

Cottam Solar Project

Consultation Report Appendix C5.11: Section 42 Applicant Response

Prepared by: Counter Context

January 2023

PINS reference: EN010133

Document reference: APP/C5.11

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)



Contents

<u>Section 42 Applicant Response Table</u>	<u>3</u>
---	-----------------

<u>Section 44 Applicant Response Table</u>	<u>351</u>
---	-------------------

Section 42 Applicant Response Table

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Agricultural Land	All arable land of whatever agricultural classification produces food, whether for animal feed or human consumption and this should be protected for its own sake. Within the project boundary there is land that is classed as the best and most versatile. The use of such land by this project would result in it being taken out of agricultural production for at least 40 years. Therefore, the use of the best and most versatile agricultural land by this project should be kept to an absolute minimum to reduce impact on UK 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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.19].</p> <p>The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land.</p> <p>The Scheme will be temporary with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality.</p> <p>Some agricultural land will be retained during the operational phase, for example pasture grazed by sheep.</p> <p>Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.19] concludes</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>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>Paragraphs 19.5.2- 19.5.3 state (in respect of food security):</p> <p>“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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>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 environmental and land degradation hazards of the most popular energy crop, maize.</p> <p>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."</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	General	[Cumulative impacts] is an important issue given the number of other NSIP projects currently programmed across	Yes	Cumulative impacts of the Scheme have been addressed as a whole within the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.1 - C6.2.21] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Lincolnshire which includes six other solar energy parks, and the need for a full assessment of environmental and social-economic impacts of the cumulative effects of the Cottam scheme in conjunction with these other projects. This must include all the other NSIPs in the West Lindsey District including the most recent Tillbridge Solar proposal that has not been taken into consideration in the preparation of the PEIR documents.		<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>Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.18] addresses socio economic impacts including the impact on jobs and employment.</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	Socio-Economics, Agriculture and Tourism and Recreation	In terms of skills LCC is seeking for Island Green Power to foster a local skills base in respect of renewable energy projects in this area which potential will host a number of energy related infrastructure projects in this local area and numerous	Yes	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

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		energy related infrastructure projects across the County. Therefore, financial measures in respect of relevant skills training within the local area should be agreed. There must also be adequate assessment of the likely origins of the labour force (both local and non-local) especially in the context of other energy projects in the area with potentially overlapping construction periods.		the Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010133/APP/C7.10].
Lincolnshire County Council	Other	Consideration needs to be given to community benefits and to consider legacy opportunities arising from the project.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. 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.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>The Planning Statement [EN010133/APP/C7.5] states at paragraph 4.8.1:</p> <p>“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.”</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	In respect of the Cottam PEIR report, pleased by the progress which has been made and by mutual engagement with finding a reasonable approach to undertaking sufficient archaeological field evaluation,	N/A	The Applicant undertook Archaeological evaluation trenching that was considered sufficient to understand the archaeological potential of features identified through non-intrusive survey techniques (i.e. desk-based research, LiDAR survey data, aerial photographs, geophysical survey etc.), as well as the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>however this accord has not been reflected throughout the document. As it stands the response to this PEIR must reflect our concern particularly with the proposed mitigation approach which is firmly believed to be ill advised and unworkable.</p>		<p>potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As agreed with Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team, this equated to 2% (+2% contingency as required) of areas where possible concentrations of archaeological deposits had been identified.</p> <p>No agreement was made regarding areas that are considered to have a negligible/low potential i.e. where baseline information had not identified any possible buried archaeological deposits. To test the results of the geophysical survey, several 'blank' areas adjacent to concentration of archaeology were also assessed at a 2% sample.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that baseline information has successfully established the absence/presence/extent/form/preservation of concentrations of buried archaeological remains within the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>Scheme, and has been used to identify areas where mitigation will be required (the majority of which were agreed on site with the Lincolnshire County Archaeologists).</p> <p>The mitigation strategy is detailed in a detailed Written Scheme of Investigation provided in Environmental Statement Appendix 13.7 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.7], and is in line with national guidance and consistent with other solar-based developments of a similar nature.</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	Regarding the report itself, it would be helpful to have allocated reference numbers throughout the document including the tables to allow for easier reference.	N/A	<p>The individual Site, Parcels and Fields that comprise the Scheme have all been given 'unique identifier' (UID) references. UIDs have also been provided for non-designated archaeological remains in Table 13.10 - 13.16 of the Environmental Statement, and for non-designated historic buildings in Tables 13.24 - 13.27 of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13]. A UID has</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				also been given to each individual area of proposed mitigation - see Section 6 of the Archaeological Mitigation WSI [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.7] and Table 13.8-2 in Appendix 13.8 of the ES [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.8] .
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	In Table 31.1 Consultation Responses, the third Where Consultation Comment is Addressed on page 359 currently says 'Discussion with LCC regarding trial trenching are ongoing'. Have now agreed to a trial trenching percentage of 2% with a 2% contingency, with trench plans for individual parcels currently being discussed and agreed, ongoing.	N/A	The Applicant notes that evaluation trenching for specific areas of the Scheme, in which concentrations of archaeological features were identified by non-intrusive survey, was agreed with the Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team, equating to 2% (+2% contingency as required) of individual Fields. No agreement was made on 2% evaluation trenching of the whole Scheme.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	Our fourth Lincolnshire County Council (Historic Environment Officer) 25 February 2022 Consultee Response on page 359 states that a full suite of evaluation including competently assessed desk-based information, geophysical survey and a robust programme of trial trenching are required to provide evidence for the site-specific archaeological potential of the development. This has not been completed.	N/A	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. 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 trenching was agreed in advance in an evaluation WSI with the Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team, regular site meetings were held with the Lincolnshire Historic

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				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.
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	The fifth Where Consultation Comment is Addressed on page 359 which is the response to that above says 'Further assessment will be submitted alongside the ES as appropriate'. This statement is not acceptable and does not address our response. The results of all evaluation and the completed desk-based assessments will need to inform an appropriate mitigation strategy as part of the Environmental Statement (ES) which will be submitted	N/A	The potential impacts of the Scheme are assessed in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] , together with an overview of the programme of mitigation required to remove or reduce such impacts. Details of the programme of mitigation are provided in a separate mitigation WSI (Environmental Statement Appendix 13.7 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.7])

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		with the DCO application. Please remove 'as appropriate' or clarify.		
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	On page 361 the first Response for Lincolnshire Council Archaeologists representing Lincolnshire and Bassetlaw 31 March 2022 states that trenching will focus on areas that have been assessed to have archaeological potential. This is only part of our response, have also consistently stated that it is necessary for comprehensive trenching across 'blank' areas where previous evaluation results have not established the archaeological potential.	N/A	The Applicant notes that a broad range of evaluation techniques were used to collect high-quality baseline information, and have successfully identified the presence/absence/extent/form/significance of potential concentration of archaeological features. Evaluation trenching was 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. There was shown to be a high correlation between the archaeological remains identified by non-intrusive surveys and those identified through evaluation trenching. Non-intrusive surveys were accurate in identifying both areas where archaeological sites were present, as well as 'blank' areas that were devoid of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>archaeological deposits. Where features were encountered in 'blank' areas that had not been recorded by non-intrusive surveys, they were primarily found to be of a low archaeological interest (i.e. likely caused by post-medieval agricultural activity).</p> <p>The extensive scope of non-intrusive survey work and the correlation between the results of non-intrusive surveys and the evaluation trenching, are considered sufficient to be able to establish that the archaeological potential for 'blank' areas is negligible/low. Consequently a large-scale programme of untargeted evaluation trenching across 'blank' areas was considered unnecessary and unreasonable, given the evidence produced by non-intrusive surveys which was supported by targeted evaluation trenching.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	Overall, however the greatest concern for Table 31.1 is that there are a number of consultation comments for which the Where Consultation Comment is Addressed column simply refers us to Appendices 13.1, 13.2 and 13.4 despite the information not being included in those appendices. As a single example the Historic England scoping response includes this statement: 'Noted the iterative approach to investigations set out in the report and will look forwards to early sight of the results of cartographic, geophysical survey, lidar and aerial photographic analysis...' The corresponding Where Consultation Comment is Addressed column says 'See Appendices 13.1, 13.2 and 13.4.' Apart from the	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes that consultation for the scheme is detailed in table 13.1 of the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13].</p> <p>The results of various assessments are detailed in appendices: Desk-Based Research (13.1) Geophysical Surveys (13.2), Geoarchaeological Surveys (13.3), Air Photo and LiDAR Assessment (13.4), Heritage Statement (13.5), Evaluation Trial Trenching (13.6), Mitigation Strategy (13.7), Impact Assessment tables (13.8) and Cultural Heritage figures (13.9) [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.1 – C6.3.13.9].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		geophysics, this analysis as required by HE has not yet been undertaken, rather the desk-based assessments are in a basic preliminary draft form consisting primarily of collation of information.		
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	Section 13.4.1 discusses the ongoing preparation of desk-based assessments. These should have been completed and used to inform the trenching programme, further trenching may be required for those areas where this information is not available. Section 13.4.2 states that geophysical survey will be undertaken on the currently proposed cable routes and that HER information will be obtained for them. The full suite of evaluation is required for the full extent of the proposed development area	N/A	<p>Full and detailed desk-based assessments have been completed and have been used to inform the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] and the production of a detailed mitigation strategy (WSI; Appendix 13.7) [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.7].</p> <p>These include assessment of the full range of cartographic sources, and all available archaeological records, including PAS, HLC, NHRE, NHLE, NMP and HER data, as well as the results of specifically commissioned LiDAR and aerial photographic analysis (ES Appendices 13.1 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.1] and 13.4</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>including complete desk-based assessments with the required sources as quoted in the middle of page 360 not just geophysical survey and HER data as currently stated. A programme of trial trenching along the cable routes is also required to ascertain the presence or absence of archaeology, to provide evidence to inform the route selection and to determine what mitigation will be required along the route. There is no reference to the use of Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) data which is included in the list of required sources which should also inform the trenching programme.</p>		<p>[EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.4]). These sources were all used in determining the location of trenches as part of the programme of archaeological evaluation trenching.</p> <p>Non-intrusive surveys have been undertaken along the cable corridor and have successfully identified the presence / absence of archaeological remains. In line with national guidance and other schemes of a similar nature, as well as with consideration to the high impact caused by the cable route, a programme of archaeological monitoring, including a watching brief and 'strip, map and sample' excavation where archaeological deposits are present, is considered appropriate mitigation.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	Section 13.4.6 -assessments of significance should be undertaken for all designated assets to ensure any assets subject to proposed descoping has an evidence base demonstrating the lack of direct or indirect impact upon the designated asset and its significance before it can be descoped.	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes that assessment of significance for designated assets has been undertaken in accordance with the guidance enshrined in Historic England's <i>Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets</i>.</p> <p>This guidance recommends a staged approach whereby the assessment of the significance of heritage assets is undertaken following an initial assessment which identifies which heritage assets could be affected. The Applicant does not consider it proportionate to also assess the significance of heritage assets that would not be affected by the Scheme.</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	Section 13.4.7 -the proposed clustering of Grade II listed buildings is acceptable where they are for example part of the same settlement or estate. Given the proposal in 13.4.8 to reduce the assessment area of listed buildings from 5km to	N/A	<p>The assessment of Grade II Listed Buildings within the 2km study areas has been undertaken in accordance with this comment (ES Appendix 13.5 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.5]).</p> <p>At the time of the PEIR submission it had not been possible to fully complete</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>2km do not agree that individual listed buildings which do not exist in clusters should be assessed in clusters as the potential impact and any proposed mitigation maybe specific to that building. Regarding section 13.4.9, note that a geophysical survey for Cottam 1 has not been completed. This should be done immediately.</p>		<p>the geophysical survey of the Cottam 1 Site. This has now been completed in full, and is presented in Appendix 13.2 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.2] to the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13].</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Archaeology</p>	<p>Only the Historic England National Heritage list has been listed separately on the sources for this PEIR therefore all other required information should have been included in the draft DBAs. As seen in 13.5.39 this has not yet been done. DBAs will also need to include the cable routes.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that DBAs were produced covering the whole Scheme, including the cable routes, comprising assessment of the full range of cartographic sources, and all available archaeological records, including PAS, HLC, NHRE, NHLE, NMP and HER data, as well as the results of specifically commissioned LiDAR and aerial photographic analysis. This is presented in Appendix 13.1 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.1] to the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13].
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	Section 13.5.36 to 13.5.39 states that HLC types will be obtained for Cottam 1, 2 and 3; that further assessment will be completed to inform the baseline; that 'further research and evaluation at the Cottam 1, 2 and 3 Sites will provide a greater understanding of the baseline conditions and inform future mitigation strategies 'and that 'The DBAs for the three Sites will be updated, to include evidence from historic map regression, LiDAR analysis and aerial photo mapping. This evidence, alongside the geophysical survey and geoarchaeological sampling results, will inform a scheme of further evaluation	N/A	DBAs have been produced covering the whole Scheme, including the cable route, comprising assessment of the full range of cartographic sources, and all available archaeological records, including PAS, HLC, NHRE, NHLE, NMP and HER data, as well as the results of specifically commissioned LiDAR and aerial photographic analysis, and geoarchaeological assessment. The location and position of evaluation trenches were informed by the results of the DBA, together with the geophysical survey results, and trench plans were revised, and areas of trenching added, as updated information became available. Based on the results of the non-intrusive surveys, and supported by the results of the extensive programmes of targeted archaeological evaluation trenching, it was not considered that

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>including targeted trial trenching in any areas where this is deemed appropriate. 'It is agreed that all of this information and assessment is required and are disappointed that it has not been completed in timely fashion. Trenching plans which have and are being agreed will need reassessment as this information may reveal new evidence and this will result in unnecessary duplication of work and have potential knock-on effects for scheduling, budget and the production of an appropriate mitigation strategy which needs the full suite of evaluation results including trenching in order to be reasonable and fit for purpose. Please remove 'where this is deemed appropriate 'above, trenching</p>		<p>trenching was required across areas of the Scheme in which there is no evidence for archaeological activity. Non-intrusive assessment, backed up by the results of archaeological features and 'blank' areas ground-truthed through targeted trenching, is considered sufficient to inform the assessment of impact provided in Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13], and to allow for the determination of the issuing of a DCO. The results of the non-intrusive surveys and assessments, and targeted trenching, combined with the assessment of the differing potential impacts of the Scheme across its area, have been used to formulate a strategy of Post-Decision archaeological mitigation detailed in a WSI (Environmental Statement Appendix 13.7 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.7]).</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		is required across the full extent of proposed impact.		
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	Section 13.5.42 states that geophysical survey will be undertaken along the cable routes with appropriate desk-based research and bolstered by targeted trenching. Full evaluation including comprehensive desk-based assessment and teaching of the 'blank' areas will be required to obtain baseline evidence across the full impact zone including the cable routes.	N/A	<p>DBAs have been produced covering the whole Scheme, including the cable routes, comprising assessment of the full range of cartographic sources, and all available archaeological records, including PAS, HLC, NHRE, NHLE, NMP and HER data, as well as the results of specifically commissioned LiDAR and aerial photographic analysis.</p> <p>Archaeological evaluation trenching has been undertaken by the Applicant within the 'Shared Cable Corridor', which has the potential to comprise three or more cable routes from the Scheme and other proposed solar schemes, and so may have greater impact than for the majority of the Scheme cable route where just a single cable will be laid. Furthermore, a high vast concentration of archaeological features was identified by baseline information within the shared cable</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>route compared to the single cable route, where minimal potential archaeological features have been identified by non-intrusive surveys and assessment.</p> <p>Non-intrusive surveys have been undertaken by the Applicant along the cable corridor and have successfully identified the presence / absence of archaeological remains. In line with national guidance and other schemes of a similar nature, as well as with consideration to the high impact caused by the cable route, a programme of archaeological monitoring, including a watching brief and 'strip, map and sample' excavation where archaeological deposits are present, is considered appropriate mitigation.</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	Regarding the 'Future Baseline' discussed in sections 13.5.49 and 13.5.50, decommissioning must be considered and do	N/A	The Applicant has presented assessment of potential impacts to heritage assets during decommissioning in section 13.7 of the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		not agree that the impact will be minimal.		Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] , and mitigation proposals are presented in section 13.8.
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	Section 13.6.1 and the proposals for dealing with 'on-site archaeological remains' by 'mitigation by design'. If what is meant by this in archaeological terms is 'preservation in situ' then it is not a case of simply not putting anchoring spikes or using concrete feet instead in these 'mitigation by design' areas. The full extent of the archaeological areas must be determined and each area must be fenced off and subject to a programme of monitoring throughout the construction and the decommissioning phases, and there will be no ground	N/A	<p>Mitigation by design using non-intrusive concrete ground anchors is a nationally recognised approach for safeguarding archaeological remains against the impacts caused by the installation of solar panels.</p> <p>Where the extensive assessment, survey and evaluation trenching programme has identified areas in which remains may be present that are particularly sensitive to impact (such as human burials), it has been recommended that archaeological excavation is used to 'mitigate by record'.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that agricultural activity is causing a high level of destruction to buried</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>disturbance whatsoever which may disturb or affect the archaeological remains, including plant movement or storage. The proposal for the installation of concrete feet requires a full understanding of the depth, extent, importance and nature of the surviving archaeology across the site. Any proposal in archaeologically sensitive areas will require a firm evidence base proving that any proposed work including decommissioning will have no impact upon the archaeology including not only direct destructive impact through groundworks, compaction or reduction in the depth of soil necessary for protecting the archaeology but also through environmental changes which</p>		<p>archaeological features, as witnessed during the evaluation trenching. Removing these sites from agricultural use provides an opportunity to conserve archaeological deposits in situ and prevent further damage being caused by current land use during the lifetime of the Scheme.</p> <p>Details of the proposed mitigation for potential direct impacts to archaeological remains caused by ground disturbance that may occur during the construction phase are provided by the Applicant in the WSI, presented as Appendix 13.7 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.7] to the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13], and in the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [EN010133/APP/C7.1].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		would be detrimental to the surviving archaeology.		
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	A mitigation entirely "by design" may result in a significant number and amount of fenced off no-go areas within the redline boundary and cable routes. This would lead to significant ongoing constraints in the construction and decommissioning phases which would affect not only the number of solar panels but the development works themselves including plant activity, the placement of associated infrastructure such as compounds and access	N/A	<p>Mitigation by design using non-intrusive concrete ground anchors is a nationally recognised approach for safeguarding archaeological remains against the impacts caused by the installation of solar panels.</p> <p>Where the extensive assessment, survey and evaluation trenching programme has identified areas in which remains may be present that are particularly sensitive to impact (such as human burials) it has been recommended that archaeological excavation is used to 'mitigate by record'. Where a high level of impact is likely to occur mitigation by record (i.e.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		routes and in the construction management plan itself.		archaeological monitoring) will be undertaken i.e. cable routes, substations and compound areas. Areas where there are multiple environmental constraints have been removed from the scheme (i.e. including but not limited to archaeology, heritage, ecology, flood risk etc). No areas are recommended for 'fenced off no-go areas' as this is not considered to be a proportionate approach to mitigation.
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	There are no references to the other standard archaeological mitigation response known as 'preservation by record' through archaeological investigation and recording (archaeological fieldwork) through a range of techniques from set piece excavation and archaeological strip map and record to archaeological monitoring.	N/A	A detailed mitigation strategy (WSI) is included by the Applicant in Appendix 13.7 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.7] to the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] . The WSI outlines the various mitigation options required to safeguard archaeological assets within the Scheme. The WSI details areas where 'preservation by record' will be required either in the form of open excavation area, 'strip,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				map and sample' or an archaeological watching brief.
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	Given the large scale of this development, a suitable mitigation programme which includes archaeological mitigation by archaeological fieldwork would be expected and expect this to be acknowledged and included in this document, certainly it must be included in the Environmental Statement as it is essential as part of an effective, robust and reasonable mitigation strategy to deal with developmental impacts on archaeology.	N/A	A detailed mitigation strategy (WSI) is included in Appendix 13.7 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.7] to the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] .
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	This document states that the full extent of the archaeological potential has not yet been established, the trenching programme is not complete and even the desk-based assessments have yet to	N/A	The Applicant notes that DBAs have been produced covering the whole Scheme, including the cable routes, comprising assessment of the full range of cartographic sources, and all available archaeological records, including PAS, HLC, NHRE, NHLE, NMP

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>be finished. Table 13.23 therefore with its proposed mitigation of either 'Targeted evaluation trenching and mitigation by design should this be warranted' or 'None' is entirely inappropriate and should be removed.</p>		<p>and HER data, as well as the results of specifically commissioned LiDAR and aerial photographic analysis and geophysical survey. A programme of evaluation trenching has been completed and confirmed the archaeological potential of features identified by non-intrusive surveys. The results of the evaluation assessments have been used to compile a detailed mitigation strategy (WSI), presented as Appendix 13.7 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.7] to the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13]. The WSI outlines where 'preservation by record' and 'preservation by design' are appropriate to safeguard archaeological assets within the Scheme. In low impact areas where baseline information, supported by the results of the evaluation trenching, has suggested a negligible/low potential for archaeological remains to be present,</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				no further works are considered necessary/appropriate.
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	The appropriate mitigation response cannot be determined without the results of the trenching.	N/A	A programme of evaluation trenching has been undertaken by the Applicant, with the assessment reports provided in Appendix 13.6 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.6] to the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] . The results of this assessment have been used to inform a detailed mitigation strategy (WSI; Appendix 13.7 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.7]).
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	The list is not complete as the specific sites come from an early phase of the evaluation programme.	N/A	A full suite of archaeological assessment, survey and evaluation trenching has been undertaken by the Applicant. The results of which have been detailed in Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] . Any former lists of sites have been updated with new information acquired from the various evaluation assessments.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	The two proposed mitigations are entirely insufficient (see above) archaeological fieldwork will also be required in the suite of mitigation.	N/A	<p>A detailed mitigation strategy (WSI) is included by the Applicant in Appendix 13.7 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.7] to the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13], that outlines where 'preservation by record' or 'preservation by design' is required to safeguard archaeological assets within the Scheme. The WSI has been informed by an extensive programme of desk-based research and field evaluations (including LiDAR survey data, aerial photographs, geophysical survey, and evaluation trenching), which have successfully established the form and extent of concentrations of buried archaeological remains within the Scheme, and have been used to identify areas where it is considered mitigation will be required (the majority of which were agreed on site with the Lincolnshire County Archaeologists).</p> <p>The mitigation approach detailed in appendix 13.7</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>[EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.7] to the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage)</p> <p>[EN010133/APP/C6.2.13], is in line with national guidance and consistent with other solar-based developments of a similar nature.</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	The phrase 'should it be warranted' is a dismissive tone for dealing with the archaeological impact with a proportionate and appropriate level of response; and	N/A	<p>A full suite of archaeological assessment, survey and evaluation trenching has been undertaken by the Applicant and used to inform a WSI, presented as Appendix 13.7</p> <p>[EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.7] to the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage)</p> <p>[EN010133/APP/C6.2.13]. The WSI identifies where archaeological mitigation is warranted and the form of mitigation that is appropriate to safeguard the loss of archaeological remains.</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	Given the size of the proposed development there will undoubtedly be much more archaeology across the	N/A	The archaeological evaluation targeted concentrations of features identified through non-intrusive surveys, as well as 'bank' areas, where baseline

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>sites which will require mitigation than is included in the table. The geophysics report alone has identified many more sites of interest, the trenching programme which has only just begun has started to reveal more, including burials.</p>		<p>information suggested a negligible/low potential for archaeological features to be present. The results of which demonstrated the validity of non-intrusive surveys for identifying the absence / presence / extent of concentrations of archaeological features. This included the discovery of an early medieval burial site, which was first identified by boundary ditches that were mapped as geophysical anomalies.</p> <p>Where features were encountered in 'blank' areas that had not been recorded by non-intrusive surveys, they were primarily found to be of a low archaeological interest (i.e. likely caused by post-medieval agricultural activity). No additional sites considered to have a local/regional archaeological interest were identified exclusively from the trial trench evaluation.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	This table suggests that there will be absolutely no archaeological mitigation by fieldwork and indeed that there will be no further archaeological work after the trenching is complete. This is a fundamentally flawed approach which does not allow for a reasonable, proportionate or appropriate level of archaeological mitigation as discussed above.	N/A	A detailed mitigation strategy (WSI) is included by the Applicant in Appendix 13.7 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.7] to the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] . The WSI outlines where 'preservation by record' or 'preservation by design' is required to safeguard archaeological assets within the Scheme. The WSI details areas where 'preservation by record' will be required either in the form of open excavation, 'strip, map and sample' or an archaeological watching brief.
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	Table 13.23 also lists a number of areas of surviving Medieval ridge and furrow earthworks with the mitigation response as 'None.' As with all earthworks which will be impacted by this development, full archaeological topographical survey and recording will be required in	N/A	Most of the ridge and furrow earthworks identified within the Scheme have now been levelled, including many that have been previously identified from air photographs. These are presented in para. 3.6.6 of Appendix 13.4 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.14] to the Environmental Statement Chapter 13

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>advance of any groundworks whatsoever and they will need to be reinstated if they are damaged or destroyed in whole or in part during associated groundworks. Thought will also need to be given for the decommissioning methodology to ensure the earthworks are protected.</p>		<p>(Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13].</p> <p>The LiDAR data indicates that those that do survive as earthworks are very low and denuded, and, as such, would be difficult to identify and accurately survey in the field, and would be more accurately represented by the LiDAR data. Provision is made in section 13.7 to the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] for future surveys during decommissioning to identify whether it would be feasible to reinstate any earthworks that might be visible.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Archaeology</p>	<p>The information presented in this Cultural Heritage chapter appears some way behind the recent discussions and agreements between the developer's consultants and the LCC Historic Places Team. The approach for trenching for the main sites has been</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a programme of evaluation trenching, which was agreed with Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team, and sampled 2% (+2% contingency as required) of Fields where possible concentrations of archaeological deposits have been identified. This programme is presented in Appendix</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>broadly agreed in principle and agreement on specific plans for each parcel is under way, and initial trenching has commenced. The value placed on the evidence from trenching in this document represents an earlier position that we are pleased to note in recent discussions has been revised, however this is not reflected in the document at all.</p>		<p>13.6 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.6] to the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13].</p> <p>Several 'blank' areas, where baseline information suggested an absence of buried archaeological remains to be present, were also tested and found either to not contain any archaeological features or features of an indistinct nature, often associated with post-medieval or later agricultural activity.</p> <p>No agreement was made regarding areas that are considered to have a negligible/low potential i.e. where baseline information had not identified any possible buried archaeological deposits.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Archaeology	Of significant concern is the approach presented for archaeological mitigation of this scheme as expressed in this PEIR. The choice of either preservation in situ or no mitigation at all is wholly inadequate and comprehensively excludes the fundamental core of mitigation techniques including the full suite of archaeological mitigation fieldwork which includes set piece excavation, strip map and record and monitoring as well as earthwork recording. In development terms such an approach would exponentially increase the constraints across the development and have an extensive and lasting impact on the construction and decommissioning phases. In archaeological terms the	N/A	A detailed mitigation strategy (WSI) is included by the Applicant in Appendix 13.7 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.7] to the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13]. The WSI outlines the various mitigation options required to safeguard archaeological assets within the Scheme i.e. 'preservation by record' or 'preservation by design'. The WSI details areas where 'preservation by record' will be required either in the form of open excavation, 'strip, map and sample' or an archaeological watching brief. Where there is no evidence to suggest the presence of archaeological features, there is not considered a requirement for archaeological mitigation.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		choice of either preservation in situ or nothing as the only choice for the range and extent of archaeology which has and will come up across such a large development is fundamentally erroneous and unworkable.		
Lincolnshire County Council	Minerals	LCC is the planning authority for minerals and waste planning matters within Lincolnshire as well as for its own development which includes schools and highway developments.	N/A	Noted.
Lincolnshire County Council	Minerals	The Development Plan for the area affected by the project includes the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (currently under review) and also the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan also under review.	N/A	Noted. The identification and safeguarding of mineral resources within Lincolnshire has been acknowledged and the impact for any safeguarded resource fully assessed. Assessment is presented in Chapter 12 (Minerals) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.12] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Minerals	In terms of the PV sites themselves, the PEIR notes that only a very small part of the sites actually affect safeguarded mineral resources, and these are predominantly isolated and constrained deposits. When considering the nature and characteristics of proposals, it is confirmed that there would be negligible impact in terms of any sterilisation of mineral resources. Whilst there are some existing oil sites in proximity to the proposals, all elements of the scheme are outside of their associated safeguarding areas and so again, no safeguarding implications identified.	N/A.	Noted. The identification and safeguarding of mineral resources within Lincolnshire has been acknowledged and the impact for any safeguarded resource fully assessed. Assessment is presented in Chapter 12 (Minerals) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.12] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Cable Route	Regarding the proposed cable corridors, the PEIR notes that there is still on-going assessment work in relation to the cable route which will inform the final corridor to be proposed in the DCO application. The route options affect safeguarded sand and gravel resources, but the PEIR recommends that wherever possible cable routes follow existing infrastructure corridors such as roads, railways, drainage routes or existing pipelines or cables routes or alternatively follow the edge of significant landscape features such as woods rather than directly crossing open fields. This approach is supported which aligns with previous discussions with the developer, and provided it is	Yes	The Applicant has further refined the Scheme Order Limits for cable routes following statutory consultation and continued to adopt the approach of seeking wherever possible to follow existing infrastructure corridors such as roads, railways, drainage routes or existing pipelines or cables routes or running along the edge of significant landscape features such as woods or ecologically sensitive habitats.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		followed, it will ensure minimal sterilization of resources.		
Lincolnshire County Council	Socio-Economics, Agriculture and Tourism and Recreation	That based on the socio economic section of the Socio - Economics, Agriculture, and Tourism and Recreation Chapter of the PEIR from a Growth perspective what is considered and the methodology in this section of the PEIR appears reasonable. Further comments will be provided as the project continues and the Environmental Statement is completed.	N/A	Noted.
Lincolnshire County Council	Transport and Access	Chapter 14 Transport and Access-the assessment included in this chapter is acceptable, it is based on reasonable assumptions of trip rates, construction	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>duration and route assignment. The results show that the predicted construction traffic would not cause capacity problems on the local highway network, it is noted that some routes will experience large percentage increases in HGV movements (>100%) however these are currently very low trafficked routes. Details of access arrangements, swept paths, parking, storage and plant areas and a Travel Plan for construction staff are proposed to be provided in a Construction Management Traffic Plan.</p>		
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage</p>	<p>Chapter 10 Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage-this includes a Flood Risk Screening Assessment which provides surface water flood risk maps for the area and</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010133/APP/C6.3.10.2 - C6.3.10.8] has been produced for each of the solar Sites which demonstrate that flood risk will not be exacerbated as a</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>advises that Flood Risk Assessments (FRA) will be undertaken. The FRA will need to address any large areas of impermeability that may be created such as plant compounds, access roads, and battery facilities, the increased run off will need to be determined and mitigated in accordance with SUDS principles.</p>		<p>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>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage</p>	<p>Hydrology and flood risk is covered in some detail in the supporting documents, acknowledging all sources of flood risk which is encouraging and siting relevant legislation. It is noted that 'a hydrological assessment has been undertaken to establish local drainage catchments and overland flow routes'.....and 'The Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Report [EN010133/APP/C6.3.10.1] has been completed in line with local, National Planning Policies and appropriate guidance and best practice.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>Strategy to be submitted with the DCO application will include a review and summary of relevant legislation and national, regional and local planning policy relevant to the water environment'. The FRA will be a key document for us to review on submission of the DCO so await any detailed comment until then, but an encouraging start.</p>		
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p>	<p>The review takes into account previous AAH comments, meetings/workshops held with Lanpro and detailed comments on methodology, study area, and landscape receptors issued to Lanpro 05th May 2022 via email. Subsequently, Lanpro have issued a "way forward" for several key documents via email on 11th July 2022. This</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		includes several attachments which have comments and amendments (to those contained within the PEIR) which have also been considered in this review.		
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	The comments provided are intended to assist in guiding the next (final) stage of the process development, refinement of the content of the LVIA chapter and the overall development proposals. It is not a review of any of the preliminary findings or initial assessments.	N/A	Noted.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Cottam Solar Project, Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report, Prepared by Lanpro, January 2022, which contained a section on LVIA. Subsequently, a Scoping Report Review was carried out by AAH on Landscape and Visual matters	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>(February 2022) which was appended to the Scoping Opinion issued by PINS dated: 09th March 2022. Overall the PEIR and subsequent scope of the LVIA is generally aligned with the scoping report and scoping opinion, as well as other AAH comments (AAH TM01 and AAH TM02), meetings/workshops held with Lanpro and AAH detailed comments on methodology, study area, and landscape receptors issued to Lanpro 05th May 2022 via email. The information provided to date by Lanpro, including at meetings and workshops, has been thorough and well presented.</p>		
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p>	<p>As outlined within Chapter 4 of the PEIR, the development proposals are still being developed and finalised. This</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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>includes the type of panel and location of taller/larger elements such as substations and battery storage. Expect these elements to be fixed for the final ES and extents/parameters of the development be clearly set out, such as heights and locations that have been used in the assessment, which if there are still some outstanding design and layout elements to be finalised would be based on a "worst case" scenario to ensure any effects are not underplayed.</p>		<p>Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8].</p> <p>The extents/parameters of the Scheme are set out Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.4], which includes dimensional data such as heights and locations that have been used in the assessment and have been assessed based on maximum parameters to ensure a robust (worst-case scenario) assessment has been undertaken.</p> <p>The Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) are presented on all figures also include theoretical visibility for both the panels and battery storage, and separately for the substation. This approach ensures a clearer presentation of the theoretical visibility of these elements to ensure a representative and proportionate approach to the assessment whilst assessing a worst-case scenario.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	It is requested that further landscape and visual consultation is carried out between AAH and District Authority landscape specialists and the developer team (Lanpro) following the conclusion of this statutory consultation phase. This would likely cover the PEIR comments as well as development proposals and mitigation scheme, including the cable route corridor (particularly river crossing) and location of any larger structures or buildings such as the substations, extent of vegetation loss for highways works, and also subsequent knock-on effects such as any requirement for additional viewpoints or AVRs.	Yes	<p>This consultation has been undertaken as a number of meetings and workshops as set out in Section 8.2 and Appendix 8.4 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.8.4] of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8].</p> <p>The consultation has enabled a consensus on the approach to the assessment over aspects of the approach to the assessment and the methodologies to be adopted. At this stage no tree removal is proposed to be undertaken to facilitate the Scheme.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	<p>Comments on the Maximum Design Scenario (Section 4.2) are as follows: As stated in previous correspondence (refer to paras. 2, 3 and 4 of AAH TM02), at this stage, no details are available on the final location and appearance/extent of taller/larger elements that form part of the development. Table 4.1 within Chapter 4 of the PEIR usefully provides details of the design parameters used for the PEIR, and chapter 4.2.2 of Chapter 4 states: "The ES will employ 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, i.e. the worst-case scenario..."</p>	N/A	<p>As outlined within Chapter 4 of the PEIR, these elements were to be fixed for the final Environmental Statement. The Applicant notes that if there are still some outstanding design and layout elements to be finalised this would be based on a "worst case" scenario to ensure any effects are not underplayed.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2] 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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8],</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				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.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	While this will likely be a reasonable approach for the solar arrays, have concerns in regard to the larger and taller elements, such as substations (up to 13m in height), and more conspicuous elements such as energy storage and conversion units/inverters. The final location and layout of these elements will have greater visual effects in this flat, rural landscape than PV panels.	N/A	The Applicant notes that a worst-case scenario has been undertaken as part of the assessment which considers the effect of all elements on site. The ZTVs presented on all ZTV figures also include theoretical visibility for both the panels and battery storage, and separately for the substation. This approach ensures a clearer presentation of the theoretical visibility of these elements to ensure a representative and proportionate approach to the assessment whilst assessing a worst-case scenario.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Expect the location and extent (footprint) of these elements to be identified for the LVIA to allow for a better understanding of the potential landscape and visual effects,	N/A	The parameters of the panels and associated infrastructure such as fencing and cameras, and substation and battery storage have been fixed for the Environmental Statement and extents/parameters of the Scheme are

