
OF_CAWB02_189 OF_CAWB02_194 OF_CAWB02_233 OF_CAWB02_234 OF_CAWB02_266	<p>Economics and viability</p> <p>The development is purely profit driven</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this response.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application.</p>
OF_CAWB02_192	<p>Rural character landscape</p> <p>The ability to teach upcoming generations the benefits in living in a rural environment would disappear.</p>	Yes	<p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will look to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the public footpath, permissive footpath and green lane network, which is aimed to benefit the community as a whole as well as tourists, visiting walkers, local residents, ornithologists and cyclists. The landscape</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			mitigation measures will seek to provide new planting which will include new native hedgerows and tree cover, and this will also include their management and maintenance. These mitigation measures are designed to benefit the rural environment and raise awareness of environmental protection to future generations.
OF_CAWB02_265	<p>Power stations</p> <p>Will the coal-fired stations be demolished?</p>	No	The Applicant notes that the West Burton Power Station, which is owned by EDF Energy is planned to be decommissioned and restored as a nuclear fusion site.
OF_CAWB02_283	<p>Cable route</p> <p>The installation of linear underground infrastructure is now a very commonly undertaken activity so can be completed with little more than short term disruption to the farmer - so long as the specification (that is</p>	N/A	The Applicant notes this response

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	ultimately set by the Developer) of the works is to a high professional standard.		
FFCAWB0206054 FFCAWB0206020 FFCAWB0205022 FFCAWB0202004 FFCAWB0206034 FFCAWB0206014 FFCAWB0206012 FFCAWB0206009 FFCAWB0206028 FFCAWB0206004 FFCAWB0204011 FFCAWB0204006 FFCAWB0201027 FFCAWB0201023 FFCAWB0201004 OF_CAWB02_035 OF_CAWB02_139 OF_CAWB02_272	<p>Consultation</p> <p>Respondents did not feel that community comments have been / would be considered by the developers.</p> <p>Respondents do not feel that design proposals have considered feedback.</p>	N/A	<p>The Applicant is grateful to everyone who has taken the time to engage with the Scheme throughout the pre-application stage. The levels of engagement are presented in the Applicant's Consultation Report [EN010132/APP/WB5.1].</p> <p>Within this report, the Applicant confirms over 1,000 submissions of feedback were received across two phases of community consultation, with over 650 attendees to the public events and webinars that were held.</p> <p>Community consultation has been undertaken in compliance with Section 47 of the 2008 Planning Act, as evidenced in</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206021 FFCAWB0206036 FFCAWB0201017			the Consultation Report [EN010132/APP/WB5.1].
FFCAWB0206053 FFCAWB0203003 FFCAWB0206039 FFCAWB0206042 FFCAWB0206010 FFCAWB0205020 FFCAWB0205019 FFCAWB0205014 FFCAWB0204011 FFCAWB0204008 FFCAWB0203016 FFCAWB0202043 FFCAWB0202022 FFCAWB0202005 OF_CAWB02_035 OF_CAWB02_079	<p>Accessibility of materials</p> <p>Respondents expressed that the material was not easily understood or sometimes seemed intentionally deceitful or misleading.</p>	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes this comment, and appreciates that a significant volume of technical information was published for consultation.</p> <p>A non-technical summary of the PEIR was made available online at the Scheme website, at CAP sites, at public information events and upon request. The Applicant recognises that the summary was introduced to broaden the reception of the PEIR to more members of the local community. The Scheme free-to-use communications channels were open</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_091 OF_CAWB02_272 OM_CAWB02_004 FFCAWB0206057 FFCAWB0206059 FFCAWB0201006			throughout the consultation period to provide assistance to consultees.
FFCAWB0206018 FFCAWB0206019 FFCAWB0206002 FFCAWB0206040 FFCAWB0206038 FFCAWB0206037 FFCAWB0206036 FFCAWB0206033 FFCAWB0206044 FFCAWB0206031 FFCAWB0206034 FFCAWB0206042 FFCAWB0206029 FFCAWB0206012	<p>Engagement with project team</p> <p>Respondents commented that they did not consultants to be knowledgeable or helpful at information events and the information that they provided was often contradictory.</p>	N/A	<p>This is the opinion of the respondent.</p> <p>The Applicant has endeavoured to make themselves available to answer questions and discuss the Scheme with members of the community, as described in the Consultation Report [EN010132/APP/WB5.1].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206028 FFCAWB0206024 FFCAWB0206026 FFCAWB0206007 FFCAWB0206004 FFCAWB0205020 FFCAWB0205012 FFCAWB0205008 FFCAWB0204006 FFCAWB0203017 FFCAWB0203015 FFCAWB0203013 FFCAWB0203006 FFCAWB0202001 FFCAWB0201025 OF_CAWB02_079 OF_CAWB02_139 OF_CAWB02_272			

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206035 FFCAWB0201014 FFCAWB0201002 FFCAWB0201001 OF_CAWB02_139 OF_CAWB02_272 FFCAWB0205021 FFCAWB0206046 FFCAWB0206021 FFCAWB0206036 FFCAWB0206022	<p>Reporting</p> <p>Respondents requested that there should be transparency regarding the number of people in opposition to the project and that a less biased perspective should be represented in information material.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant is committed to reading and reviewing all comments and feedback submitted regarding the Scheme.</p> <p>The feedback received is presented within the Consultation Report [EN010132/APP/WB5.1].</p>
FFCAWB0206045	<p>Useful information</p> <p>Respondent found the information provided at events helpful.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0203011 FFCAWB0203009	<p>Freepost</p> <p>Respondent commented that a return envelope was not provided which will inhibit the capacity of some people to provide feedback.</p>	N/A	<p>The Applicant is committed to open communications lines throughout the entire pre-application stage. Through these channels you the Applicant kept communications lines open to the public to ask questions, request information (including in alternative formats) and provide feedback. A freepost service free of charge for returning feedback or feedback forms was provided by the Applicant to ensure no costs were placed on the public.</p>
FFCAWB0203005 OF_CAWB02_272 FFCAWB0202003	<p>Public information events</p> <p>Respondent felt that there should be more consultation times when more residents are available.</p> <p>Respondents commented that information events should be made accessible to disabled people or further information provided for</p>	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes this response.</p> <p>Community consultation has been undertaken in compliance with Section 47 of the 2008 Planning Act, as evidenced in the Consultation Report [EN010132/APP/WB5.1].</p> <p>This included consulting relevant local planning authorities on a draft of the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	those which were unable to attend due to disability.		<p>Applicant's Statement of Community Consultation to inform the how consultation was undertaken.</p> <p>The Applicant provided materials on the West Burton Solar Project at information events, as well as local Community Access Points to ensure materials were accessible to the public. Free-to-use Scheme communications channels were hosted to allow members of the community to submit questions and comments directly to the Applicant's project team.</p>
FFCAWB0202034 FFCAWB0202013 FFCAWB0201024 OF_CAWB02_004	<p>Support</p> <p>Respondent commented that they support the proposals.</p>	N/A	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_112 OF_CAWB02_145 OF_CAWB02_063 OF_CAWB02_145 OF_CAWB02_070 OF_CAWB02_071 OF_CAWB02_091 OF_CAWB02_237 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206056 OF_CAWB02_272 OF_CAWB02_273	<p>PEIR Status</p> <p>Incomplete assessments. No glint and glare and noise undertaken so far. Residents visual impact not yet undertaken</p> <p>No loss of amenity of view undertaken in public spaces nor residential and businesses.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this comment but remains confident in the level of consultation undertaken and information presented throughout the pre-application stage, as described in the Consultation Report [EN010132/APP/WB5.1].</p> <p>For example, as part of the six-week phase two consultation on the Scheme, the Applicant presented consultees with as detailed information as possible by publishing a PEIR. A non-technical summary was published to accompany the PEIR, with public information events and free-to-use communications channels open to help aid accessibility and understanding of the Scheme.</p> <p>Assessments have been updated and are presented in the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>FFCAWB0203022 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206058 FFCAWB0206056 OF_CAWB02_270 OF_CAWB02_273</p>	<p>Technology</p> <p>Respondents expressed scepticism regarding the efficiency of solar PV as a technology.</p> <p>It was commented that solar panels will only provide 27% of energy, and that this proportion does not warrant the destruction of the countryside.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>In addition to the information shared through consultation materials at the pre-application stage, a Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, explaining the reasons for the Scheme being large scale solar generation, and setting out the context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p> <p>Regarding efficiency, the Applicant notes that single-axis tracking technology may be used as part of the Scheme. The axis will be oriented North-South, with modules rotating East-West tracking with backtracking strategy for tracking arrays: when the mutual shadings begin, the tracking angle does not follow the sun anymore, but it instead goes back (decreases) so that no shading occurs.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Generally, a solar panel system with a single-axis solar tracker installed sees a performance gain of anywhere between 10 to 30 percent compared to a fixed mounting system.</p> <p>Early signs from other Solar Farms suggests panels are lasting longer than original expected lifespan of 25 years, therefore it is expected that the majority of panels will remain efficient for at least 40 years.</p>
FFCAWB0206061	Although opposed to this development due to its sheer scale and the aforementioned points, I found the Saxilby information evening useful, with the Applicant's team able to address my particular objections and willing to amend the proposal to overcome these concerns.	N/A	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
FFCAWB0206056 OF_CAWB02_123 OF_CAWB02_170 OF_CAWB02_212 OF_CAWB02_294 OM_CAWB02_018 OM_CAWB02_019 OM_CAWB02_020 FFCAWB0203039 FFCAWB0206060 FFCAWB0206058	<p>Opposition to West Burton 4</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that mitigation measures would not be able to compensate for the adverse effects caused by the installations on the West Burton 4 site.</p> <p>Respondents commented that the conservation villages of Clayworth and Gringley and surrounding countryside will be negatively impacted by the Scheme.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
OF_CAWB02_162	<p>Respondents are concerned that WB4 is a trojan horse for future developments.</p>	Yes	<p>The limits of the DCO would not allow for any further works beyond the Scheme as described and presented in the Applicant's application.</p> <p>Any future development would be subject to its own separate planning application and consultation process.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OM_CAWB02_009	WB1 dwarfs the Village of Broxholme. Using LVIA assessment criteria this is not acceptable and is bad practice.	Yes	<p>The Applicant has undertaken an extensive process of site selection to identify suitable areas of land for the proposals.</p> <p>The LVIA provides comments on alternative technologies and design alternatives within Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p>
OF_CAWB02_026 OF_CAWB02_029 OF_CAWB02_043 OF_CAWB02_045 OF_CAWB02_051 OF_CAWB02_091 OF_CAWB02_105 OF_CAWB02_110 OF_CAWB02_120 OF_CAWB02_123 OF_CAWB02_156	<p>Topography of West Burton 4 Site</p> <p>Respondents were concerned about the visual impact of the proposed industrial development, commenting that it would be visible from Derbyshire in accordance with the topography making the site difficult to screen. It will be particularly visible from Lincoln Edge.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_172 OF_CAWB02_173 OF_CAWB02_183 OF_CAWB02_189 OF_CAWB02_190 OF_CAWB02_192 OF_CAWB02_194 OF_CAWB02_208 OF_CAWB02_212 OF_CAWB02_224 OF_CAWB02_237 OF_CAWB02_239 OF_CAWB02_240 OF_CAWB02_241 OF_CAWB02_262 OM_CAWB02_014 OM_CAWB02_015 OM_CAWB02_016 CAWB0207017_W B			results of a range of environmental assessments.

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAWB02_029 OF_CAWB02_072 OF_CAWB02_145 OF_CAWB02_156 OF_CAWB02_212 OF_CAWB02_224 OF_CAWB02_285	<p>Flood Risk</p> <p>The present water management of the site is vital to prevent flooding in Clayworth. Development of the site will exacerbate flooding problems in Clayworth.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
FFCAWB0201034	<p>see q5 I therefore expect you to contact me in time for me to respond again within the timescale, showing there has been movement by you and my concerns are taken into account.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that all feedback submitted during this phase of consultation has been logged and considered to help further refine the Scheme prior to DCO Application.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
OF_CAUB02_217	<p>In view of the strength of local resident opinion against the West Burton 4 (81%), the Council do not feel able to support the West Burton 4 Solar project proposal.</p> <p>As a Parish Council it is our role to represent the majority view of our residents.</p> <p>From the statistics now provided by IGP on the opposition vote from Gringley on the Hill residents during the Phase One Consultation revealed that 81% of residents did not support the Proposal.</p> <p>The Parish Council are not opposed to Solar development, but firmly believe that such developments should be of an appropriate area that's meets developer's site selection criteria, should be of an appropriate size, should not reduce local agriculture capacity and that it should not pose significant detrimental effects upon wildlife and the surrounding villages/residents. The Council are concerned that West Burton 4 proposal</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>fails to meet any of these criteria.</p> <p>The Council is aware that due to land grading, the size of the site has been reduced. Despite this, the Council feel that the size of this development remains on an industrial scale and this being the case, feel that such a development would continue to be incongruous with the surrounding environment.</p> <p>The Council are now aware of previous Government Guidance, recognised by the Secretary of State, that states that 3b agricultural land is classed as 'best and most versatile' and as such it should not be used for any other purposes other than agriculture.</p> <p>We are aware that the site is predominantly 3b and would hope that in light of this Government guidance, that the developer will respect this fact and withdraw the West Burton 4 planning application.</p>		

11 Table 5.12.10: Feedback received during phase two consultation extension due to availability of updated Agricultural Land Classification data pertaining to West Burton 4

ID code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
02ALC003 02ALC008 02ALC009 02ALC013 02ALC018 02ALC020 02ALC022 02ALC024 02ALC040 02ALC041 02ALC052 02ALC053 02ALC056 02ALC058 02ALC060 02ALC061 02ALC062 02ALC063 02ALC064 02ALC065 02ALC067 02ALC069 02ALC071	<p>Removal of the West Burton 4 site from the Scheme</p> <p>A significant number of respondents submitted feedback during the extension feedback strongly requesting for the West Burton 4 site area to be removed from the Scheme. Respondents noted that they had previously opposed the inclusion of the site within the Scheme, and indicated that the updated soil analysis results strengthened the case for its removal.</p> <p>Respondents cited policy regarding Best and Most Versatile Land, expressed concern regarding food security, considered solar panels to be unsuitable development and technology for this grade of agricultural land, and requested</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure has been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
02ALC072 02ALC073 02ALC074 02ALC077 02ALC078 02ALC079 02ALC080 02ALC081 02ALC082 02ALC084 02ALC085 02ALC087 02ALC088 02ALC089 02ALC090 02ALC091 02ALC096 02ALC099 02ALC102 02ALC104 02ALC097 02ALC108 02ALC114 02ALC117 02ALC011 02ALC120	alternative brownfield or lower grade sites be considered as alternatives.		