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>an updated ZTV based upon these parameters and an understanding of the likely requirement for additional viewpoint photographs to capture views of the taller/larger elements</p>		<p>presented in Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.4]</p> <p>This includes dimensional data such as heights and locations that have been used in the assessment and have been assessed based on maximum parameters to ensure a robust (worst-case scenario) assessment has been undertaken. The ZTV's presented on all figures also include theoretical visibility for both the panels and battery storage, and separately for the substation. This approach ensures a clearer presentation of the theoretical visibility of these elements to ensure a representative and proportionate approach to the assessment whilst assessing a worst-case scenario.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p>	<p>Could it be clarified if any above-ground lines and associated poles are proposed. It is clearly stated that as part of the cable connection, cables will be underground (paras. 4.3.14</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that runs of overhead lines between components or to connect underground cables is not proposed. All cables will be underground, and no new overhead lines and associated poles will be required. Assessment and evaluation of</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>and 4.3.19), however it is not clear if within the site any additional short runs of overhead lines will be installed between components or if these would also be connected by underground cables. Additional lines and poles would likely be visible in this landscape above boundary vegetation.</p>		<p>the impacts and effects of the cable routes is set out within Appendix 8.2 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.8.2] and Appendix 8.3 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.8.3] of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8].</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p>	<p>The extent of any vegetation loss to facilitate construction access or the permanent site access points is not identified. Also, any vegetation loss to facilitate any potential wider highways works is not identified. While it is understood existing agricultural access points are intended to be utilised (para. 4.4.2), it is likely these may need widening or cut back for sight lines. Expect this all to be</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Due to the nature of the Scheme, it is considered that existing vegetation on the Sites would be retained. At this stage no tree removal is proposed to be undertaken to facilitate the Scheme. Where this is not possible, the mitigation associated with any such tree or hedgerow loss 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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		clearly illustrated and included within any assessment as this has the potential to remove existing features (that make up the character area) and open up views into or across the site. Expect any proposed vegetation removal to be surveyed to BS:5837 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction to Construction so it is clear what the arboricultural value is known (to aid assessment) and subsequently is appropriately mitigated against.		and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] . 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.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	A refinement of the cable route corridor has been carried out from the scoping stage, and the PEIR at para. 5.5.2 identifies "the crossing of the River Trent, with a preferred location chosen to the southwest of Marton", which seeks to combine this	Yes	In relation to the cable route crossing the Trent, the Applicant recognises that this has always been included in the Scheme. The refinement of the position since PEIR still sits within the identified cable corridor.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>crossing with Gate Burton and West Burton. This crossing is indicative at this stage and subject to micro siting, and due to the context has likely landscape and visual effects, as well as potential ecological effects. It is requested that LCC, as well as other relevant stakeholders, are involved and consulted further in regard to the crossing, and cable corridor, once further design and surveys have been carried out. Also, subject to the final design solution and location of the crossing and cable corridor, additional viewpoints and potentially AVRs of the crossing may need to be included within the LVIA to assess and illustrate any potential visual effects.</p>		<p>Consultation has been undertaken with Lincolnshire County Council as well as other relevant stakeholders in regard to the crossing of the River Trent. The cable will be directionally drilled under the river and so no permanent above ground structures are proposed. During the construction period there are likely to be temporary construction compounds which will then be removed. The crossing is proposed to be directionally drilled to reduce the effects on ecology and landscape and visual receptors. Disturbance will be minimal and not likely to result in significant effects. Additional viewpoints are therefore not considered to be required.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	While the scoping report in para. 7.5.1 states that visual study beyond 5km has been scoped out, it was observed on site that there are potential long-distance views to Lincoln Cathedral and Lincoln Castle. Comments issued to AAH/LCC by Lanpro on 11 th July 2022, confirm that: "LVIA Chapter (where inter visibility captures listed buildings and monuments), this would be considered as part of the visual baseline where appropriate. Additional views have been suggested by LCC and NCC that take account of locations where heritage assets may be affected".	Yes	Additional views suggested by Lincolnshire County Council and Nottinghamshire County Council that take account of locations where heritage assets may be affected are taken into account by the Applicant within the Section 8.2 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] . Detailed overlap and consultation with the Heritage topic areas has also been undertaken when developing the landscape and visual baseline and in identifying landscape and visual effects for the LVIA Chapter. No additional viewpoints have been assessed as being necessary as long distance views are not affected by the Scheme either to or from Lincoln Castle and Cathedral.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	The PEIR identifies a range of landscape and visual receptors within the Study Area. The visual receptors and	N/A	The effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure such as fencing and cameras, and substation and battery storage have been fixed for

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>viewpoints were previously discussed and agreed with AAH, as were the locations of Photomontages. However as stated and noted in previous correspondence, at this stage, do not have details on the location and appearance/extent of taller/larger elements that form part of the development, which would likely have visual impacts that may require additional viewpoints beyond those initially identified.</p>		<p>the final Environmental Statement and extents/parameters of the Scheme are set out in Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.4]. This includes dimensional data such as heights and locations that have been used in the assessment and have been assessed based on maximum parameters to ensure a robust (worst-case scenario) assessment has been undertaken. The ZTV's presented on all figures also include theoretical visibility for both the panels and battery storage, and separately for the substation. This approach ensures a clearer presentation of the theoretical visibility of these elements to ensure a representative and proportionate approach to the assessment whilst assessing a worst-case scenario.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Fourteen potential landscape receptors at varying scales are identified for consideration in the LVIA within section 8.7 (paras. 8.7.90 to 8.7.102). The correct National, Regional and Local Landscape Character Areas (LCA) have been referred to within the PEIR and cover a range of scales, and there is potential to scope out character areas that would not be affected by the development. Typically National Character Areas, and often LCA at a regional level, are at a large scale, large geographic area of land and typically provide context only, as opposed to being a receptor to be assessed. A finer-grained site-level character assessment and identification of individual elements or features of the landscape have not been	N/A	The LVIA includes an assessment of landscape effects at a range of scales, including a finer grain landscape assessment that includes the Sites, Cable Routes and Substations, their immediate area and the wider landscape setting. This finer grained assessment considers individual contributors under the topics of land use, topography, communications and infrastructure, settlement, industry, commerce and leisure, public rights of way and access, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Registered Parks and Gardens and Ancient Woodlands and natural designations. The assessment and evaluation of the potential impacts and effects of these individual contributors is set out within Appendix 8.2 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.8.2] and Appendix 8.3 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.8.3] of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>identified at this stage, which would expect to be included within the LVIA. However comments issued to AAH/LCC by Lanpro on 11th July 2022, confirm that the LVIA Chapter will include "a finer grained assessment that includes the Site and immediate area, including individual landscape elements such as trees hedgerows, woodlands, ponds/water features, or historic landscape features."</p>		
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p>	<p>As requested by AAH/LCC, comments issued by Lanpro on 11th July 2022, confirm that the LVIA Chapter will include reference to:</p> <p>The Historic landscape characterisation project: The Historic Character of The County of Lincolnshire (September 2011); and</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) takes these publications into account at Section 8.5 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8].</p> <p>The information collated as part of the historic landscape characterisation project: The Historic Character of The County of Lincolnshire (September 2011) is considered to ensure that the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>HLF funded Landscape Partnership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Trent Vale Landscape Conservation Management Plan (June 2013). ○ Trent Vales Landscape Character Assessment. 		<p>Scheme is sensitive to the historic landscape. The relevant section for Cottam is TVL1 – The Northern Cliff Foothills. The LVIA also takes into account the HLF funded publications by the Trent Vale Landscape Partnership including the Trent Vale Conservation Management Plan (June 2013) and the Trent Vales Landscape Character Assessment.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p>	<p>The methodology notes in para 1.1.1 that the assessment methodology follows GLVIA3 and also follows guidance from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment (October 2014); • Landscape Institute (17th September 2019) Technical Guidance Note 06/19 Visual Representation of 	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The LVIA references these publications including the 'Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 2/21 Assessing landscape value outside national designations', May 2021 and also 'Technical Information Note 01/21 GLVIA Webinar Q&As'. These documents are recognised as being relevant guidance and are taken account of in the assessment process within the LVIA, including the GLVIA Webinar.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>Development Proposals.</p> <p>The Landscape Institute guidance: 'Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 2/21 Assessing landscape value outside national designations', May 2021 is also of relevance and Technical Information Note 01/21 'GLVIA Webinar Q&As' also provides relevant information and should be referred to.</p>		
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	<p>To aid clarity, para. 1.2.1 may benefit from some minor restructuring – effects are determined through consideration of the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of change. Sensitivity is judged through consideration of the value of the landscape or view, and the susceptibility of the receptor to change.</p>	N/A	<p>Noted. The LVIA Methodology at paragraph 1.2.1 is restructured as follows: "The significance of landscape and visual effects are determined through consideration of the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of change. Sensitivity is judged through consideration of the value of the landscape or view, and the susceptibility of the receptor to change."</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Para. 1.3.8 now contains additional potential receptors as requested. Users of roads are listed to include walkers and horse riders, and expect country lanes to include these as receptors, as well as cyclists (leisure and commuting).	N/A	The Applicant notes this has been included within Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] .
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Should the title "Evaluating Visual Susceptibility to Change" added after para. 1.5.3 be "Evaluating Landscape Sensitivity"?	N/A	The LVIA Methodology wording after paragraph 1.5.3 is updated as follows: "Evaluating Landscape Sensitivity to Change".
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Under Landscape Value (paras. 1.5.6 to 1.5.8), it is potentially implied that only designated landscapes may have a medium or high value. This is not the case, and GLVIA paragraph 5.19 states that "value can apply to areas of landscape as a whole, or to the individual elements, features and aesthetic or perceptual dimensions which contribute	N/A	The LVIA references 'Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 2/21 Assessing landscape value outside national designations', May 2021 and also 'Technical Information Note 01/21 GLVIA Webinar Q&As'. These documents are recognised as being relevant guidance and are taken account of in the assessment process within the LVIA including the GLVIA Webinar.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>to the character of the landscape" and that "the value attached to undesignated landscapes also needs to be carefully considered and individual elements of the landscape – such as trees, buildings or hedgerows – may also have value.". Para. 1.5.8 and Table 8.1.2 also need updating to consider new guidance and suggested factors used within: 'Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 2/21 Assessing landscape value outside national designations', May 2021. Table 8.1.1: Landscape Receptor Value should be updated as required following incorporating this more recent guidance.</p>		<p>The LVIA Methodology at paragraph 1.5.7 has added clarity as follows: "GLVIA3 paragraph also recognises that relative value is attached to different landscapes, and at paragraph 5.19 states that "value can apply to areas of landscape as a whole, or to individual elements, features and aesthetic or perceptual dimensions which contribute to the character of the landscape." And that "the value attached to undesignated landscapes also needs to be carefully considered and individual elements of the landscape – such as trees, buildings or hedgerows – may also have value.".</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p>	<p>In regards to Landscape Sensitivity, criteria are provided in Table 8.1.4, however how value and</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The LVIA Methodology has been updated to provide the additional Table 8.1.5: Matrix for Determining Landscape Sensitivity.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>susceptibility are combined (which would have already been defined within Tables 8.1.1 and 8.1.3), potentially as a matrix, to assess Sensitivity may be more useful and would remove reference to Landscape Capacity, which is likely not relevant in this context. While not a requirement, including a matrix, which would guide professional judgement, would assist in transparency and provide a consistent approach as to how the Sensitivity of a receptor has been arrived at rather than relying on the pre-determined criteria within Table 8.1.4.</p>		<p>This is presented within Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8].</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p>	<p>For consistency, query why Table 8.1.6 Magnitude of Landscape Change does not have separate description columns for Size, Scale and</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The LVIA Methodology is updated at Table 8.1.7 to show that Magnitude of Landscape Change has a separate description column for Size, Scale and</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Nature; Geographical Extent; and Duration and Reversibility as Table 8.1.10 does.		Nature, Geographical Extent and Duration & Reversibility. This is presented within Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] .
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	In regard to Visual Effects, paragraph 1.6.11 is titled: "Evaluating Visual Susceptibility to Change", however goes on to explain/introduce the general process of developing the visual baseline: it appears the title should be more aligned with an overview of assessing sensitivity, as para.1.6.14 is more focussed on susceptibility.	N/A	The LVIA Methodology is updated at paragraph 1.5.4 with a title: 'Overview to Assessing Landscape Sensitivity'. The LVIA Methodology is updated at paragraph 1.6.11 with a title: 'Overview to Assessing Visual Sensitivity'. This is presented within Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] .
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	In regard to Visual Sensitivity, criteria are provided in Table 8.1.9, however how value and susceptibility are combined (which have already been defined within Tables 8.1.7	N/A	The LVIA Methodology is updated to provide the following additional Table 8.11: Table 8.1.11: Matrix for Determining Visual Sensitivity.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>and 8.1.8), potentially as a matrix, to assess Sensitivity would be more useful. The characteristics shown mix the value of the view, and the susceptibility of the receptor: Table 8.1.9 attributes value to the receptor and susceptibility to the view, so removing this would aid in clarity. While not a requirement, including a matrix, which would guide professional judgement, would assist in transparency and provide a consistent approach as to how the Sensitivity of a receptor has been arrived at rather than relying on the predetermined characteristics within Table 8.1.9.</p>		<p>This is presented within Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8].</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p>	<p>Section 1.9 covers Cumulative Effects. However, Appendix 8.1.3 also provides a Cumulative Effects methodology which is different</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The LVIA Methodology summarised in the LVIA chapter has been updated to align with the methodology within Appendix 8.1 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.8.1] LVIA Methodology.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		to that included within section 1.9. Suggest just one Cumulative Effects methodology is included.		This is presented within Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] .
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	The methodology references that it has been prepared in accordance with Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note TGN 2/19: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment.	N/A	Noted.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Para. 1.1.9 references a RVAA study area as being "limited to those properties within 1 km of the proposed convertor station, which appear on the Ordnance Survey 1:25,000 scale map". Assume this is a typo, and the study area should be clarified in the ES. Any properties outside the 1km study area also identified with direct, extensive and/or open views towards the development, particularly larger and taller elements or	N/A	The Review of Visual Assessment of Residential Properties Methodology is updated at paragraph 1.1.9 to note that the Study Area is clarified in Section 8.4 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] . The LVIA includes clear justification at Section 8.4 regarding the extent of the Study Area for residential receptors as being: "The study area for the residential receptors is limited to properties within a 1km radius. Any properties outside the 1km study area also identified with

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		large open expanses of PV arrays, should also be identified and included if appropriate.		direct, extensive and/or open views towards the development, particularly larger and taller elements or large open expanses of PV arrays, should also be identified and included if appropriate."
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Para. 1.1.6, 1.1.7 and 1.1.9 reference consultation with SDC – should this be West Lindsey, Bassetlaw, Nottinghamshire County and Lincolnshire County?	N/A	<p>The Cumulative Methodology is updated at Paragraphs 1.1.6, 1.1.7, and 1.1.9 to exclude the following text: "West Lindsey, Bassetlaw, Nottinghamshire County and Lincolnshire County"</p> <p>The LVIA includes clear justification at Section 8.4 regarding the extent of the Study Area for cumulative assessment.</p> <p>This is presented within Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8].</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Para. 1.1.7 suggests a study area has been agreed. It is assumed this is a typo, and would subsequently be agreed with relevant stakeholders.	N/A	The Cumulative Methodology is updated at Paragraphs 1.1.6, 1.1.7, and 1.1.9 to exclude the following text: "In consultation with the West Lindsey, Bassetlaw, Nottinghamshire County and Lincolnshire County the geographic extent (or study area) over which the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>cumulative effects will be agreed with the relevant stakeholders”</p> <p>The LVIA includes clear justification at Section 8.4 regarding the extent of the Study Area for cumulative assessment.</p> <p>This is presented within Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8].</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Para 1.2.10 references pg. 132 of GLVIA3, the quoted text is on page 131 of GLVIA3.	N/A	<p>The Cumulative Methodology is updated at Paragraphs 1.2.10 to include: “P131”.</p> <p>This is presented within Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8].</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	The methodology describes the ZTV has been prepared to inform the visual assessment. The parameters any ZTV are generated upon are needed to be clearly stated within the LVIA, and whether taller	N/A	Section 8.5 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] sets out the parameters that the ZTVs are generated upon and that additional ZTVs are run to take account of all

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>elements have, or have not been included, as the omission of these elements will likely underplay the extent of visibility of the development. Comments issued to AAH/LCC by Lanpro on 11th July 2022, confirm that the LVIA Chapter will include "Additional ZTVs will be run to take account of all works elements including battery storage and/or substations."</p>		<p>works elements including battery storage and/or substations.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p>	<p>1. Tables of the identified published Landscape Character Areas have been included, which break down each landscape character area's key characteristics. However at this point, it is unclear as to what the full aim of the tables is, and some clear introductory narrative and more detail on column/row labelling would assist in clarity.</p>		<p>The aim of the tables, which have been updated for Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8], is to set out the baseline position for the landscape receptors.</p> <p>The LVIA includes updated tables at Appendix 8.2 and explains their purpose at section 8.5: "The Landscape Character Tables at Appendix 8.2 break down each landscape character area's key</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		It is assumed that this is to illustrate what the key characteristics are, which plot contains the key characteristics and the identification of likely significant effects.		characteristics. The purpose of the tables are to illustrate what the key characteristics are and provide an understanding of the landscape in the area that may be affected, for example, which land area contains constituent elements, features, aesthetic and perceptual factors that contribute to it, its character and the way this varies spatially, its geographic extent, its history, its condition, the way the landscape is experienced and the value attached to it."
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	It is unclear what "SAO" within the tables indicates.		SAO stands for "Study Area Only" meaning that the nature and extent of the potential landscape effects would not apply to the Sites themselves and only be confined to the Study Area.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Tables of the identified key viewpoints have been included, which break down each viewpoint and provide more detailed information and usefully provide an indication	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		of which plot or plots are potentially visible and a brief narrative. The viewpoints listed now include those identified at earlier consultation stages. These have been indicated with an "LCC" prefix.		
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	The PEIR identifies those consultations that have been carried out, and AAH have held meetings and workshops with Lanpro and other relevant stakeholders. Appendix 8.4 of the PEIR includes copies of email correspondence and submitted information on the methodology, study area and viewpoints.		Noted.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	It is requested that further landscape and visual consultation is carried out between AAH and District Authority landscape specialists and the developer team	Yes	The Applicant notes that further consultation continued from the PEIR stage with LCC and NCC at additional workshops during July and August 2022, on the location and appearance/extent of taller/larger

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>(Lanpro) following the conclusion of this statutory consultation phase. This would likely cover the PEIR comments as well as development proposals and mitigation scheme, including the cable route corridor (particularly river crossing) and location of any larger structures or buildings such as the substations. Comments issued to AAH/LCC by Lanpro on 11th July 2022, confirm that: "Mitigation will be covered during further consultation with LCC and NCC. The PEIR provides a section on Policy Compliance to understand where the proposed mitigation meets with policy expectations and other guidance within landscape character assessments and published best practice data."</p>		<p>elements that form part of the Scheme. The consultation also included detailed presentations on the mitigation measures, which would likely have visual impacts and that may require additional beyond those initially identified.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Generally: Figures are well presented and read well.	N/A	Noted.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Figure 8.6: Cottam 1, 2 and 3: Landscape Receptor and Figure 8.7: Cottam 1, 2 and 3: Visual Receptor: These figures present a lot of useful, pertinent information and as such, providing additional plans at a scale closer to 1:40,000, split over 2 sheets, would be useful to see the detail at a site scale.	N/A	Further to the PEIR stage, all figures presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] provide additional plans to see the detail at a scale proportionate to the Sites, Cable Route/s and Substations.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Figure 8.14: Technical Photography Methodology and Viewpoint Photography: A full methodology of photography has been provided. Comments issued to AAH/LCC by Lanpro on 11 th July 2022, confirm that the LVIA Chapter will ensure that "visualisations are supported by a full technical	N/A	Noted. 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 [EN010133/APP/C7.15] and Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.4] , which accompany the DCO application.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		methodology, which aligns with LI TGN 06/19.". This should include full details/parameters of the elements that have been modelled (Solar Arrays, substation etc.).		
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	<p>Comments in regards to the viewpoint photography:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, the images presented for the viewpoints are of a resolution that does not allow for clarity of medium or long-distance views, with elements in the mid-distance appearing hazy and elements in the long distance often not being distinguishable, so as to not appear in the view at all. Have assumed these are interim low 	N/A	The Applicant has noted this comment and ensured that full resolution images have been provided for the final LVIA, as presented through Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>resolution images for the PEIR and would expect full resolution images for the final LVIA to allow.</p>		
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VP01: While a long-distance view, this viewpoint provides a panoramic view of Cottam 1 from a recognised viewing area (Tillbridge Lane Viewpoint) and the view likely includes West Burton and Gate Burton, so important for cumulative effects. The image included within the PEIR does not provide clarity of this long-distance view and beyond approximately 1 to 2km appears very hazy and pixelated. This is likely 	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment and ensured that full resolution images have been provided for the final LVIA. Summer photography has also been taken from this viewpoint to provide further clarity. Views from viewpoint 1 are included on figure 8.14.1a-1e [EN010133/APP/C6.4.8.14.1] as presented through Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>due to the resolution; however we would expect this viewpoint image to pick up views of these sites, and Cottam Power Station beyond, which on the current image would likely be indistinguishable;</p>		
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VP04: Please check correct image used – could not replicate the view on site; 	N/A	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment and the correct image is used for viewpoint VP04 at figure 8.14.4 [EN010133/APP/C6.4.8.14.4].</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VP09: View may provide more context if rotated to the right (looking more to the north-east/east) to include the edge of the tree belt and some of the hedgerow so the view is 	N/A	<p>The Applicant has updated the corresponding viewpoint, presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8], to look more to the north-east/east to include edge of tree belt.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		not dominated by foreground trees.		
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VP10: Image used looking southwest, should be Northeast. 	N/A	The Applicant has updated the corresponding viewpoint, presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] , to look to the north-east.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VP16: Would this view be more illustrative if orientated west/southwest to possible of the parcels to the north, VP16 should cover a wider view (split over several sheets) to illustrate this. 	N/A	The Applicant has updated the corresponding viewpoint, presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] , to be a wider view (split over several sheets).
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VP23: Would this viewpoint also benefit from a view north west to capture the southern tip of the northern parcel. 	N/A	The Applicant has updated the corresponding viewpoint, presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] , to capture the southern tip of the northern parcel.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VP27: This view should be rotated slightly to the left to capture long distance views of the southern areas of Cottam 1, and potentially cumulative views of West Burton and Gate Burton. 	N/A	The Applicant has updated the corresponding viewpoint, presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] , to capture long-distance views to the southern areas of Cottam 1.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VP31: Image of view is looking north and should be rotated to the left to capture views west/southwest. 	N/A	The Applicant has updated the corresponding viewpoint, presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] , to capture views west/southwest.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VP33: Check orientation of image – appears to be looking south east. 	N/A	The Applicant has noted this comment and 360-degree photography has now been provided. The photography can be found on figure 8.14.33 [EN010133/APP/C6.4.8.14.33] .
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VP37: Image looking south – needs reorientating to cover views northeast. 	N/A	The Applicant has updated the corresponding viewpoint, presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] , to capture views northeast.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VP46: View should be rotated to the right (east) to fully capture Cottam 2 and extents of development amended as appears to show Cottam 3 rather than Cottam 2; 	N/A	The Applicant has updated the corresponding viewpoint, presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] , to capture views east.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VP47: View would benefit from being rotated to the left (north) to have Cottam 2 more central to the view. 	N/A	The Applicant has updated the corresponding viewpoint, presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] , to capture views north to have Cottam 2 more central in the view.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VP48: Incorrect image - repeat of VP47. 	N/A	The Applicant has updated the corresponding viewpoint VP48, presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] , The corrected VP48 is shown at figure 8.14.48 [EN010133/APP/C6.4.8.14.48] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VP49: Extent of Development in this view would likely extend across the Corringham Grange Farm driveway to the left of the view (to the east). 	N/A	The Applicant has updated the corresponding viewpoint, presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8], to extend the view across the Corringham Grange Farm.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VP50: View should be rotated to the right (north) to capture more of Cottam 2; and 	N/A	The Applicant has updated the corresponding viewpoint, presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8], to capture more of Cottam 2.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Additional LCC viewpoints have been located on Figure 8.13 as agreed, however these photographs have not been included within the PEIR, but are available online as 360 degree panoramas and AAH will review providing comments directly to Lanpro.	N/A	Noted. The additional Lincolnshire County Council viewpoints are covered and have been discussed in more detail during continued consultation with the local authority. Viewpoint assessment sheets are provided for each of the viewpoints and panoramas/level of AVR are agreed for each and set out within LVIA at Appendix 8.3.1 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] .
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Figure 8.15: Cumulative Sites: The plan identifies the other NSIP developments in the local area. A list of potential sites to be considered as part of the cumulative assessment has been forwarded to West Lindsey District Council, who are better placed to provide more detailed information.	N/A	The Applicant notes that a list of potential projects to be considered as part of the cumulative assessment has been forward to West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) who are better placed to provide more detailed information. Feedback from WLDC has not been received to date. Nottinghamshire County Council provided final comment the list on cumulative developments in their email 1 September 2022.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Figure 8.16: Strategic Landscape Mitigation Measures: This plan illustrates the site proposals and mitigation areas in the context of existing landscape character and ecological objectives for the Study Area. Indicative cross sections of boundary treatments and offsets/buffers from residential properties, PROW and ecological features	N/A	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 at Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>are provided. The mitigation buffer zones illustrated on Figure 8.16 are set out in Paragraph 8.8.24 of chapter 8 of the PEIR. The final submission should clearly state if the final Strategic Mitigation plan and mitigation buffer zones illustrated on the sections and identified within chapter 8.8.24 of the PEIR are indicative to allow for flexibility, or if fixed. If indicative, the LVIA needs to clearly state what layout and mitigation it has been based upon, as different mitigation strategies will likely alter potential effects, and also a strategy to secure the mitigation should be provided. Comments issued to AAH/LCC by Lanpro on 11th July 2022, confirm that: "The LVIA Chapter will also include a dedicated section with</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>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>supporting detailed plans to reflect appropriate local and regional aims where applicable. These mitigation measures will aim to deliver design that accords with green infrastructure objectives at the regional and local level “ and goes on to state: “The mitigation measures within the LVIA will be supported by a LEMP”.</p>		
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p>	<p>Due to the evolving nature of the layouts, there are currently no Landscape and Visual Comments. However, it is requested that additional meetings and workshops be held with AAH/LCC to discuss these landscape and visual comments prior to the final ES and scheme submission, and also that a continued dialogue is maintained in regards to the development proposals,</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that due to the evolving nature of the layouts, additional meetings and workshops have continued with AAH/LCC to discuss the landscape and visual comments prior to the final Environmental Statement and Scheme submission. A dialogue continues in regards to the Scheme proposals, including the Cable Route Corridor and location of any larger structures or buildings such as the substations. The ZTV's presented on all figures also</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>including the cable route corridor and location of any larger structures or buildings such as the substations. The Sub Station and Battery Storage is currently illustrated on drawings Cottam 1 West A Solar Project Preliminary Layout v3 and Cottam 1 West B Solar Project Preliminary Layout v3. This location is near several sensitive receptors, including residents of Willingham by Stow. If this location is likely to be taken forward for these elements, it would be advisable to run an updated ZTV and re-assess potential views of the taller more conspicuous elements.</p>		<p>include theoretical visibility for both the panels and battery storage, and separately for the substation. This approach ensures a clearer presentation of the theoretical visibility of these elements to ensure a representative and proportionate approach to the assessment whilst assessing a worst-case scenario.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Climate Change</p>	<p>The energy output from the plant has a significant impact on the reduction of GHG emissions, a larger energy</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		output equating to a lower GHG emissions intensity.		
Lincolnshire County Council	Climate Change	How can the yearly energy output of the plant be met given that the maximum long term averages for PV output for periods between 1994 - 2018 is at around 1,100 kWh/kWp (Global Solar Atlas)?	N/A	The Applicant notes that the energy calculations have been completed and provided based on the most up-to-date available data. This is further addressed in Chapter 7 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.7] .
Lincolnshire County Council	Climate Change	What type of tracking is considered in the design, and how much of an increase in efficiency is expected?	N/A	Single-axis tracking technology will 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.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Climate Change	<p>Different types of batteries could mean different cycle life and would hence dictate the replacement frequency.</p> <p>How are the batteries going to be decommissioned considering they will be replaced several times over the plant's lifespan?</p>	Yes	<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 [EN010133/APP/C7.2] explains that this will be secured via the Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan.</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	Climate Change	Battery capacity has also not been included in the PIER document; however, two options have been provided for the land size that can be allocated (6.58ha from Cottam 1 West A or one of three potential sites from Cottam West 15.34). Allocation of land size does not equate to the	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes the total energy storage capacity assumed for the purpose of this assessment is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option A – 1,357MWh • Option B – 2,773 MWh <p>The Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan [EN010133/APP/C7.9] explains that the system being used for assessment is</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>number of battery cabins that can be installed and the capacity of the BESS unit. For instance, a 2 MW BESS unit occupying 48m² could accommodate 342 BESS units (400MWh of storage capacity) if only 15% of the land area allocated in the PIER is used¹¹, see Fig 3. Batteries carry a lot of weight in the overall GHGs calculations due to their embodied carbon and decommissioning methods.</p> <p>What is the total battery capacity? Especially knowing that a given land area can accommodate a lot of the BESS units.</p>		<p>the LeBlock modular battery system by LeClanché. These are high density 744kWh lithium-ion batteries including a fire suppression system. The exact technology and system chemistry type is still to be determined, but it will be a lithium-ion battery cell type.</p> <p>The batteries will be recycled insofar as practical with the supplying manufacturer being obliged under the Waste Batteries and Accumulators Regulations 2009 (as amended) (or such equivalent regulations in force at the time of decommissioning) to offer a recycling service.</p> <p>The batteries will be recycled insofar as practical and with the technology available at the time of replacement.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		What is the battery technology considered?		
EN010133/AP P/C7.9]	Climate Change	<p>Questions on GHG emissions: GHG emissions in PV plants are typically categorised into Construction, Operation and Decommissioning stages. A wholesome value from the construction stage is taken as the representative emissions from the plant over its entire life in scheme.</p> <p>The emissions source highlighted during the construction stage does not fully state other possible emissions sources: water use, fuel use, switch gears, fencing, module structure, cables and batteries. The operational and decommissioning stages have not been provided with an estimate of the associated GHGs.</p>	No	The Applicant notes these were not included within the PEIR due to information not yet being available for these details but are included within the Chapter 7 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.7] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Climate Change	Although the total GHGs from the construction stage is mentioned as the worst-case scenario in the PIER, what other sources of emissions (aside table 7.15) have been considered in the 'worst-case' estimate?	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes sources of emissions during construction considered within the Environmental Statement 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 • Waste • Water Usage • Energy Usage for Construction Period • Packaging <p>These assessments are presented in Chapter 7 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.7].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Climate Change	What are the possible emissions during the operation stage? What is the replacement rate for the sources of emissions identified in the operations stage?	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes emissions sources considered during the operational phase include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance trips • Replacement batteries • Replacement PV modules • Water Usage • Operational Waste • Energy Usage for Operational Period <p>These assessments are presented in Chapter 7 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.7].</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	Climate Change	What are the emissions sources and total carbon emissions in the decommissioning stage?	No	<p>While it is unknown at this stage to what extent emissions will be representative during decommissioning in 40 years, for the purpose of assessment within the Environmental Statement the following sources of emissions have been considered during the decommissioning stage:</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worker Transportation • Removal of onsite materials • Water Usage • Energy Usage for Decommissioning Period <p>These assessments are presented in Chapter 7 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.7].</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	Climate Change	Is grid decarbonisation considered in the GHG emissions estimations and what are the total net savings from the plant with a decarbonising grid?	N/A	Decarbonisation has not specifically been accounted for within the total calculations as the values used are based on base-year CO2 emissions from the Scheme.
Lincolnshire County Council	Climate Change	What are projections of grid decarbonisation over the lifespan of the project?	N/A	The Scheme has not accounted for grid decarbonisation beyond the project itself being a form of grid decarbonisation.
Lincolnshire County Council	Climate Change	For a different generation technology type (especially renewable energy), what would be the like-for-like GHG intensity and net savings if a	N/A	The Applicant considers this be outside the scope of the Scheme and Environmental Statement.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		similar methodology, as shown in the scheme, were to be made in the calculations. The methodology here refers to estimating the construction, operational and decommission GHGs emissions and calculating the savings vs the grid from a similar plant of the same power rating).		
Lincolnshire County Council	Public Rights of Way	No comments to make at this stage	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes this response.</p> <p>With regards to PRow users, Pager Power has concluded that the effects upon observers (cyclist or horse-riders) would be at most a low impact (not significant) in the worst case. This is due to the effects upon amenity and safety as not being considered as significant when compared to a road user or dwellings.</p> <p>Glint and glare generated by panels is very similar to the glint and glare generated by bodies of water (such as lakes or rivers), therefore impacts are likely going to be the same.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Public Health	No comments to make at his stage	N/A	Noted.
National Grid	General	Due to the proximity of some of our assets, NGET wishes to express their interest in further consultation while the impact on our assets is still being assessed.	N/A	Noted.
National Grid	General	Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with or work within close proximity to any of NGET's apparatus and land, this will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights.	N/A	Noted. Appropriate protective provisions are in discussion and will be included within the DCO.
National Grid	General	National Grid Electricity Transmission has high voltage electricity overhead transmission lines and substations within or in close proximity to the order	N/A	Noted. .Appropriate protective provisions are in discussion and will be included within the DCO.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		boundary. The overhead lines and substations form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales.		
National Grid	General	National Grid's Overhead Line/s is protected by a Deed of Easement/Wayleave Agreement which provides full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect our asset	N/A	Noted. .Appropriate protective provisions are in discussion and will be included within the DCO. Easements have been adhered to within the Scheme.
National Grid	General	Statutory electrical safety clearances must be maintained at all times. Any proposed buildings must not be closer than 5.3m to the lowest conductor. National Grid recommends that no permanent structures are built directly beneath overhead lines. These distances are set out in EN 43 – 8 Technical Specification for "overhead line clearances Issue 3 (2004)	Yes	Noted. Concept Design Parameters [EN010133/APP/C7.15] include >5.3m horizontal offset from overhead lines.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
National Grid	General	If any changes in ground levels are proposed either beneath or in close proximity to our existing overhead lines then this would serve to reduce the safety clearances for such overhead lines. Safe clearances for existing overhead lines must be maintained in all circumstances.	Yes	Noted. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (outline CEMP) [EN010133/APP/C7.1] sets out outline management measures at Table 3.14.
National Grid	General	The relevant guidance in relation to working safely near to existing overhead lines is contained within the Health and Safety Executive's (www.hse.gov.uk) Guidance Note GS 6 "Avoidance of Danger from Overhead Electric Lines" and all relevant site staff should make sure that they are both aware of and understand this guidance.	Yes	Noted. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (outline CEMP) [EN010133/APP/C7.1] sets out outline management measures at Table 3.14.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
National Grid	General	Plant, machinery, equipment, buildings or scaffolding should not encroach within 5.3 metres of any of our high voltage conductors when those conductors are under their worse conditions of maximum "sag" and "swing" and overhead line profile (maximum "sag" and "swing") drawings should be obtained using the contact details above.	Yes	Noted. Concept Design Parameters [EN010133/APP/C7.15] include >5.3m horizontal offset from overhead lines.
National Grid	General	If a landscaping scheme is proposed as part of the proposal, we request that only slow and low growing species of trees and shrubs are planted beneath and adjacent to the existing overhead line to reduce the risk of growth to a height which compromises statutory safety clearances.	Yes	<p>The Landscape Environmental Management Plan [EN010133/APP/C7.3] sets out at paragraph 4.6.11 that the creation of flower rich pollinator strips is focussed on areas within the Sites where development is constrained by overhead and underground utilities.</p> <p>Within areas under this treatment, a low growing, floristically rich habitat will be created. In order to create this habitat, a flower rich seed mix will be</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				utilised. The habitat would be mowed once on an annual basis, in September to avoid impacts on nesting birds.
National Grid	General	Drilling or excavation works should not be undertaken if they have the potential to disturb or adversely affect the foundations or "pillars of support" of any existing tower. These foundations always extend beyond the base area of the existing tower and foundation ("pillar of support") drawings can be obtained using the contact details above.	Yes	<p>Noted. Appropriate protective provisions are in discussion and will be included within the DCO.</p> <p>The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (outline CEMP) [EN010133/APP/C7.1] sets out outline management measures at Table 3.14.</p> <p>Appropriate protective provisions are in discussion and will be included within the DCO.</p>
National Grid	General	National Grid Electricity Transmission high voltage underground cables are protected by a Deed of Grant; Easement; Wayleave Agreement or the provisions of the New Roads and Street Works Act. These provisions	N/A	Noted. Appropriate protective provisions are in discussion and will be included within the DCO.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>provide National Grid full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect our assets. Hence we require that no permanent / temporary structures are to be built over our cables or within the easement strip. Any such proposals should be discussed and agreed with National Grid prior to any works taking place.</p>		
National Grid	General	<p>Ground levels above our cables must not be altered in any way. Any alterations to the depth of our cables will subsequently alter the rating of the circuit and can compromise the reliability, efficiency and safety of our electricity network and requires consultation with National Grid prior to any such changes in both level and</p>	N/A	<p>Noted. Appropriate protective provisions are in discussion and will be included within the DCO.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		construction being implemented.		
Bassetlaw District Council	General	The sites for built development and are identified as Cottam 1, 2 and 3 which will connect to Cottam Power Station and offer 600MW of electricity to the grid. It is positive to see that a description of each of the sites has been included and sets out the key constraints as this will set the basis for the final ES.	N/A	Noted. This Applicant has also applied this approach to the Environmental Statement.
Bassetlaw District Council	General	The vast majority of the project will be situated within West Lindsey but the cable route is within the administrative boundary of Bassetlaw District Council and Nottinghamshire County Council. The updated PEIR notes that the selected design option is 'Tracking Panels' which have a greater height	N/A	The draft DCO seeks consent for both tracker and fixed panel options within the array Sites. The design parameters are set out in the Concept Design Parameters [EN010133/APP/C7.15] which are secured in the draft DCO:

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>than 'Fixed Panels' which have a maximum height of around 4.5 metres as opposed to 3.5 metres. The greater height of the former may have the possibility of more significant visual impacts (depending on the prevalence of panels at their maximum height). There are not any specific comments to make on the ancillary elements of the proposed development in a general sense. The site security, battery storage and other ancillary elements appear to be within standard measurements and are essential to support the operation of the proposed development.</p>		<p>For the purposes of the ES, the tracker panels have been assessed in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] as a worst-case scenario given their larger scale.</p> <p>Chapter 15 (Noise) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.15] assesses tracker panels given that fixed solar panels do not have any moving parts and therefore have no noise emission associated with them. Chapter 16 (Glint and Glare) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.16] considers both fixed and tracker panel options.</p>
Bassetlaw District Council	General	Like any proposal, appropriate consideration should be given to the potential impacts of the proposed development	N/A	Noted. The relevant national and local policies, as well as applicable legislation, has been set out within each ES chapter.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		against the relevant policies in the development plan alongside relevant material planning considerations.		
Bassetlaw District Council	General	It is difficult to make more precise comments about the cabling as the exact routing of the cables is not yet known. Once these details become clearer, it will be easier to make a better judgement on the constraints that will be most likely to be impacted. The route has since been narrowed, but it is difficult to make specific comments. Any route should look for the least sensitive route unless unavoidable and appropriate mitigation should be put in place where the impacts of the cable route are potentially significant. The narrow scale in terms of the final width of the cable routes	N/A	Noted. Table 5.13: Main Stages of Refinement for the Cable Route Corridor within Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.5] 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. Greater width is provided in specific locations where required for accesses and laydown areas and in the area where the route is

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		will clearly reduce their potential harms.		<p>shared with Gate Burton and West Burton NSIP projects and greater working width is required.</p> <p>Two cumulative scenarios have been considered within the Environmental Statement for the shared cable route: These are firstly the construction of all three projects' ducts and cables at the same time, within the same construction programme. The Environmental Statement assumes an 18 months duration for this. Secondly, the installation of each projects' ducts and cables, sequentially over a 5-year period, has been assessed.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Bassetlaw District Council	General	<p>It is encouraging that the ES will contain a chapter that will consider alternative sites. Given that the site for the main development has already been selected, it would have been preferable if some consideration had already been given to this. This is especially important as by the time the proposal proceed to submission, there is essentially no scope for alterations. That being said, it is promising that the broad methodology has been set out for establishing the selected site. The most preferable option would be for the chapter within the ES to fully justify why other potential sites were less preferable on balance.</p>	Yes	<p>Noted. 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 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.3.5] explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Bassetlaw District Council	General	There are no further comments at this stage. The Local Planning Authority worked closely with the Applicant and agent by providing feedback during the drafting of the Statement of Community Consultation.	N/A	Noted.
Bassetlaw District Council	General	The proposal appears to broadly outline all of the relevant legislation, national policy and local policy documents. Some policies such as DM4 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy (Design and Character) and Policy 12 of the Sturton Ward Neighbourhood Plan (Energy efficiency, renewable energy and climate change) appear to have not been assessed. Policy DM4 is especially relevant when considering landscape, visual impacts and	N/A	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy DM4 is considered within Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8].</p> <p>An assessment of the Scheme against the relevant planning policies is contained within Appendix C: Local Planning Policy Accordance Table of the Planning Statement [EN010133/APP/C7.5].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>layout which is a critical consideration in the DCO process. It is positive that appropriate references have been made to specific policies in the NPPF. Section 14 of the NPPF clearly provides great weight to renewable energy development alongside the recent Energy Security Strategy.</p>		
<p>Bassetlaw District Council</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>More broadly, the PEIR is viewed favourably on balance by the Local Planning Authority as it is much more substantial than the original EIA Scoping Report and appears to include greater assessment of the policies and enhanced mitigation. There will inevitably be some issues for consideration in some of the sections and it is hoped that these comments will be taken into account</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		when the DCO is finally submitted, likely later this year.		
Bassetlaw District Council	General	The PEIR is also more viewed more favourably in its approach to considering relevant policies and mitigation. Each section (with the exception of the policies outlined above) is more structured and sequential in its approach and sets out in much greater detail the proposed mitigation for the development.	N/A	Noted.
Bassetlaw District Council	Climate Change	Climate change (including the impact of the development itself) has been scoped into the PEIR which is welcomed by the Local Planning Authority. The chapter within the PEIR itself appears comprehensive and assesses key baselines. Although the development	N/A	The Applicant notes that reference to this policy has been included within Chapter 7 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.7] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>itself will inevitably produce some carbon emissions, especially during the construction and decommissioning phases, it is clear that these will be more than mitigated for by the provision of 480 MW of clean energy per annum. Nevertheless, efforts to reduce carbon emissions produced by the project should be carried forward. Policy 12 of the Sturton Ward Neighbourhood Plan may also be relevant due to the presence of the cable route.</p>		
Bassetlaw District Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	<p>It is positive to see that the PEIR has made references to policies that were missing in the original EIA Scoping Report such as paragraph 174 of the NPPF and policies within the Emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan (2020-</p>	Yes	<p>Due to the evolving nature of the layouts, the Applicant held additional meetings and workshops post PEIR with Nottinghamshire County Council to discuss the landscape and visual comments prior to the final Environmental Statement and Scheme submission. A continued dialogue</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>2037) –these will carry progressively more weight as the Local Plan moves through examination which is likely to coincide with the submission of the DCO. Policy DM4 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy also appears to have not been included. This is our critical design and character policy which broadly mirrors critical policies within Section 12 of the NPPF.</p>		<p>continues in regard to the Scheme proposals, including the policy matters supporting critical design and landscape character. The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8], with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and at Section 8.8.</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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives.
Bassetlaw District Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	This is one of the most important and sensitive considerations for the District. It should be made clear that any response received from Nottinghamshire County Council will form the basis for our comments and as such should be taken into account as well. This was the case for the EIA Scoping Report and this will continue to be the case going forward.	Yes	<p>Due to the evolving nature of the layouts, the Applicant held additional meetings and workshops post PEIR with Nottinghamshire County Council to discuss the landscape and visual comments prior to the final ES and Scheme submission. A continued dialogue continues in regard to the Scheme proposals, including the policy matters supporting critical design and landscape character. The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8], with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and the report at Section 8.8.</p> <p>The LVIA picks up the delivery of landscape mitigation to address biodiversity net gain through the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				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.
Bassetlaw District Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	It is positive to see that the cumulative impacts alongside other large scale development has been considered. It is also positive that the LVIA as part of the ES will include other material considerations such as biodiversity and cultural heritage due to the interaction between these material considerations.	N/A	The Applicant notes this. ES Chapter 8: landscape and Visual Impact [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] and supporting appendices consider likely significant effects of views from heritage assets. 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 LVIA picks up the delivery of landscape mitigation to address biodiversity net gain through the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>enhancement of existing habitats and green infrastructure proposals. The landscape measures also include the preparation of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010133/APP/C7.3] 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 and heritage consultants 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>
Bassetlaw District Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	With regards to the cabling, it is more difficult to assess at this stage as the final route of the cabling is not yet known.	N/A	The assessment of both the landscape and visual effects of the final route of the cabling is set out within the LVIA within the detailed receptor sheets at Appendix 8.2 and Appendix 8.3 to

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] .
Bassetlaw District Council	Ecology and Biodiversity	<p>Please see attached comments from Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The most relevant section of their response is quoted below:</p> <p>'Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) are a local, non-statutory designation, that sits below (but complements) the national suite of statutorily designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). They are of substantive value for the conservation of biodiversity and are home to rare and scarce species or represent the best surviving examples of habitats that were once widespread and typical</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that three Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) are located within the Cable Route Study Area (CRSA) which have the potential to be affected by the cable route installation works. Those LWS's that are partially within the CRSA are, Cow Pasture Lane Drains (CPLD) LWS, Willingham to Fillingham Road Verges (WFRV) LWS and Upton Grange Road Verges (UGRV) LWS. In each case, the Applicant has ensured care has been taken to ensure that the habitats for which these sites have been designated remain unimpacted.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that access to the adjacent development areas will be afforded through existing field accesses. In the case of UGRV, an existing field access will be used to facilitate cable installation haulage routes and set-down, while the cable itself will be installed via horizontal</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>of the Nottinghamshire landscape. Collectively, these sites form an essential ecological network and act as wildlife corridors and steppingstones, allowing species to migrate and disperse between sites. The continued existence of these sites is vital to safeguard wildlife from the pressures of development, intensive agriculture, and climate change. The LWS network is comprehensive (meaning that every site which qualifies as a LWS is designated as one), whereas SSSIs are representative of the best sites in an area, such that that not all sites which meet the SSSI selection criteria have been, or will be, designated as a SSSI. Because of this, a number of LWS would potentially qualify as SSSIs,</p>		<p>directional drilling methods. In all cases, measures within the Outline EPMS [EN010133/APP/C7.19] will be followed to further minimise the possibility of indirect impacts on the LWSs, 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.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>meaning that LWS are best described as sites that are of at least county-level importance for their flora and/or fauna. We acknowledge that neglect and/or inappropriate management can result in LWS being in unfavourable condition, but NWT is constantly seeking opportunities to support LWS owners to manage/restore their sites. There should, therefore, be a presumption against routing cables through sites of county biodiversity value. Wherever possible LWS should be avoided. Where this is not possible then it may be justifiable that impacts proceed if accompanied by sufficient mitigation, compensation and aftercare. We are of the opinion that the</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		mitigation hierarchy should be applied.'		
Bassetlaw District Council	Ecology and Biodiversity	The commitment to a 'significant Net Gain' is welcomed. The Environment Act 2021 promotes biodiversity net gain in new development, albeit from 2023. However, the NPPF recommends securing net gains now. Reflecting the principles of national planning policy and the emerging provisions of the Act we would strongly recommend that the proposal secures at least 10% net gain in biodiversity to ensure that the value of the development exceeds the pre-development on site habitat value by at least 10%.	Yes	The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.3.9.12] 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 approximately 96%, with an approximate 70% gain of Hedgerow Units and approximately a 11% 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 [EN010133/APP/C7.3] which will be legally secured under a requirement of the DCO and so ensure that objectives

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				are met and increase the reliability of these projections.
Bassetlaw District Council	Ecology and Biodiversity	It is positive to see that reference has been made to the mitigation hierarchy which is outlined in the response from the Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. There are no concerns regarding the updated assessment of the cable routing and the approach outlined for surveys refinement of the cable routing is satisfactory. Reference to 'Biodiversity 2020' has been included in the PEIR which is welcomed. Lighting, even during construction phase, has the	N/A	The Applicant notes that lighting during the construction and operational phase of the Scheme has been assessed in reference to bats and freshwater fish within Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.9] , with mitigation put forward including the restriction of fitting lighting to certain operational structures and restriction of operation to the hours of darkness only.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		potential to impact on ecology. It is positive to see that this has been addressed in the assessment of potential impacts.		
Bassetlaw District Council	Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	No reference has been made in the PEIR to Policies ST52 Flood Risk and Drainage and ST53 Protecting Water Quality and Management. This is regrettable given the original EIA Scoping Report made reference to these policies. Further detail on flood impacts and drainage solutions would be welcome. The Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in June 2021 concluded that the Cottam Priority Regeneration Area was found to be highly susceptible to groundwater flooding. Whilst it is acknowledged that this	N/A	Policies ST52 Flood Risk and Drainage and ST53 Protecting Water Quality and Management are recorded in section 10.3 (Policy Context) of Chapter 10 (Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.10] and Section 2.4 (Local Policy) of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		proposal may not have the same impact on flood risk as mixed use regeneration, such issues should be given due consideration in the planning process.		
Bassetlaw District Council	Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	Solar farms typically do not result in a significant increase in impermeable ground so the impacts are generally acceptable. There is significant reference to aspects of the development site being located within Flood Zone 3. This should be fully assessed within the ES. The proposed cable route should avoid Flood Zones 2 and 3 wherever possible but it is acknowledged that the impact of cable routing on flood risk would likely not be significant. The main issue would be ensuring the cabling infrastructure is	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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.10].</p> <p>The proposed development will not 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>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		appropriately design should flooding occur but this is not considered to be a material planning consideration so we have no further comments in this respect.		
Bassetlaw District Council	Ground Conditions and Contamination	Again it is acknowledged that the cabling element in this regard is less advanced. There are no further comments to make at this stage.	N/A	Noted.
Bassetlaw District Council	Minerals	The safeguarding of minerals is given local and national importance in the Section 17 of the NPPF (facilitating the sustainable use of minerals) and the Policy SP7 of the Nottinghamshire County Council Minerals Local Plan. It is recommended that ongoing consultation is done with the County Planning Authorities at Nottinghamshire County Council and Lincolnshire County Council to	No	The Applicant notes this. The identification and safeguarding of mineral resources within Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire has been acknowledged and the impact for any safeguarded resource fully assessed in the context of National and Local Mineral Safeguarding Policies. Both Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils in their role as Minerals Planning Authorities have been consulted as part of the mineral resource assessment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>properly determine whether this approach it acceptable. Given that Bassetlaw will only include the cabling it is very possible that there will be no mineral safeguarding consideration as the final routing of cables will only include a very small section of the search area for potential cable routes.</p>		
<p>Bassetlaw District Council</p>	<p>Minerals</p>	<p>Please see the response from The Coal Authority, this reads as follows:</p> <p>'I have checked the site location plan against the information held by the Coal Authority and can confirm that the proposed development site is located outside of the defined coalfield. Accordingly, the Coal Authority has no specific detailed comments / observations to make and there is no requirement for</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that no coalfields are affected by the Scheme.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		the Local Planning Authority to consult us on any future application for this site'		
Bassetlaw District Council	Archaeology	<p>Please find below the response from Lincolnshire County Council's Archaeologist:</p> <p>The Cottam PEIR addresses Cultural Heritage in Chapter 13. The bulk of the project is located within Lincolnshire, however the cable connection will run through Bassetlaw District connecting to the hub at the site of the former power station at Cottam. Consequently, this response concerns the proposals for the cable route and not main site.</p>	N/A	The Applicant notes that the four solar sites are located in Lincolnshire. The western section of the cable route is located in the Bassetlaw district of Nottinghamshire, running from the west banks of the River Trent to the south of Trent Port to the Cottam Power Station. All works have been undertaken in consultation with relevant stakeholders in Lincolnshire and Bassetlaw.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Bassetlaw District Council	Archaeology	<p>In terms of progress with gathering baseline data on Cultural Heritage, the PEIR does not accurately reflect the current situation on the ground. Sufficient progress is being made with regard to ongoing desk-based research and the geophysical survey is underway. Data from evaluation trenching will also be required to support the Environmental Statement (ES) along the entire cable corridor route and this has yet to be agreed. As it stands, my response to this PEIR reflects what has been presented within the document and also my concern particularly with the proposed mitigation approach which is fundamentally flawed.</p>	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes that a programme of geophysical survey, presented as Appendix 13.2 to Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13], and evaluation trenching has been undertaken on the cable route in Bassetlaw (Appendix 13.6), which was agreed with Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team. The geophysical survey covered a 100% sample of accessible land within the Scheme. The trial trench evaluation sampled 1 - 1.1% of accessible areas along the 'Shared Cable Corridor'.</p> <p>The results of these field evaluations, along with desk-based research (including LiDAR survey data, aerial photographs), has been used to inform a detailed mitigation strategy (WSI; Appendix 13.7 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.13.7]).</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Bassetlaw District Council	Archaeology	The PEIR notes that the initial response to the scoping opinion has been supported by the Planning Inspectorate and that geophysics survey should be used to inform the design evolution of the route corridors. It further states that geophysical survey of the route corridors is underway and the results should be used to help inform the final routes.	Yes	<p>Desk-based research (including LiDAR survey data, aerial photographs, Appendix 13.1) has identified areas where there is a potential for archaeological remains to occur within the cable route corridor. The Applicant notes a programme of geophysical survey, presented as Appendix 13.2 to Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13], was undertaken along the cable route corridor to further understand the absence / presence / extent / form of buried archaeological remains.</p> <p>Baseline information has been used to inform the final cable route, including micro-siting away from areas considered to have a high potential for substantial archaeological remains to be present.</p>
Bassetlaw District Council	Archaeology	The cable route corridor geophysics results will also need to form a significant element of the baseline data	N/A	Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] and mitigation strategy (WSI; Appendix 13.7) are informed by a full suite of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		for the ES Chapter and inform the overall mitigation strategy.		archaeological assessments including desk-based research, aerial photographs, LiDAR data, geophysical survey, and evaluation trenching.
Bassetlaw District Council	Archaeology	On p359 in the 'Comment Addressed' column (Table 13.1), the Applicant states 'Further assessment will be submitted alongside the ES as appropriate'. 'Appropriate' in this case will be the results of all evaluation including geophysics and trial trenching of the full length of the cable route corridor as well as the completed desk-based analysis. On p361 the first 'Response' column states that 'trenching will focus on areas that have been assessed to have archaeological potential'. It has been consistently stated that trenching is also required across 'blank' areas where	N/A	<p>Archaeological evaluation trenching has been undertaken within assessable areas of the 'Shared Cable Corridor'. Evaluation trenching was considered appropriate within the 'Shared Cable Corridor' given the form / extent of archaeological features identified by baseline information and the possible higher level of impact that will potentially occur due to it being used by up to three or more cable routes belonging to the Scheme and other proposed solar schemes.</p> <p>No evaluation trenching was considered necessary for the remainder of the Scheme Route in Bassetlaw where a single cable is proposed, and where baseline information has suggested a minimal potential for archaeological features to</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		previous evaluation results have not established the archaeological potential.		<p>be present, as alternative mitigation was considered appropriate to safeguard against any potential loss of archaeological deposits present.</p> <p>Information collated by desk-based research and non-intrusive survey work, the validity of which has been proven by the results of the evaluation trenching, is considered sufficient to be able to establish that the archaeological potential for 'blank' areas is negligible/low. Consequently, a comprehensive programme across all 'blank' areas is not considered necessary.</p>
Bassetlaw District Council	Archaeology	Of significant concern is the reference to Appendices 13.1, 13.2 and 13.4 where these do not adequately address the comments raised for the Scoping Report. While I appreciate the gathering of baseline data is an ongoing process, a certain level of	N/A	A full suite of archaeological assessment, survey and evaluation trenching has been undertaken by the Applicant as part of the Scheme. These assessments have been undertaken using a staged approach so that each phase of assessment works could inform the next (i.e. the location of evaluation trenches was based on

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>attainment is expected at each stage to inform the next. The data from the Desk-Based Assessment, LiDAR & AP Assessment and Geophysical Survey should be largely completed and combined prior to the trenched evaluation so trenches can be targeted where necessary.</p>		<p>information acquired through desk-based research and non-intrusive surveys). To maximise the knowledge and understanding attained through the various assessments and field evaluations, initial interpretation of baseline information has been re-examined using the results of subsequent works (i.e. the desk-based assessments were updated with the results of subsequent surveys). Data collected from desk-based research, non-intrusive surveys and the trial trench evaluation has been fully detailed and assessed in Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Bassetlaw District Council	Archaeology	<p>Section 13.4.2 states that geophysical survey will be undertaken on the currently proposed cable routes and that HER information will be obtained for them. The full suite of evaluation is required for the full extent of the proposed development area including complete desk-based assessments with the required sources as quoted in the middle of p360 not just geophysical survey and HER data as currently stated. As mentioned previously, a programme of trial trenching along the cable routes is also required to ascertain the presence or absence of archaeology, to provide evidence to inform the route selection and to determine what mitigation will be required along the route.</p>	N/A	<p>Desk-based research (HER, NHLE, NHRE, HLC, PAS and cartographical information), along with non-intrusive surveys (assessments of LiDAR, aerial photographs and geophysical survey) has been undertaken by the Applicant to create a comprehensive suite of baseline information.</p> <p>Archaeological evaluation trenching has been undertaken within assessable areas of the 'Shared Cable Corridor' in Bassetlaw. Evaluation trenching was considered appropriate within the 'Shared Cable Corridor' given the form / extent of archaeological features identified by baseline information and the higher level of impact that will potentially occur due to it being used by up to three or more cable routes belonging to the Cottam, and other, proposed solar schemes.</p> <p>No evaluation trenching was considered necessary for the majority of the Cottam Cable Route in</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>Section 13.5.42 states that 'geophysical survey will be undertaken along the cable routes with appropriate desk-based research and bolstered by targeted trenching'. As above, full evaluation including comprehensive desk-based assessment and trenching of the 'blank' areas will be required to obtain baseline evidence across the full impact zone including the cable routes.</p>		<p>Lincolnshire where a single cable is proposed, and baseline information has suggested a minimal potential for archaeological features to be present as alternative mitigation was considered appropriate to safeguard against any potential loss of archaeological remains which could be present.</p>
<p>Bassetlaw District Council</p>	<p>Archaeology</p>	<p>Regarding section 13.6.1 and the proposals for dealing with 'on-site archaeological remains' by 'mitigation by design'. This implies significant levels of 'preservation in situ' which is not possible in regard to the cable routes. Archaeological mitigation within the corridor routes is</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>A detailed mitigation strategy (WSI) is included in Appendix 13.7 to Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] that outlines where 'preservation by record' or 'preservation by design' is required to safeguard archaeological assets within the Scheme. The WSI details areas where 'preservation by record' will be</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>likely to require archaeological excavation and there is no reference in the document to the other standard archaeological mitigation response known as 'preservation by record' through archaeological investigation and recording (archaeological fieldwork).</p> <p>Given the large scale of this development, a suitable mitigation programme which includes archaeological mitigation by archaeological fieldwork would be expected and I would expect this to be acknowledged and included in this document, certainly it must be included in the ES as it is essential as part of an effective, robust and reasonable mitigation strategy to deal with developmental impacts on archaeology</p>		<p>required (i.e. in high impact areas such as the cable route), and the form that it should take based on the potential for archaeological remains to be present (i.e. open excavation, 'strip, map and sample' or an archaeological watching brief).</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Bassetlaw District Council	Ecology and Biodiversity	It is difficult to make further comments apart from those that were made in response to the EIA Scoping Report at this stage as the final cabling route is not yet fully know. As a general point, the cabling route should take the least historically and environmentally sensitive route unless unavoidable and should include the necessary mitigation where appropriate.	Yes	The Applicant notes that, as set out in Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.9] , an iterative assessment process has been followed in order to ensure that the most environmentally sensitive route for the cable corridor has been followed. This has involved undertaking a desk study of ecological designations and the presence of records of protected species and habitat within a wider search area, before being narrowed down to the Cable Corridor within the Order Limits. Furthermore, the Applicant notes the Cable Corridor and surrounding land have been examined in person by a team of experienced ecologists to assess the potential presence of protected species and the relative importance of all habitats. Surveys have also included breeding bird surveys, otter and water vole surveys, bat roost surveys and great crested newt surveys. All information has been used to deduce the least

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				ecologically sensitive route possible, with further mitigation, such as Horizontal Directional Drilling, pre-works inspections and the presence of an Ecological Clerk of Works. Such mitigation measures are contained within the Outline Ecological Protection and Mitigation Strategy (EPMS) [EN010133/APP/C7.19] .
Bassetlaw District Council	Transport and Access	There are no further comments with respects to transport and access.	No	Noted.
Bassetlaw District Council	Noise and Vibration	Given the fact that the details of the design and location of the proposed cabling is not yet fully established it is considered that ground vibration or noise should be fully assessed within the relevant chapter with the ES (it is positive to see that these effects have been scoped in). Generally, the potential	No	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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.15] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		impacts of the project seem acceptable with more significant activity taking place at distances further away from the nearest sensitive receptors.		
Bassetlaw District Council	Noise and Vibration	The PEIR acknowledges that there are still significant gaps in the information provided including cumulative effects, residual effects, operational noise, and construction traffic noise. However, we acknowledge that any impacts are highly unlikely to be permanent once the construction works are completed.	N/A	The Applicant notes that gaps in the aforementioned information have been addressed in Chapter 15 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.15] .
Bassetlaw District Council	Glint and Glare	No comment to make on this topic, the District is pleased to see that it is scoped into the ES.	N/A	Noted. The Applicant has presented assessment of glint and glare in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.16] .
Bassetlaw District Council	Public Health	Human health is a material consideration and the District	Yes	Noted. Impacts upon human health have been assessed within Chapter 21 (Other Environmental Matters) of the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>consider that this should be scoped into the ES.</p> <p>It is agreed that this does not have to be a standalone chapter; however it will need to be addressed in other relevant chapters such as biodiversity, transport etc. Whilst it is agreed as well that the impacts will likely not be significant and temporary, the potential impacts should be fully explored within the relevant sections of the ES.</p>		Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.21].
Bassetlaw District Council	Major Accidents and Disasters	The approach to this topic is agreed.	N/A	Noted.
Bassetlaw District Council	Air Quality	There are no further comments to make at this stage.	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Bassetlaw District Council	Socio-Economics, Agriculture and Tourism and Recreation	It is acknowledged that the project will bring considerable benefits as well as potential harms, the broad approach in terms of impacts and proposed mitigation is agreed. There are no further comments to make at this stage.	N/A	Noted.
Bassetlaw District Council	Agricultural Land	It is considered that this is an important issue for the relevant Districts, especially when considering these proposals cumulatively with other similar proposals. The potential impact on agricultural land should be fully assessed within the ES and appropriate mitigation put in place where necessary.	N/A	Noted. Impacts upon agricultural land have been assessed within Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.19] .
Bassetlaw District Council	Waste	Please refer to our original response to the EIA Scoping report. There are no further comments to make at this stage.	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Bassetlaw District Council	Telecommunications, Utilities and Television Receptors	The proposed approach to this chapter is agreed.	N/A	Noted.
Bassetlaw District Council	Cable Route	We can confirm that the proposed ecological survey work and methodologies relating to the cable routes is satisfactory. We note that a qualitative assessment of habitat suitability for the species/groups included in the summary table will be undertaken at the same time as the Phase 1 Survey that will identify those which may be at risk from being impacted by proposals. We are satisfied that this process will inform future survey needs.	N/A	Noted.
Bassetlaw District Council	Cable Route	The cable route corridor is referred to as the 'Cable Route Search Area' (CRSA) and forms the scope of the ecological desk study for the cable route	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>used at PEIR stage, within which ecological records (notable species and habitats and designated sites) will be searched for. We note that the final location of the cable route elements will be refined through use of the desk study, supported by further ecological survey and consideration of responses to statutory consultation, prior to submission of the DCO application. We consider this process to be satisfactory.</p>		
<p>Bassetlaw District Council</p>	<p>Cable Route</p>	<p>We note within Chapter 9.3 Ecological Desk Study for Cable Route Search Areas states:</p> <p>Care should be taken to avoid direct impacts on LWSs. However, depending on the circumstances and presence of other constraints, it may be justifiable that</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Noted. Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.9] assesses the impacts of the scheme upon Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and other non-statutory and statutory designated sites. See Section 9.7) Local Wildlife Sites noted for grassland, wetland and linear habitats were found to be present in proximity to most of</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>impacts proceed if accompanied by sufficient mitigation, compensation and aftercare. If direct impacts are probable, a detailed inspection of the habitat should be undertaken by an ecologist to determine its current condition. In many cases, LWSs have lost condition since designation through poor management. In this situation, impacts may be more justifiable and corresponding opportunities for restoration and net gain are likely to be welcomed. The cost and achievability of any restoration and mitigation would differ according to the complexity, condition and replicability of the habitats present.</p>		<p>the array Sites, while a small number are present adjacent. These valuable sites will be protected by the Ecological Protection and Mitigation Strategy (EPMS) [EN010133/APP/C7.19] during the construction phase and enhanced in the long term wherever possible through the provisions of the Landscape Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010133/APP/C7.3]. Similarly, protected sites such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest which were noted within 5km of the Sites for their wetland habitats will be protected from potential pollution events or disturbance during construction.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Bassetlaw District Council	Cable Route	Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) are a local, non-statutory designation, that sits below (but complements) the national suite of statutorily designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). They are of substantive value for the conservation of biodiversity and are home to rare and scarce species or represent the best surviving examples of habitats that were once widespread and typical of the Nottinghamshire landscape. Collectively, these sites form an essential ecological network and act as wildlife corridors and steppingstones, allowing species to migrate and disperse between sites. The continued existence of these sites is vital to safeguard wildlife from the pressures of development, intensive	Yes	<p>Noted. Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.9] assesses the impacts of the scheme upon Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and other non-statutory and statutory designated sites (See Section 9.7). 16 LWSs were located within 2km of the Cable Route Search Area. The process of finalising the Cable Route Corridor has meant that none of the LWSs will be directly affected by the cable installation. This is due either by avoiding crossing/making incursions into the LWSs or, in the case of Cow Pasture Lane Drains LWS and Upton Grange Road Verges LWS, employing Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) to install the cables without needing to open a trench.</p> <p>The Outline EPMS provides precautionary measures in relation to using HDD in proximity to these LWSs,</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>agriculture, and climate change. The LWS network is comprehensive (meaning that every site which qualifies as a LWS is designated as one), whereas SSSIs are representative of the best sites in an area, such that that not all sites which meet the SSSI selection criteria have been, or will be, designated as a SSSI. Because of this, a number of LWS would potentially qualify as SSSIs, meaning that LWS are best described as sites that are of at least county-level importance for their flora and/or fauna. We acknowledge that neglect and/or inappropriate management can result in LWS being in unfavourable condition, but NWT is constantly seeking opportunities to support LWS owners to manage/restore</p>		<p>and to ensure potential indirect pollution or dust deposition effects from the cable installation works in proximity to these sites are mitigated.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>their sites There should, therefore, be a presumption against routing cables through sites of county biodiversity value. Wherever possible LWS should be avoided. Where this is not possible then it may be justifiable that impacts proceed if accompanied by sufficient mitigation, compensation and aftercare. We are of the opinion that the mitigation hierarchy should be applied.</p>		
<p>Bassetlaw District Council</p>	<p>Cable Route</p>	<p>Collectively, avoidance, minimisation and rehabilitation/restoration serve to reduce, as far as possible, the residual impacts that a project has on biodiversity. Typically, however, even after their effective application, additional steps will be required to achieve no</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed development will result in a significant Net Gain for biodiversity, with 96.09% gains provided in habitat, 70.22% gains in hedgerow and 10.69% gains in river units, in line with local and national planning policies. The significant gains in biodiversity will offset any minimal impacts from the cable route which has been refined as set out above to avoid LWSs and other statutorily and non-</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		overall negative impact or a net gain for biodiversity.		statutorily designated sites. See Appendix 9.12 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) [EN010133/APP/C6.3.9.12] to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.9] .
Bassetlaw District Council	Cable Route	Offset: offsetting aims to compensate for any residual, adverse impacts after full implementation of the previous three steps of the mitigation hierarchy. Biodiversity offsets are of two main types: 'restoration offsets' which aim to rehabilitate or restore degraded habitat, and 'averted loss offsets' which aim to reduce or stop biodiversity loss in areas where this is predicted. Offsets are often complex and expensive, so attention to earlier steps in the mitigation hierarchy is usually preferable.	N/A	Noted. The proposed development will result in a significant Net Gain for biodiversity, with 96.09% gains provided in habitat, 70.22% gains in hedgerow and 10.69% gains in river units, in line with local and national planning policies. The significant gains in biodiversity will offset any minimal impacts from the cable route which has been refined as set out above to avoid LWSs and other statutorily and non-statutorily designated sites. See Appendix 9.12 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) [EN010133/APP/C6.3.9.12] to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.9] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Bassetlaw District Council	Cable Route	Ecological Clerk of Works - Cabling operations should be carried out according to a PMW or Ecological Method Statement in the presence of an Ecological Clerk of Works to supervise and advise during the process to avoid direct impacts upon protected and notable species	Yes	The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] , with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and at Section 8.8. The Outline EPMS [EN010133/APP/C7.19] contains (among other measures) provision for an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) to oversee certain construction activities which have the potential to impact on protected species, such as localised habitat clearance, ditch/watercourse engineering works. The EPMS will set out in detail what will trigger the need for ECoW attendance and, potentially, pre-commencement surveys or preparation by an ecologist, as well as follow-up monitoring or reporting.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<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 proposals allow for flexibility, but they can also be fixed, where appropriate and applicable.</p>
Canal and River Trust	General	The Trust is Navigation Authority for the River Trent and also has freehold	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>landowner interests with respect to the riverbed. The river is classified as a commercial waterways and can accommodate large freight carriers as well as smaller vessels. The Trust also owns and operates the Fossdyke Canal which is located to the south of the project area and the Chesterfield Canal to the west of the project area. It appears unlikely that there would be any impacts on either the Fossdyke Canal or the Chesterfield Canal.</p>		
Canal and River Trust	Cable Route	<p>We further note that the PEIR states that the developers have worked collaboratively on design development and environmental avoidance mitigation to maximise opportunities for reducing overall environmental and</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that additional measures regarding the need to liaise with Canal & River Trust prior to finalisation of or undertaking of drilling beneath the River Trent are needed. This has been added to the Outline Ecological Protection and Mitigation</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>social effects, in particular on communities in proximity to the grid connection corridor and on known ecological and archaeologically sensitive areas adjacent to the River Trent and we consider that this is an appropriate approach.</p> <p>We strongly recommend that the Trust is included in future discussions over the location of the cable crossing and whether a single crossing point can be agreed by the respective project promoters so we can advise on any potential issues likely to affect navigational safety or our interests as an affected landowner. The PEIR indicates that the cable crossing of the river will be underground and</p>		<p>Strategy (EPMS) [EN010133/APP/C7.19].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		we consider that this will assist in minimising visual impacts on the river and potential impacts on use of the Navigation.		
Canal and River Trust	Cable Route	Any crossing of the river is likely to require the prior consent of the Trust. Please be advised that the Trust is a statutory undertaker and has specific duties to protect its waterways. We would therefore resist any proposed use of compulsory purchase powers which may affect our land or undertakings. We reserve the right to seek protections under S16 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 should any proposals affect land which has been acquired for the purposes of our undertaking. Accordingly, we advise that the acquisition of any Trust land or rights over	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Trust land should be secured by agreement and we strongly recommend early contact with the Trust's Utilities Team to commence discussions over the terms of such an agreement ahead of submission of the DCO application.		
Canal and River Trust	Cable Route	As the proposal will involve works affecting the Trust's waterways, in our capacity as landowner, we will also require the Applicant/developer to comply with the Trust's current Code of Practice for Works Affecting the Canal & River Trust and recommend early discussion with the Trust's Infrastructure Services Team over all works likely to affect Trust property.	N/A	Noted.
Canal and River Trust	General	The stretch of river identified in the PEIR lies immediately south of two areas of land in	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>the Trust's ownership, located on either side of the river. This land has been used as dredging tips (and the site to the east of Coates Lane is still in use for this purpose) and any use of this land for routing cables could reduce the ability of the Trust to carry out future dredging activities on the River Trent, which is particularly important to facilitate continued navigation of the river by commercial vessels. We therefore recommend that, in considering the final cable route, this land is avoided. The Environmental Statement should nonetheless consider any potential impacts on existing dredging tips, including consideration of the potential for them to contain elevated levels of contamination.</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Canal and River Trust	General	<p>The installation of new solar farm equipment could involve the importation of significant indivisible heavy loads. The River Trent is a commercial waterway, where the transport of equipment may be possible which could help to minimise the need to utilise the Highway Network. We note that PIER Vol 2 Transport & Access at page 57 includes the potential use of the River Trent to bring in components for the West Burton Sub-station to the EDF Energy Berth at Cottam Power Station. We advise that the use of the Trent should be included within the Transport and Access chapter of the Environmental Statement, so as to ensure that every possibility to reduce the impact on the highway network is considered.</p>		<p>Noted. Use of the River Trent is considered within Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.14].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Canal and River Trust	Noise and Vibration	Works to install a cable crossing beneath the River Trent have significant potential to generate noise and vibration impacts and these effects on the river and users of the river should be considered within the Environmental Statement. In particular, works in proximity to the river need to be carefully managed to minimise the risk of significant vibration or loading that could adversely affect the stability of the river bank.		Chapter 15 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.15] evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning.
Canal and River Trust	Ecology and Biodiversity	Para. 9.6.164 of the Ecology and Biodiversity chapter of the PEIR states that the cable installation process which is likely to be required to cross underneath rivers, will utilise directional drilling methods. It is suggested that there will be a small risk of vibrations	Yes	The Applicant notes that the potential for release of sediment during drilling operations will be minimised by careful siting of drilling entry and exit pits, suitable depth control and visual monitoring by an Ecological Clerk of Works (see paragraphs (9.7.210-9.7.215 of Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity)