ID code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
02ALC004 02ALC002 02ALC007 02ALC006 02ALC014 02ALC019 02ALC101 02ALC121 02ALC010 02ALC012 02ALC015 02ALC016 02ALC017 02ALC110 02ALC111 02ALC042 02ALC044 02ALC045 02ALC021 02ALC023 FFALC006 FFALC002 FFALC003 FFALC009 FFALC011 FFALC008			

ID code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
FFALC015 FFALC014 02ALC048 FFALC001 02ALC025 02ALC026 02ALC027 02ALC028 02ALC029 02ALC031 02ALC032 02ALC034 02ALC035 02ALC036 02ALC037 02ALC038 02ALC043 02ALC047 02ALC055 FFALC010 02ALC075 02ALC076 02ALC086 02ALC092 02ALC094 02ALC095			

ID code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
02ALC098 02ALC107 02ALC109 02ALC112 02ALC115 02ALC116 02ALC118 02ALC119 02ALC030 02ALC033 02ALC039 02ALC049 02ALC050 02ALC051 02ALC059 02ALC066 02ALC093 FFALC013 02ALC100 02ALC103 FFALC005 FFALC007 FFALC012 02ALC057 02ALC083 02ALC113			

ID code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
FFALC004			
02ALC001 02ALC033 02ALC039 02ALC046 02ALC054 02ALC059 FFALC006 FFALC015	<p>Timing of information release and confidence in data</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the timing of publication of the PEIR addendum, with this being towards the scheduled end of the phase two consultation period.</p> <p>While commenting on West burton 4, respondents queried whether ALC results for other site areas had also been updated.</p> <p>Respondents also expressed lower confidence in other data presented in the PEIR, given the release of this updated information and queried whether other addendum, such as on geophysical data, would also be released.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Applicant provided and communicated an extension to the phase two consultation period to ensure a minimum of 28 days was available for communities and consultees to consider and respond to updated information reported in the PEIR addendum.</p> <p>When extending the phase two consultation, the Applicant confirmed that the results of further soil sampling had become available across the Scheme, and that these results were consistent with the information already presented in the PEIR, apart from for West Burton 4.</p> <p>In accordance with paragraph 3.2.92 of the PEIR, the Applicant published an addendum to the PEIR including updated ALC results as they materially changed the figures reported for West Burton 4.</p> <p>Information presented in the PEIR has been further developed and is now presented in the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2].</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Some respondents claimed that the addendum indicated that phase two consultation had been held prematurely.		
02ALC033	<p>Decommissioning</p> <p>Respondent expressed concern that the Scheme should not be considered temporary as they did not consider it likely for Scheme to be decommissioned properly, and that land would not be able to be able to return to agricultural use.</p>	Yes	<p>The operational life of the Scheme is anticipated to be 40 years. Once the Scheme ceases to operate, the development will be decommissioned. A 40-year period for the operational phase of the development has been assessed in the EIA and reported in the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2] which accompanies the DCO application. However, as is typical for energy generation NSIPs, the DCO Application does not seek a temporary or time limited consent.</p> <p>At decommissioning, the 400kV and 132kV cables may be left in situ, depending on which method is likely to have the least environmental impact at the time, but are likely to be removed. It is considered generally desirable to remove the cables where possible, for both recycling purposes and to leave the land as close to its previous use state as possible. The cables would be removed by pulling the cables out from the ducts without the subsequent removal of the ducts themselves, thereby minimising surface disturbances.</p> <p>An Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.2] is provided as part of the DCO application.</p>

12 Table 5.12.11: Section 47 feedback received from notable organisations.

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>Notts Area Ramblers Right of Way</p>	<p>The respondent provided detailed feedback regarding existing rights of way within and in the vicinity of the West Burton 4 site area. Comments included feedback on planned and potential upgrades to paths, and concerns regarding proposed fencing and potential impacts to user experience.</p> <p>Comments considered potential temporary and permanent impacts to paths and flooding.</p> <p>The respondent also noted existing biodiversity within the West Burton 4 site area.</p> <p>The respondent also noted potential opportunities offered by a solar development, including additional</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure has been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	paths, wildlife corridors, and the provision of information boards.		
The British Horse Society	<p>DEFRA has recorded 5,599 horses in the immediate DN10, DN22, LN1 and DN21 postcode areas (2021), making a total of £31,063,252 contribution to the economy. There are livery yards in the area creating employment and using equine services (vet, farrier, feed, instructors, etc) as well as growing interest in equestrian tourism ('take your horse on holiday').</p> <p>New development plans present threats and opportunities for vulnerable road users: equestrians, cyclists, pedestrians, wheelchair users and mobility scooter users. The bridleway and byway network in this area is fragmented (with more provision in the Nottinghamshire side than the Lincolnshire side), therefore</p>	Yes	<p>Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14] details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction.</p> <p>The Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2] also considers road users safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the development.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that mitigation measures are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.1], the Construction Traffic Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.2 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2] and the Public Rights of Way Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.3 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the</p>

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>leaving limited access for equestrians unless they ride/lead/drive on the main roads to reach the safety of off-road provision.</p> <p>The construction period for a development of this scale is considerable. HGV return journeys at the height of the construction period will impact on the volume of traffic on the road network locally. Already mainly 60mph roads with some sections of 30mph and 50mph, the additional traffic and the added complication of vehicles regularly turning into the access road will make the road higher risk for vulnerable road users in the absence of speed restrictions or other traffic calming measures. Movement of the construction traffic, particularly if outside of 'rush hour' as suggested,</p>		<p>Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.3].</p>

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>may well coincide with times that equestrians are active on the roads to reach the off-road routes. Any abnormal loads which may be transported should be notified in advance to allow equestrians to choose to avoid the area on that day.</p> <p>HGVs are generally 2.5m wide and 4.5m high (some vehicles for component transportation significantly larger) which, on the road network local to the site, would sandwich a horse and rider between the vehicle and the hedgerow or ditch along the route with little room for refuge which may cause panic. Appropriate information for development workers and signage giving priority to users of the PRow would be welcome and there should be additional signage during construction to warn traffic of</p>		

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>equestrians and other vulnerable road users in the area, and ensure they are considerate in terms of vehicles stopping if necessary and allowing PRow users to pass safely.</p>		
<p>The British Horse Society</p>	<p>The position of the inverters should ensure they are installed away from the highway. Sudden noise and continuous levels of noise can be a hazard for equestrians as horses are flight animals, therefore the further these elements can be located from the highway, the better it will be for safety.</p> <p>The site layout mentions the road network but not the off-road network. The landscaping states impact on Public Rights of Way will be limited but this should be an opportunity to improve and extend paths for all</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Scheme complies with the landscape-related criteria of paragraph 98 of the NPPF in that consideration is given to the enhancement of the network of open spaces, footpaths, and bridleways.</p> <p>The Scheme avoids impacts on the rights of way network and where users of these routes are close to the Site, mitigation measures would look to provide effective screening and softening of views where effects are predicted.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment looks to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the public footpath, permissive footpath and green lane network, which is aimed to benefit the community as a whole. The</p>

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>vulnerable road users. Access to permissive routes using existing footpaths or tracks for the life of the project could be a contribution to the community and provide off-road access for all vulnerable road users. The dimensions usually applied to buffer permissive and public rights of way would provide ample space for shared use.</p>		<p>landscape mitigation measures will seek to provide new planting which will include new native hedgerows and tree cover, and this will also include their management and maintenance.</p>
<p>The British Horse Society</p>	<p>The community benefit mentions walking and cycling networks at the exclusion of equestrians. According to BETA two-thirds of equestrians are women and Church et al (2010) found 37% of women who are horse riders are over 45 years of age and over a third would pursue no other physical activity. Developers should be looking at how to include this group, not how to exclude them.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Equestrian PRoW users have been included in the assessment of impacts on PRoWs in Section 18.7, and in the assessment of impacts on road users in Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.14].</p> <p>A permissive path has been provided as part of the Scheme to increase connectivity in tandem with ecological mitigation strategies.</p>

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>Also, the two permissive footpaths in the consultation leaflet make for a very limited offer considering the size and scale of the development.</p>		<p>The Scheme complies with the landscape-related criteria of paragraph 98 of the NPPF in that consideration is given to the enhancement of the network of open spaces, footpaths, and bridleways.</p> <p>In addition to the new permissive path included within the Scheme, the Applicant has explored alternative permissive path routes but these proved to be incompatible with existing farming activities, or required land beyond the Applicant's control. The permissive path from the track off Sykes Lane will contribute to the wider network of footpaths in the area and facilitate greater public access to the countryside.</p> <p>In addition to on-site connectivity and biodiversity benefits, the Applicant continues to engage with Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire Community Foundations to explore how best to provide funding for meaningful opportunities to local communities.</p>

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>Destination Lincolnshire</p>	<p>Having reviewed the information about the Solar Farm Development, we fully support the calls of West Lindsey District Council, our visitor economy business partners, and other operators working in tourism, leisure, retail and hospitality to reject this project from happening in this area of Lincolnshire.</p> <p>The project will have a direct, long term negative impact on the visitor economy.</p> <p>Overall, Lincoln SMEs working in retail, tourism, hospitality and leisure have had to survive against a backdrop that saw over £100m wiped off their revenue. [Date provided by respondent].</p> <p>Economists have predicted that it will take up to 2025/26 for businesses in this sector to recovery to pre-covid</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Impacts on tourism and recreation at a local and regional level have been assessed in Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.18]. This takes into account the level of significance of attractions in Section 18.7, and accounting for the cumulative impacts from solar NSIP development in the area in Section 18.10.</p> <p>A full policy review has been undertaken in the Planning Statement [EN010132/APP/WB7.5] which sets out the full planning case of the Scheme and identifies how the Scheme responds to local, county, and national policy regarding tourism and recreation strategies.</p>

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>level. All activity that risks this recovery needs to be mitigated.</p> <p>Continuing with this project, knowing the long-term impact that it will have on Lincolnshire as a destination, is totally counterintuitive to the Government's 'Levelling Up' agenda, as it hinders a key sector and businesses working in it.</p>		

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>Brendan Clarke-Smith MP</p>	<p>Concerns regarding use of agricultural land. You claim that the soil quality is grade 3b but high-yield crops such as potatoes, which typically grow in good quality soil, have been grown on the site. Bassetlaw district council is carrying out its own analysis on the quality of the soil as there is a lot of scepticism about the soil quality analysis. Following our exit from the EU and the evolving geopolitical situation in Ukraine, I would like to stress that the UK currently produces 60 percent of all the food we need and 74 percent of food which we can grow or rear in the UK for all or part of the year.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and appreciates the importance of agricultural land.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resources & Farming Circumstances)</p>

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			<p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.3.19.1].</p> <p>The majority of the Scheme is located on lower quality agricultural land with only 26.24% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality. Agricultural land may also be retained during the operational phase, such as pasture grazed by sheep, for example.</p>

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>At 6,000 acres, WB solar project will be more than twice the size of the UK's current largest solar farm. As this site abuts two conservation villages, in my view the potential damage to the environment from the scale of the project outweighs the potential renewable energy gain. Planning decisions such as this should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure has been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>Brendan Clarke-Smith MP</p>	<p>A consultation of six weeks is not adequate for a development of this scale and the consultation period should be extended to allow for greater engagement with residents surrounding the project.</p> <p>Consultations planned for Gringley on the Hill and Clayworth are too short and are not held on multiple days. This restricts community input as those with other commitments cannot attend. Residents have repeatedly informed me that their questions have been ignored or not adequately answered in the first round of consultation.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this comment but remains confident in the level of consultation undertaken and information presented throughout the pre-application stage, as described in the Consultation Report [EN010132/APP/WB5.1].</p> <p>The Applicant held two rounds of community consultation during which a significant volume of feedback was received.</p> <p>The Applicant consulted with relevant local planning authorities on their approach to undertaking their phase two consultation through their draft Statement of Community Consultation. The feedback received and how this was considered by the Applicant is described in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report [EN010132/APP/WB5.1].</p>

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Brendan Clarke-Smith MP	As Bassetlaw has been badly hit by flooding in the past, my constituents would add to the revised draft a requirement to make any development safe without increasing flood risks elsewhere, as part of this development is inside a Zone 2 Flood risk.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure has been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p>
7000 Acres Action Group	Many miles of cable trenching across the countryside, connecting the various sites together and to the Grid connection at the two former power stations 12 miles away and across the river Trent. This would cause unnecessary damage to more farmland and wildlife habitats. There would be masses of heavy construction traffic on country lanes for 2 years, because many of the sites	Yes	<p>Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] has been prepared in accordance with the EIA Regulations and builds on the preliminary information set out in the PEIR.</p> <p>NPS EN-1 states: "Applicants are obliged to include in their Environmental Statement, as a matter of fact, information about the main alternatives they have studied. This should include an indication of the main reasons for the Applicant's choice, taking into account</p>