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>leading to sediment mobilisation, or the emission of pollutants, although such impacts are considered likely to be minor to moderately adverse in the short to medium term. We consider that directional drilling can cause sediment discharges and problems arising from mud toxicity due to vibrations below the river. Impacts on fish species and invertebrates found in the water and their likely sensitivity to potential sediment movement should therefore be considered within the Environmental Statement.</p>		<p>of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.9].</p>
<p>Canal and River Trust</p>	<p>Ecology and Biodiversity</p>	<p>Temporary construction lighting along the cable corridor route in the vicinity of the River Trent will have the potential to disturb wildlife. We note that mitigation measures to minimise such</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<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) [EN010133/APP/C7.19] to minimise the need for lighting and the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		impacts are proposed to be incorporated into a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (para 9.6.91).		timing of its usage, during all project phases.
Canal and River Trust	Landscape and Visual Impact	The sites for the solar panels are set well away from the River Trent and their location and the local topography suggest that they are unlikely to be visible from the river. However, notwithstanding the distance between the solar panels and the river, as noted in the PINS Scoping Opinion, the Environmental Statement should assess glint and glare impacts to river users where significant effects are likely to occur. The River Trent is a navigable waterway which is also designated as a commercial waterway carrying freight. It is therefore important that visual impacts	No	In relation to the cable route crossing the Trent, the Applicant notes that this has always been in the Scheme. The refinement of the position since PEIR still sits within the identified cable corridor. Consultation has already been undertaken with LCC as well as other relevant stakeholders in regard to the crossing of the River Trent. The cable will be directionally drilled under the river and so no permanent above ground structures are proposed. During the construction period there are likely to be temporary construction compounds then these will be removed. The crossing is proposed to be directionally drilled to reduce the effects on ecology and landscape and visual receptors. Disturbance will be minimal and not likely to result in

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		(including impacts from glint and glare) on the river do not result in any harm to navigational safety.		significant effects. Additional viewpoints are therefore not considered to be required.
Canal and River Trust	Landscape and Visual Impact	The Trust notes the comments at para 16.4.36 of the Glint and Glare chapter, but we do not consider that potential impacts on river users can be discounted without providing evidence to support such a position. The Environmental Statement should therefore provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that significant visual impacts will not occur and we consider that the potential for adverse impacts on navigational safety should be considered within the glint and glare assessment. In view of the potential risk to	No	Landscape and Visual impacts of the section of cable route between the Cottam Power Station and Cottam 1 Site have been assessed within Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] . In relation to the cable route crossing the Trent, the Applicant notes that this has always been in the Scheme. The refinement of the position since PEIR still sits within the identified cable corridor. Consultation has already been undertaken with Lincolnshire County Council as well as other relevant stakeholders in regard to the crossing

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>navigational safety should there be any adverse impacts, the Trust recommends that this matter should be explicitly considered in order to ensure that it can be discounted.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement should also consider the potential visual impact of construction operations along the cable route corridor, which extends to, and includes part of, the River Trent. In particular, the siting of construction compounds should be considered within the LVIA and river users should be considered as potential receptors. It is important that visual impacts are assessed within the context of the river being a navigable waterway and also designated as a commercial waterway carrying freight. It is important that</p>		<p>of the River Trent. The cable will be directionally drilled under the river and so no permanent above ground structures are proposed. During the construction period there are likely to be temporary construction compounds then these will be removed. The crossing is proposed to be directionally drilled to reduce the effects on ecology and landscape and visual receptors. Disturbance will be minimal and not likely to result in significant effects.</p> <p>Chapter 16 (Glint and Glare) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.16] considers the potential glint and glare impacts upon River users.</p> <p>The River Trent is circa 5.4km west of Cottam Solar Development (at its closest point). Any glint and glare effects will not have a significant impact due to the large separation distance. Overall, there are only three streams</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		visual impacts on the river do not result in any harm to navigational safety.		that pass close to the Cottam Solar Development, however, none of these are suitable for navigation and therefore impacts are not possible.
Tarmac Aggregates Limited	Cable Route	<p>We have been instructed by Tarmac Aggregates Limited ("TAL") to submit a response to the current Phase Two Consultation on the Cottam Solar Project ("the solar project"), specifically in the context of Rampton Quarry ("the quarry"), which is partially situated within the southern limits of the solar project's cable route search corridor ("the cable corridor").</p> <p>Rampton Quarry, which is located to the south of the decommissioned Cottam Power Station has been fully restored to a combination of agriculture and nature</p>	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>conservation after uses in accordance with the approved restoration scheme under Planning Permissions I/15/01688/CDM and I/15/01689/CDM dated 31 October 2016.</p> <p>The quarry was fully restored with effect from 30 September 2017 and the restored land is currently undergoing aftercare in accordance with statutory requirements.</p>		
Tarmac Aggregates Limited	Cable Route	With regard to the areas of restored quarry that are located within the cable corridor, the respective land, subject to written confirmation from the Mineral Planning Authority, will be out of aftercare with effect from 1 October 2022, with the expectation that if not already by that point, the land will be	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		returned to the freehold Title owners.		
Tarmac Aggregates Limited	Cable Route	On the basis of the above and as the anticipated solar project construction start date is understood to be in 2024, it is confirmed that TAL does not wish to make any specific comments as part of this consultation insofar as the quarry is concerned.	N/A	Noted.
Tarmac Aggregates Limited	Cable Route	In terms of other comments on behalf of TAL, it is essential that the potential presence of mineral resources is given adequate consideration, particularly within the cable corridor, which appears to be located within Minerals Safeguarding Areas identified within the Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire Minerals/Minerals and Waste Local Plans. This is of paramount importance to	N/A	Noted. Chapter 12 (Minerals) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.12] assesses the impacts of the Scheme upon mineral resources.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		avoid any unnecessary sterilisation of minerals.		
Tarmac Aggregates Limited	Cable Route	It is acknowledged that the proposed areas for the solar panels and associated development are generally located outside of Minerals Safeguarding Areas.	N/A	Noted.
Tarmac Aggregates Limited	Cable Route	It should be noted that if for any reason the cable corridor is extended, or an alternative cable corridor considered, TAL reserves it position such that further consultation with TAL will be necessary.	N/A	Noted.
Tarmac Aggregates Limited	Cable Route	Finally it should be noted that on a general level and in the context of climate change mitigation/reduction, TAL is supportive of increases in renewable energy generation and projects which seek to reduce greenhouse gas emissions/mitigate the impacts of climate change.	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Natural England	Landscape and Visual Impact	<p>The proposed development is not located within, or within the setting of, any nationally designated landscapes. As a result, Natural England have no specific comments to make on the landscape implications. We welcome the reference made to Natural England's National Character Areas, and advise that the development should complement and where possible enhance local distinctiveness. We would also like to stress the importance of cumulative landscape impacts from the development; welcome the assessment of the developments listed within PEIR Table 8.6. Public Rights of Way and Access Natural England note the intention to enhance the footpath network associated with the site, noted as secondary mitigation for Public Rights of Way and</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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8], 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 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 Scheme and encourage public access to nature.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>Access in PEIR paragraphs 8.9.46-54. We recommend that the enhancement of this network would not have to be limited to increasing accessibility and connectivity of PRow, but that it could also include measures to increase understanding of the local landscapes and the solar project itself, for example via information boards at vantage points. The ecological enhancement measures which are being undertaken as part of the project could be summarised to provide public understanding of the project and encourage access to nature.</p>		
Natural England	Ecology and Biodiversity	<p>Assessment of Effects (Chapter 9.6) Designated Sites: The PEIR has assessed potential impacts to the Humber Estuary SPA. As discussed within PEIR</p>	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>paragraph 9.6.2, Natural England have provided advice regarding the potential for impacts to this site. We agree with the conclusion of no residual effects likely, and consider that the survey information indicates the site is not critical to, or necessary for, the ecological or behavioural functions of the qualifying features of the SPA, thus, is not functionally linked to the SPA. We also note that the retention of existing boundary features, along with the various enhancement works under and around the solar panels will retain the potential low level of use of the site by the qualifying features of the SPA; there is little evidence to show solar farms pose a risk to birds in terms of either confusion of panels with water or collisions.</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Natural England	Ecology and Biodiversity	As outlined within our EIA scoping response, impacts to Laughton Common SSSI, Scotton Common SSSI, Scotton Beck Fields SSSI and Scotton and Laughton Forest Ponds SSSI are possible. We also note Tuetoos Hill SSSI has been included in the assessment of impacts. Below we have reviewed the conclusions regarding impacts to these sites:	N/A	Noted.
Natural England	Ecology and Biodiversity	We note that no SSSI Impact Risk Zones have been triggered for these SSSIs, by either the Cottam sites, or the cable corridor works, along with the fact that no habitats associated with the SSSIs can be found within Cottam 3 (the nearest parcel of the development) and no strong habitat corridors exist between the SSSIs and the	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>site. As a result ,we consider that impacts to these SSSIs are unlikely during all phases of development, however, we welcome the inclusion of mitigation measures to further reduce the likelihood of impacts to the SSSIs, and prevent impacts to other locally designated sites.</p>		
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Ecology and Biodiversity</p>	<p>Despite no IRZ triggers, as noted in PEIR paragraph 9.6.19, there is a low possibility of impacts from contaminated surface water from the site reaching Laughton Common SSSI. We are pleased to see the intention to implement a CEMP; that the provisions of the CEMP, outlined in Appendix 4.3,include protecting boundary features, avoiding working in adverse weather conditions and using appropriate storage of fuels,</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the potential for impacts upon Laughton Common SSSI are discussed in paragraphs 9.7.6 to 9.7.12 in Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.9]. Mitigation is put forward to reduce potential impacts (including those listed in Natural England's comment) to neutral levels. These will be implemented through the Outline Ecological Protection and Mitigation Strategy (EPMS) [EN010133/APP/C7.19]. The Defra</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>oils and chemicals. We would also recommend the CEMP to include measures to protect the soil resource during construction too, as these two areas dovetail and suitable handling of soils should reduce the possibility of significant sediment runoff during construction. Defra has published a Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites which provides advice on the use and protection of soil in construction projects, including the movement and management of soil resources, which we strongly recommend is followed.</p>		<p>Code of Practice is acknowledged and is referenced in the EPMS.</p>
Natural England	Ecology and Biodiversity	<p>During operation, embedded mitigation, i.e. the maintenance of vegetation under and around the panels, will bind the soil surface,</p>	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		reducing sediment runoff, and reduced site traffic will significantly reduce the chances of a pollution incident.		
Natural England	Ecology and Biodiversity	We would also like to note that the development poses an opportunity to create additional habitat which could complements the SSSIs in this area, and/or contributes to increasing the ecological connectivity of the area. This is noted within PEIR paragraph 9.6.23 and we have made comments on the LEMP further down in this response. We would be happy to provide further advice regarding habitat creation/management via our existing DAS contract as detailed designs emerge.	Yes	The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010133/APP/C7.3] 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. 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 "opportunity for creation" within the Greater

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				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.
Natural England	Ecology and Biodiversity	We have no specific comments to make regarding the other locally designated sites the report has assessed, but are broadly welcoming of the measures which have been proposed to prevent impacts and enhance these sites. We recommend consultation with the relevant site owners/managers, i.e. Wildlife Trusts, who have extensive local knowledge of these sites.	N/A	Noted. Environmental Statement Appendix 9.1 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.9.1] details the consultation that took place with various Ecological bodies including Natural England, RSPB, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust.
Natural England	Ecology and Biodiversity	Natural England have no specific comments to make	Yes	Noted. This guidance was taken into account within Chapter 9 (Ecology and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>regarding protected species. However, we refer you to our Standing Advice for Protected Species, and the advice previously provided as part of our DAS (Discretionary Advice Service), dated 5th May 2022 and 2nd July 2022. Further advice regarding Species and licencing can be provided via the existing DAS contract.</p>		<p>Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.9].</p>
Natural England	General	<p>The impacts of decommissioning are largely similar to those of construction; we welcome the intention to create a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) to prevent adverse impacts. The appropriate wording of a DCO requirement to ensure the DEMP contains measures as set out in Decommissioning Statement Section 3, should render</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that decommissioning phase effects are discussed within Section 9.8 of Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.9] and are likely to be largely similar to the construction phase effects. A commitment to update ecological survey is made and approaches to follow the mitigation hierarchy will be made.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>impacts to designated sites to be unlikely. The loss of created habitats in order to revert to agriculture after 40 years of operation will inevitably have a negative impact on biodiversity and the habitats, and species associated with these, which have established in the operational period. We acknowledge the difficulty in pre-planning for a scenario 40 years into the future, but welcome the intention to ensure new surveys are undertaken to identify any protected species present on the site to enable additional mitigation/compensatory measures to be implemented prior to any works occurring (PEIR paragraph 9.7.4). We would also encourage the retention of areas of particular biodiversity value, i.e. widened field boundaries/buffer areas,</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		and/or compensatory habitat being provided off-site. It may be possible for areas of the site to be retained and managed under an Agri-Environment Agreement, or sold as Biodiversity Net Gain credits, however the status of such schemes in 40 years' time is clearly unknown; thus consideration of options closer to the decommissioning phase is recommended.		
Natural England	Ecology and Biodiversity	Paragraph 9.3.15 of states that a requirement for 10% Biodiversity Net Gain is not currently in force for NSIPS. We would like to note that whilst the mandatory requirement for 10% Biodiversity Net Gain has not yet come in to effect, when it does, NSIPS will also be required to demonstrate this Net Gain. Nonetheless, we	Yes	The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.3.9.12] 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 approximately 96%, with an approximate 70% gain of Hedgerow Units and approximately a 11% net gain in River Units. All three

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>welcome the intention, set out in section 9.9,of the scheme to demonstrate a Biodiversity Net Gain using the Biodiversity Metric 3.1, or the latest version available at the time of assessment. We also concur with the anticipation that the calculations will illustrate a significant Net Gain. We understand that the LEMP will provide the management strategy for all of the ecological enhancement across the site, and would recommend that the management of the habitats for the lifetime of the development is secured. This would ensure the habitats are maintained beyond the anticipated mandatory 30 year period.</p>		<p>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 [EN010133/APP/C7.3] which will be legally secured under a requirement of the DCO for the life of the scheme (approximately 40 years) and so ensure that objectives are met and increase the reliability of these projections.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Natural England	Other	<p>We note the Outline LEMP has been produced to summarise the principles which will be followed within the design of mitigation and enhancement for landscape and ecology, and does not comprise a final management plan. Below we have provided general comments on the principles and potential habitat creation measures; have provided further detail where we feel appropriate.</p> <p>Overall, we welcome the principles set out within the LEMP; the selection process being related to current conditions, nearby habitats and local priorities is welcomed by Natural England. We would like to note that further specific input can be provided on habitat creation / management plans via our</p>	Yes	The Outline LEMP [EN010133/APP/C7.3] has been provided in the DCO application.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		DAS contract; would ask that specific issues/options are presented to allow us to provide the most useful advice.		
Natural England	Other	Natural England welcome the intention to provide tree planting along hedgerows, in keeping with local character. We recommend that all planted trees are Native to the UK and are locally prevalent. We note the inclusion of Sycamore having potential to replace Ash and consider that, despite prevalence of Sycamore in the UK, that it is not a Native Species; would recommend use of the other species listed in the table at paragraph 2.3.8 of the Outline LEMP. We welcome the intention to plant new hedgerows and are pleased to see reference to these		<p>The Outline LEMP has been amended following consultation with Natural England to delete sycamore as having the potential to replace Ash. Suitable native species are set out at paragraph 4.3.23 of the outline LEMP [EN010133/APP/C7.3].</p> <p>The outline LEMP confirms that locally appropriate hedgerow species will be used, based on those already found within the local area. The planting of blackthorn will provide habitat for rare species such as brown hairstreak butterfly. Tall thorny species will provide appropriate nesting habitat for turtle doves. See Hedgerow Planting paragraphs 4.3.5 – 4.3.10 of the Outline LEMP [EN010133/APP/C7.3].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>enhancing Green Infrastructure and acting as wildlife corridors through the sites. The potential for these to provide habitat for both Brown Hairstreak and/or Turtle Dove is also noted, and management of the hedgerows specifically to benefit these species would be welcomed by Natural England. The intention to cut hedgerows less frequently, at strategic times of year and remove fertiliser/pesticide input nearby will all benefit the hedgerows and we would welcome this positive management across the site. Lastly, we would like to note the potential of tree planting and hedgerow planting/enhancement measures to contribute to a Biodiversity Net Gain. Hedgerow enhancements</p>		<p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.3.9.12] 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 approximately 96%, with an approximate 70% gain of Hedgerow Units and approximately a 11% 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 [EN010133/APP/C7.3] which will be legally secured under a requirement of the DCO for the life of the scheme (approximately 40 years) and so ensure</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		score well within the Biodiversity Metric; we would expect these works to be included within the BNG calculations.		that objectives are met and increase the reliability of these projections.
Natural England	Other	The inclusion of strict buffer areas is welcomed by Natural England, and their management should be focussed on the nearby habitat features which require buffering, to not only protect the feature, but enhance it. The general principle of 'the right habitat in the right place' is apparent throughout the LEMP, and we welcome here the intention not to create one type of habitat, but to create a mosaic of habitats based on the specific buffer areas and surrounding habitat. This is particularly important considering the scale of the development; what is a good	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>habitat in one area, may be inappropriate elsewhere. BRE National Solar Centre Biodiversity Guidance for Solar Developments states that 'Usually the greatest biodiversity value is gained from a variety of grassland habitats. The best results will come from sites that contain both wild flower meadows and areas of tussocky uncropped grassland.'. We welcome reference to this guidance within the LEMP and note this principle is clearly being followed. The general options of Tussocky Grassland Margins, Herb-Rich pollinator Margins, Wild Bird Seed Crop and Scrubby Field Margins for buffer areas provide a good starting point for creating this mosaic of habitat around the site. We note that scrubby field margins would be best suited</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>to woodland boundaries, as evidence suggests that having a graduated edge to woodland is beneficial to many woodland bird species. This is not to say that areas of scrub are not beneficial elsewhere, but we would suggest that areas bordering woodland could be best suited for this habitat type. For each of the habitat types, the timing and frequency of cutting appears appropriate.</p>		
Natural England	Other	<p>We would like to note that the former use of the fields for arable farming may pose issues regarding Nutrient content of soils; this must be factored into the early years of management. Measures should be put in place should the intended habitat fail to establish. This should be taken into account for all buffer</p>	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>areas too, as even where the buffers may not have been in agricultural cultivation, fertiliser application to the adjacent land is likely to have influenced the nutrient content of these areas too. We welcome the acknowledgement of these nutrient issues (LEMP paragraphs 2.5.8 and 2.5.10) along with other factors impacting establishment, i.e. pH and soil types. We note the intention to select any seed mixed based on these factors, as well as to implement extensive ecological monitoring (LEMP section 2.7) across the site. We would recommend that this monitoring data should be reviewed regularly to allow any alterations to be made to maintenance schedules etc. The two options of Diverse</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>Meadow Creation and Grazing Pasture both show benefits for the land. We are pleased to see measures proposed to ensure establishment of a diverse sward in areas either of these options are implemented, i.e. regular and cut and collect cutting initially to reduce nutrient levels and injurious weed prevalence, aftermath grazing, low intensity grazing year-round (conservation grazing) on Diverse Meadow. Orwhere Grazing Pasture is preferred, use of a more diverse grazing mix. From a Biodiversity standpoint, the former, Diverse Meadow, is likely to score higher within the Biodiversity Metric and, as stated, can still be grazed (i.e. aftermath or conservation intensity), however, a mixture of beneath panel habitats</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>would still provide biodiversity benefits whilst enabling higher levels of grazing to continue in certain areas. The reference to a 'shade cut' (LEMP paragraph 2.5.12) is also welcomed, and we advise that a diverse sward should aim to be created throughout the entire area beneath the panels; small management techniques such as this can be used to retain efficiency of the panels whilst still allowing the largest gains for biodiversity and avoiding areas of bare ground which may impact soil health and sediment runoff.</p>		
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>Whilst developing diverse buffer areas and beneath panel habitats across the majority of the site may lead to a considerable gain in biodiversity, this can be readily complimented by</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>creation/enhancement of other habitats. We are pleased to see the intended inclusion of these other habitats across the site. Creation of Ponds/Scrapes and other wetland features across the site would be encouraged. The presence of GCN on site indicates that the development area may have potential to be used by the species. Where pond creation is considered, we would encourage ponds to be created in series, with the aim of connecting a larger portion of the land, i.e. creating 'stepping stones' for GCN and other wildlife associated with wetland habitat. It is worth noting that water retention in ponds should be considered, as field drains associated with agriculture and ground conditions may lead to failure</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		of new ponds to hold water and establish. Use of Bat/Bird boxes is welcomed, although should be limited to areas which lack in natural nesting opportunities. Likewise, provision of hibernacula near to wetland features is encouraged.		
Natural England	Other	See comments above regarding Beneath Panel habitats. Additionally, soil compaction may occur during routine maintenance of panels/surrounding habitats. We would recommend implementation of measures to reduce any compaction as far as is reasonably practicable. This may include visual monitoring of the sites to identify any areas which are becoming compacted.	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Natural England	Other	<p>Natural England support the range of site specific measures set out within this section. The implementation of a variety of options is illustrated, and as further investigations take place, we welcome the fact that these will inform the final plans, for example where conditions suitable for Acid Grassland are suspected. We would like to welcome the use of Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping to identify key areas of habitat creation and network expansion. However, we would also encourage greater enhancements outside these areas, to go above and beyond the BOM to create additional habitat, where this is possible/appropriate. The exclusion of two areas at Cottam 3 to create beneficial habitat for Turtle Dove is specifically welcomed, and is a</p>	Yes	<p>The Outline LEMP [EN010133/APP/C7.3] sets out that the habitat creation prescriptions for much of Cottam 1 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>The outline LEMP sets out at paragraph 4.8.12 that an area of approximately 28ha covering three fields at Cottam 1 West (Figure C6.4.16.7), adjacent to the River Till, will be used to create wetland bird mitigation habitat.</p> <p>Further input will be sought on specific habitat creation in preparing the detailed LEMP.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>good example of design evolution to account for site specific variables. The River Till corridor running through the site is noted for opportunities for habitat creation; we would encourage the widening of the corridor along the river to form a key Green Infrastructure corridor through the site. Where further input on specific habitat creation/management is required, we would be happy to provide this via our existing DAS contract; would ask that specific issues/options are presented to allow us to provide the most useful advice.</p>		
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>Natural England note that the LEMP makes no reference to enhancements to be made along the cable route. We assume this is due to the cable</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Section 4.4 of Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.4] sets out the design parameters for cable installation. The land above the cables</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>route surveys etc. being at a less advanced stage, along with the land above the cables largely being put back to it's previous use following construction. Nonetheless, we would like to see the final LEMP include maintenance of any enhancement measures made along the cable route; the linear nature of the cable route may provide opportunities to create new Green Infrastructure corridors, however we appreciate land ownership may pose issues with regards to this.</p>		<p>will be reinstated to its previous use once cables have been laid.</p> <p>Ecological protection and remediation measures required in relation to the cable installation works are contained within the Outline Ecological Protection and Mitigation Strategy [EN010133/APP/C7.19].</p>
<p>Witham Third Internal Drainage Board</p>	<p>Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage</p>	<p>While Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board has a standing objection in principle to development within flood plain, as shown on the Environment Agency flood maps, Solar Farms can be appropriate with mitigation.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the development has been designed in consideration of the existing flood risks. Where development is proposed within the flood extent, it will be resilient (as detailed in sections 10.6 Embedded Mitigation and 10.8 Mitigation Measures of Chapter 10 (Hydrology,</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>The expectation would be that all the electrical equipment is above design flood levels in the main river system and any construction is resilient to flooding. Any development requires the discharge to be limited to the green field rate, assuming the ground will have grass, there should a small impermeable area.</p>		<p>Flood Risk and Drainage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.10] and throughout the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (included as Appendix 10.1. to the Environmental Statement).</p> <p>The Scheme will not have a detrimental impact of 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>Witham Third Internal Drainage Board</p>	<p>Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage</p>	<p>There are several Board maintained watercourses that will be affected by the sites. Under the terms of the Board's Byelaws, the prior written consent of the Board is required for any proposed temporary or permanent works or structures in, under,</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Given the length of the proposed cable, the Applicant notes it is not possible to avoid local watercourses be they Internal Drainage Board, Lead Local Flood Authority, or Environment Agency managed. A plan detailing the proposed watercourse crossings is included as Annex B of the Flood Risk</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>over or within the byelaw distance of 6m of the top of the bank of a Board maintained watercourse. A clear unobstructed strip the full width is required adjacent to all the maintained watercourses. Note new Byelaws will shortly be adopted with a revised distance of 9m.</p> <p>For any other watercourses within or adjacent to the site appropriate maintenance access should be provided in consultation with who is responsible for the maintenance.</p>		<p>Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010133/APP/C6.3.10.2].</p> <p>All watercourses will be crossed through directional drilling ensuring no impact to their operation and the appropriate consultee will be consulted as necessary to ensure appropriate permission is acquired prior to works commencing.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that easements have been applied as necessary within the development masterplan, as detailed in section 10.6 'Embedded Mitigation' of Chapter 10 (Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.10].</p>
Witham Third Internal	Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	The Board wishes to reiterate, Cottam 1 site is within the Environment Agency Lincoln Washland site and is subject to	N/A	The Applicant notes that it is West Burton 2 and a small area of West Burton 1 (from the West Burton Solar project, rather than the Scheme) which

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Drainage Board		<p>periodic inundation to protect Lincoln. Contact with the Environment Agency will be needed, to discuss the implications of this location.</p> <p>Land Drainage Consent application forms and guidance is available to download from the Boards website. (http://www.witham3idb.gov.uk)</p>		<p>encroaches the Environment Agency Lincoln Washland.</p> <p>Detailed conversations have been held with the Environment Agency in this regard, as detailed in Section 10.2 of Chapter 10 (Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.10] and this will be considered within the Flood Risk Assessment for West Burton Solar Project.</p>
Newark and Sherwood District (border with SKDC)	General	I can advise that Newark & Sherwood District Council have no comments to make on the pre application consultation including the contents of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR).	N/A	Noted.
NHS Lincolnshire CCG	General	Thank you for sharing the consultation documentation regarding Cottam Solar	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Project. The CCG notes the work however we are not in a position to comment at this time.		
City of Lincoln council	General	Thank you for your consultation on the above and I would confirm that the City of Lincoln Council has no objections to this proposal.	N/A	Noted.
NATS safeguarding	General	NATS anticipates no impact from the proposal and has no comments to make on the application.	N/A	Noted.
Network Rail	General	Network Rail has been reviewing the information provided and note that proposals include the development of solar farms adjacent to the railway infrastructure with connections through railway property. The scheme will intersect the operational railway on three lines MAC3 (Deepcar to Cleethorpes),	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		SPD3 (Spalding and Doncaster) and TYB1 (Clarborough Junction to Cottam CEGB).		
Network Rail	Glint and Glare	Key concerns will be how the scheme impacts on the railway operations in terms of glint and glare issues causing distraction for train drivers approaching and passing the site, how any issues of this nature that may arise are to be mitigated, the management of construction works around the operational railway and details such as boundary treatments, any lighting and drainage schemes that may impact on the operational railway.	Yes	<p>The Applicant has proposed instant screening on the northern side of Cottam 3b if fixed panels are used. This screening will effectively block views of the reflective area and train drivers will not experience any impact and no further mitigation is required. If tracker panels are used, the developer has proposed to use a different backtracking angle to fully remove solar reflections. Therefore, no impact is predicted, and no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>Further details are provided in Sections 7.3 and Appendix D of Chapter 16 (Glint and Glare) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.16].</p>
Network Rail	Transport and Access	In addition, the routing of construction traffic (including HGVs/abnormal loads) and subsequent operational site	No	The Applicant notes that high loaded vehicles will avoid routes with low railway bridges and weight restrictions. A small number of vehicles will have to