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>are nowhere near decent road links. This is a serious safety concern.</p>		<p>the environmental, social and economic effects and including, where relevant, technical and commercial feasibility."</p> <p>This Chapter, supported by Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1] undertakes this exercise in accordance with the above requirements.</p> <p>Effects from construction vehicle movements on road safety for vehicular and non-vehicular traffic have been assessed in ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [EN010132/APP/ WB6.2.14] and where required, mitigation measures are set out to ensure human health risks are mitigated.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8] set outs the ways in which the Applicant has considered the potential visual and landscape impacts to local residents and visitors, potential effects</p>

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			<p>associated with the panels and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the impacts and effects on the fabric of the landscape are taken into account as well as the views and visibility.</p> <p>Additional secondary mitigation has also been designed into the Scheme, consisting of new planting proposals, details of which can be found on Figures 8.18.1-8.18.3 [EN010132/APP/WB6.4.8.18.1 – WB6.4.8.18.3] and is further described within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010132/APP/WB7.3]</p>

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
7000 Acres	Impact on rural homes due to ill-considered land grabs, with 4.5-metre-high solar panels, vast battery storage containers, transformers and associated equipment including CCTV, being sited close to homes.	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and acknowledges this as a concern for neighbouring residents.</p> <p>Throughout the pre-application stage the Applicant has sought to assess potential effects to neighbouring properties and consult with local residents. The results of these assessments, along with proposed mitigations, are presented in the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2].</p> <p>The Applicant is confident that there is no empirical evidence to suggest that solar farms adversely affect nearby property values.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the LVIA provides comments on alternative technologies and design alternatives within Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p>
7000 Acres	People made the choice to live in or be surrounded by the countryside. If your proposals go ahead, then the mental health issues would be	Yes	Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.18] considers environmental effects arising as a result of the Scheme, in relation to

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>enormous for many. Their lives being impacted by 2 years of construction on a 5000-acre building site, a total landscape change and the oppression of the 15-foot-high solar power plant looming over everywhere you look. This would be truly depressing.</p>		<p>topics including population health, tourism and accessibility and desirability of recreational facilities.</p> <p>Visual amenity is assessed and considered in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, as described in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], looks to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the public footpath, permissive footpath and green lane network, which is aimed to benefit the community as a whole as well as tourists, visiting walkers, local residents, ornithologists and cyclists. The landscape mitigation measures will seek to provide new planting which will include new native hedgerows and tree cover, and this will also include their management and maintenance.</p>

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
7000 Acres	<p>The development fails the 2008 planning act. For example. The solar panels are sited close to property and it would take 15 years until they are screened. This is not mitigation! The proposal would be half way through its life before it has anything to help conceal its immense industrial impact on the countryside. The sheer scale of the development shows the Applicant has not taken account of aesthetics, as the solar farm will have a devastating effect on the local scenery, habitat and quality of life of the residents.</p>	Yes	<p>The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and the report at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8].</p> <p>The LVIA picks up the delivery of landscape mitigation to address biodiversity net gain through the enhancement of existing habitats and green infrastructure proposals. The landscape measures also include the preparation of a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives. The Applicant and its LVIA consultants at Lanpro have worked closely with the ecology consultant throughout the application process to inform the LVIA and associated mitigation plans. The mitigation</p>

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			<p>proposals allow for flexibility, but they can also be fixed, where appropriate and applicable.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, such as presented in Section 8.6 and Table 8.22 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.8], takes embedded mitigation into account to include the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Panels to be set a minimum of 3m from Site boundaries. - Panels to be set minimum of 20m from major watercourses and minimum of 8m from minor watercourses. - Panels to be set 50m (min) from boundary curtilage to outer edge of solar panel. - Site boundary fencing to be set back 5m from adjacent existing hedgerows to allow for proposed thickening and growth. - Let existing hedges grow out and managed at 5m. Encourage hedgerow trees to grow out within existing

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			<p>hedges to add further thickening and growth within the field boundaries.</p> <p>Additional secondary mitigation has also been designed into the Scheme, consisting of new planting proposals, details of which can be found on Figures 8.18.1-8.18.3 [EN010132/APP/WB6.4.8.18.1 – WB6.4.8.18.3] and is further described within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010132/APP/WB7.3]</p>
<p>7000 Acres</p>	<p>You have failed to provide the reasons why 40 years is required (this time span is not temporary) for the development or your anticipated power generation during the Winter months.</p> <p>When questioned you hide behind the “Rochdale Envelope” and state that the final details would be decided at a later date.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>In addition to the information shared through consultation materials at the pre-application stage, a Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application, explaining the reasons for the Scheme being large scale solar generation, and setting out the context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p> <p>The operational life of the Scheme is anticipated to be 40 years. Once the Scheme ceases to operate, the development will be decommissioned. A 40-year</p>

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			<p>period for the operational phase of the development has been assessed in the EIA and reported in the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2] which accompanies the DCO application. However, as is typical for energy generation NSIPs, the DCO Application does not seek a temporary or time limited consent.</p>
<p>7000 Acres</p>	<p>None of the proposed contractors have conducted community consultation in good faith. Your leaflets posted to houses and displays at the public consultation do not mention many of the pertinent facts, such as the height of the solar panels.</p> <p>Local residents would have to interrogate the documentation to find that the solar panels are planned to be up to 4.5m high, considerably taller than current local solar farms.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this comment but remains confident in the level of consultation undertaken and information presented throughout the pre-application stage, as described in the Consultation Report [EN010132/APP/WB5.1].</p> <p>For example, as part of the six-week phase two consultation on the Scheme, the Applicant presented consultees with as detailed information as possible by publishing a PEIR. A non-technical summary was published to accompany the PEIR, with public information events and free-to-use communications channels open to help aid accessibility and understanding of the Scheme.</p>

Respondent	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>Providing the documentation in a digital format does not make it easy to interrogate and then to charge £500 for a printed version is NOT inclusive consultation.</p>		