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>traffic will require further consideration and discussion with Network Rail if it such routes take in railway assets such as bridges (with low clearance/weight restrictions) and railway level crossings.</p>		<p>travel over a level crossing on the A1500. These vehicles will be associated with the cable route corridor, and will be within standard vehicle dimensions. An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010133/APP/C6.3.14.2] provides a framework for the management of construction vehicle movements to and from the Site, to ensure that the effect of the construction phase on the local highway network is minimised.</p>
Network Rail	General	<p>With these points in mind, at this stage the information supplied is not sufficiently detailed to fully assess potential impacts of the scheme on the railway and further information will be required to properly respond on the likely impacts of the proposed scheme.</p>	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>In order to ensure that the scheme does not impact on operational railway safety, the developer must liaise closely with Network Rail Asset Protection to ensure that the haulage routes into the site are appropriate, and the design and construction of the new facility and associated infrastructure will not have an adverse impact on railway operations (including glint and glare issues as outlined above). It is therefore assumed that a condition of the Order would be that detailed specifications of the proposed scheme and traffic management plans are to be provided and agreed in writing before development can commence.</p>		
Network Rail	Cable Route	Please note that if the intention is to install	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		cabling/equipment in support of the project through railway land, the developer will be need an easement from Network Rail and we would recommend that they engage with us early in the planning of their scheme in order to discuss and agree this element of the proposals.		
Network Rail	General	Network Rail will be seeking protection from the exercise of compulsory purchase powers over operational land either for permanent or temporary purposes. In addition, Network Rail will wish to agree protection for the railway during the course of the construction works and otherwise to protect our undertaking and land interests. Network Rail reserves the right to produce additional and further grounds	N/A	The Applicant is in discussions with Network Rail and a Basic Asset Protection Agreement has been agreed, given that the Cable Route Corridor crosses a railway at three locations, and the Cottam 3b Site shares a boundary with a railway. Protective provisions are proposed within the DCO and discussions will continue to ensure agreement is reached.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>of concern when further details of the application and its effect on Network Rail's land are available. In addition, any rights for power or other lines under, over or alongside the railway line will require appropriate asset protection measures deemed necessary by Network Rail to protect the operational railway and stations. We have standard protective provisions which will need to be included in the DCO as a minimum therefore contact should be made to obtain a copy of the relevant wording In addition a number of legal and commercial agreements will need to be entered into, for example, asset protection agreements, method statements, connection agreements, property agreements and all other relevant legal and</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		commercial agreements. This list is not exhaustive and will need to be reviewed once more details of the scheme are discussed between the parties.		
Network Rail	General	Consideration should be given to ensure that the construction and subsequent maintenance can be carried out without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail's adjacent land. In addition, security of the railway boundary will require to be maintained at all times. In any event you must contact Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineers as soon as possible in relation to this scheme.	N/A	.The Applicant is holding ongoing discussions with Network Rail to agree protective provisions will ensure their assets aren't compromised during Site or cable route construction.
Network Rail	General	Network Rail is prepared to discuss the inclusion of Network Rail land or rights over land subject to there being no impact on the	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		operational railway, all regulatory and other required consents being in place and appropriate commercial and other terms having been agreed between the parties and approved by Network Rail's board.		
Network Rail	General	Network Rail also reserves the right to make additional comments once we have evaluated the proposals in more detail.	N/A	Noted.
Network Rail	General	Network Rail would welcome further discussion and negotiation with Cottam Solar Project in relation to the proposed development as required going forward. If you have any questions or require more information in relation to the above please let me know.	N/A	The Applicant notes that the LVIA considers the cumulative effects and the methodology is set out within Appendix 8.3.1. The assessment of potential visual effects is set out in detail within Appendix 8.3 of the assessment where sequential effects are considered. This takes account of those travelling along the regularly used routes such as the rail network.
Network Rail	General	It is understood that the three proposed site locations will be	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		accessed directly from various junctions on the local road network. As such, we have no specific comments to make on site access.		
National Highways	Transport and Access	As outlined in the PEIR, the operation of the Cottam Solar Project will generate negligible vehicle flows consisting of less than one vehicle per day on average. We can accept these assumptions and agree that no additional assessment or mitigation is required with respect of the operational phase of the site.	No	Noted.
National Highways	Transport and Access	The PEIR sets out the anticipated construction traffic trip generation for the development proposal. Construction related HGV trips have been forecast at approximately 60 two-way trips, with the majority of these associated with Cottam	No	The Applicant notes that updated vehicle numbers are presented in Table 14.3 of Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.14] with greater detail compared to the PEIR. These are slightly different to those set out in the PEIR, but do not change the conclusions.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Site 1. Additionally, the PEIR forecasts construction worker trips to generate around 400 two-way trips. These vehicles are assumed to be cars or LGVs.		
National Highways	Transport and Access	The PEIR outlines that all construction vehicles will arrive to the site from either the M180 to the north or the A46 to the south and then travel via the A15 and then onto the local road network to access the site. These vehicles have been assigned onto the local road network however, there has been no distribution onto the SRN.	No	Vehicle trips will be distributed throughout the daily period and will be coordinated to avoid the network peak hours. Therefore, the effect on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) will be negligible.
National Highways	Transport and Access	In relation to the above, we would like to seek further clarification on the methodology used to inform the construction trip generation and trip distribution, specifically how	No	The Applicant notes further information on the trip generation and distribution is set out within Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.14] and the Transport Assessment (Appendix 14.1)

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>construction traffic will be distributed across the SRN. Based on this information we will have a better understanding of the likely impacts of construction traffic on the SRN and whether further assessments (including a cumulative impact assessment to include other sites) will be required.</p>		<p>[EN010133/APP/C6.3.14.1]. 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>
<p>National Highways</p>	<p>Transport and Access</p>	<p>We would recommend that the above-mentioned information is set out in the form of a Transport Assessment and we request that construction traffic trip generation and distribution is agreed with National Highways prior to any further transport analysis being undertaken. The information contained in the Transport Assessment can subsequently be used to inform a Construction Traffic</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment, and has prepared a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The is provided as Appendix 14.1 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.14.1] to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.14].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Management Plan, which National Highways may seek input on, depending on the potential traffic and transport impacts identified for the SRN.		
National Highways	Transport and Access	As set out above, it is advised that further evidence to demonstrate how construction trip generation has been estimated and distributed on the SRN is presented to National Highways for agreement.	Yes	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.
National Highways	Transport and Access	Hourly trip generation figures should be presented with further detailed assessments of the network AM and PM peaks to be determined. If further impact assessments related to the SRN are required, these should be carried out in accordance with DfT Circular 02/2013.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this is provided within Section 5 of the Transport Assessment, which is submitted as Appendix 14.1 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.14.1] to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.14].</p> <p>Vehicle trips will be distributed throughout the daily period and will be coordinated to avoid the network peak</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				hours. Therefore, the effect on the SRN will be negligible.
National Highways	Transport and Access	We advise that any assessments be carried out in staged approach with inputs to be agreed with National Highways prior to further analysis being undertaken.	No	Noted.
National Highways	Transport and Access	We have reviewed the Abnormal Indivisible Loads Access Summary and we are aware that an agreement in principle has been confirmed by National Highways regarding the movements of abnormal loads. It is noted the proposed AIL routes use M180 Junction 4 to then access the local road network.	No	Noted.
National Highways	Transport and Access	In summary, we welcome the consultation on the proposed Cottam Solar Project and we look forward to working with you further to fully understand the likely traffic impacts	No	Noted

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		associated with the construction phase of the proposal.		
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	With respect to the Cottam PEIR report, we are pleased by the progress which has been made and by our mutual engagement with finding a reasonable approach to undertaking sufficient archaeological field evaluation, however this accord has not been reflected throughout the document. As it stands our response to this PEIR must reflect our concern particularly with the proposed mitigation approach which we firmly believe to be ill advised and unworkable.	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes that archaeological evaluation trenching was undertaken that was considered sufficient to understand the archaeological potential of features identified through non-intrusive survey techniques (i.e. desk-based research, LiDAR survey data, aerial photographs, geophysical survey etc.), as well as the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As agreed with Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team, this equated to 2% (+2% contingency as required) of areas where possible concentrations of archaeological deposits had been identified.</p> <p>No agreement was made for regarding areas that are considered to have a negligible/low potential i.e. where baseline information had not identified any possible buried archaeological</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>deposits. To test the results of the geophysical survey, several 'blank' areas adjacent to concentration of archaeology were also assessed at a 2% sample.</p> <p>Baseline information has successfully established the absence/presence/extent/form/preservation of concentrations of buried archaeological remains within the Scheme, and has been used to identify areas where mitigation will be required (the majority of which were agreed on site with the Lincolnshire County Archaeologists).</p> <p>The mitigation strategy is detailed in a detailed Written Scheme of Investigation provided in Appendix 13.7 to Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13], and is in line with national guidance and consistent with other solar-based developments of a similar nature.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	Regarding the report itself, it would be helpful to have allocated reference numbers throughout the document including the tables to allow for easier reference.	N/A	The individual Site, Parcels and Fields that comprise the Scheme have all been given 'unique identifier' (UID) references. UIDs have also been provided for non-designated archaeological remains in Table 13.10 - 13.16 of the ES, and for non-designated historic buildings in Tables 13.24 - 13.27 of the ES. A UID has also been given to each individual area of proposed mitigation - see Section 6 of the Archaeological Mitigation WSI (Appendix 13.7) and Table 13.8-2 in Appendix 13.8 of Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] .
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	In Table 31.1 Consultation Responses, the 3rd Where Consultation Comment is Addressed on p359 currently says 'Discussion with LCC regarding trial trenching are ongoing'. We have now agreed to a trial trenching percentage of 2% with a 2% contingency,	N/A	Evaluation trenching for specific areas of the Scheme, in which concentrations of archaeological features were identified by non-intrusive survey, was agreed with the Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team, equating to 2% (+2% contingency as required) of individual Fields. No agreement was

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		with trench plans for individual parcels currently being discussed and agreed, ongoing.		made on 2% evaluation trenching of the whole Scheme.
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	Our 4th Lincolnshire County Council (Historic Environment Officer) 25th February 2022 Consultee Response on p359 states that a full suite of evaluation including competently assessed desk based information, geophysical survey and a robust programme of trial trenching are required to provide evidence for the site-specific archaeological potential of the development. This has not been completed.	N/A	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. 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

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				remains. All evaluation 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.
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	The 5th Where Consultation Comment is Addressed on p359 which is the response to that above says 'Further assessment will be submitted alongside the ES as appropriate' This statement is not acceptable and does not address our response. The results of all evaluation and	N/A	The potential impacts of the Scheme are assessed in Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] , together with an overview of the programme of mitigation required to remove or reduce such impacts. Details of the programme of mitigation are provided in a separate mitigation WSI (ES Appendix 13.7).

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>the completed desk-based assessments will need to inform an appropriate mitigation strategy as part of the ES which will be submitted with the DCO application. Please remove 'as appropriate' or clarify.</p>		
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Cultural Heritage</p>	<p>On p361 the first Response for Lincolnshire Council Archaeologists representing Lincs and Bassetlaw 31st March 2022 states that trenching will focus on areas that have been assessed to have archaeological potential. This is only part of our response, we have also consistently stated that we require comprehensive trenching across 'blank' areas where previous evaluation results have not established the archaeological potential.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Applicant has used a broad range of evaluation techniques to collect high-quality baseline information, and have successfully identified the presence/absence/extent/form/significance of potential concentration of archaeological features. Evaluation trenching was 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. There was shown to be a high correlation between the archaeological remains identified by non-intrusive surveys and those identified through evaluation trenching.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>Non-intrusive surveys were accurate in identifying both areas where archaeological sites were present, as well as 'blank' areas that were devoid of archaeological deposits. Where features were encountered in 'blank' areas that had not been recorded by non-intrusive surveys, they were primarily found to be of a low archaeological interest (i.e. likely caused by post-medieval agricultural activity).</p> <p>The extensive scope of non-intrusive survey work and the correlation between the results of non-intrusive surveys and the evaluation trenching, are considered sufficient to be able to establish that the archaeological potential for 'blank' areas is negligible/low. Consequently a large-scale programme of untargeted evaluation trenching across 'blank' areas was considered unnecessary and unreasonable, given the evidence produced by non-intrusive surveys</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				which was supported by targeted evaluation trenching.
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	Overall, however our greatest concern for Table 31.1 is that there are a number of consultation comments for which the Where Consultation Comment is Addressed column simply refers us to Appendices 13.1, 13.2 and 13.4 despite the information not being included in those appendices.	N/A	<p>Consultation for the Scheme is detailed in table 13.1 of Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13].</p> <p>The results of various assessments are detailed in appendices: Desk-Based Research (13.1) Geophysical Surveys (13.2), Geoarchaeological Surveys (13.3), Air Photo and LiDAR Assessment (13.4), Heritage Statement (13.5), Evaluation Trial Trenching (13.6), Mitigation Strategy (13.7), Impact Assessment tables (13.8) and Cultural Heritage figures (13.9).</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	Section 13.4.7 The proposed clustering of Grade II listed buildings is acceptable where they are for example part of	Yes	The assessment of Grade II Listed Buildings within the 2km study areas has been undertaken by the Applicant, in accordance with this comment. This

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		the same settlement or estate. Given the proposal in 13.4.8 to reduce the assessment area of listed buildings from 5km to 2km we do not agree that individual listed buildings which do not exist in clusters should be assessed in clusters as the potential impact and any proposed mitigation may be specific to that building.		is presented in Appendix 13.5 to Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] . At the time of the PEIR submission it had not been possible to fully complete the geophysical survey of the Cottam 1 Site. This has now been completed in full and is presented as Appendix 13.2) to Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] .
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	Regarding section 13.4.9, we note that a geophysical survey for Cottam 1 has not been completed. This should be done immediately.	N/A	The Applicant notes that at the time of the PEIR submission it had not been possible to fully complete the geophysical survey of the Cottam 1 Site. This has now been completed in full and is presented in Appendix 13.2 to Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] .
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	We agree that all of this information and assessment is required and we are	N/A	A full suite of archaeological assessment, survey and evaluation trenching has been undertaken by the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>disappointed that it has not been completed in timely fashion. Trenching plans which have and are being agreed will need reassessment as this information may reveal new evidence and this will result in unnecessary duplication of work and have potential knock-on effects for scheduling, budget and the production of an appropriate mitigation strategy which needs the full suite of evaluation results including trenching in order to be reasonable and fit for purpose.</p>		<p>Applicant as part of the Scheme. These assessments have been undertaken using a staged approach so that each phase of assessment works could inform the next (i.e. the location of trial trenches was based on information acquired through desk-based research and non-intrusive surveys). To maximise the knowledge and understanding attained through the various assessments and field evaluations, initial interpretation of baseline information has been re-examined using the results of subsequent works (i.e. the desk-based assessments were updated with the results of subsequent surveys). Data collected from the various assessments have been used to compile an appropriate mitigation strategy as presented in Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13], including the WSI (Appendix 13.7).</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	Please remove 'where this is deemed appropriate' above, trenching is required across the full extent of proposed impact.	N/A	<p>Archaeological evaluation trenching was undertaken that was sufficient to understand the archaeological potential of features identified through non-intrusive survey techniques (i.e. desk-based research, LiDAR survey data, aerial photographs, geophysical survey etc), as well as the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As agreed with Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team, this equated to 2% (+2% contingency as required) of areas where possible concentrations of archaeological deposits had been identified.</p> <p>No agreement was made regarding areas that are considered to have a negligible/low potential i.e. where baseline information had not identified any possible buried archaeological deposits. To test the results of the geophysical survey, several 'bank' areas were also assessed at a 2% sample.</p> <p>Information collated by desk-based</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>research and non-intrusive survey work, the validity of which has been proven by the results of the archaeological evaluation, is considered sufficient to be able to establish that the archaeological potential for 'blank' areas is negligible/low. Consequently, a comprehensive programme across 'blank' areas was not considered necessary.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Cultural Heritage</p>	<p>Section 13.5.42 states that geophysical survey will be undertaken along the cable routes with appropriate desk-based research and bolstered by targeted trenching. Full evaluation including comprehensive desk-based assessment and trenching of the 'blank' areas will be required to obtain baseline evidence across the full impact zone including the cable routes.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that desk-based research (HER, NHLE, NHRE, HLC, PAS and cartographical information), along with non-intrusive surveys (Assessments of LiDAR, aerial photographs and geophysical survey) has been undertaken to create a comprehensive suite of baseline information.</p> <p>Archaeological evaluation trenching has been undertaken within assessable areas of the 'Shared Cable Corridor' in Bassetlaw. Trial trench evaluation was considered appropriate within the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>'Shared Cable Corridor' given the form / extent of archaeological features identified by baseline information and the higher level of impact that will potentially occur due to it being used by up to three or more cable routes belonging to the Cottam and other proposed solar schemes.</p> <p>No evaluation trenching was considered necessary for the remainder of the Cottam Cable Route in Bassetlaw where a single cable is proposed, and baseline information has suggested a minimal potential for archaeological features to be present as alternative mitigation was considered appropriate to safeguard against any potential loss of archaeological deposits present.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	Regarding section 13.6.1 and the proposals for dealing with 'on-site archaeological remains' by 'mitigation by design'. If what is meant by this in archaeological terms is 'preservation in situ' then it is not a case of simply not putting anchoring spikes or using concrete feet instead in these 'mitigation by design' areas. The full extent of the archaeological areas must be determined and each area must be fenced off and subject to a programme of monitoring throughout the construction and the decommissioning phases, and there will be no ground disturbance whatsoever which may disturb or affect the archaeological remains, including plant movement or storage. The proposal for the installation of concrete feet requires a full	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes that mitigation by design using non-intrusive concrete ground anchors is a nationally recognised approach for safeguarding archaeological remains against the impacts caused by the installation of solar panels. Where the extensive assessment, survey and evaluation trenching programme has identified areas in which remains may be present that are particularly sensitive to impact (such as human burials) it has been recommended that archaeological excavation is used to 'mitigate by record'.</p> <p>It should also be noted that agricultural activity is causing a high level of destruction to buried archaeological features, as witnessed during the trial trench evaluation. Removing these sites from agricultural use, provides an opportunity to conserve archaeological remains in situ and prevent further damage being caused by current land use.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>understanding of the depth, extent, importance and nature of the surviving archaeology across the site. Any proposal in archaeologically sensitive areas will require a firm evidence base proving that any proposed work including decommissioning will have no impact upon the archaeology including not only direct destructive impact through groundworks, compaction or reduction in the depth of soil necessary for protecting the archaeology but also through environmental changes which would be detrimental to the surviving archaeology.</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	<p>This document states that the full extent of the archaeological potential has not yet been established, the trenching programme is not complete and even the desk-based assessments have yet to be finished. Table 13.23 therefore with its proposed mitigation of either 'Targeted evaluation trenching and mitigation by design should this be warranted' or 'None' is entirely inappropriate and should be removed.</p>	N/A	<p>DBAs have been produced covering the whole Scheme, including the cable routes, comprising assessment of the full range of cartographic sources, and all available archaeological records, including PAS, HLC, NHRE, NHLE, NMP and HER data, as well as the results of specifically commissioned LiDAR and aerial photographic analysis and geophysical survey. A programme of evaluation trenching has been completed and confirmed the archaeological potential of features identified by non-intrusive surveys. The results of the evaluation assessments have been used to compile a detailed mitigation strategy, presented in Appendix 13.7 to Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13]. This outlines where 'preservation by record' and 'preservation in design' are appropriate to safeguard archaeological assets within the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Scheme. In low impact areas where baseline information, supported by the results of the trial trench evaluation, has suggested a negligible/low potential for archaeological remains to be present, no further works are considered necessary/appropriate.
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	The appropriate mitigation response cannot be determined without the results of the trenching.	N/A	<p>A programme of evaluation trenching has been undertaken, which is included as Appendix 13.6 to Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13].</p> <p>The results of this assessment have been used to inform a detailed mitigation strategy, presented in Appendix 13.7 to Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13].</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	The two proposed mitigations are entirely insufficient. Archaeological fieldwork will	N/A	The Applicant notes that a detailed mitigation strategy (WSI) is included in Appendix 13.7 to Chapter 13 (Cultural

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		also be required in the suite of mitigation.		<p>Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13].</p> <p>This outlines where 'preservation by record' or 'preservation by design' is required to safeguard archaeological assets within the Scheme. The WSI has been informed by an extensive programme of desk-based research and field evaluations (including LiDAR survey data, aerial photographs, geophysical survey and evaluation trenching etc), which have successfully established the form and extent of concentrations of buried archaeological remains within the Scheme, and have been used to identify areas where mitigation will be required (the majority of which were agreed on site with the Lincolnshire County Archaeologists).</p> <p>The mitigation approach detailed is in line with national guidance and consistent with other solar-based developments of a similar nature.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	The phrase 'should it be warranted' is a supremely dismissive tone for dealing with the archaeological impact with a proportionate and appropriate level of response; and	N/A	A full suite of archaeological assessment, survey and evaluation trenching has been undertaken by the Applicant and used to inform a WSI, presented as Appendix 13.7 to the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] . The WSI identifies where archaeological mitigation is warranted and the form of mitigation that is appropriate to safeguard the loss of archaeological remains.
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	Given the size of the proposed development there will undoubtedly be much more archaeology across the sites which will require mitigation than is included in the table. The geophysics report alone has identified many more sites of interest, the trenching programme which has only just begun has started to reveal more, including burials.	N/A	The archaeological evaluation targeted concentrations of features identified through non-intrusive surveys, as well as 'blank' areas, where baseline information suggested a negligible/low potential for archaeological features to be present. The results of which demonstrated the validity of non-intrusive surveys for identifying the absence / presence / extent of concentrations of archaeological features. This included the discovery of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>an early medieval burial site, which was first identified by boundary ditches that were mapped as geophysical anomalies.</p> <p>Where features were encountered in 'blank' areas that had not been recorded by non-intrusive surveys, they were primarily found to be of a low archaeological interest (i.e. likely caused by post-medieval agricultural activity). No additional sites considered to have a local/regional archaeological interest were identified exclusively from the trial trench evaluation.</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	The information presented in this Cultural Heritage chapter appears some way behind the recent discussions and agreements between the developer's consultants and the LCC Historic Places Team. The approach for trenching for the main sites has been broadly agreed in principle	N/A	A programme of evaluation trenching has been undertaken by the Applicant (Appendix 13.6), which was agreed with Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team, sampled 2% (+2% contingency as required) of areas where possible concentrations of archaeological deposits have been identified. Several 'blank' areas, where baseline information suggested an absence of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		and agreement on specific plans for each parcel is under way, and initial trenching has commenced. The value placed on the evidence from trenching in this document represents an earlier position that we are pleased to note in recent discussions has been revised, however this is not reflected in the document at all.		buried archaeological remains to be present, were also tested and found either to not contain any archaeological features or features of an ephemeral nature, often associated with post-medieval or later agricultural activity. No agreement was made for regarding areas that are considered to have a negligible/low potential i.e. where baseline information had not identified any possible buried archaeological deposits.
Bolsover District Council	General	I refer to the consultation recently sent to us regarding the above described project and am writing to confirm that Bolsover District Council has no comments to make in respect of this submission.	N/A	Noted.
Rotherham Metropolitan District Council	General	I can confirm that Rotherham Local Planning Authority have no comments to make on the proposal.	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Western Power Distribution (East Midlands) PLC (WPD)	General	<p>WPD's objective is to secure protection of its assets and agreement on any diversions or works necessary to facilitate the development. In doing so it will expect the development consent order (DCO) to include protective provisions specific to WPD. We suggest that you consider WPD-specific protective provisions secured on other DCO schemes including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Triton Knoll Electrical System Order 2016 - The M54 to M6 Link Road Development Consent Order 2022 	N/A	Noted.
Western Power Distribution (East Midlands) PLC (WPD)	General	<p>In addition, WPD will usually expect the developer to enter into an Asset Protection Agreement. We would encourage you to engage with WPD in respect of the terms of this agreement.</p>	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Western Power Distribution (East Midlands) PLC (WPD)	General	WPD's general position on DCO schemes is to submit a holding objection to the scheme until the above requirements have been secured. This objection does not mean that WPD objects in principle to the proposed development.	N/A	Noted.
Western Power Distribution (East Midlands) PLC (WPD)	General	Given the scale of the application land to which the DCO relates, we have not undertaken an audit of WPD's assets which may be affected by the development nor have we provided an overlay plan showing WPD's affected assets.	N/A	Noted.
Western Power Distribution (East Midlands) PLC (WPD)	General	The above response does not take into account any specific engagement you may have directly with WPD's local offices. Should you require further information regarding WPD's assets which are	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		situated on or within the DCO land, we recommend you engage with WPD's local offices to obtain this.		
Western Power Distribution (East Midlands) PLC (WPD)	General	Should you be proposing any diversionary works to WPD's assets that require land outside of the proposed DCO limits, we suggest you consider engaging with WPD on any land rights required to undertake those diversions prior to submission of your application.	N/A	Noted.
East Lindsey District Council	General	I have looked through the documentation provided and that on the Planning Inspectorate website and can confirm we have no comments to make at this stage.	N/A	Noted.
Royal Mail	Transport and Access	Royal Mail has one operational property within 10 miles of the proposed Solar Park: Gainsborough DO.	No	The Applicant notes this. Construction activity associated with the Scheme should not affect Gainsborough, but vehicles will use the A631 to the east. It is anticipated that there could be

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>Whilst Royal Mail does not consider that the proposed Solar Park itself will impact upon its operational interests, the cumulative impact of this development and those in the vicinity that are of concern. Every day, in exercising its statutory duties Royal Mail vehicles use all of the main roads that may potentially be affected by the proposed Cottam Solar Park and surrounding developments. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - West Burton Solar Park - Gate Burton Energy Park - EDF West Burton C - Decommissioning of West Burton A - Saxilby Heights - Development at Land off Sturton Road - Blyton Driving Centre - Wood Lane Solar Farm 		<p>approximately 67 movements associated with equipment deliveries and workers on the A631 over a daily period. This is unlikely to create any capacity issues.</p> <p>A cumulative assessment has been undertaken as part of Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.14] (see Section 14.9), and the Transport Assessment (Appendix 14.1) [EN010133/APP/C6.3.14.1] (see Section 10).</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Royal Mail	Transport and Access	Any periods of road disruption / closure, night or day, on or to the roads immediately connected to these developments or the surrounding highway network will have the potential to impact operations and may consequently disrupt Royal Mail's ability to meet its Universal Obligation service delivery targets.	No	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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.14] .
Royal Mail	Transport and Access	<p>Royal Mail are unable to assess the level of potential risk to its operations and any proposed mitigations due to the traffic data in the PEIR being out of date. As such, at this point in time, Royal Mail are unable to provide a robust consultation response.</p> <p>Royal Mail therefore requests that the forecasted traffic flows in the PEIR be updated to reflect up to date data of</p>	No	<p>Traffic data was undertaken in 2021. Section 6 of the Traffic Assessment, presented as Appendix 14.2 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.14], provides a breakdown of construction vehicle movements on the local highway network.</p> <p>A cumulative assessment has been undertaken as Section 14.9 of Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		cumulative impacts of nearby developments. Royal Mail wishes to reserve its position to submit a consultation response/s later in the DCO consenting process when sufficient information is available.		[EN010133/APP/C6.2.14], and as Section 10 of the Transport Assessment.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	The Transport Team have no comments to make on the application as the site lies outside of the Nottinghamshire County boundary.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Waste	The adopted Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Replacement Waste Local Plan, Part 1: Waste Core Strategy (adopted 10 December 2013) and the saved, non-replaced policies of the Waste Local Plan (adopted 2002), along with the adopted Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan (adopted March 2021), form part of the	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>development plan for the area. As such, relevant policies in these plans need to be considered. In addition, Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Areas (MSA/MCA) have been identified in Nottinghamshire and in accordance with Policy SP7 of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan, these should be taken into account where proposals for non-minerals development fall within them.</p>		
<p>Nottinghamshire County Council</p>	<p>Minerals</p>	<p>From the point of the Scoping Report, Chapter 11: Minerals, draws attention to the Minerals Safeguarding Area policies within the respective Minerals Local Plans. West Burton 4 being the only site within Nottinghamshire. Contact has already been made by the consultants to source the appropriate GIS</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that the identification and safeguarding of mineral resources within Nottinghamshire has been acknowledged and the impact for any safeguard resource fully assessed.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>constraint mapping for MSA's and existing minerals sites. The County Council would draw attention to the 'Cable Route Corridor Search Areas', as identified in Figure 3.6. and reference is drawn to the detailed response in the following sections of these comments.</p>		
<p>Nottinghamshire County Council</p>	<p>Minerals</p>	<p>As the Mineral Planning Authority, it is the responsibility of Nottinghamshire County Council to form policies and determine applications relating to mineral development. One of the key responsibilities of both the County Council but also the District and Borough Councils is to safeguard mineral resource (PPG, Paragraph 005, 2014). As minerals are a finite resource that can only be</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Noted. The identification and safeguarding of mineral resources within Nottinghamshire has been acknowledged and the impact for any safeguarded resource fully assessed.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>worked where they are found, the emerging Minerals Local Plan contains a policy, SP7, Adopted Minerals Local Plan Nottinghamshire County Council which seeks to safeguard mineral resource from unnecessary sterilisation from non-mineral development and so establishes Mineral Safeguarding and Consultation Areas (MSA/MCA).</p>		
<p>Nottinghamshire County Council</p>	<p>Minerals</p>	<p>As a two-tier authority, the Minerals Local Plan forms part of the overall Development Framework for Bassetlaw District Council. The entire western side of the River Trent lies within a Sand and Gravel Mineral Safeguarding Area, but that given relatively small land take we do not foresee any problems.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Noted. The identification and safeguarding of the sand and gravel resource within Nottinghamshire has been acknowledged and the impact for the safeguarded resource assessed.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Minerals	<p>There is an area of concern however. The northern cabling route option, the buffer zone for which, runs through or at least very close to the permitted sand and gravel site at Sturton Le Steeple quarry (1/46/06/00014/). This site is operated by TARMAC. As this site is not presently active, it may not have been picked up as part of the initial scoping exercise. NCC would draw attention to Adopted Minerals Local Plan March 2021 (Policy MP2c) and Policies Map Inset 4. Adopted Minerals Local Plan Nottinghamshire County Council.</p> <p>Sturton le Steeple Quarry is an important source of sand and gravel and is a significant contributor to the resource landbank, as identified within the Adopted Nottinghamshire</p>	No	Noted. Sturton le Steeple quarry lies approximately 3 km north of the nearest part of the Cottam site and is unaffected by the Scheme.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Minerals Local Plan March 2021.		
Nottinghamshire County Council	Waste	In terms of the Waste Core Strategy, there are no existing waste sites within the vicinity of the site whereby the proposed development could cause an issue in terms of safeguarding existing waste management facilities (as per Policy WCS10).	N/A	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	The Rights of Way Team welcome the provisions set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report for the protection and enhancement of the network of Public Rights of Way within the proposed development site. This response focuses on the area affected by the Grid Connection Corridor and the associated buffer zone as the proposed solar facility is		The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, as described in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] , 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

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>situated in Lincolnshire and does not impact directly on the PROW of Nottinghamshire. For the same reason, NCC have not considered the Glint and Glare connotations with regards the PROW network.</p> <p>With regard to the cabling installation within Nottinghamshire, with potentially up to six Public Rights of Way impacted, it would be difficult to comment until the specific route has been identified. Trenching underground cabling, requiring a 25m working corridor, would invariably affect PROW in the short term during the construction phase and it is requested that these closures, wherever practicable, are employed sensitively to optimise the connectivity of the wider PROW network and</p>		<p>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	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		any works that affect the safe use of the PROW should be closed temporarily under a formal Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO), which is managed by Nottinghamshire County Council as Highway Authority.		
Nottinghamshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	The Rights of Way Team acknowledge the collaborative approach to cabling by liaising with the Gate Burton project to minimise the impact on the PROW network.		Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	The 3 solar panel sites – Cottam 1,2 and 3 are located in Lincolnshire, the main concern of the EMD Team is the crossing of the River Trent by the electrical supply to Cottam Power Station and the location of the cable route corridor. The following information in the PEIR document - Chapter 4 –	Yes	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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] . This consultation has enabled a consensus on the approach to the assessment over aspects of the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>Development Proposal has been noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Refinement of the cable route corridor location has taken place between the scoping and the PIER stage, with a preferred crossing location chosen to the south west of the village of Marton, and the developer is seeking to establish a combined route with the West Burton, and Gate Burton solar Projects (PEIR Document Chapter 4 - paragraph 5.5.2). - This proposal is still indicative and is to be refined following statutory consultation. Upon selection of a preferred route, geophysical and ecological surveys will be carried out to explore micro siting options ahead of the DCO application (PEIR Document Chapter 4 - paragraph 5.5.4). 		<p>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.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>The EMD Team request to continue to be involved in the discussions about the location of the cable route corridor and the crossing of the River Trent, and any new buildings/substations at or around the existing Cottam Power Station.</p>		
<p>Nottinghamshire County Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p>	<p>Both the document and the appendices relating to Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Chapter 8) have been reviewed and the following is additionally noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The use of underground cables in the cable route corridors is confirmed (PEIR Document paragraph 4.3.13). - Any existing overhead power lines will be 	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that runs of overhead lines between components or to connect underground cables is not proposed. All cables will be underground and no new overhead lines and associated poles will be required. Assessment and evaluation of the impacts and effects of the cable routes is set out within Appendix 8.2 and Appendix 8.3 of</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		retained, and no new overhead lines will be required (PEIR Document paragraph 4.3.19)		
Nottinghamshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	The correct National, Regional and Local Landscape Character areas (for Lincolnshire only) have been referred to (section 8.7 - Existing Baseline – 8.7.90, 8.7.95, and 8.7.100)	N/A	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	A strategic mitigation plan Figure 8.16 has now been provided which shows the proposals for all 3 sites overlaid onto existing landscape character and ecological objectives for the whole area, this drawing also formalises the offset arrangements for residential properties and ecological features. The mitigation buffer zones are	N/A	An outline Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010133/APP/C7.3] . is provided with the DCO application. The mitigation associated with the Scheme is also 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 within Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		also set out in Paragraph 8.8.23).		<p>Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8].</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 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 proposals allow for flexibility,</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				but they can also be fixed, where appropriate and applicable. The relevant environmental design parameters are set out within Table 8.22 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] .
Nottinghamshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	The LVIA will include a Residential Visual Amenity assessment (PEIR Methodology Appendix 8.1.2)	N/A	With regard to a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA), the Applicant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment takes into account that where at Year 15 there remain significant effects of the highest magnitude, a RVAA would be undertaken, where appropriate, for those affected properties.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Having reviewed the information provided VIA (EMD) are satisfied the Applicant has clarified/addressed all our observations and comments regarding Landscape and	N/A	Noted. The assessment of both the landscape and visual effects of the cable routes and substations is set out within Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>Visual Impact at this point in the application process.</p> <p>VIA (EMD) do not envisage any visual impact from the actual solar panel sites in Lincolnshire, and the only likely visual impact we can foresee is that arising from the cable connections to the power station and any new buildings/sub stations at or around the existing power station.</p>		
West Lindsey District Council	Agricultural Land	It is noted that initial ALC Survey Results have been undertaken (paragraph 3.2.73) with the initial findings across the entire development, as follows: Grade 2: 26.6 Ha (2.2%) / Grade 3a: 78.8 Ha (6.4%) / Grade 3b: 1130.2 Ha (91.4%). This equates to	N/A	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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resources & Farming

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		105.4ha on best and most versatile land.		<p>Circumstances) [EN010133/APP/C6.3.19.1].</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 4.07% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land).</p>
West Lindsey District Council	Agricultural Land	It is noted that the areas quoted (appendix 3.2, paragraph 2.6) do have some variation to the site areas in the PEIR (3.2.53 onwards – for instance, Cottam1 is quoted at 923.9ha, whereas the site area in the PEIR is given at 894ha – a variation of 29.9ha. Can this be clarified?	Yes	<p>A wider land area was assessed and the Scheme has evolved to take into account constraints as set out at Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.3.5]. This has resulted in the removal of some fields from the Scheme for a range of reasons including Agricultural Land Classification results.</p>
West Lindsey District Council	Agricultural Land	It is noted that the report is based on 38 days of sampling conducted in September, October and November 2021	Yes	<p>Reports are provided at Appendix 19.2 (Agricultural land Classification Reports) [EN010133/APP/C6.3.19.2].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		(approximately 1 sample per hectare) (appendix 3.2, paragraph 2.3), and that "Further soil sampling (including in-field carbonates testing) has been undertaken to supplement these reports and the samples are currently being processed." (paragraph 3.2.73).		
West Lindsey District Council	Agricultural Land	We will reserve further comment for the full surveys.	N/A	Noted.
West Lindsey District Council	Agricultural Land	It is noted (paragraph 3.2.9) that "As the design of the Scheme has evolved some areas of higher-grade agricultural land have been taken out of the Scheme and structures have been set back from Site boundaries generally, and for example, where there is the potential for impacts on residential amenity. As the Scheme design	Yes	Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.3.5] sets out the design evolution of the Scheme. This has resulted in the removal of some fields from the Scheme for a range of reasons including Agricultural Land Classification results.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		continues to evolve, the Applicant anticipates that the impact of the Scheme on Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land reported in the PEIR will be reduced even further."		The vast majority of the Scheme is located on lower quality agricultural land with only 4.07% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land).
West Lindsey District Council	Agricultural Land	It is not however clear the extent to which this has taken place – for instance – it is noted that Cottam 1 contains BMV land, whereas the Preliminary Layout drawing (V2 14/04/2022) – indicates that part of this land is nonetheless given over to solar panels? It is also noted that the preliminary plan predates the ALC report (May 2022)?	Yes	Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.3.5] 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.
West Lindsey District Council	General	Solar Panels - It is noted that tracking panels are proposed (4.3.2) – whereas the West Burton Project proposes both tracking and fixed panels.	Yes	Section 4.4 of Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.4] sets out the design parameters for the Scheme and explains that the draft