13 Table 5.12.12: Section 47 feedback to targeted consultation on updated proposals for the West Burton 3 site area.

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
03WB006_E	I am struggling to gauge how the proposed solar panels will affect us personally from the maps I've seen and I wonder if you'd be able to help please. [REDACTED]	N/A	The Applicant notes that an email response to the question was provided to this enquiry on 05/12/2022.
03WB007_E	It was asked at the various consultation meetings if the outlined panels could be removed and relocated in an area so that the village (Brampton) was not surrounded by solar panels!	Yes	The Applicant has followed a step-by-step site selection process which confirms the location of the West Burton 3 site is suitable for solar panels. This has included the avoidance of sensitive landscape and environmental designations in confirming site suitability and consideration of alternative sites. Details of the process are set out in Appendix 5.1: Site Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			<p>Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>The LVIA (Section 8.6 and Table 8.22) takes embedded mitigation into account to include the following measures:</p> <p>Panels to be set a minimum of 3m from Site boundaries.</p> <p>Panels to be set 50m (min) from boundary curtilage to outer edge of solar panel.</p> <p>Site boundary fencing to be set back 5m from adjacent existing hedgerows to allow for proposed thickening and growth.</p> <p>Let existing hedges grow out and managed at 5m. Encourage hedgerow trees to grow out within existing hedges to add further thickening and growth within</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			<p>the field boundaries.</p> <p>Additional secondary mitigation has also been designed into the Scheme, consisting of new planting proposals, details of which can be found on Figures 8.18.1-8.18.3 [EN010132/APP/WB6.4.8.18.1 – WB6.4.8.18.3] and is further described within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010132/APP/WB7.3]</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact assessment considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the impacts and effects on the fabric of the landscape are taken into account as well as the views and visibility from nearby villages. The assessment includes a suite of viewpoints, across the West Burton 3 site area at various ranges, that cover a wide range of visual receptors, including public locations such as transport routes, local villages, PRow and residential properties. There is no further change to this suite of</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			<p>viewpoints since they have been discussed and agreed with the competent authority.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application. In reviewing the policies and information available regarding solar generation and the need to decarbonise, it is the Applicant's view that large-scale solar must be considered as additional to, as opposed to instead of, smaller scale solar, and this includes the development of rooftop solar.</p>
03WB010_E	<p>7000 acres of solar arrays, batteries and electrical transformers all planned for West Lindsey and all within 7 miles of each other, making this the most solar farm dense region in Europe. This is not levelling up the nation?</p> <p>The magnitude would cause total landscape domination in many areas.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and appreciates the importance of agricultural land.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites, as presented in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19]. The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land from the Scheme.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>The loss of 7000 acres of farmland at a time when food security is a real issue both nationally and globally. This precious commodity should not be used for these land hungry, inefficient solar projects that would provide little net gain in the UK's energy capacity.</p> <p>Many miles of cable trenching across the countryside, connecting the various sites together and to the Grid connection at the two former power stations sited 12 miles away and across the river Trent. This would cause unnecessary damage to more farmland and wildlife habitats. There would be masses of heavy construction traffic on country lanes and through villages for 2 years, because many of the sites are</p>		<p>The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality. Agricultural land will be retained during the operational phase, e.g. pasture grazed by sheep.</p> <p>The LVIA (Section 8.6 and Table 8.22) takes embedded mitigation into account to include the following measures:</p> <p>Panels to be set a minimum of 3m from Site boundaries.</p> <p>Panels to be set 50m (min) from boundary curtilage to outer edge of solar panel.</p> <p>Site boundary fencing to be set back 5m from adjacent existing hedgerows to allow for proposed thickening and growth.</p> <p>Let existing hedges grow out and managed at 5m. Encourage hedgerow trees to grow out within existing hedges to add further thickening and growth within the field boundaries.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>nowhere near decent road links. This is a serious safety concern.</p> <p>Impact on rural homes due to ill-considered land grabs, with 4.5-metre-high solar panels, vast battery storage containers and associated equipment including CCTV, being sited close to homes. Changing people's rural lifestyle to one with an industrial outlook.</p> <p>We made the choice to live in or be surrounded by the countryside.</p> <p>If these proposals go ahead then the psychological issues would be enormous for many. Their lives being impacted by 2 years of construction on a 7000-acre building site, a total landscape change and the oppression</p>		<p>The Applicant is cognisant of other projects being proposed in the area and has undertaken assessments to consider the potential cumulative effect of this. Cumulative impacts of the Scheme have been addressed as a whole within the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.1 - WB6.2.21]. Each topic chapter considers the impacts of Scheme; and the impact of the Scheme in conjunction with other large scale solar proposals and other committed developments within the County.</p> <p>Additional secondary mitigation has also been designed into the Scheme, consisting of new planting proposals, details of which can be found on Figures 8.18.1-8.18.3 [EN010132/APP/WB6.4.8.18.1 - WB6.4.8.18.3] and is further described within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010132/APP/WB7.3]</p> <p>The Applicant further details that construction traffic</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>of the 15-foot-high solar power plant looming over everywhere you look.</p>		<p>will be managed through a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.14.2]</p> <p>The aim of the CTMP is to minimise the effects of construction traffic on the local highway network.</p> <p>A road condition survey will be undertaken with a commitment to rectify any damage caused by construction vehicles.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units. All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			<p>local area given the large size of the Scheme. The BNG assessment report also sets out how these calculations are based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010132/APP/WB7.3] which will be legally secured under a requirement of the DCO and so ensure that objectives are met and increase the reliability of these projections.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application. In reviewing the policies and information available regarding solar generation and the need to decarbonise, it is the Applicant's view that large-scale solar must be considered as additional to, as opposed to instead of, smaller scale solar, and this includes the development of rooftop solar.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, includes a search for suitable brownfield land and consideration of rooftop solar opportunities, and is presented in the Site Selection Assessment</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			<p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact assessment considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the impacts and effects on the fabric of the landscape are taken into account as well as the views and visibility. The assessment includes a suite of viewpoints that cover a wide range of visual receptors, including public locations such as transport routes, PRow and residential properties. There is no further change to this suite of viewpoints since they have been discussed and agreed with the competent authority.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
03WB012_E	I'm 100% in favour of your proposals. Good luck in getting through the interminable planning process!	N/A	Noted.
03WB016_E	Please can you confirm the type and electrical capacity of the proposed energy storage facility and advise what provision has been made for fire and explosion protection including access for fire and rescue vehicles. Please can you provide details of the type and electrical capacity of the revised transformer, and confirm what provision has been made for fire and explosion protection.	N/A	<p>Chapter 21 (Other Environmental Matters) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.21] assesses the impacts of the Scheme upon human health and also considers major accidents and disasters.</p> <p>The outline battery storage safety management plan [EN010132/APP/WB7.9] sets out fire fighting and safety measures in the event of a fire or explosion.</p> <p>This has been informed through consultation with the local Fire and Rescue authority.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to continued engagement with the local fire services throughout the design and construction phases of the Scheme, to ensure a</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			<p>robust emergency plan and material is available in an emergency.</p> <p>The Applicant is cognisant of Dame Marie Miller's <i>Lithium-Ion Battery Storage (Fire Safety and Environmental Permits) Bill</i>, due for its second reading in March 2023 and will ensure a robust Emergency Response Plan is in place with consideration of credible plant failure scenarios.</p> <p>The Scheme has been informed by the following considerations regarding fire safety.</p> <p>Mitigating the risk of fire or emergency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BESS will be designed, selected, and installed in accordance with international guidance, good practice, and related standards. • Equipment will, where possible, be selected to be fire limiting, such as selection of transformer oils with low flammability and the fire resistance of the BESS containers.

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the case of the BESS, it will be designed with multiple layers of protection to minimise the chances of a fire or thermal runaway. • The BESS will also include integrated fire detection with automated suppression systems. • All equipment will be monitored, maintained, and operated in accordance with manufacturer instructions. This includes 24 hour monitoring of the system via a dedicated control room. • Risk assessments will be carried out for the entire system and elements across the project lifecycle. <p>Designing for the unlikely event of a fire occurring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to the site will be made possible for the fire service, in the event of any emergency. • As agreed with the Lincolnshire Fire Service, water will be required to be stored on site in close proximity to the energy storage systems. This water will be stored in either above ground tanks or open water bodies so that they can be

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			<p>accessed by the fire service in the unlikely event of a fire.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The substation and energy storage infrastructure is situated away from properties and public rights of way, to reduce the risk caused by fire should it occur.