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>What are the parameters that have been taken into account on deciding the type of panel used?</p>		<p>DCO seeks consent for both tracker and fixed panel options within the array Sites.</p> <p>For the purposes of the ES, the tracker panels have been assessed in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] as a worst case scenario given their larger scale.</p> <p>Chapter 15 (Noise) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.15] assesses tracker panels given that fixed solar panels do not have any moving parts and therefore have no noise emission associated with them.</p> <p>Chapter 16 (Glint and Glare) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.16] considers both fixed and tracker panel options.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
West Lindsey District Council	General	Energy Storage – it is noted that energy storage is proposed at Cottam 1 – either as one potential area (Option A) or three potential areas (option B). It is presumed that these are the areas indicated on preliminary drawings V3 (27/05/22) – what is the site area for the battery storage? Option B suggests a significantly larger land take?	N/A	<p>Section 4.4 of Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.4] sets out the design parameters for the Scheme. It explains that the DCO Application proposes that the energy storage for the Scheme will be located within Cottam 1 and presents two alternative layouts (Option A - Work No. 2 and Option B - Work No. 3). The Environmental Statement has considered both options.</p> <p>If Option A were pursued, a more extensive area for solar panels is proposed on the remaining area.</p>
West Lindsey District Council	Cable Route	Cable corridor – it is noted that cables will be underground and “no new overhead lines will be required” (4.3.19).	N/A	The Applicant notes that runs of overhead lines between components or to connect underground cables is not proposed. All cables will be underground, and no new overhead lines and associated poles will be required. Assessment and evaluation of the impacts and effects of the cable routes is set out within Appendix 8.2

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				and Appendix 8.3 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] .
West Lindsey District Council	General	Section 5.2 – Site selection - A description of the reasonable alternatives, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, are a requirement under the EIA Regulations (Schedule 4, paragraph 2)	N/A	Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.3.5] has been prepared in response to this. Section 5.5 sets out how alternative sites have been considered.
West Lindsey District Council	General	It is noted that an assessment of commercial rooftops was undertaken (5.2.10) and a high level review of lower grade agricultural land (5.2.11). These should be detailed in order that the site selection can be properly understood. For instance, as noted above, it would appear that development is still being proposed on best and most versatile agricultural land?	N/A	An assessment of commercial rooftops in the host authorities of West Lindsey and Bassetlaw Districts identified no rooftops or combined premises of an adequate area to facilitate a large-scale solar project or provide a viable network of sites. See Appendix 5.1: Site Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.3.5.1] . Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>[EN010133/APP/C6.2.19] (and associated Appendices) provides detailed assessments of agricultural land grading for the Scheme.</p> <p>Table 5.6-5.9 of Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.3.5] details the design evolution that has led to the majority of BMV land being removed from the Scheme. The finalised Scheme contains only 4.07% 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>
West Lindsey District Council	General	Solar PV Arrangement (5.3.2) - It is noted that "double height (2P) portrait tracking panels, laid out in north-south rows" is favoured, but that "The Sites may alternatively require south-facing fixed panelling (laid out in east-west rows)	N/A	Section 4.4 of Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.4] sets out the design parameters for the Scheme and explains that the draft DCO seeks consent for both tracker and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>due to site and environmental constraints". It is noted that fixed panels are considered likely on the West Burton Solar Project – are they considered likely here? The Environmental Statement should set out and identify clearly the differentiation between the two, across the sites.</p>		<p>fixed panel options within the array Sites.</p> <p>For the purposes of the ES, the tracker panels have been assessed in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] as a worst case scenario given their larger scale.</p> <p>Chapter 15 (Noise) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.15] assesses tracker panels given that fixed solar panels do not have any moving parts and therefore have no noise emission associated with them.</p> <p>Chapter 16 (Glint and Glare) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.16] considers both fixed and tracker panel options.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
West Lindsey District Council	General	<p>Energy Storage System (5.3.8) - It is noted that the compound will be set out over a maximum of 15.4ha, and that units will be a maximum size of 16m (l) x 3m (w) x 3.2m (h).</p> <p>Does 15.4ha cover the 3 sites under option B? What is the size of area under option A?</p>	N/A	Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.4] provides details on site areas for the Scheme.
West Lindsey District Council	General	It is recognised that the site layout is still evolving (paragraph 5.4) – design iterations should be set out in the ES, and how known parameters have influenced the design (for instance – the location of known high grade ALC land).	Yes	Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.3.5] sets out how the scheme has evolved in response to known constraints including Agricultural Land Classification.
West Lindsey District Council	General	<p>The transitional provisions following the review of the National Policy Statements are noted, as set out in draft EN-1 (September 2021).</p> <p>Nonetheless, it is considered that the draft NPS, particularly</p>	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		draft EN-3, now contain provisions specific to solar projects and that these should be presumed to be important and relevant considerations, even if the project is accepted for examination prior to designation of the statements.		
West Lindsey District Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	8.2.7 – The West Lindsey Local Plan (First Review) was superseded in 2017 by the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. It is not part of the Development Plan or relevant to the assessment.	N/A	Noted. Relevant policies are set out within the ES Chapters.
West Lindsey District Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	8.5.5 – The extent of study area is noted, and implementation of 2km and 5km study areas. The ES will need to clearly explain these parameters. In particular, it is noted that the zone of theoretical visibility is not limited to 5km – figure 8.8 would indicate it extends	N/A	The assessment of both the landscape and visual effects of the substations 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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		beyond the study areas. There is also the potential for longer distance views from key Lincolnshire landmarks – namely Lincoln Castle and Cathedral. It is not clear if this has been explored and scoped out, or not.		
West Lindsey District Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	8.8.1 – It is noted that the layout and design are in an iterative stage of development and is not yet set. It is also noted (table 4.1) that substations have the potential to be up to 13m high. The LVIA should incorporate the “Maximum design scenario” approach (as advocated at section 4.2).	N/A	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.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] , 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.
West Lindsey District Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Sensitivity of visual receptors (8.9.174 onwards) – it is noted that the PEIR does identify sensitive receptors, including high sensitivity residential receptors in proximity to the sites.	N/A	The assessment of both the landscape and visual effects within the LVIA identifies the sensitivity of the receptors, and this is set out within the detailed receptor sheets within Appendix 8.2 and Appendix 8.3 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] . Residential receptors are judged to be high sensitivity.
West Lindsey District Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	The identification of potential cumulative development (table 8.6) is noted. It recognises the potential for sequential and	N/A	The LVIA considers the cumulative effects and the methodology is set out within Appendix 8.3.1 to Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>combined visual effects with both the West Burton and Gate Burton Projects. It is considered that views from the east and elevated limestone escarpment should be considered when assessing the cumulative effects.</p> <p>The combination of the West Burton project (1035ha - of which 784ha in WL); Cottam (1270ha) and Gate Burton (684ha) amounts to approximately 3000ha of land. The LVIA needs to pick up the sequential effect on more transient receptors - those that are travelling through the District, be it by car, bicycle, walking / hiking, and even the train. For instance, those travelling along the A1500 (Tillbridge Lane) will be sensitive to, and experience both this and the other</p>		<p>Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8].</p> <p>The assessment of potential visual effects is set out in detail within Appendix 8.3 of the assessment where sequential effects are considered. This takes account of those travelling along the regularly used routes such as major roads or popular paths, in particular those which capture views from the east and the elevated limestone escarpment and when assessing the cumulative effects.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		projects during their journey, which may be over many kilometres.		
West Lindsey District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	We are encouraged that consultation has taken place with LWT and Parish Councils (table 9.1).	N/A	Noted.
West Lindsey District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The presence of badgers (9.4.51) are noted. As this is desk top based, the PEIR is not clear as to whether further survey work will take place – and how the development will then take account of badger presence. Table 9.2 is not clear – they are not considered an important ecological Feature, “but included in impact assessment for legal reasons”. Are they to be distinguished from the other identified IEF?	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that all areas of the Scheme have been surveyed for badger setts and all recorded badger setts have been re-visited to classify their status (active/inactive, outlying, subsidiary, main and annexe). Badgers are not a species of conservation concern or receive any designation for their conservation value, so are not often considered an Important Ecological Feature.</p> <p>However, they are legally protected as a result of ongoing persecution and therefore remain a legal ecological constraint to development.</p> <p>Consequently, Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.9], considers potential impacts on badgers in their own right.</p> <p>Impacts on badger setts will be avoided through the implementation of appropriately sized (10-30m) exclusion zones around them within which access and construction activities will not occur. Furthermore, the Outline EPMS [EN010133/APP/C7.19] will set out the need for further pre-commencement survey for badger setts.</p>
West Lindsey District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	It is noted that mitigation measures, and enhancement opportunities are considered for various habitats and species. It is also recognised that a detailed Biodiversity Net Gain assessment will be carried out (paragraph 9.9.1) although it cannot be carried out at this time due to incomplete survey data and the preliminary nature of the	Yes	The Applicant notes that appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.9.12] , 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 approximately 96%, with an approximate 70% gain of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>scheme. It is encouraging that "it is anticipated that a significant net gain for area-based, linear and water habitats is possible as a result of the scheme."</p> <p>Paragraph 5.3.15 of NPS EN-1 does state that "When considering proposals, the [decision-maker] should maximise such opportunities in and around developments, using requirements or planning obligations where appropriate." The draft replacement EN-1 goes further (paragraph 5.4.22) when stating "The Secretary of State should consider what appropriate requirements should be attached to any consent and/or in any planning obligations entered</p>		<p>Hedgerow Units and approximately a 11% 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. The BNG assessment report also sets out how these calculations are based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010133/APP/C7.3] which will be legally secured under a requirement of the DCO for the life of the scheme (approximately 40 years) and so ensure that objectives are met and increase the reliability of these projections.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>into, in order to ensure that any mitigation or biodiversity net gain measures, if offered, are delivered and maintained. Any habitat creation or enhancement delivered for biodiversity net gain should generally be maintained for a minimum period of 30 years.”</p>		
<p>West Lindsey District Council</p>	<p>Ecology and biodiversity</p>	<p>The intention to undertake a detailed BNG assessment is welcomed, and should set out the long term management of the site. Whilst 30 years is noted in policy, the development itself is anticipated to have an operational life of 40yrs (paragraph 4.1.12) and at paragraph 4.5.13 the PEIR states that “It is anticipated that some of the areas of habitat and biodiversity mitigation and enhancement will potentially be left in situ</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes it is correct that the intention is for the habitat provisions of the LEMP and BNG assessment to be in place for the lifespan of the scheme which is anticipated to be 40 years. The decommissioning phase is discussed in Section 9.8 of Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.9], and this sets out how ecological surveys will need to be undertaken in advance of decommissioning in order to ensure legal compliance with the prevailing ecological protection legislation and policy of the time.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>given that they could contain protected species. The need for any relevant protected species licenses will be considered at that time if reinstatement activities are likely to have an impact." It is considered that chapter 9 should address this.</p>		
<p>West Lindsey District Council</p>	<p>Hydrology, Flood risk and drainage</p>	<p>10.2.18 – The West Lindsey Local Plan (First Review) was superseded in 2017 by the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. It is not part of the Development Plan and does not require to be referenced.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>This has been updated within section 10.3 (Policy Context) of Chapter 10 (Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.10] and Section 2.4 (Local Policy) of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy.</p>
<p>West Lindsey District Council</p>	<p>Hydrology, Flood risk and drainage</p>	<p>It is noted that a desktop analysis has taken place (10.3.2), but that a detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Drainage Strategy are currently being undertaken and not yet available (10.3.3).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy has been produced by the Applicant 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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				panels. Where additional infrastructure is proposed, such as 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.
West Lindsey District Council	Hydrology, Flood risk and drainage	It is however identified that parts of Cottam 1 are in FZ2 and FZ3; the eastern edge of Cottam 2 is in FZ3; and Cottam 3 is wholly within FZ1. It is noted that the PEIR does consider the increase in permanent impermeable area to have a medium adverse magnitude of effect to people and property and the significance of effect is Major Adverse (10.5.19).	N/A	The Applicant notes the proposed development will not have a detrimental impact of 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 (as detailed in sections 10.6 Embedded Mitigation and 10.8 Mitigation Measures of the Chapter 10 (Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.10] and throughout the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy). A detailed

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Drainage Strategy for the proposed battery storage and substation area within Cottam 1 West (Detailed within Section 'Drainage Strategy' of the Annex).
West Lindsey District Council	Hydrology, Flood risk and drainage	It is noted that mitigation will be required to reduce the effect to negligible (10.5.34). The PEIR states that "it is proposed to maintain the predevelopment surface water regime post development" (10.8.10) and that "The arrangements for adoption should be investigated at an early stage and proposals agreed acceptable by the LPA." We will therefore await further details – and whether this would be a matter for the Local Planning Authority – or Lead Local Flood Authority.	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes the proposed development will not have a detrimental impact of 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>A detailed Drainage Strategy for the proposed battery storage and substation area within Cottam 1 West (Detailed within Section 'Drainage Strategy' of the Annex).</p>
West Lindsey District Council	Ground Conditions and Contamination	The preliminary findings are noted and that "The following potential contaminant linkages	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>were assessed and the PRAs indicate that the risk is generally classified as Moderate to Minor across Cottam 1, 2 and 3" and that with mitigation "the potential effects of contamination or risk of contamination will be negligible and not significant."</p>		
<p>West Lindsey District Council</p>	<p>Minerals</p>	<p>It is noted that Cottam 1 (50ha), Cottam 2 (25ha) and less than 1.5ha of Cottam 3 are identified as falling within Sand and Gravel Mineral Safeguarding areas. The Preliminary findings conclude a "minor" magnitude of impact upon Cottam 1 & 2, and "moderate/minor" for Cottam 3 and the route corridor, although it is considered mitigation is only necessary for the route corridors. We will defer to the advice of Lincolnshire County Council, as</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Noted. Lincolnshire County Council as the Minerals Planning Authority has stated that having considered the nature and characteristics of the proposals there would be a negligible impact in terms of any sterilisation of mineral resources.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		the Minerals Planning Authority, in this regard.		
West Lindsey District Council	Cultural Heritage	13.4.1 – The ES will need to set out how non-designated heritage assets have been identified i.e. through the Historic Environment Register and 'local listing'. Whilst 1km is likely to be reasonable in most cases – “setting” is “the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. The extent to which the development may affect the setting of the asset will depend upon the asset itself.	N/A	<p>Full details of the sources of information used for the identification of non-designated heritage assets is set out by the Applicant in section 13.4 of Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13].</p> <p>This includes information identified from the Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record, but the Lincolnshire Local List has yet to be populated. Settings of designated heritage assets of the 'highest significance' (e.g. Grade I and II* Listed Buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens and Scheduled Monuments) within a 5km study area have been assessed, and the settings of Grade II Listed Buildings within 2km study areas</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				surrounding the sites have been assessed, as presented in Appendix 13.5 to Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] .
West Lindsey District Council	Cultural Heritage	13.4.6 – we are encouraged to note that the study area has been extended to up to 5km for designated assets 'of the highest significance'. This will then be subject to a 'sifting' exercise. The Local Planning authority wishes to be kept informed of this exercise and be given the opportunity to comment.	N/A	The results of this 'sifting' exercise are discussed in the Heritage Statement, presented as Appendix 13.5 to Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] . The Applicant notes that there will be further opportunity to comment upon these results during the DCO examination period.
West Lindsey District Council	Cultural Heritage	13.4.8 – it is noted that there are 158 GII listed buildings within the 5km zone and that "proposed that the assessment of Listed Buildings within 2km of the Cottam Sites previously included in the Scoping Report is built upon as	N/A	The evidence base justifying the 'scoping out' of designated heritage assets from further assessment is provided by the Applicant in section 3.1 of the Heritage Statement, presented as Appendix 13.5 to Chapter 13 (Cultural

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>part of the further assessment, bolstered by 'ground-truthing' visits where feasible. The resultant evidence base will be agreed with the local authority, if possible, prior to the 'scoping out' of assets where appropriate." We will wish to be kept informed and consulted upon any intentions to "scope out" designated heritage assets, after these assessments have taken place.</p>		<p>Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13].</p> <p>The Applicant notes that there will be further opportunity to comment upon these results during the DCO examination period.</p>
<p>West Lindsey District Council</p>	<p>Cultural Heritage</p>	<p>Table 13.6 – As a designated heritage asset – Grade II Listed Buildings should also be valued as "high". This is consistent with paragraph 5.8.14 of EN-1 which states that "Loss [of significance] affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification."</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that Valuing Grade II Listed Buildings as 'High' would not be in accordance with the assessment methodology adopted for the EIA, as set out in Table 13.6 of Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13].</p> <p>Valuing them as 'Medium' would still be consistent with paragraph 5.8.14 of EN-1 which states that "Loss [of</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				significance] affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.”
West Lindsey District Council	Cultural Heritage	13.6.1 It is acknowledged that baseline and further baseline data is to be completed, and that a “full impact assessment” has yet to be undertaken and will be included in the ES once all of the results have further evaluation have been completed. West Lindsey DC will wish to be consulted and kept informed, ahead of its inclusion within the ES.	N/A	The Applicant notes that it would not be feasible to provide all of the disparate strands of baseline information which have been collated into the Environmental Statement prior to their incorporation into the overarching document, but there will be an opportunity to review this information and comment upon the impact assessment during the DCO examination period.
West Lindsey District Council	Cultural Heritage	13.7.1 – it is noted that cumulative impacts will be considered, particularly in regards to views from the Lincoln Edge escarpment.	N/A	Cumulative impacts are discussed in Section 13.10 of Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] .
West Lindsey District Council	Transport and access	The preliminary findings, and expected trip generation figures are noted. It is noted that a minor adverse effect on pedestrian amenity is	N/A	Noted and confirmed.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		expected, to be managed through a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP).		
West Lindsey District Council	Noise and Vibration	It is recognised that baseline noise surveys have been undertaken, and discussed with Council Officers. Operational Noise Assessments are to be undertaken and included in the ES.	No	Operational noise assessments are included in Chapter 15 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.15] .
West Lindsey District Council	Glint and Glare	It is noted that some assumptions are based around "Pager Power's [consultant] experience" (16.4.33; 16.4.35) – the ES should be clear in setting out how these assumptions have been reached. At 16.4.33 it dismisses an assessment of users on the PRoW due to factors such as "The typical density of pedestrians on a PROW is low in a rural environment".	N/A	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will look to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to curtail any visibility of the Scheme from these routes, but also 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

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>However, the PEIR recognises PRow users as a sensitive visual receptor in Chapter 8. They are also recognised as a factor for local tourism and recreation – “The local network of Public Rights of Way is important to the local population and is thus of a medium sensitivity to [tourism and recreation] impacts” (18.4.16). Chapter 16 should therefore be clear as to whether PRow users are likely to be affected by glint and glare, and set out that assessment accordingly.</p> <p>It is noted that the scheme is predicted to have a ‘moderate’ significance of effect that will require mitigation.</p>		<p>management and maintenance.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that Public Rights of Way (PRow) have not been included within the assessment because they are receptors with “low” sensitivity which means the receptor is tolerant of change without detrimental effect, is of low or local importance.</p> <p>A public right of way user (walker, cyclist) has high tolerance with regards to glare effects and can easily change in nature to reduce the impact. Pager Power in its longstanding experience is not aware of any issue related to glint and glare with regards to horses (horse-riders).</p> <p>The Applicant notes that an assessment will conclude that any effect will have low impact upon PRow users.</p>
West Lindsey District Council	Air Quality	It is recognised that fire risk has been considered, with mitigation through an “Outline Battery Fire Management Plan”	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>proposed. The PEIR recognises that "There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion." As the extent of battery storage area in Cottam 1 is yet to be established, chapter 17 of the ES should be based on a worst case scenario.</p>		
West Lindsey District Council	Air Quality	<p>It is noted that the Preliminary assessment finds a medium risk for ecology through dust soiling and that mitigation will therefore be required.</p>	N/A	Noted.
West Lindsey District Council	Socio-Economics, Agriculture and Tourism and Recreation	<p>It is noted that the PEIR considers (18.3.16) that the [tourism and recreation] impacts "are likely to be felt at a local level only as a result of direct visual impacts, or indirectly as a result of changes to their desirability for tourism and recreational use".</p>	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
West Lindsey District Council	Socio-Economics, Agriculture and Tourism and Recreation	However, the scale of development is such (1270ha), and taken in combination with the West Burton (1035ha) and Gate Burton projects (684ha) that around 3000ha of arable land in rural Lincolnshire would be transformed to solar project areas. Consequently the ES cannot simply consider the direct impacts at a local level, but must take into consideration the likely direct and indirect impacts upon tourism and recreation at a higher level. As the PEIR acknowledges "The land does however play a substantive role in providing a landscape context to recreational use of waterways and walking and cycling routes."	N/A	Section 18.10 of Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.18] sets out the cumulative effects of the Scheme.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
West Lindsey District Council	Socio-Economics, Agriculture and Tourism and Recreation	How will the development, alone and in combination with other projects, affect visitor perceptions of rural Lincolnshire? Will it affect the desirability of West Lindsey as a place to visit? How will it affect visitor numbers?	N/A	Where quantifiable, these have been addressed by the Applicant in Sections 18.5 and 18.7 of Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.18] . This will be limited as no similar schemes have been constructed in the UK and as such little comparative data is available. Where based on qualitative information, professional judgement will be used to determine anticipated impacts.
West Lindsey District Council	Socio-Economics, Agriculture and Tourism and Recreation	<p>The development will result in the loss of over 1270ha of agricultural land – of which, 105.4ha is proposed on best and most versatile land (appendix 3.1).</p> <p>In combination with the West Burton Solar Project (1035ha) and Gate Burton (684ha) – it will cumulatively amount to over 3000ha of Lincolnshire (&</p>	Yes	The amount of BMV land within the Scheme has been reduced from these figures. Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.19] (and associated Appendices) provides detailed assessments of agricultural land grading for the Scheme. Table 5.6-5.9 of Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.3.5] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Nottinghamshire) agricultural land.		Details the design evolution that has led to the majority of BMV land being removed from the Scheme. The finalised Scheme contains only 4.07% 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.
West Lindsey District Council	Socio-Economics, Agriculture and Tourism and Recreation	The farming circumstances (18.4.49) should therefore set out the agri-economic impacts of development. The baseline study should set out the current agricultural use of the sites, on a seasonal basis. What is being produced on site? What is its contribution towards food supplies and other sectors? How many are directly and indirectly employed that will be affected by the development and at what socio-economic impact?		Direct and indirect impacts on employment have been assessed by the Applicant in Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.18] 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.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
West Lindsey District Council	Socio-Economics, Agriculture and Tourism and Recreation	Whilst it is noted that this loss may be "temporary" (paragraph 18.5.15) - the development is expected to operate for around 40 years (18.5.20). Taking into account commissioning and decommissioning phases including any necessary site restoration, the impact will be even longer. This is a significant part of a lifetime and within the economic cycle.	N/A	Noted.
West Lindsey District Council	Socio-Economics, Agriculture and Tourism and Recreation	These impacts must be fully assessed within the ES.	N/A	Noted. Assessments are presented in Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.18] .
West Lindsey District Council	Waste	It is noted that at the decommissioning stage, it is estimated that significant volumes of waste will be	N/A	Noted. Details are provided in Chapter 20 (Waste) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.20] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>generated. The PEIR states that "Standard good practice for waste management will be implemented during decommissioning". It is appreciated that decommissioning is expected to take place some 40 years after operations commence – however, it would be relevant to set out principles at this stage. It is noted that further details will be provided with the ES.</p>		
<p>West Lindsey District Council</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>It is noted that "The risk zones for fires and explosions are to be fully defined in the ES to determine the number of residential dwellings, and number of publicly accessible highways or rights of way that are of high or medium sensitivity to impacts from the Scheme."</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 21 (Other Environmental Matters) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.21] assesses the impacts of the Scheme upon human health and also considers major accidents and disasters. The outline battery storage safety management plan [EN010133/APP/C7.9] sets out firefighting and safety measures in the event of a fire or explosion.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire Police	Other	<p>At this early stage of what is an outline proposal any comments will be largely generic and would only refer to the measures to help reduce crime and any related anti-social behaviour and not the principle of the development.</p> <p>Further comments, advice and recommendations may be made when the detail and exact specifications of the development are available and are provided.</p> <p>The advice and recommendations can be applied to the general planning proposal and refer to the measures that should be considered and included in a large-scale project.</p>	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire Police	Other	<p>Lincolnshire has small, medium, and large solar parks or farms which have over the past 10 years been subject to theft, criminal damage and other crime types, including theft of solar panels, and removal of cabling and infrastructure which has proved costly to the various developers and management companies that operate such facilities therefore the security and safety of the sites should be an important feature of the planning and design of the sites.</p> <p>Solar Farms or Solar Parks have in recent years been subject of some significant thefts of the installed solar panels with replacement costs more than £40,000. I would ask that consideration to the specific and detailed measures</p>	N/A	<p>Noted. Work No. 7 includes associated works for each of the Solar Farm Sites including fencing, gates, boundary treatment and other means of enclosure; the provision of security and monitoring measures such as CCTV columns, lighting columns and lighting, cameras, weather stations, communication infrastructure, and perimeter fencing. Further details regarding these components can be found in Section 4.5 of Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.4].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		that are to be taken by the developers on this site are explained.		
Lincolnshire Police	Other	I would strongly avoid the use of what is described as 'Deer Fencing' as this does not provide any difficulty or deterrent to the criminal.	No	Noted. Deer fencing up to a maximum height of 2.5m is proposed around the site as just one of a number of measures to deter public access onto the site, including the CCTV and remote monitoring described in Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.4] . This design is cost-effective and is used across a number of existing solar sites. The substations on each Site and the energy storage compound will also have palisade fencing on their boundaries up to a maximum height of 2.6m.
Lincolnshire Police	Other	Land selected should aim to avoid affecting the visual aspect of landscapes, maintain the natural beauty and should be predominantly flat, well	Yes	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

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		screened by hedges, tree lines, etc. and not cause undue impact to nearby domestic properties or roads. (BRE. Planning guidance for the large-scale ground mounted solar PV systems)		Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] .
Lincolnshire Police	Other	I would recommend that the boundary fence is to a minimum of LPS 1175 level 3 and to a height of 2.4 metres or to the current UK Government standard, SEAP (Security Equipment Approval Panel) class 1-3.	Yes	The Concept Design Parameters and Principles document [EN010133/APP/C7.15] allows for the perimeter fence to be up to a maximum height of 2.5m. The perimeter of the Sites will be secured by deer fencing, with palisade fencing as described in Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.4] required for substations and energy storage compounds. The final specification of the fencing will be determined prior to construction, and will be of a standard that will satisfy the Scheme's insurers.
Lincolnshire Police	Other	The use of 2.4 metre welded mesh fencing (in green) would be the most unobtrusive	No	A common design for solar farms is for the perimeter to be secured by deer fencing, with palisade fencing as

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>method of providing a secure perimeter border. All gated entrances should be secured with appropriate access systems. The NFU Mutual recommends good perimeter security fencing for all solar installations along with CCTV, motion sensors and infrared beams, depending on location. It also recommends panels are secured to frames with unique fastenings, requiring special tools – much like alloy wheel bolts?</p>		<p>described in Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.4] required for substations and energy storage compounds. Deer fencing minimises environmental impacts such as to the landscape and ecology.</p> <p>All site entrances will be secured via locked gates and monitored via CCTV.</p> <p>Motion sensors and additional panel frame security measures are available on the market and could be implemented at the point of construction.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire Police</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>Whilst considering the often-isolated locations that Solar Farms are to be installed the installation of a remotely monitored with motion detection CCTV system is an effective deterrent and is most likely to provide effective evidence should a crime occur.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Pole mounted internal facing CCTV systems will be used around the perimeter of the operational elements of the Sites. It is anticipated that these will be galvanised steel painted green poles with a maximum height of 3m. The system will be remotely monitored.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>Installers of remotely monitored detector activated CCTV systems will comply with all the following standards and guidelines: NPCC Security Systems Policy; BS 8418 Installation and remote monitoring of detector activated CCTV systems – Code of Practice; BS EN 50132-7: CCTV Application guidelines; RVRCs monitoring detector activated CCTV systems will conform to all the following standards; BS 5979 (Cat II); BS 8418: Installation and remote monitoring of detector activated CCTV systems – Code of Practice.</p> <p>There will probably be little reward in deploying CCTV or other defence unless it is monitored in some way or can provide an instant alert in some form.</p>		<p>Motion sensors and additional security measures such as perimeter alarms are available on the market and may be implemented at the point of construction, subject to final design approval.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire Police	Other	It has been identified that individual panels can be easily removed from the aluminium frames which are usually secured by a small bracket which is in turn secured by an alum key. Whilst aluminium can itself be easily forced the use of an additional security bracket may help reduce the ease by which panels can be removed adding to the time that a criminal would need to remove panels increasing the risk to offenders.	N/A	Noted. Additional security measures such as those described do exist on the market, and the comment will be taken into account upon final detailed design of the Scheme, at the point of construction.
Lincolnshire Police	Other	Whilst not intending to draw attention to a solar farm the effective use of signage to act as an informative deterrent may also be considered.	Yes	Noted. Signage is proposed under Work No. 7.
Lincolnshire Police	Other	I would ask that the Applicant considers a perimeter alarm system now we are aware that these sites are attracting criminal interest.	Yes	Noted. Additional security measures such as those described do exist on the market, and the comment will be taken into account upon final detailed design

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				of the Scheme, at the point of construction.
Lincolnshire Police	Other	<p>There have been several instances where offenders have been able to access sites quite easily with large vehicles enabling the large-scale removal of panels and equipment. Due to the poor planning and design (particularly across fields and tracks in dry weather) they spent some considerable time undetected.</p> <p>There have also seen several incidents where crimes have been committed on power transmission sites with some offenders risking their lives after targeting live cabling.</p>	Yes	<p>During construction, site entrances will include a security gate and kiosk, as described in Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.4]. When the Scheme is operational, vehicle access to the Sites will only be possible via gates which will be kept locked. Further locked gates and security fencing will surround the substations and energy storage compounds.</p> <p>CCTV has been designed into the Scheme and the final design for construction will ensure it covers the perimeter with no blind spots, so that any perimeter breach would be quickly discovered.</p>
Lincolnshire Police	Other	Landscaping techniques such as ditches and berms (bunds) may also be appropriate in some instances. To be effective in stopping vehicles	Yes	Noted. The number of construction Site accesses have been minimised whilst minimising impacts to the local highway network. A description of the site accesses can be found in the Outline

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		these need to be designed carefully. Police can provide further specific advice in relation to the design of such defences upon request. There should be a minimum number of vehicular access points onto site, ideally only one.		Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010133/APP/C6.3.14.2] . Access points to the Sites during operation have also been minimised as part of the design and will be secured by locked gates and CCTV monitoring, as described in Chapter 4 (Scheme Description) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.4] .
Lincolnshire Police	Other	The development will need to have regard in both its design layout, and future maintenance plans for the retention of growth of vegetation on these important boundaries, including the opportunity for trees within the boundaries to grow on to maturity.	Yes	The Outline LEMP [EN010133/APP/C7.3] sets out the basis for ongoing management of trees and vegetation associated with the Scheme. This includes enabling boundary trees to grow to maturity.
Lincolnshire Police	Other	The use of natural vegetation as a feature should not compromise the benefit of clear and unobstructed natural and formal (CCTV System) surveillance.		Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Lincolnshire Police	Other	Existing hedges and established vegetation, including mature trees, should be retained wherever possible.	N/A	Due to the nature of the Scheme, it is considered that existing vegetation on the Sites would be retained. Where this is not possible, the mitigation associated with any such tree or hedgerow loss 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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] .
Fillingham Parish Council	General	Beyond the PIER material, having attended three Information Events, IGP do not seem able to have been able articulate a clear view of what the proposed scheme could contribute to the UK energy system or the challenge to decarbonise it. I would refer IGP to the website of the Heckington Fen (Ecotricity)	N/A	Noted. In addition to the information shared through consultation materials at the pre-application stage, 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.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		development under the section "How the numbers are calculated" as a good example. IGP have twice promised to clarify their figures (on the 25th June and 27th June events), but I have received no further clarification to date.		
Fillingham Parish Council	Other	Notwithstanding the leaflets and information events, from general conversations with people in local villages there are relatively low levels of awareness of the schemes locally; many seem to have treated leaflets as "junk mail". Overall, the level of engagement in the Information Events also appears to have been low. Having attended 3 such sessions, on Saturday 25/06 in Marton and Gate Burton Village Hall, the representatives from the	N/A	Noted. 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 [EN010133/APP/C5.2] 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.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>developers outnumbered the residents throughout the 90 minutes we were there. For the Webinar on 27/07 there were only 4 participants not from the developer's side, and on the 12/07 there were only around 10 at maximum. It would seem that, the net effect of the communication is that the level of general reach and engagement is very low. The developers have not used more options to engage with the community (other developers are advertising on Facebook, for instance – where there appears to be much more engagement, the majority of which is overwhelmingly negative). For the scale and scope of the scheme – and the clear investment that has gone into producing material for the PIER and other documents, it</p>		<p>The Consultation Report sets out the various activities undertaken to publicise consultation opportunities, including extensive mailouts to a consultation area extending 2km from the Sites, advertising in local newspapers, online updates and correspondence with stakeholders.</p> <p>While the Applicant does not host a social media account for the Scheme, their Statement of Community Consultation does commit to providing information to parish councils for them to post on their social media. The Applicant considers this would reach a wider audience than a project social media account.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		is disappointing that more has not been done in this area, as it serves to undermine the credibility of any claimed public support.		
Fillingham Parish Council	General	In describing the energy need, the PIER uses the urgent words of the Prime Minister, Boris Johnson, but neglects to mention that Solar does not form part of the 10-point plan within the Energy Security Strategy. Solar is included afterwards in "other measures" as something of a footnote to the Renewables section of the Strategy. The Energy Security Strategy includes an ambition for what "could be up to 70GW" of solar. The current 14GW of solar is split between "Large scale solar" and rooftops. (A large scale solar scheme in the UK is currently c.50MW. There is no	N/A	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.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>call in the Energy Security Strategy to expand this by a factor of 10.) As part of the section on solar is the commitment that the Government will support effective land use – “encouraging large scale projects to locate on previously developed land”... and to “maximise the efficiency of land use”. It is hard to understand how the Cottam or West Burton solar schemes meet these criteria.</p>		
Fillingham Parish Council	General	<p>The assessment of rooftop solar as a viable alternative is particularly weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The developer has limited the search area and pre-determined the approximate size (as commented in 5.2.4) - There are only around 3% of 	N/A	<p>A Statement of Need [EN010133/APP/C7.11] 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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>the UK's households with solar panels on the rooftops, and no figures readily available for commercial warehousing. There has been no assessment to explore the extent to which the Government's policy objectives could be pursued through a combination of new mandatory planning requirements and retro-fit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The PIER provides insufficient evidence to conclude that a large-scale solar deployment could be facilitated in combination across premises using rooftops. 		<p>continued development in distribution connected, smaller scale solar, and this includes the development of rooftop solar.</p>
<p>Fillingham Parish Council</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>The developer appears to have commenced the concept from two fixed points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Having being notified of grid capacity at West Burton, Cottam and High Marnham, no other options appear to have 	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.5] explains that options to use the coal closure plants listed have not been examined because grid capacity has not been identified in these areas.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>been explored (e.g. other coal closure sites at Fiddler's Ferry, Eggborough, Ferrybridge, Didcot, West Thurrock, Aberthaw, Drakelow, Kingsnorth, Ironbridge for example). A broader range of sites could have provided an opportunity to use more brown-field options or to mitigate the impact by disaggregation of the project scale across different areas.</p> <p>- The developer also seems to have commenced from a position of absolutely maximising grid connection capacity as a limiting factor – thereby pre-determining the approximate size (land use) for the proposed scheme. In this way the developer has severely limited their consideration of alternative proposals.</p>		<p>Decommissioning of coal fired power stations does not automatically equal available grid connection capacity at these locations, often due to the fact that grid connection offers may already have been made to others. It would not be reasonable nor proportionate for the Applicant to have to assess alternative locations throughout the country to this level of detail.</p> <p>NPS EN1 requires that the consideration of alternatives to comply with policy requirements should be carried out in a proportionate manner. It also states that <i>"alternative proposals which are vague or inchoate can be excluded on the grounds that they are not important and relevant to the IPC's decision"</i>.</p> <p>Smaller development as an alternative to the Scheme does not need to be considered, because NPS EN-1 at paragraph 4.4.3 states that the decision</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>maker: "...should be guided in considering alternative proposals by whether there is a realistic prospect of the alternative delivering the same infrastructure capacity (including energy security and climate change benefits) in the same timescale as the proposed development".</p> <p>A smaller scheme would not deliver the same generation capacity or energy security and climate change benefit as the Scheme, and as such would not represent a reasonable alternative.</p> <p>The Statement of Need submitted with the DCO Application [EN010133/APP/C7.11] explains the need for large scale solar assets.</p>
Fillingham Parish Council	Socio-Economics, Agriculture and Tourism and Recreation	The PIER acknowledges that use of agricultural land by the scheme will impact the agricultural economy for a "temporary period" (of 40+ years?). The section is generally lacking in detail – the	N/A	The Applicant notes that the assessment of impacts on employment and to the economic prosperity of the Local Impact Area have been included in Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>developer has not carried out the assessment to understand the net effect, but asserts there will be a net economic gain to the region in the “non-technical PIER” – 16.3.6 as a “significant effect”</p>		<p>Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.18].</p> <p>The net economic change accounts for losses to the agricultural economy against benefits from the construction and ongoing maintenance of the Scheme. Preliminary estimations have been clarified and evidenced with formal economic estimates in this assessment.</p>
<p>Fillingham Parish Council</p>	<p>Agricultural Land</p>	<p>Within the PIER, 91% of the land is classified as 3B. This contrasts strongly with the DEFRA assessment of expected BMV land, which suggested a “moderate likelihood” of BMV (3a) land, i.e. in the range 20-60%, published in 2017. Likelihood of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land - Strategic scale map East Midlands Region - ALC017 (naturalengland.org.uk)</p>	<p>Yes</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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resources & Farming Circumstances) [EN010133/APP/C6.3.19.1]. These assessments are detailed and comprehensive whilst the DEFRA</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>mapping is broadbrush and not based on detailed soil sampling.</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 4.07% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land).</p>
Fillingham Parish Council	General	<p>NB "Solar" is not mentioned at all in the 82-pages of the Renewable Energy Policy Statement document.</p> <p>The current NPS explicitly does not cover beyond Biomass / EfW, Wind (on/offshore) – citing these as not technically viable. Tidal is mentioned as a possible future option that may warrant revision of the NPS. Draft NPS EN-3 is currently being reviewed and a</p>	N/A	<p>Local and national planning policy has been identified in Chapter 6 (Energy Need, Legislative Context and Energy Policy) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.6].</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>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>draft policy statement has been developed. The document does now include a section on solar farms: 2.47.2</p> <p>The draft NPS describes approximate capacity (MW) per acre, and gives an example of a "typical 50MW solar farm". Even the new draft document is silent on schemes of the size proposed in the PIER.</p> <p>The draft NPS reiterates the use of "previously developed land, brownfield land, contaminated land, industrial land, or agricultural land preferably of classification 3b, 4, and 5 (avoiding the use of "Best and Most Versatile" cropland where possible.</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Fillingham Parish Council	Socio-Economics, Agriculture and Tourism and Recreation	<p>The Applicant must describe the existing socio-economic conditions, and how the proposed development correlates with local planning policies. The PIER accurately describes the difficult socio economic problems the region faces, but the PIER not clear how the proposed development aligns with local planning policies and actions. Overall comment NB "Solar" is only mentioned once in the 120-pages of the Policy Statement, in section 3.3.11, citing the drawbacks of intermittent sources of energy which requires back-up energy supply. (although it is acknowledged a revision to this document is under development)</p>	N/A	<p>Local and national planning policy has been identified in Chapter 6: Energy Need, Legislative Context and Energy Policy [EN010133/APP/C6.2.6]. Matters directly related to socio-economic conditions are assessed in Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.18], with policy considerations combined into the assessment of significant impacts.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Fillingham Parish Council	Agricultural Land	<p>The developer should minimise impact on Best & Most Versatile (1, 2 & 3a) land, and preferably use 3b or below, "except where this would be inconsistent with other sustainability considerations." – The PIER does not address the changed landscape of food security (following Russian invasion of Ukraine), or sustainability of food production miles. The Inspector should give little weight to the loss of poor quality land (including 3b), "except... in areas... where particular agricultural practices may themselves contribute to the quality and character of the environment or the local economy." Notwithstanding the unusually high proportion of land that has been assessed as 3b, it is clear that within this region, there is a</p>	Yes	<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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resources & Farming Circumstances) [EN010133/APP/C6.3.19.1].</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 4.07% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land).</p> <p>Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.19] states at paragraphs 19.5.2- 3 (in respect of food security):</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>demonstrable link between agriculture, the environment and the local economy, therefore the exception should apply. Note: In an Environmental Audit Committee meeting, 29/06/2022, George Eustice, Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, clearly set out guidance that had been made clear by Government that 3b land was included in the Best & Most Valuable classification.</p>		<p>"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 environmental</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>and land degradation hazards of the most popular energy crop, maize .</p> <p>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."</p>
Fillingham Parish Council	Other	Is impact on the landscape temporary and can it be reversed in a reasonable timescale (judgement of planning inspectorate). This project will significantly impact the local landscape for c. 50 years. This cannot be considered temporary.	N/A	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

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				previous state; thus, giving the Scheme it's temporariness. However, as is typical for energy generation NSIPs, the DCO Application does not seek a temporary or time limited consent.
Fillingham Parish Council	Other	"Applying "good design" to energy projects should produce sustainable infrastructure sensitive to place, efficient in the use of natural resources and energy used in their construction and operation, matched by an appearance that demonstrates good aesthetic as far as possible" The PIER does not appropriately address this requirement as the scale of the development shows an absolute disregard to any sense of place.	N/A	Noted.
Fillingham Parish Council	Other	Existence of alternatives to the proposed development is beyond NPS1 – it is "in the first instance, a matter of law". This	Yes	Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.5] has been prepared in accordance with the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>is understood to mean that it is mandatory to explore alternatives. Applicants are obliged to include in their Environmental Statement information about the main alternatives they have studied. In the PIER, the exploration of alternatives is very limited, leading to a very narrow consideration of alternatives that fulfil the developer's pre-determined geographic and scale decisions.</p>		<p>EIA Regulations and builds on the preliminary information set out in the PEIR.</p> <p>NPS EN-1 states: <i>"Applicants are obliged to include in their ES, 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 the environmental, social and economic effects and including, where relevant, technical and commercial feasibility."</i></p> <p>This Chapter, supported by Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) [EN010133/APP/C6.3.5.1] undertakes this exercise in accordance with the above requirements.</p>
Fillingham Parish Council	Other	EN1 Envisages large scale renewable energy generation from wind (offshore / onshore), Biomass, EfW, Wave and Tidal – Citing the UK's abundant national resources	N/A	Local and national planning policy has been identified in Chapter 6 (Energy Need, Legislative Context and Energy Policy) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.6] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>in these areas – notably, the current guidance does not include solar.</p> <p>Advice that there should be a presumption in favour of granting consent, given the urgency of need, but only for types of energy covered in Part 3 (i.e. this does not include Solar)</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.
Fillingham Parish Council	Other	Diversified enterprise” and “sheep grazing enterprises” – please expand on how these would advance the local economy.	N/A	Noted.
Fillingham Parish Council	Socio-Economics, Agriculture and Tourism and Recreation	The PIER asserts that during operation, there will be a beneficial impact on local economic prosperity, but the previous section has explained that this has not been explored in detail as yet, and there is no evidence to back this up, i.e. the inference is that whatever arrives will	N/A	The Applicant notes that quantitative evidence was not available at PEIR to be able to determine these impacts. A full assessment of the economic impact of the Scheme is presented in Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.18] , with quantitative results for numbers of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>benefit more than the agricultural jobs lost – but this is not explained. It would be good to know how skills and training would be bolstered during the operation of a largely “passive” system.</p> <p>The PIER acknowledges that employment opportunities arising from the scheme are limited. The net impact of marginal gains in energy jobs vs loss of agricultural jobs has not been explored. How realistic it will be for local jobs / opportunities and apprenticeships during construction phase is not described. The loss of agricultural skills in the region through a 40 year period of such a wide area of the county being covered by solar farms does not appear to have been considered.</p>		<p>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 [EN010133/APP/C7.10].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Fillingham Parish Council	Ecology and Biodiversity	Significantly extending these would provide more credibility to habitat protection. The currently proposed limited area would establish small, isolated / disconnected habitat islands.	Yes	The Applicant notes that, as set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010133/APP/C7.3] , 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.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Fillingham Parish Council	Socio-Economics, Agriculture and Tourism and Recreation	<p>Quotation from the NPPF emphasising the importance of building a strong, competitive economy by supporting "economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development" (paragraph 81) and helping to support a prosperous rural economy.</p> <p>The PIER does not describe how the scheme would support this objective. The demographic assessment notes a shortfall in their 20's and 30's, which is used as the basis of concluding that there is a medium level of sensitivity to population & labour market. (16.2.2 of Non Technical Summary PIER).</p> <p>Similarly the PIER acknowledges that the existing</p>	N/A	<p>The interrelationship between socio-economic factors are considered in Chapter 18 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.18], to determine secondary characteristics of sensitivity and magnitude of impact on socio-economic receptors.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>population is "at greatest risk of being deprived of access to employment, education and skills, and suitable incomes" (16.2.5).</p> <p>The PIER acknowledges that agriculture provides employment for 5.6% of the workforce in the region (16.2.8). The PIER does not seem to recognise that a lack of opportunities or prospects exacerbates the shortfall in population in the 20- to 30-age range as people move out to seek employment. Hence, it is especially important that any significant development strongly considers opportunities for employment in support of the rural economy.</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Fillingham Parish Council	Ecology and Biodiversity	<p>Does the baseline that is used to underpin the Greenhouse gas assessment and net biodiversity gain assume there are no changes / improvements in farming practice over the lifetime of the project? (e.g. in carbon footprint or biodiversity)</p> <p>Claim that there will be a 10% net gain, as required by the Environment Act, 2021. This is frequently asserted in the material, but the assessment has yet to be carried out, so it is not clear how / if this will be achieved. (See also 7.3.11 of non-technical Summary PIER)</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.9] 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 approximately 96%, with an approximate 70% gain of Hedgerow Units and approximately a 11% 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 [EN010133/APP/C7.3] which will be legally secured under a requirement of the DCO for the life of the scheme (approximately 40 years) and so ensure that objectives are met and increase the reliability of these projections.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Fillingham Parish Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	15 years is a significant part of people's lives. How much longer would it then take to address problems.	N/A	Noted.
Fillingham Parish Council	Socio-Economics, Agriculture and Tourism and Recreation	The intermittency of solar generation, and the timing of solar production is at odds with meeting the electricity demand curve. Solar therefore places more reliance upon other sources to meet peak demand, when prices are at their highest in the market. On its own, solar does not reduce exposure to high prices.	N/A	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.
Fillingham Parish Council	Other	The implied conclusion is that, in the fight for available brownfield sites, the economics of solar energy are outweighed by all other development options – e.g. housing, commercial. Given the Government's clear direction that solar should be placed on previously	N/A	The Statement of Need submitted with the DCO Application [EN010133/APP/C7.11] 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. A search for suitable brownfield land has been undertaken as part of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		developed land, the developer has simply shifted the "battle ground" to agricultural land, where it would appear that the economics of solar outweigh the economics of farming (which is perhaps more indicative of a problem with the economics of farming).		<p>Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.3.5.1].</p> <p>As explained at paragraph 5.2.6 of Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.3.5], draft NPS EN-3 sets out the factors that are likely to influence the key considerations involved in the siting of a solar farm. These include irradiance and site topography, proximity of a site to dwellings, capacity of a site, grid connection, agriculture land classification and land type and accessibility. These factors have been considered in the Site Selection Assessment and no suitable brownfield sites were identified when all these factors have been taken into account.</p>
Fillingham Parish Council	Other	Further points from NPPF: - Access to high quality open spaces - Effective landscaping – sympathetic to local character - Protecting valued		Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] set out the ways in which the Applicant has considered the potential visual and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>landscapes and intrinsic character of the countryside – claim that the scheme complies by “recognising” this – but doesn’t adequately address it.</p> <p>Character of the land would undoubtedly be dominated by solar fields – at 4.5m this would not be adequately screened by hedgerows (at all) or by trees (for many years), or at all from B1398 (Area of Great Landscape Value – AGLV).</p>		<p>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>
Fillingham Parish Council	Other	The assessment treats every kWh the same (i.e. gCO2e/kWh). This does not consider the importance of when the energy is produced, i.e. peak solar is in a summer afternoon, typically when demand is at a low, and solar production is zero when the	N/A	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.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		demand is at its highest during a winter's evening. The current assessment methodology is like treating every driving hour the same, but clearly, building road capacity specifically for outside rush hour limits the value of the contribution. The assessment should be broadened to consider what contribution a demand-weighted GHG assessment or price-weighted figure would look like. For all solar has a low GHG assessment per kWh, this on its own is misleading, as solar is most likely to require support from other types of generation or technologies to contribute during peak demand periods.		
Fillingham Parish Council	Other	Referring to the National Planning Policy Framework – there is a clear requirement that development should be	N/A	Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8] sets out the assessment and mitigation of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>"sympathetic to local character & history". The scale of proposed development means this is not the case as it will (particularly in conjunction with other proposed developments) radically alter the character of the local area.</p>		<p>potential impacts to landscape and visual amenity.</p>
<p>Fillingham Parish Council</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>Given the very low energy density of solar, the scheme needs a colossal amount of land. Proposing to have sought a brownfield site of the size necessary, in an area that is predominantly agricultural is disingenuous. I would no more expect to find space available for agriculture in the centre of London than brownfield space in farmland. The situation is falsely created by not having broadened the potential range of grid connections (see above). It is striking that, despite proposing two</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>A search for brownfield land has been undertaken as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.3.5.1].</p> <p>The site was chosen to support the grid connection offer made at Cottam Power Station. Therefore, brownfield sites were assessed within the 20km Search Area identified in the Site Selection Assessment but ultimately did not meet the size or locational requirements of the Scheme as detailed at Table 2.2: PDL Sites from Brownfield Registers of Bassetlaw and West Lindsey (Appendix 5.1).</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		schemes, at over 5000 acres, the developer does not appear to have included any brown field sites in its schemes, demonstrating a clear disregard for planning guidance.		
Fillingham Parish Council	Other	<p>The duration of the operational time period of the project is 40 years as the basis for the assessment. By contrast throughout the documentation, there is repeated references to these being "Temporary Structures", e.g. in 5.2.14.</p> <p>Between construction, operation and decommissioning, a life cycle of c. 50 years does not reasonably constitute "temporary" in a human lifetime.</p>	N/A	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 its temporariness. However, as is typical for energy generation NSIPs, the DCO Application does not seek a temporary or time limited consent.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		The developer should be consistent and honest with the public about the lifetime of the scheme.		
Fillingham Parish Council	General	I would reiterate that we support the urgent need to decarbonise our economy and understand that solar will have a part to play. However, with only around 3% of UK households having been fitted with panels, and the fact that solar remains outside any pre-requisite for planning consent on either domestic or commercial properties, new-build and retro-fit rooftop solar must be the clear priority ahead of using agricultural land with all the attendant adverse consequences, e.g. on food production, the agricultural economy and visual aspects.	N/A	Noted. A Statement of Need [EN010133/APP/C7.11] 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.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Stow Parish Council	General	While we are broadly in support of solar power we cannot support the current proposals. There is a great deal of information available, but it is not necessarily easily accessible.	N/A	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that the PEIR contained a significant amount of information. 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>
Stow Parish Council	Site layout	We opposed the original plans because of the close proximity of the fields, which were to have solar panels, to the homes of residents both at Normanby by Stow and those on Ingham Road, Stow and the use of otherwise productive agricultural land. While we understand panels are not now to be sited next to East Farm at Normanby, the cluster of houses on Ingham Rd near Fleets Lane is still significantly	Yes	<p>The Design and Access Statement [EN010133/APP/C7.6] explains that on Cottam 1, field numbers A3, B1, and D19 (refer to field numbering plans at Appendix 1: Figures 6.1-6.3) were removed to address residential amenity concerns.</p> <p>Fields D1, D7 (west end), D8, and E3 were removed at the request of Stow Parish Council and F1, F2, and F7 were removed upon request by Stow Parish Council on behalf of the residents of the hamlet of Normanby by Stow.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>affected. They are to have solar panels to the north and south of their dwellings.</p> <p>The fields concerned are relatively small some with odd shapes, which we would not have thought conducive to the siting of panels, but the main issue is their proximity to where a number of people live and the adverse impact the panels will have on their lives.</p>		
Stow Parish Council	Transport and Access	Panels are also proposed along Green Lane, which goes from Ingham Rd to the Coates/Normanby lane. This is a very popular recreational route for walkers, runners and riders and it would be major disruption to the wildlife in the area including the deer we see more and more frequently. We are also very concerned about the use of Green Lane as an	Yes	Following this comment, the Applicant can confirm that construction access is no longer proposed on the Green Lane. Access will now take place on Ingham Road to the east of the Green Lane. Operational access by a light van or similar vehicle will still take place from the Green Lane. It is expected that there will only be one or two movements at the junction per month by a transit van (or similar).

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		access for construction traffic and also for maintenance. It is a historic track, most of it grassed and well used by people locally. Use of it during the construction of a solar farm would prevent locals from accessing it for their usual exercise and enjoyment.		
Stow Parish Council	Fire risk and safety	We have concerns about the storage facilities and the risks of fire with battery storage.	Yes	<p>Chapter 21 (Other Environmental Matters) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.21] 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 [EN010133/APP/C7.9] sets out firefighting and safety measures in the event of a fire or explosion.</p>
Stow Parish Council	Flood risk and hydrology	We are also surprised that you propose to use some fields near the Till, which regularly flood to the extent that	Yes	Chapter 10 (Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.10] assesses the flood risk impacts of the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Ingham Rd has flooded as far as Fleets Lane.		Scheme. Areas of flood depth of more than 0.9m have been avoided entirely, with only non-vulnerable infrastructure to be located within areas of shallower than 0.9m flooding. Consultation with the Environment Agency has been undertaken to confirm this approach. No significant effects have been assessed in terms of the EIA regulations.
Stow Parish Council	Agricultural land	We understand it is Government policy that solar panels should not be located on land that is 3a or 3b. We are, therefore, surprised at the inclusion of productive agricultural land, some of which we believe to be 3a, when we desperately need a food strategy and land available to grow food for the nation.	Yes	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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resources & Farming Circumstances) [EN010133/APP/C6.3.19.1] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>We are aware of four major solar projects linking into Cottam and/or West Burton power plants. The way things are progressing, it is highly likely more will emerge soon. Vast quantities of agricultural land - literally thousands of hectares - will be taken out of food production by these projects. Can we see the work done which assesses what effect losing all these agricultural areas will have on UK food production over the next 40 years?</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 4.07% 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 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.5] 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>
Stow Parish Council	General	<p>Until we receive adequate answers to these questions we have to oppose all of these solar projects.</p>	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Stow Parish Council	Ecology and Biodiversity	While we welcome the plans for some mitigation we are concerned about the impact of the construction phase on the local wildlife and in particular round Green Lane. Access to certain areas would be damaging to local wildlife as well as severely limiting recreational activity. We are also concerned about the impact of the panels upon migratory birds and the routes wildlife currently take and how much this would be hindered by the enclosure of the fields on which panels are sited.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that since PEIR, the Scheme has been amended to avoid impacts on the Green Lane during construction.</p> <p>Careful design consideration has been given to minimise the number of new field access points for construction and operation meaning that the vast majority of access points will utilise existing farm gateways with only 12 permanent new locations required within the Scheme.</p> <p>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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.9].</p> <p>Fencing is limited to the outermost fields within each Site, i.e. fields without</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				an external Site boundary will not require separate security fencing.
Stow Parish Council	General	We still do not understand why fields adjacent to local dwellings are being chosen for the siting of panels given the potential negative impact on the lives of those residents, not just during the construction phase when the noise and potential damage from the HGVs etc. will make life very unpleasant, but also during operation given issues of the visibility of the panels, glint and glare and the noise from tracking. It is not going to be good for the health and wellbeing of those residents.	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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8], 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.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	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 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.
Stow Parish Council	Agricultural Land	We reiterate our concern at the use of productive agricultural land.	N/A	Noted.
Stow Parish Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	Hedges and trees are the appropriate landscaping but we are concerned as to the timescales given that a significant hedgerow can take some years to mature. Given	N/A	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

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>the rural nature of the proposed sites however any other screening would seem inappropriate.</p>		<p>which will be managed to a height of 5m.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				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.
Stow Parish Council	Transport and Access	We are concerned that the infrastructure required to sustain movement of such large transporters and other HGV traffic is not in place. Our local roads are not built to cope with either the weights or volume of traffic proposed. We understand there has been no vibration testing on the routes.	No	A noise and vibration assessment has been undertaken within the ES. 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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.14] .
Stow Parish Council	Transport and Access	We question the proposals to access the Cottam 1 site along Stow Lane given the weight limit of 7.5 ton and the fact that a stretch of it is single track with passing places. The large trucks proposed would have difficulties as it is also very narrow with ditches and last year there was the	No	Stow Lane has a weight limit of 7.5 tonnes except for access. This restriction is not enforced for structural reasons, but to limit through traffic towards Stow. Construction vehicles associated with Scheme will not travel as far as Stow, and will be using the road for access only, which is permitted by the wording of the restriction.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>example of a crane driver using Sat. Nav. and ending up in the ditch. The repairs to the road took sometime given the amount of damage with impact on locals accessing schools and work. We do not support using Stow Lane as an access route.</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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.14].</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>Stow Parish Council</p>	<p>Transport and Access</p>	<p>The project has included in its PEIR (June 2022), as illustrated in the map at Figure 14.1 the intention to use Green Lane, which is a public right of way, as a construction traffic route. However the track is not included in the PEIR in either the traffic surveys carried out on local roads (Table 14.7) or the list of public rights of way in Table 14.5. There is therefore no 'baseline' use of</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Following this comment, construction access is no longer proposed on the Green Lane. Access will now take place on Ingham Road to the east of the Green Lane. Operational access by a light van or similar vehicle will still take place from the Green Lane. It is expected that there will only be one or two movements at the junction per month.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		the track to compare against the intended usage – this is not surprising as its current traffic count consists solely of occasional use by agricultural vehicles serving the fields either side of it. It is however a very popular pedestrian route.		
Stow Parish Council	Landscape and Visual Impact	The PEIR acknowledges at para 8.7.42 that 'The Site is bordered by the footpath network with some footpaths passing along the boundaries and passing across east to west. As a general observation, footpaths appear well used with observations of pedestrian activity. Because the network is sporadic the local lanes are also used to supplement the network.' This supports assertions by local residents that Green Lane is part of a very popular route for walking/ running/ dog	N/A	The Applicant notes that 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 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.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>walking/ horse riding that includes Ingham Road and Coates Lane – a combination of local lanes and public rights of way. Stow Parish Council has recently installed a seat at the north end of the track - with a view over the (currently) unspoiled rural landscape – to enable those walking the lanes to stop and rest. There is also historic significance as, on the southwest corner of Green Lane and Normanby Lane, there is a pollarded oak, which was a 'waymarker'.</p>		
<p>Stow Parish Council</p>	<p>Transport and Access</p>	<p>The PEIR then contradicts itself at paragraph 14.6.30 stating 'As set out above, the level of pedestrian activity on the roads surrounding the Site is very low meaning that the sensitivity receptor is low. However, it is acknowledged that the addition of HGVs to</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The PEIR is acknowledging that, whilst pedestrian and cyclist volumes are low, there are public rights of way in the local area. The amenity of any users of this public right of way may be affected by the presence of construction vehicles in the area.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>the network will affect the relative pleasantness of any pedestrian and cyclist journeys in the area. It is also acknowledged that a number of Public Rights of Way operate through the Site.</p> <p>14.6.31 Whilst these will remain open during the construction phase, there will be some effect on the relevant pleasantness of pedestrian journeys in these locations.</p>		
Stow Parish Council	Transport and Access	14.6.32 In light of this, it is considered that the likely significant effect of the construction traffic to pedestrian and cyclist amenity will be minor adverse and temporary, which is not significant'. How can that be the case?	No	The Applicant notes that a minor adverse impact on a small number of pedestrians using the PROW is does not constitute a significant effect, in line with the IEMA guidance.
Stow Parish Council	Transport and Access	It is not clear how Green Lane will remain open as a PROW	Yes	The Applicant notes that construction access is no longer proposed on the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>during the construction phase if it is to be used as a construction route, and how the safety of pedestrians, dogs and horse riders will be ensured or maintained.</p> <p>Drawings of the access onto Green Lane from Ingham Road and from Green Lane onto Coates Lane are included in Appendix A to the draft CTMP in Appendix 14.1 - Drawing SK05 - Existing agricultural access which will be widened and formalised and Drawings SK06(1) and SK06 (2) - Existing farm track west of Coates.</p>		<p>Green Lane. Access will now take place on Ingham Road to the east of the Green Lane. Operational access by a light van or similar vehicle will still take place from the Green Lane. It is expected that there will only be one or two movements at the junction per month,</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Stow Parish Council	Transport and Access	<p>In appendix 14.1 para 2.20 re Public Rights of Way it continues. ' There may be instances whereby construction traffic is required to cross local footpaths and Public Rights of Way. Where this occurs, the following measures will be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Speeds will be limited to 10mph; ▪ Drivers will stop and give-way to any pedestrian, equestrian and cyclist that they encounter; ▪ Appropriate signage will be installed along the bridleway to make users aware of the construction activity. This will include information on operating times; ▪ Banksmen will also be present to ensure the safe movement of all users; ▪ The PROWs will be kept clear outside of construction hours; ▪ Any damage to the surface of the 	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that construction access is no longer proposed on the Green Lane. Access will now take place on Ingham Road to the east of the Green Lane. Operation access by a light van or similar vehicle will still take place from the Green Lane. It is expected that there will only be one or two movements at the junction per month.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>bridleway will be repaired immediately. The surface will be returned to its original condition following construction.' However, if Green Lane falls under Appendix 14.1 para 2.21, ie '2.21 Once operational, maintenance vehicles will access the Site via the same access arrangements as described above for the construction phase.' Then the surface will not be returned to its original condition following construction. Our historic and valued Green Lane would never regain its character.</p> <p>Yet more concerning is a suggestion in Appendix 14.2 – a report on the Abnormal Indivisible Loads – that Green Lane could be used as a route for the transformer parts, which involve 16 axle girder</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		frame trailers and 12 axle flattop trailer, with weights up to 157,000kg! We are appalled that this suggestion has even made and is being considered.		
Stow Parish Council	Transport and Access	We do not support the use of Stow lane for access. We vehemently oppose the proposal to use Green Lane (Ingham Rd to Coates/Normanby lane) which is a historic green lane much used by locals for walking and riding and which would be irreparably damaged by any large machinery/HGVs. There would also be a massive negative impact on the residents adjacent to Green Lane from the volume of traffic during construction.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that construction vehicle movement on Stow Lane will be managed through a Construction Traffic Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.2 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.14].</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that construction access is no longer proposed on the Green Lane. Access will now take place on Ingham Road to the east of the Green Lane. Operational access by a light van or similar vehicle will still take place from the Green Lane. It is expected that there will only be one</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				or two movements at the junction per month.
Stow Parish Council	Transport and Access	The proposal for a form of lorry park opposite (on the south side of Ingham Road) so the panels could be moved from the larger vehicles to smaller ones before going along Green Lane would create an eyesore and additional noise.	Yes	The Applicant notes that construction access is no longer proposed on the Green Lane. Access will now take place on Ingham Road to the east of the Green Lane. Operational access by a light van or similar vehicle will still take place from the Green Lane. It is expected that there will only be one or two movements at the junction per month.
Stow Parish Council	Transport and Access	Any traffic surveys would appear to have included the usual farm machinery (tractors/trailers/combine harvesters?) driven by locals who know the roads and conditions - there are few, if any, other HGVs using Ingham Road given the access restrictions and certainly not	No	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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.14] . and the Public Rights of Way Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.3 to Chapter

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		of the size proposed. The mitigation measures are not sufficient to protect local residents, local walkers, riders, runners and cyclists.		14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.14] .
Stow Parish Council	Other	There is one permissive path proposed, but this is inadequate as there is no access to the banks of the Till which is what we asked for.	N/A	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. As explored within Table 5.9 contained within ES Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.5] , the permissive path from Stow village will contribute to the wider network of footpaths in the area and facilitate greater public access to the countryside.
Ingham Parish Council	General	It is disappointing that the consultation seems so low key for such a large scale project. It was surprising that representatives of both projects have not requested a public meeting in each village	N/A	Noted. 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

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>that borders the proposed developments. The Parish Council fully support the response of Lincolnshire County Council and West Lindsey District Council. We oppose these large scale proposals of development as these are not proportionate for this area.</p>		<p>Applicant's Consultation Report [EN010133/APP/C5.1]. 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. Public information events were held across a range of days, times and locations across the Scheme area. The Applicant offered and agreed to hold meetings with stakeholders and organisations throughout the pre-application period.</p> <p>The Consultation Report [EN010133/APP/C5.1] sets out the various activities undertaken to publicise consultation opportunities, including extensive mailouts to a consultation area extending 2km from the Sites, advertising in local newspapers, online updates and correspondence with stakeholders.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
National Farmers' Union	General	<p>It is vital that Island Green Power (IGP) engage fully and effectively with Landowners and Occupiers affected by the scheme especially those affected by the cable corridors. IGP and its representatives must engage effectively with productive meetings looking in detail at technical and practical issues which will impact the farm businesses with the objective of mitigating the impact of the scheme in the final stages of design for neighbouring occupiers and owners.</p> <p>The NFU would like to see IGP engaging and negotiating with all landowners and occupiers to reach a voluntary agreement to lay the cables, rather than relying on rights under a DCO. It is important that IGP enter into these</p>	N/A	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Applicant has prepared a Consultation Report [EN010133/APP/C5.1] and Book of Reference [EN010133/APP/C4.3] as part of their application, setting out how they have referenced and consulted with landowners and occupiers.</p> <p>The Applicant initially presented a cable route search corridor, which has been refined through engagement and consultation with landowners.</p> <p>The Site areas for panels have been determined through agreement with landowners.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>negotiations properly discussing heads of terms within an Option Agreement in detail first, or any type of agreement if this is what is offered.</p>		
<p>National Farmers' Union</p>	<p>Agricultural Land</p>	<p>The NFU is pleased to see that for Cottam Solar the project has identified as occupying 91.7% as Grade 3b and that the project is only located on small areas of higher grade 2 and 3a land.</p> <p>The NFU does not support solar farms being located on higher grade best and most versatile land. The NFU believes that it is important that consideration is being given to animal grazing underneath the panels such that multifunctionality of the land is retained and optimised as far as possible. The NFU</p>	<p>Yes</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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.19] and associated Appendix 19.1 (Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resources & Farming Circumstances) [EN010133/APP/C6.3.19.1].</p> <p>The vast majority of the Scheme is located on lower quality agricultural land with only 4.1% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land).</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		feels strongly that every effort should be made by the developers to avoid and minimise higher grade land that would otherwise be available for food production.		<p>See Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.3.5] 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 Outline LEMP [EN010133/APP/C7.3] sets out that grazing could form part of the management of the diverse Meadow Creation beneath the solar panels.</p>
National Farmers' Union	General	The NFU is pleased to see that IGP have been working in collaboration with Low Carbon when refining the cable corridors for the Cottam and West Burton Solar Projects and the Gate Burton Energy Park to minimise the impacts within the shared corridor. However, this will mean that	N/A	The Applicant notes that runs of overhead lines between components or to connect underground cables is not proposed. All cables will be underground, and no new overhead lines and associated poles will be required. Bassetlaw District Council commented at the PEIR stage submission on 2 July 2022 that "Its is positive to see that the cumulative

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>farming businesses within this shared corridor are going to be significantly impacted by these proposals which will be increased by the cumulative number of projects that will be requiring cables through this corridor. The NFU believes that there must be strong collaboration between the developers to minimise the impacts such as coordination of construction programmes, sharing haul roads etc to avoid additional land requirements unnecessarily. The NFU could like to understand further the measures being taken by IGP to reduce the cumulative impact of these projects.</p>		<p>impacts alongside other development have been considered. It is also positive that the LVIA as part of the ES will include other material considerations such as biodiversity and heritage due to the interactions between these material considerations."</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 Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8].</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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives.
National Farmers' Union	Cable Route	There is very little detail within the consultation material with regard to the cable construction and surface apparatus that will be left post construction. The NFU would like to understand in more detail how the cables will be constructed including the number of cables, the depth that the cables will be laid to and whether there will be chambers for joint bays, the size and distance that would be between the chambers.	N/A	The Applicant notes that runs of overhead lines between components or to connect underground cables is not proposed. All cables will be underground, and no new overhead lines and associated poles will be required.
National Farmers' Union	Other	The NFU would like further information regarding the length of the proposed easement term for the cables. The NFU expects the term to	N/A	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

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		be no longer than the lifetime of the project, which is stated to be 40 years in the PIER.		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.
National Farmers' Union	Ecology and Biodiversity	It is noted that the projects are expected to deliver a significant amount of biodiversity net gain, due to the large-scale reversion of arable to permanent grassland and ecological buffer zones. The NFU would like to understand the anticipated percentage of biodiversity net gain that is proposed for this scheme and further detail regarding how this will be delivered. The NFU would want to see biodiversity net	Yes	The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.12 to Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.3.9.12] 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 approximately 96%, with an approximate 70% gain of Hedgerow Units and approximately a 11% 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