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
03WB018_E	<p>Can you please confirm where the access is going to be west of the railway as there is no access over the railway to this block.</p> <p>We have been told at two public meetings there will be no site access off Cowdale lane if you could please confirm this that would be appreciated</p>	N/A	The Applicant notes that an email response to the question was provided to this enquiry on 27/01/2023.

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
03WB019_E	<p>As the action group representing the devastating solar take over covering 10,000 acres of farmland in West Lindsey, we write to in response by angered residents about your latest inadequate consultation of changes on the West Burton Solar Project.</p> <p>West Burton Solar Project was originally over 4 main sites, you have now decided to withdraw WB4 in Nottinghamshire from the project. This does not entitle you to dump the BESS and 400kv infrastructure that was originally to be sited close to West Burton power station (Nottinghamshire) into Lincolnshire without thorough consultation.</p> <p>Thorough consultation consists of making transparent information</p>	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes that an email response to the question was provided to this enquiry on 20/12/2022.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p> <p>The Applicant remains confident in the level of consultation undertaken and information presented throughout the pre-application stage, as described in the Consultation Report [EN010132/APP/WB5.1].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>visible to all concerned/affected by the West Burton proposal, not just close neighbours of the WB3 site where you now intend installing this appalling apparatus.</p> <p>West Burton Solar Project consists of three sites, they are not individual projects.</p> <p>We will be informing our MP and legal professionals of this major change, its impact on Lincolnshire and your bad procedure.</p> <p>We look forward to proper consultation and a sincere response.</p>		

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
03WB0001_L	<p>Under the circumstances I find there is little point me responding specifically to your updated proposals for West Burton 3 since you appear to have taken no notice of my original comments regarding extension of the Ash Holt Copse in a northerly direction. This would have provided some screening to mine and other properties located on the East side of Brampton which are directly impacted by the proposals.</p> <p>My overriding concern however remains that it is incongruous to be considering this proposal in isolation since it represents but a fraction of the four solar farm Schemes covering circa 10,000 acres. Such wholesale development would devastate North Lincolnshire and cause irreparable</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and appreciates the importance of agricultural land.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land and consideration of rooftop solar opportunities, is presented within the Site Selection Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resources & Farming Circumstances) [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.19.1].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>damage to the local population. I like the majority of residents in the area, object most strongly to all these proposals. A fact that was indeed recognised in your September 2022 circular,</p> <p>Acre for acre these solar farms will cause greater damage to our small green and pleasant land than will the devastation being caused by the deforestation of the Amazon rainforests.</p> <p>Four simple truths,</p> <p>At a time when there is a worldwide food shortage, to destroy 10,000 acres of agricultural land borders on insanity. It will place greater reliance on imports of food and quite</p>		<p>The vast majority of the Scheme is located on lower quality agricultural land with only 26.24% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land). See Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] which sets out the design evolution of the Scheme. This includes justification for removal of certain fields from the Scheme and retention of other limited areas of BMV. The Scheme will be decommissioned with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality. In addition, some agricultural land may be retained during the operational phase, such as with pasture grazed by sheep, for example.</p> <p>The LVIA (Section 8.6 and Table 8.22) takes embedded mitigation into account to include the following measures: - Panels to be set a minimum of 3m from Site</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>naturally make the country less self-sufficient.</p> <p>The destruction of such a vast area, which equates to double the area destroyed on Saddleworth moors by fire in 2018, when at the time this was considered a natural disaster. Solar energy farming on this scale will cause significant damage to the mental health and wellbeing of the local population. Hitherto the green belt was always considered sacrosanct with development rejected, other than associated with farming, to protect our countryside. Should all these proposals proceed they will produce a 10,000-acre industrial park!</p> <p>Such development will totally destroy</p>		<p>boundaries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Panels to be set 50m (min) from boundary curtilage to outer edge of solar panel. - Site boundary fencing to be set back 5m from adjacent existing hedgerows to allow for proposed thickening and growth. - Let existing hedges grow out and managed at 5m. Encourage hedgerow trees to grow out within existing hedges to add further thickening and growth within the field boundaries. <p>Additional secondary mitigation has also been designed into the Scheme, consisting of new planting proposals, details of which can be found on Figures 8.18.1-8.18.3 [EN010132/APP/WB6.4.8.18.1 – WB6.4.8.18.3] and is further described within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010132/APP/WB7.3]</p> <p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>wildlife in the area, one of the great joys of living in the country. It will take away mammals' natural habitats, food sources and nesting, and will greatly affect migrating birdlife. In addition, overall, there will be a reduction in carbon capture associated with the loss of 10,000 acres of agricultural land only to be replaced by a totally inefficient energy source.</p> <p>Solar energy in this latitude can only be considered at best a second-tier power source owing to the climate and seasonal changes. In winter when demand is high, power generation will be extremely limited with short days and poor weather. In summer when demand is lower there is currently only limited effective power storage</p>		<p>[EN010132/APP/WB6.3.9.12] provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of 86.80%, with a 54.71% gain of Hedgerow Units and a 33.25% net gain in River Units. All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme. The BNG assessment report also sets out how these calculations are based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010132/APP/WB7.3] which will be legally secured under a requirement of the DCO and so ensure that objectives are met and increase the reliability of these projections.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact assessment considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the impacts and effects on the fabric of the landscape are taken into account as well as the views</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>available to harvest excess energy. The storage of significant amounts of power is still currently unacheivable.</p> <p>Despite all your consultations, glossy publications and pretence of riding on the back of zero emission reduction, it is apparent to me that this is purely a money-making venture. Accordingly, in the light of the foregoing I will wholeheartedly support any petition or action taken to object and prevent any of these Schemes becoming a reality.</p>		<p>and visibility. The assessment includes a suite of viewpoints that cover a wide range of visual receptors, including public locations such as transport routes, PRoW and residential properties. There is no further change to this suite of viewpoints since they have been discussed and agreed with the competent authority.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010132/APP/WB7.11] has been submitted as part of the application. In reviewing the policies and information available regarding solar generation and the need to decarbonise, it is the Applicant's view that large-scale solar must be considered as additional to, as opposed to instead of, smaller scale solar, and this includes the development of rooftop solar.</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, includes a search for suitable brownfield land and consideration of rooftop solar opportunities, and is presented in the Site Selection Assessment [EN010132/APP/WB6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			<p>and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Regarding efficiency, the Applicant notes that single-axis tracking technology may be used as part of the Scheme. The axis will be oriented North-South, with modules rotating East-West tracking with backtracking strategy for tracking arrays: when the mutual shadings begin, the tracking angle does not follow the sun anymore, but it instead goes back (decreases) so that no shading occurs. Generally, a solar panel system with a single-axis solar tracker installed sees a performance gain of anywhere between 10 to 30 percent compared to a fixed mounting system.</p>
03WB001	We have serious concerns that the noise from this project will affect our wellbeing as it is sited too close to a residential area.	Yes	The Applicant notes that worst-case noise and vibration activities associated with the proposed cabling have been assessed at the closest distances to nearby sensitive receptors to provide a robust