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>gain being delivered through the enhancement of existing habitats rather than taking additional agricultural land, especially that classified as BMV, out of production for this purpose. Any plans for net gain must be consulted on fully and transparently with those landowners and manager impacted. They will have the best knowledge on location and management to optimise outcomes and minimise unnecessary or impractical land take.</p>		<p>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 [EN010133/APP/C7.3] 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>
National Farmers' Union	Agricultural Land	<p>The NFU has specific wording that it will expect to be included in an Outline Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to cover how practical aspects of the construction should be dealt with in relation to agricultural land. The NFU wording covers</p>	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Agricultural Liaison Officer, b) Records of Condition, c) Biosecurity, d) Irrigation, e) Agricultural Land Drainage, f) Treatment of Soils, g) Agricultural Water Supplies 		
Historic England	Cultural Heritage	<p>We welcome the scope of the Historic Environment assessment set out in the PEIR and the ongoing assessment work currently underway. In particular we note the necessity of geophysical survey and targeted trial trenching to inform a proportionate approach to the significance of below ground heritage assets and their individual sensitivity and importance. We refer you to the advice of Local Government archaeological advisors with regards to the</p>	N/A	<p>A full suite of archaeological assessment has been undertaken by the Applicant to understand the archaeological potential of the proposed development site (desk-based research, air photo and LiDAR assessment, geophysical survey, geoarchaeological surveys and evaluation trenching).</p> <p>The results of these assessments have successfully identified the absence / presence / extent / form / preservation of buried archaeological features and have informed an proportionate mitigation strategy, which takes into consideration the archaeological</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>methodologies for and assessment of trial trenching results (we are supporting out Local Government colleagues with the expertise of our Regional Science Advisor). Panel arrays and associated structures, cable runs and substations have the potential for significant environmental effects through physical impacts upon buried remains. These impacts will vary depending upon the particular character and sensitivity of such remains (for instance field systems are generally less sensitive to localised intrusions than burial grounds or Roman villas). Appropriate consideration of impacts and proportionate design adaptation and mitigation is only possible where significance and importance are well understood prior to</p>		<p>interest of buried deposits that were identified during the various investigations, as presented in Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] and the production of a detailed mitigation strategy (WSI; Appendix 13.7).</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		determination (up to and including public benefit balances in respect of harm to assets of demonstrable equivalent importance to scheduled monuments).		
Historic England	Cultural Heritage	<p>Deposit modelling is crucial in areas of alluvium and aeolian deposits - see our guidance [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>A shared Trent river crossing option that combines Cottam, West Burton and other adjacent Solar NSIPS accessing the grid via these outgoing coal burning power station connections is highly desirable to minimise archaeological impacts. Early attention should be paid to investigating crossing point options in this complex and dense</p>	N/A	A desk-based geoarchaeological survey was undertaken by the Applicant to identify the paleoenvironmental potential of the Scheme and trial trench evaluation along the shared cable route (informed by the results of non-intrusive surveys). Particular attention was given to areas adjacent to the River Trent, where there was a heightened potential for alluvium and aeolian deposits. Assessment works were undertaken in collaboration with other proposed Solar Schemes and have been used to inform the final cable route in order to minimise impact on the archaeological landscape running adjacent to the River Trent.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>archaeological landscape. The reach of the Trent from around Marton / Littleborough to Torksey presents particularly acute archaeological risks with the combination of Roman and Viking activity and the presence of windblown sand and alluvial deposits and it will be important to allow as much time as possible to plan the design and mitigation of works in this area.</p>		
Historic England	Cultural Heritage	<p>We welcome a dynamic approach to setting assessment which is not overly constrained fixed radii (see out GPA 3 Setting of Heritage Assets)</p> <p>██</p> <p>████████</p> <p>██</p> <p>██</p> <p>work should focus upon the</p>	N/A	<p>Assessment of the settings of designated heritage assets has been undertaken by the Applicant, in accordance with the methodology proposed in the PEIR, which follows the guidance provided in Historic England's <i>GPAN3: The Settings of Heritage Assets</i>.</p> <p>This includes, <i>inter alia</i>, an assessment of Grade I listed Church of St Mary, Stow, the scheduled Site of college and</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>particular significance of the assets under assessment and the impacts of the scheme thereon. In EIA scoping advice we highlighted the setting of the following assets (without prejudice to other issues that may emerge through assessment), viz the Grade I listed Church of St Mary, Stow, the scheduled Site of college and Benedictine abbey of St Mary, Stow, the Grade I listed Church of St Laurence, Corringham, the scheduled Medieval Settlement and Moated Site at Coates, the Grade I listed Church of St Edith, Coates by Stow, the Scheduled Medieval Settlement, Thorpe, the Grade II* Church of Andrew, Fillingham and Conservation Area, and the Grade I listed Fillingham Castle and GII Registered Park.</p>		<p>Benedictine abbey of St Mary, Stow, the Grade I listed Church of St Laurence, Corringham, the scheduled Medieval Settlement and Moated Site at Coates, the Grade I listed Church of St Edith, Coates by Stow, the Scheduled Medieval Settlement, Thorpe, the Grade II* Church of Andrew, Fillingham and Conservation Area, and the Grade I listed Fillingham Castle and GII Registered Park, as presented in Appendix 13.5 to Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Historic England	Cultural Heritage	We made a site visit with the Applicant's consultants on 13th May 2022 to Cottam 1 to initially assess impacts upon the significance of the Thorpe le Fallows Scheduled Monument (deserted medieval village earthworks) NHLE ref 1016978 Thorpe Medieval settlement. We have no in principal objection to the proposals within Cottam 1, but we may need to see some offset of development from immediately adjacent to the northern edge of the scheduled monument to better address its significance and avoid what could otherwise be a likely significant environmental effect (as noted at PEIR para 13.6.3). This should be subject to further assessment of the setting relationship between scheduled remains and the	Yes	Solar panels have been set back 50m from the northern edge of the Scheduled Monument at Thorpe le Fallows. The setting assessments of the impacts and effects of the Scheme on this and other Scheduled Monuments within the wider landscape surrounding the Scheme are provided in the Heritage Statement, presented as Appendix 13.5 to Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement (Cultural Heritage) [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		fields and field boundaries to the immediate north which appear to fossilise the pattern of associated groups of field strips and hence historic landscape setting. We raised no other objections on the basis of that initial inspection in relation to the Cottam 2 and 3 sites but look forwards to structured setting assessments to assist us in coming to a considered view in respect of designated assets (as noted above).		
Marine Management Organisation	General	Please be aware that any works within the Marine area require a licence from the Marine Management Organisation. It is down to the applicant themselves to take the necessary steps to ascertain whether their works	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		will fall below the Mean High Water Springs mark.		

Section 44 Applicant Response Table

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Party ID 185454 (North farm, Willingham Rd, Fillingham, Gainsborough, DN21 5BJ)	Objection	I am forced to object to the Cottam solar project on the following grounds.	No	The Applicant notes the consultee's objection to the Scheme, and has considered the reasons stated.
Party ID 185454 (North farm, Willingham Rd, Fillingham, Gainsborough, DN21 5BJ)	Agricultural land	Apart from the huge loss of food producing land in the present climate.	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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.19].</p> <p>The ALC results have informed the removal of some fields containing best and most versatile land.</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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>4.07% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land).</p> <p>The Scheme will be temporary with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality.</p> <p>Some agricultural land will be retained during the operational phase, for example pasture grazed by sheep.</p> <p>Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.19] 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>Paragraphs 19.5.2- 19.5.3 state (in respect of food security):</p> <p>"It should be noted that the above Lincolnshire County Council consultation</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>response is incorrect when it states that "... all arable land of whatever agricultural classification produces food, whether for animal feed or human consumption..."</p> <p>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 environmental and land degradation hazards of the most popular energy crop, maize.</p> <p>Arable land is also used to produce non food crops for markets including industrial oils,</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				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."
<p>Party ID 185454 (North farm, Willingham Rd, Fillingham, Gainsborough, DN21 5BJ)</p>	<p>Consultation and engagement</p>	<p>I have worked patiently with [the Applicant] since October 2021.</p> <p>We have tried to work with [the Applicant] but have been let down.</p> <p>I will still gladly work with [the Applicant] but we need to be treated with the same respect as the people who live in the villages and more populated areas.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Applicant is grateful for the consultee's engagement throughout the pre-application phase, and notes the series of meetings held between the consultee, the Applicant, and Applicant's landscape consultants, in addition to their formal consultation response. The Applicant has considered all information and feedback in developing the Scheme.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Looking forward to impartial positive feedback.		
<p>Party ID 185454 (North farm, Willingham Rd, Fillingham, Gainsborough, DN21 5BJ)</p>	Landscape and visual	<p>My property would be surrounded by this solar proposal with solar arrays being visible from all windows of my house.</p> <p>The magnitude of this development would totally dominate the landscape here transforming a countryside setting to an industrial one in all directions with 4.5 m high panels impossible to screen, especially in the Winter.</p> <p>[The Applicant] assured me that the closest solar panels in the two</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant is grateful for the consultee's engagement throughout the pre-application phase, and notes the series of meetings held between the consultee, the Applicant, and Applicant's landscape consultants, in addition to their formal consultation response. The Applicant has considered all information and feedback in developing the Scheme. The feedback has shaped the Scheme design resulting in a number of iterations of the layout. The most significant of these includes the removal of panels from field parcel A3, the removal of panels to the south of field parcel A4 and landscape parameters guiding the Scheme layout ensuring offsets from watercourses and existing and proposed vegetation to enable management and planting prescription to be able to mature and mitigate the effects of the Scheme. In their assessment of the Scheme and associated effects the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>fields to the North would be removed and the contour of the land would screen the rest further back. I was pleased by their willingness to compromise and their understanding.</p> <p>My phase 1 feedback was based on this relationship and outcome.</p> <p>The other field is only screened by our own small copse and the solar panels would be extremely close and clearly visible from our house and garden.</p> <p>We need reassurances that the minimum that</p>		<p>Applicant's landscape consultants have visited the site in the vicinity of North Farm and North Farm itself on several occasions to engage and consult with the consultees and to satisfy themselves that the extent of embedded and secondary mitigation is appropriate to mitigate the effects of the Scheme on the consultee's property.</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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>we asked for is honoured and also that mitigations for our other views (as discussed) are also treated seriously. 4.5 m high panels are unacceptable in this setting and in this landscape.</p>		
<p>Party ID 185454 (North farm, Willingham Rd, Fillingham, Gainsborough, DN21 5BJ)</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>I see other parcels of land being taken out of development, but not around our home? This is not how we expect to be treated and is totally unfair.</p> <p>Massive amounts of land would be taken up by these solar developments in West Lindsey and we rural residents deserve better treatment!</p>	<p>N/A</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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>consistent with relevant legislation and guidance.</p> <p>The Statement of Need submitted with the DCO Application [EN010133/APP/C7.11] 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>As explained at paragraph 5.2.6 of Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.5], draft NPS EN-3 sets out the factors that are likely to influence the key considerations involved in the siting of a solar farm. These include irradiance and site topography, proximity of a site to dwellings, capacity of a site, grid connection, agriculture land classification and land type and accessibility.</p> <p>The Applicant's Consultation Report [EN010133/APP/C5.1] describes and evidences the pre-application consultation</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				and engagement on the scheme, consistent with relevant legislation and guidance.
Party ID 184179 (Western Power Distribution (East Midlands) PLC	General	<p>WPD's objective is to secure protection of its assets and agreement on any diversions or works necessary to facilitate the development. In doing so it will expect the development consent order (DCO) to include protective provisions specific to WPD. We suggest that you consider WPD-specific protective provisions secured on other DCO schemes including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Triton Knoll Electrical System Order 2016 - The M54 to M6 Link 	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes that Western Power Distribution (East Midlands) plc is now National Grid Electricity Distribution (East Midlands) plc (NGED). Protective provisions for the benefit of NGED have been included in Part 4 of Schedule 16 to the draft DCO and discussions are ongoing with NGED.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Road Development Consent Order 2022		
Party ID 184179 (Western Power Distribution (East Midlands) PLC	General	In addition, WPD will usually expect the developer to enter into an Asset Protection Agreement. We would encourage you to engage with WPD in respect of the terms of this agreement.	N/A	Discussions are ongoing with NGED regarding the terms of an asset protection agreement.
Party ID 184179 (Western Power Distribution (East Midlands) PLC	General	WPD's general position on DCO schemes is to submit a holding objection to the scheme until the above requirements have been secured. This objection does not mean that WPD objects in principle to the proposed development.	N/A	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Party ID 184179 (Western Power Distribution (East Midlands) PLC)	General	<p>Given the scale of the application land to which the DCO relates, we have not undertaken an audit of WPD's assets which may be affected by the development nor have we provided an overlay plan showing WPD's affected assets.</p>	N/A	<p>Noted. Discussions are ongoing with NGED regarding the impacts of the Scheme on NGED's assets.</p>
Party ID 184179 (Western Power Distribution (East Midlands) PLC)	General	<p>The above response does not take into account any specific engagement you may have directly with WPD's local offices. Should you require further information regarding WPD's assets which are situated on or within the DCO land, we recommend you engage with WPD's</p>	N/A	<p>Noted. Discussions are ongoing with NGED regarding the impacts of the Scheme on NGED's assets.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		local offices to obtain this.		
Party ID 184179 (Western Power Distribution (East Midlands) PLC)	General	Should you be proposing any diversionary works to WPD's assets that require land outside of the proposed DCO limits, we suggest you consider engaging with WPD on any land rights required to undertake those diversions prior to submission of your application.	N/A	Noted. Discussions are ongoing with NGED regarding the impacts of the Scheme on NGED's assets.
Party ID 192314 Party ID 192315 Party ID 193631 Party ID 193633	Landscape and Visual	On behalf of each interested party I advise you of our objection to the proposed site of solar panels for these projects to the South and East of Kexby Road	Yes	The Applicant's landscape consultants have visited the property curtilage and surrounding landscape to satisfy themselves that the extent of embedded and secondary mitigation is appropriate to mitigate the effects of the Scheme on the consultee's property.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>(Glentworth Grange, Kexby Road, Glentworth, Gainsborough Lincs. DN21 5DP)</p>		<p>centered at my property, across to the parallel lane between Fillingham and Willingham.</p> <p>These proposed sites will change the vista and encroach on the free space which a key feature of Glentworth Grange and the adjacent properties. In so doing you effectively place a "blight" on these properties which will affect their market value when sold in the next 5 to 10 years. In consequence, damage can result from this.</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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>Party ID 192314 Party ID 192315 Party ID 193631 Party ID 193633</p> <p>(Glentworth Grange, Kexby Road, Glentworth, Gainsborough Lincs. DN21 5DP)</p>	General	A remedy may be that that you, your agents and principles cancel your plans as they pertain to the two sites which I have referenced?	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>The Statement of Need submitted with the DCO Application [EN010133/APP/C7.11] 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>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>As explained at paragraph 5.2.6 of Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.5], draft NPS EN-3 sets out the factors that are likely to influence the key considerations involved in the siting of a solar farm. These include irradiance and site topography, proximity of a site to dwellings, capacity of a site, grid connection, agriculture land classification and land type and accessibility.</p>
<p>Party ID: 170817</p> <p>Exolum Pipeline System Ltd</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>The consultee provided contact and reference details for the Applicant to engage them on assets and apparatus owned or operated by the consultee.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant is grateful for the ongoing engagement with the consultee during and following the statutory consultation period.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that engagement has been held with the consultee's engineering team regarding safe construction and operational working practices, as well as their legal team to ensure that suitable protective measures can be agreed and an asset protection agreement or crossing agreement entered into. Discussions are ongoing with this consultee.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>Party ID: 170817</p> <p>Exolum Pipeline System Ltd</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>Damage to Exolum pipelines may have disastrous health and safety or environmental consequences including the potential for loss of life. Works within 3 metres of the Exolum assets requires agreement and supervision from the Operator, most works also require prior consent under The Energy Act 2013. A decision on a consent application can take between 4 to 6 weeks.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Party ID: 192699</p> <p>(on behalf of The Parochial Church</p>	<p>Cultural Heritage</p>	<p>The [consultee] is concerned about the impact on St Mary's Church, Stow (Grade 1 of</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Assessment of the settings of designated heritage assets has been undertaken by the Applicant, in accordance with the methodology proposed in the PEIR, which follows the guidance provided in Historic</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Council of the Parish of Stow-in-Lindsey)		<p>national and international significance NHLE 1146624) which is within 5 kilometres of both developments (c.1.49km to NE of West Burton 3, and c.1.15km to W of Cottam 1).</p> <p>We note the PEIR for Cottam, paragraph 13.4.6 on page 364:</p> <p><i>Consequently, this PEIR will identify all designated assets 'of the highest significance' within a 5km radius of each of the five Sites under consideration. It is proposed that the assets</i></p>		<p>England's <i>GPAN3: The Settings of Heritage Assets</i>.</p> <p>This includes, <i>inter alia</i>, an assessment of Grade I listed Church of St Mary, Stow and the scheduled Site of college and Benedictine abbey of St Mary, Stow, as presented in Appendix 13.5 to Chapter 13 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.13].</p> <p>The assessment concluded that views towards the Scheme from the immediate vicinity of the Grade I listed church and associated Scheduled Monument are screened by the surrounding built environment of the village of Stow, and likewise assessment of views towards the church from Stow Park Road the west also indicate that the surrounding built environment and trees within the village of Stow would prevent any views of the Scheme being present within the same arc of view as the Listed Building. In addition, LVIA visualisations produced from locations</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p><i>thus identified will then be taken forward for further assessment in accordance with the methodology detailed in The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic England 2017). This will involve a 'sifting' exercise at Step 1, whereby a suite of techniques will be utilised to 'scope out' from further assessment those assets where it is considered that views from, or towards, would not be affected by the proposals. Such techniques would include the use of Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) maps, viewshed analysis from selected receptors, analysis of online aerial and street</i></p>		<p>in the wider landscape to the north, east and south-east of Stow (e.g., from Viewpoints 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 19 and 20) illustrate that the church is not prominently visible from these locations due to the generally flat topography and intervening vegetation, and therefore views of the church are unlikely to be affected.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p><i>view imagery, as well as on-site 'ground-truthing' where this is deemed appropriate and where access is possible. It is considered likely that this would greatly reduce the quantity of designated assets that would require more detailed analysis in subsequent stages of the assessment.</i></p> <p>And from Table 13.3, on page 367 the factors to be considered when assessing buildings of major significance (and in this the [consultee] consider the Grade 1 listed St</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>Mary's Church, Stow to be so categorised):</p> <p><i>i) Changes to key historic building elements such that the resource is totally altered</i></p> <p><i>ii) Comprehensive changes to setting (where this affects the significance of the asset).</i></p> <p>Regarding the above extracts the [consultee] notes also Historic England and Lincolnshire County Council Archaeology Services are in ongoing discussions about impact assessment generally but these were not yet complete at the time of</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>producing the reports. The [consultee] wishes to record it's concern about potential impacts on the visualisation from distance of St Mary's Church, Stow, the impact on visitor numbers and on surrounding archaeology that could inform the history of Stow, and request it's further involvement in the ongoing discussions about the locations and size of West Burton 3 (as indeed it will so request regarding the nearby development proposals for Cottam 1</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>and Gate Burton Energy Park).</p> <p>It should be noted that St Mary's Church, Stow also appears on Historic England's "Heritage at Risk" register.</p>		
<p>Party ID: 192699</p> <p>(on behalf of The Parochial Church Council of the Parish of Stow-in-Lindsey)</p>	<p>Transport and Access</p>	<p>Concerns about the local infrastructure's ability to support the construction phase. Local residents have expressed concern about the inadequacy of class "C" roads, unclassified roads and green lanes to support the heavy vehicle movements required during the construction phase. Such roads, according to knowledgeable locals,</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.14] 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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.14].</p> <p>A HGV delivery booking system will be in place, with the aim of managing arrivals and</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>were not engineered to support the quantity of heavy traffic envisaged in the projects and are therefore at serious risk of damage. Often quoted is a relatively recent incident of a large vehicle unable to avoid the roadside ditch in the "single" track section of the road between Stow and Ingham which closed the road for several days. Such closure of a well used local routes could be easily repeated should these warning concerns not be heeded.</p>		<p>departures to ensure that they do not cross each other on the local highway network.</p> <p>Following consultation, the Applicant notes that construction access is no longer proposed on the Green Lane (referred to in the consultee's response). Access will now take place on Ingham Road to the east of the Green Lane. Operational access by a light van or similar vehicle will still take place from the Green Lane. It is expected that there will only be one or two movements at the junction per month.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that Stow Lane has a weight limit of 7.5 tonnes except for access. This restriction is not enforced for structural reasons, but to limit through traffic towards Stow. Construction vehicles associated with Scheme will not travel as far as Stow, and will be using the road for access only, which is permitted by the wording of the restriction.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	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, presented as Appendix 14.2 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.14]. and the Public Rights of Way Management Plan, presented as Appendix 14.3 to Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.14].</p>
<p>Party ID: 192699</p> <p>(on behalf of The Parochial Church Council of the Parish of Stow-in-Lindsey)</p>	Public health	<p>Concerns about the impact on local residents' mental health. There are two specific examples that have been reported to the Churchwarden. One where there is a potential suicide risk because of the proximity of a scheme to the resident's home</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes and recognises the importance of this comment.</p> <p>Impacts upon human health have been assessed within Chapter 21 (Other Environmental Matters) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.21]. Considering the potential impact to local properties, the Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, such as</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>- the resident having chosen to live in a rural setting now finds that the proposed development to be disastrous to their wellbeing, and likely to affect the property value should the decision to sell be inevitable because of the disruption and changed environment brought about by the proposed development. In another report, a distraught farmer said that "If I don't rent them the land it will be compulsory purchased - either way I lose" and thus felt there was little</p>		<p>presented in Section 8.6 and Table 8.22 of Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8], 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

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>value in raising objection to the proposed project. These two examples, one of which relates to the Cottam project, the other to the Gate Burton Energy Park project, nevertheless reflect the sentiments expressed to the members of the PCC to these massive solar projects that will surround our parish.</p>		<p>existing hedges to add further thickening and growth within the field boundaries.</p> <p>Regarding engagement and cooperation with landowners, the Applicant has prepared a Consultation Report [EN010133/APP/C5.1] and Book of Reference [EN010133/APP/C4.3] as part of their application, setting out how they have referenced and consulted with landowners and occupiers.</p> <p>The Applicant initially presented a cable route search corridor, which has been refined through engagement and consultation with landowners.</p> <p>The Site areas for panels have been determined through agreement with landowners.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>Party ID: 192699</p> <p>(on behalf of The Parochial Church Council of the Parish of Stow-in-Lindsey)</p>	<p>Agricultural Land</p>	<p>Overall the local area is in line for FOUR large schemes, not only Cottam and West Burton, but also Gate Burton Energy Park and now Tillbridge Solar. In addition there are already two large solar farms in the area between West Burton 3 and the Gate Burton Energy park proposal. The [consultee is] not sure how all this fits with the Government strategy on Food security as described by Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) recently published Government Food Strategy. The following is taken from the</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.19].</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 4.07% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land).</p> <p>The Scheme will be temporary with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>introduction to the strategy:</p> <p><i>We are the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. We're responsible for improving and protecting the environment, growing the green economy, sustaining thriving rural communities and supporting our world-class food, farming and fishing industries.</i></p> <p><i>We work closely with our 33 agencies and arm's length bodies on our ambition to make our air purer, our water cleaner, our land greener and our food more sustainable. Our</i></p>		<p>Some agricultural land will be retained during the operational phase, for example pasture grazed by sheep.</p> <p>Chapter 19 (Soils and Agriculture) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.19] 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>Paragraphs 19.5.2- 19.5.3 state (in respect of food security):</p> <p>"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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p><i>mission is to restore and enhance the environment for the next generation, and to leave the environment in a better state than we found it.</i></p> <p>The massing of solar projects in the area is unlikely to “sustain thriving rural communities”. Elsewhere in the strategy the importance of retaining agricultural land as part of the food strategy is stated:</p> <p><i>The conflict in Ukraine has shown us that domestic food production is a vital contributor to national</i></p>		<p>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 environmental and land degradation hazards of the most popular energy crop, maize.</p> <p>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.”</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p><i>resilience and food security. Domestic food production can reduce the offshoring of food production to countries that do not meet our high environmental and animal welfare standards.</i></p> <p>Not only does the Ukraine conflict bring into sharp relief the weakness of having dependence on relative few countries as major producers of a given food type, the strategy emphasises the need to avoid "offshoring" food production abroad. The strategy also recognises the</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>need to treat farmers fairly:</p> <p><i>As the custodians of our natural environment and important contributors to our food security, farmers must be treated fairly.</i></p> <p>The concerns raised to us by residents would question whether local farmers are being treated fairly. The expediency of accessing the National Grid at the Cottam and West Burton seems to be the overriding consideration for the proposed projects.</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>Party ID: 192699</p> <p>(on behalf of The Parochial Church Council of the Parish of Stow-in-Lindsey)</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>The oft quoted "levelling-up agenda" raises questions about whether there are similar such projects, in similar such concentrations being proposed elsewhere in the country, and thus to what extent this project is respectful of the aim to level-up across the country.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Applicant has been informed by Government legislation and policy in selecting the Sites for Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.5] 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: <i>"Applicants are obliged to include in their ES, 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 the environmental, social and economic effects and including, where relevant, technical and commercial feasibility."</i></p> <p>This Chapter, supported by Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) [EN010133/APP/C6.3.5.1] undertakes this</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>exercise in accordance with the above requirements.</p> <p>Local and national planning policy has been identified in Chapter 6 (Energy Need, Legislative Context and Energy Policy) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.6].</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>Party ID: 192699</p> <p>(on behalf of The Parochial Church Council of the Parish of Stow-in-Lindsey)</p>	General	<p>At the Glasgow COP26 conference the Government was keen to address issues in Climate Change. Global warming is happening, and recent record temperatures in the UK (UK record of 40.30C at Coningsby on 19th July</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes the data on climate change experienced in the UK and globally.</p> <p>Assessments regarding the Scheme and Climate Change are presented in Chapter 7 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.7].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>2022) are evidence of this. The</p> <p>consequence of this is altered weather patterns, and thus inevitably alterations in the food production abilities of countries around the world. It is therefore important to retain food productive land for this purpose in those more temperate countries as the probabilities of equatorial, and thus hotter, countries to maintain production becomes evermore at risk. Another feature of the altered weather patterns is that historic data on sunshine levels etc. is no guarantee for</p>		<p>The Statement of Need submitted with the DCO Application [EN010133/APP/C7.11] explains the need for large scale solar assets.</p> <p>Smaller development as an alternative to the Scheme does not need to be considered, because NPS EN-1 at paragraph 4.4.3 states that the decision maker: <i>"...should be guided in considering alternative proposals by whether there is a realistic prospect of the alternative delivering the same infrastructure capacity (including energy security and climate change benefits) in the same timescale as the proposed development"</i>.</p> <p>A smaller scheme would not deliver the same generation capacity or energy security and climate change benefit as the Scheme, and as such would not represent a reasonable alternative.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		the future expectation. It is therefore unwise to over proliferate massive solar schemes in the West Lindsey District Council area.		
<p>Party ID: 192699</p> <p>(on behalf of The Parochial Church Council of the Parish of Stow-in-Lindsey)</p>	Agricultural Land	It is noted that there is an extension to the consultation deadline for West Burton 4 to 23rd August 2022 in respect to Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) arising from soil sampling revealed differences against the information used about ALC in the PEIR. It is therefore imperative that sufficient soil samples are taken across all land to be used within proposed projects to	Yes	<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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.19].</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 4.07% of the land within the Sites classified as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land).</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.3.5] sets out the design evolution of the Scheme. This includes</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		ensure that no Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a land is taken out of food production should these projects proceed.		justification for removal of certain fields from the Scheme and retention of other limited areas of BMV.
Party ID: 184779 (Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board)	Hydrology, Flood risk and drainage	<p>Byelaw Number 3 states that:</p> <p><i>No person shall as a result of development (within the meaning of section 55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended ("the 1990 Act")) (whether or not such development is authorised by the 1990 Act or any regulation or order whatsoever or none of them) for any purpose by means of</i></p>	N/A	<p>Chapter 10 (Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.10] assesses the flood risk impacts of the Scheme. Areas of flood depth of more than 0.9m have been avoided entirely, with only non-vulnerable infrastructure to be located within areas of shallower than 0.9m flooding. Consultation with the Environment Agency has been undertaken to confirm this approach. No significant effects have been assessed in terms of the EIA regulations.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy has been produced by the Applicant for each of the solar Sites which demonstrate that flood risk will not be exacerbated as a result of their installation</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p><i>any channel, siphon, pipeline or sluice or by any other means whatsoever introduce any water into any watercourse in the District so as to directly or indirectly increase the flow or volume of water in any watercourse in the District (without the previous consent of the Board)."</i></p> <p><i>Consent will only be granted for the increase in flow to a watercourse where the Board is happy that in doing so no demonstrable harm will be caused. It may be the case that appropriate mitigations</i></p>		<p>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, such as 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> <p>The Applicant notes the Scheme will not have a detrimental impact of 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 (as detailed in sections 10.6 Embedded Mitigation and 10.8 Mitigation Measures of the Chapter 10 (Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.10] and throughout the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy). A detailed Drainage Strategy for</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p><i>are required to be put in place to either attenuate flow or to enhance the existing watercourse to ensure no detriment. If this is not possible alternative outfall locations may need to be considered.</i></p> <p>Early investigations have identified two areas of concern where historic flooding has occurred. These are Toft Dyke at Clayworth and Cuckstool Dyke, East of Ossington at Sutton on Trent. Further investigations on these watercourses should be considered</p>		<p>the proposed battery storage and substation area within Cottam 1 West (Detailed within Section 'Drainage Strategy' of the Annex) has been included in the DCO Application.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		as a part of the development process.		
Party ID: 184779 (Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board)	Hydrology, Flood risk and drainage	<p>Byelaw Number 10 states that:</p> <p><i>No person without the previous consent of the Board shall erect any building or structure, whether temporary or permanent, or plant any tree, shrub, willow or other similar growth within nine metres of the landward toe of the bank where there is an embankment or wall or within nine metres of the top of the batter where there is no embankment or wall, or where the</i></p>	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes that easements have been applied as necessary within the development masterplan, as detailed in section 10.6 'Embedded Mitigation' of Chapter 10 (Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.10].</p> <p>Panels to be set minimum of 20m from major watercourses and minimum of 8m from minor watercourses.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p><i>watercourse is enclosed within nine metres of the enclosing structure.</i></p> <p>This will relate primarily to the location of the arrays, compounds and transformer stations.</p>		
<p>Party ID: 184779</p> <p>(Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board)</p>	<p>Hydrology, Flood risk and drainage</p>	<p>Byelaw number 17 states that:</p> <p><i>No person shall without the previous consent of the Board -</i></p> <p><i>(a) place or affix or cause or permit to be placed or affixed any gas or water main or any pipe or appliance whatsoever or any electrical main or cable</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Noted. Protective provisions for the benefit of internal drainage boards have been included in Part 8 of Schedule 16 to the draft DCO. Discussions are ongoing with the IDB.</p> <p>The Applicant will work with the IDB when required, (for example. for necessary watercourse crossings). The Scheme is not anticipated to breach this byelaw.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p><i>or wire in, under or over any watercourse or in, over or through any bank of any watercourse;</i></p> <p><i>(b) cut, pare, damage or remove or cause or permit to be cut, pared, damaged or removed any turf forming part of any bank of any watercourse, or dig for or remove or cause or permit to be dug for or removed any stone, gravel, clay, earth, timber or other material whatsoever forming part of any bank of any watercourse or do or cause or permit to be done anything in, to or</i></p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p><i>upon such bank or any land adjoining such bank of such a nature as to cause damage to or endanger the stability of the bank;</i></p> <p><i>(c) make or cut or cause or permit to be made or cut any excavation or any tunnel or any drain, culvert or other passage for water in, into or out of any watercourse or in or through any bank of any watercourse;</i></p> <p><i>(d) erect or construct or cause or permit to be erected or constructed any fence, post, pylon, wall, wharf, jetty, pier, quay, bridge, loading</i></p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p><i>stage, piling, groyne, revetment or any other building or structure whatsoever in, over or across any watercourse or in or on any bank thereof;</i></p> <p><i>(e) place or fix or cause or permit to be placed or fixed any engine or mechanical contrivance whatsoever in, under or over any watercourse or in, over or on any bank of any watercourse in such a manner or for such length of time as to cause damage to the watercourse or banks thereof or obstruct the</i></p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p><i>flow of water in, into or out of such watercourse.</i></p> <p><i>Provided that this Byelaw shall not apply to any temporary work executed in an emergency but a person executing any work so excepted shall, as soon as practicable, inform the Board in writing of the execution and of the circumstances in which it was executed and comply with any reasonable directions the Board may give with regard thereto.</i></p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>Party ID: 184779</p> <p>(Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board)</p>	<p>Hydrology, Flood risk and drainage</p>	<p>Along the cable route ALL Board watercourses are to be crossed by HDD. The minimum depth of cover from hard bed level is 1.5m. However, from experience this would generally be closer to 3m for this type of crossing. This requirement should be covered by Protective Provisions within the DCO. This matter should be discussed further and in more detail as the proposed cable route is refined.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Given the length of the proposed cable, the Applicant notes it is not possible to avoid local watercourses be they Internal Drainage Board, Lead Local Flood Authority, or Environment Agency managed. A plan detailing the proposed watercourse crossings is included as Annex B of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010133/APP/C6.3.10.2].</p> <p>All watercourses will be crossed through directional drilling ensuring no impact to their operation and the appropriate consultee will be consulted as necessary to ensure appropriate permission is acquired prior to works commencing.</p> <p>Protective provisions for the benefit of internal drainage boards have been included in Part 8 of Schedule 16 to the draft DCO. Discussions are ongoing with the IDB.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>Party ID: 184779</p> <p>(Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board)</p>	<p>Hydrology, Flood risk and drainage</p>	<p>Any culverting or other works within the bed of any riparian watercourse within the Board's district be they temporary or permanent will also require consent.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Boards consent is required irrespective of any permission gained under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Board's consent will only be granted where proposals are not detrimental to the flow or stability of the watercourse/ culvert or the Board's machinery</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Noted. Protective provisions for the benefit of internal drainage boards have been included in Part 8 of Schedule 16 to the draft DCO. Discussions are ongoing with the IDB.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		access to the watercourse/ culvert which is required for annual maintenance, periodic improvement and emergency works.		
Party ID 193692 (Unregistered land 1227)	Consultation and engagement	Perhaps you could explain why I have received no acknowledgement or response to the completed phase two consultation form/questionnaire which I sent in hard copy form and on commonplace. I asked a number of questions and provided various comments about the PEIR etc and to date [the Applicant has] not had the courtesy or decency to provide any	N/A	<p>The Applicant is grateful to the consultee for responding to both the Section 42 and Section 47 consultation. The Applicant confirms the consultees feedback has been recorded and responded within Appendix 11.1 (Section 47 Applicant Response Table) of the Consultation Report [EN010133/APP/C5.1].</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that they have exchanged correspondence with the Applicant by email during the pre-application stage, and thank them for taking the time to attend a public information event to speak with members of their team during the phase two consultation period.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		kind of response to my queries. I guess this demonstrates the kind of company [the Applicant is] and the care and consideration the company has about concerned local residents whose lives they plan to totally disturb and disrupt.		
<p>Party ID 193694</p> <p>(Unregistered land 1227)</p>	General and Transport and Access	We do not want any disturbance to our quiet country life and/or the habitat and wildlife by any activities associated with [the Applicant] and their monstrous solar panels, and their ridiculous cable routes to Cottam or West Burton. In addition it is totally outrageous for	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes this feedback, and notes that these issues are considered and addressed throughout the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2].</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 [EN010133/APP/C6.2.8].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Scheme or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>[the Applicant] to expect local residents to accept the total disruption, these projects and the traffic associated with the construction, will have on their normal way of life.</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 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.9]. This includes Appendix 12, which shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of approximately 96%, with an approximate 70% gain of Hedgerow Units and approximately a 11% 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>Regarding traffic, Chapter 14 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010133/APP/C6.2.14] describes the Applicants assessment and consideration of vehicle routes and movements.</p>