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			assessment. Details of the noise assessment can be found in Chapter 15 (Noise) of the Environmental Statement [EN010132/APP/WB6.2.15] .
03WB002	1. You make no mention in your letter above which I received, or in a slightly different letter also of the same date to a Marton resident, that the changes you are proposing to West Burton 3 (in Lincolnshire) are because your company has withdrawn from West Burton 4 (in Nottinghamshire) for several reasons, predominantly because the land at West Burton 4 site area (covering 248 hectares, approximately 612 acres) is classified as Grade 3A Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land (BMVAL). Leaving this crucially important information out of the above letter about withdrawal from West Burton 4 to	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that West Burton 4 and the associated cabling infrastructure have been removed from the Scheme in its entirety. This decision was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Scheme, and the results of a range of environmental assessments.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that all documents are available to view via the dedicated Scheme website. Consultation Materials were also provided in Hard Copy by the Applicant to St Mary's Church, 3 Church Rd, Stow, Lincoln LN1 2DE, which were available for collection throughout the consultation period. This</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>those you wish to Consult with is not being wholly transparent. Despite this information having been published in your Phase Two Consultation Summary Report in September 2022 it should have also been included in the 25 November 2022 letters to grant the recipients of the letter to make an informed decision on your proposals. These two West Burton sites are in different Counties each with different District Councils.</p> <p>2. I question if your letter and/or September Summary Report has reached new people who have moved/are moving into the surrounding villages and the new housing developments that are now being or are occupied within, Saxilby for example? Those newly arriving,</p>		<p>was communicated to all consultees identified in the core consultation area who received a letter regarding the proposed changes to the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the relocation of substation and energy storage infrastructure from within the West Burton Substation site area to the West Burton 3 site area was communicated in point 2 of the summarised changes to the Scheme within the Information change note, related to the change to the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the changes to the Scheme will not give rise to any additional Glint and Glare concerns beyond those identified within the PEIR. No additional receptors relating to road safety, residential amenity, aviation activity or railway operations and infrastructure have been identified.</p> <p>The Applicant further notes changes proposed to the internal arrangement of infrastructure within West</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>who did not receive such information previously, surely are entitled to know about the entire Solar Project and in particular make comment on your West Burton 3 proposals and also be made aware of point 8 below.</p> <p>3. As you make no mention of the fact that withdrawing from West Burton 4 has brought about these proposed changes I believe the wording of your letter is woolly at best and conveys to the reader that the substation and energy storage infrastructure were essentially part of West Burton 3 and that the changes, in essence, relate purely to the greater height change (now 13.2m), greater capacity (132kV to 400kV) and take up a larger footprint on the land (from 0.6 to 1.8 hectares) of the West Burton 3 site</p>		<p>Burton 3, including the increase in height of the substation, does not require for any additional new landscape or visual receptors to be brought into the assessment. The Applicant notes that no changes to the conclusions of the Preliminary Environmental Impact Assessment (as set out in the PEIR) have resulted from the changes to the Scheme. The Applicant notes that the PEIR can be accessed via the Scheme website.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the consultation process was open to anyone who may be interested in, or in any way feels impacted by, the proposed changes to the West Burton 3 site area.</p> <p>The opportunity for anyone interested in the proposed changes to the Scheme, and who wished to respond to the consultation, was further publicised through our project website and by emailing all parties that have registered to be kept informed.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>than before. I feel most people, if asked, will have little idea of what a substation with busbars of 13.2 metres looks like or what it means to increase from 132kV to accommodate the 400kV infrastructure.</p> <p>4. You do not state if there will be artificial light surrounding the compound at West Burton 3 and if so, how this might interfere with the natural environment or affect the resident community at night.</p> <p>5. The local communities need to be made aware that it will be impossible within West Burton 3 to mitigate the size of these structures with tree and hedge planting which would take years and years to reach a suitable height, if at all.</p>		<p>To notify the community in the vicinity of the West Burton 3 site area, the Applicant wrote to all properties within a minimum of 2km of the site boundary, this includes 1,979 properties.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>6. There is the negative impact on the local environment, the negative interference with the regions natural ecosystem which may also indirectly affect neighbouring ecosystems due to their interconnectedness.</p> <p>7. There will be residents and others who do not have access to the internet and therefore will be precluded/prohibited from carrying out their own searches to learn more about the Project and the structures involved.</p> <p>8. There is no mention in any of your documentation of the hazards/dangers associated with the proposed West Burton 3 Energy Storage Unit and the Lithium-Ion batteries which can spontaneously</p>		

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>explode causing a fire which cannot be extinguished by normal means. There have been many, many instances worldwide of battery units on solar farms exploding and catching fire. When a lithium-ion battery combusts, it produces hydrofluoric acid and hydrogen fluoride gas, an acute poison, into the atmosphere which are hazardous from a human and environmental perspective damaging lungs and eyes. There are no Government regulations currently in place on how to deal with fires of this nature. The residents of Marton and surrounding villages should be informed of this danger especially as the proposed compound is close to Marton village Primary School. The proximity of this Energy Storage Unit within the village and school could</p>		

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>cause anxiety and bring about mental health issues for residents in the future.</p> <p>These are Health and Safety matters that affect all people within the West Burton Solar Project (West Burton 1, West Burton 2 and West Burton 3) and not just properties extending 2 km from the West Burton 3 site area. There are many, many more than 2000 properties within the West Burton Solar Project who will be affected by these proposed changes and who should be fully consulted (not to mention the concern of people who will travel past this area on their way to their destination).</p> <p>The proposed changes printed in your letter are shown on a piece of A4</p>		

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>paper with a 'red hatched area' on a small map. The typed names of the villages and the words and the boxes on this map are large scale compared to the solar site area which again makes the overall map of West Burton 3 in your letter look incredibly small rather than the fact it is close to 916 acres which is an enormous area!!! Residents need a true picture of the scale of the infrastructures/solar panels and the site area.</p> <p>You make no mention of the negative impact on the local environment by moving the proposed substation and energy storage to West Burton 3. There is no illustration in your leaflets/correspondence of what this particular busbar sub-stations could</p>		

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>look like especially in the landscape and how these changes will affect the communities.</p> <p>Consequently, the level and nature of these changes you are proposing for West Burton 3 commands that communities/residents should be and are given the opportunity to Consult fully in person with representatives of Island Green Power/West Burton Solar Project and ask as many questions as they need answers to as they cannot realistically do that via a telephone enquiry based on a letter that is not being fully transparent. The public should also be given an opportunity to see a 3D scale model of these battery energy storage systems and substation structures as they will appear in the landscape to</p>		

ID Code	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	<p>enable full discussion and disclosure by Island Green Power/West Burton Solar Project.</p> <p>Thorough consultation consists of making transparent information visible to all concerned of the Solar Projects not just those in the immediate vicinity of your proposed changes. I am taking this matter further ... in the interim I await your comments.</p>		